## 1st off

### Increase not extend 1NC

#### A.Substantial increase means at least a doubling

Mormann ’11 (Fellow, Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, Stanford Law School.)

Felix 38 Ecology L.Q. 903

Innovation of the scale necessary for a timely transition to renewable sources of energy is not just risky, it is costly, too. If the United States wants to be a leader in renewables innovation and develop a strong domestic renewables industry, government funding for research, development, and demonstration (RD&D) must be increased substantially. Since 1997, numerous entities, including the International Energy Agency, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, and the National Commission on Energy Policy have called for substantial increases in federal spending on energy innovation. The spectrum of suggested increases ranges from a mere doubling to a tenfold raise. n186 In 2009, more than thirty Nobel Laureates called on President Obama to support stable energy innovation support at $ 15 billion per year. n187 In 2010, a group of industry leaders, including Bill Gates, Chad Holliday, and Ursula Burns, urged the U.S. government to raise its investment in clean energy innovation to $ 16 billion annually. n188 For comparison, in 2008, total U.S. spending on R&D for low-carbon energy technologies amounted to less than $ 2.5 billion. n189 This disconcertingly low figure includes funding not only for renewable and other sources of clean energy but also investment in energy efficiency as well as the building and transport sector. In fact, renewables accounted for fewer than 20 percent of the 2008 budget for energy RD&D funding, which amounts to less than $ 500 million. n190 Compared to its primary trading partners and [\*944] competitors, such as Japan, Korea, France, and China, the United States spends the smallest fraction of its gross domestic product on energy RD&D. n191

#### Extending duration of incentive is not increase

Lanier ’11 (exec.Dir. Jacksonville Boys & Girls Club)

http://www.coj.net/departments/special-services/docs/childrens-commission/about-us/jcc-board-minutes-6-15-11-(1).aspx

The Board is asked to approve a contract extension for Boy’s and Girl’s Clubs B.O.L.D. Afterschool program from June 30 to July 29. The agency is requesting an additional month to spend down the contracted amount. This extension does not increase or decrease the contract amount.

#### Ground. Their interp guts uniqueness ground for all our DAs. Our Interp allows any aff that substantially increase incentives over CURRENT levels.

#### Limits. Their interp justifies affs extending any current incentive with a sunset provision—which is most of them.

#### Topical version of the aff. They can extend current incentives, but that have to add to it, not simply extend the duration its offered.

#### Vote neg for fairness and education.

## 2nd off

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should terminate its Wind PTC in 2016.

#### Phasing out PTC solves and is politically popular

E&E News 6-12

“Building a bridge to zero -- questions swirl around design of wind incentive phaseout,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/EEDaily/2012/06/12/2>

Most renewable energy supporters agree that the boom-and-bust cycle created by reliance on temporary tax breaks and eleventh-hour extensions has not been an ideal arrangement, although lawmakers have been unable to agree on steadier forms of support.¶ The wind industry is the latest to face a potential bust if its prized tax incentive disappears as scheduled at the end of this year. While congressional aides predict the incentive will win a last-minute reprieve, attention in some policymaking circles has turned to an alternative arrangement with the potential to give the industry the certainty it desires while appeasing deficit hawks and skeptics of government backing for certain energy sources: a phaseout of the credit over a set period of years.¶ It remains an open question whether such a phaseout can gain traction this year. Most industry backers on and off Capitol Hill maintain a laser-like focus on winning an immediate extension to the production tax credit (PTC) for at least another year, noting that a sudden drop-off at the end of this year would cause tens of thousands of jobs to be lost while depriving the industry of billions of dollars in private investment.¶ But the idea is gaining favor with House Republicans -- who would have to sign off on any PTC extension -- and is seen as a real possibility for the wind industry. Executives and analysts predict electricity from turbines could compete with other sources of generation, without relying on subsidies, in as little as four to six years.

## 3rd off

#### Obama will win- Polls and economic rebound

Cook 9-22

Charlie is the director of the Cook Political Report and a Columnist for National Journal, “Obama’s Uptick,” <http://nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-uptick-20120920>

Reality is often more complicated than conventional wisdom would have you believe, a point underscored in the latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll. The survey showed President Obama with a 6-point lead among all registered voters, a 7-point edge among registered voters in 12 swing states, and a 5-point advantage among likely voters nationally. The Obama lead in the survey, no matter which set of numbers you focus on, is wider than in many other public polls, including the widely watched automated robo-polls, which are not allowed to dial cell phones. Such robo-polls miss entirely the 30 to 40 percent of the electorate who don’t have land-line phones or rarely use them. The robo-polls rely on respondents who are not representative of the broader public and undercount young and minority voters, who are more likely than other demographic groups to have only cell phones.¶ As widely different as the NBC/WSJ poll is from many other public polls, the numbers are very close to the 4- or 5-point Obama lead I have been picking up in recent days from top pollsters and strategists from both parties. Of course, this shouldn’t be too much of a shocker, as the NBC/WSJ poll is conducted jointly by Peter Hart, the preeminent Democratic pollster (although Hart no longer does political campaigns), and Bill McInturff, a founder and partner of Public Opinion Strategies, a highly respected Republican polling firm.¶ To be sure, other highly regarded polls showed Obama with a smaller lead. The Gallup tracking poll conducted Sept. 11-17 had the race narrowing to a single point, 47 percent to 46 percent, down from a 3-point Obama lead from the two previous days, and a separate Sept. 11-17 Gallup poll in 12 swing states showed Obama up by 2 points, 48 percent to 46 percent. The most recent CBS News/New York Times national poll put the Obama edge at 3 points, 49 percent to 46 percent. Fox News had it at 5 points, 48 percent to 43 percent. The debate is over the margin, not over who is ahead.¶ There has been a lot of news in the past few weeks with the potential to affect the presidential race, including the party conventions and the anti-American violence in the Middle East. Obama’s job-approval rating in the Hart/McInturff survey, conducted Sept. 12-16 among 900 registered voters (including 270 cell-phone-only respondents), ticked up by 2 points since the August survey, from 48 percent to 50 percent, with his disapproval number dropping by a point to 48 percent. Not a big shift, but if you are an incumbent seeking reelection, it’s nice to have a job-approval rating of 50 percent or higher.¶ Three sets of numbers in other questions might explain the uptick. In the key “right direction/wrong track” question, called the “Dow Jones indicator of American politics” by the late Dick Wirthlin, President Reagan’s pollster, the “right direction” jumped up 7 points since August, from 32 percent to 39 percent; the “wrong track” dropped 6 points, from 61 percent to 55 percent. Obama’s job approval on handling the economy ticked up 3 points to 47 percent, while disapproval dropped 3 points, to 51 percent, perhaps driven by stock-market gains and more optimism about housing. In other words, Obama went from a net minus 10 points in August to a net minus 4 points in September. When asked, “During the next 12 months, do you think that the nation’s economy will get better, get worse, or stay about the same?” the percentage of respondents saying they expected the economy to get better increased 6 points, to 42 percent; the “get worse” remained the same at 18 percent; and the share saying “stay about the same” declined to 32 percent. In another question, 51 percent said they thought that the economy is recovering (up a point from August) and those saying that it isn’t dropped a point, so the net responses citing economic recovery shifted slightly from a net 4 to a net 6 points. These aren’t big changes, but they are an improvement on what had been Obama’s biggest liability: the state of the economy and the public’s perception of his stewardship of it.¶ While all of this modestly good news for the president was occurring, however, his approval rating on handling foreign policy dropped 5 points in a month, from 54 percent to 49 percent, with his disapproval number rising from 40 percent to 46 percent. Clearly, what is happening abroad is making an impression on voters, but it is being offset by a cautiously improving view of where the country and economy are going.¶ Central to Mitt Romney’s challenge is that too many Americans either don’t like him or can’t figure out if they do. Only 38 percent of registered voters had a positive view of Romney (the same as last month), while 43 percent had a negative view, 1 point down from August. Romney’s underwater ratings—minus 6 points in August, minus 5 points in September—compare with Obama being plus 5 points in August and plus 6 points this month.¶ Equally dispiriting for Republicans are the responses to questions about which candidate would be better in dealing with three subjects: Medicare, taxes, and the economy. On Medicare, 47 percent said that Obama would be better, while 37 percent chose Romney. On taxes, Obama had a 6-point edge, 45 percent to 39 percent. And on the economy, the two men are now tied at 43 percent, compared with a 6-point Romney edge in July.¶ With six weeks to go before the election, this contest is certainly not over. But it is becoming increasingly clear that Romney needs something to happen to change the trajectory of this race. Right now, it isn’t heading in a good direction for him.

#### Environmental groups hate wind- species loss

Maxwell ’12

Veery is a third-year law student at UC Hastings, “Wind Energy Development: Can Wind Energy Overcome Substantial Hurdles to Reach the Grid,” West Northwest Journal of Environmental Law and Policy, 18 W.-N.W. J. Env. L. & Pol’y323, lexis

Environmental groups have also been opposed to wind development, particularly in sites inhabited by threatened or endangered species. It seems paradoxical that environmentalists actively oppose emission-free energy production. This incongruous conflict is driven by the fact that wind [\*330] turbines have been known to cause species mortality, and are often sited in rural areas that offer needed species habitat. [n44](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n44) This has caused environmental groups to pursue lawsuits under the Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Act, and other environmental protection statutes, in hopes of seeking an injunction against the wind farm construction and operations. [n45](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n45)¶ The Coastal Habitat Alliance sued a Texas wind developer in 2007, demanding an injunction to halt construction on a wind project adjoining the Laguna Madre, an environmentally sensitive bay between the Texas mainland and Padre Island. [n46](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n46) The Coastal Habitat Alliance alleged that the defendant developer impinged its rights under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 and the Texas Coastal Management Program by not holding public hearings or conducting appropriate environmental review on the wind farm. [n47](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n47) A federal court dismissed the case, holding the statutes did not confer a right of action on private parties. [n48](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n48) However, the case drew attention to the emerging issue of wind turbine siting in ecologically fragile areas.¶ In West Virginia, environmental plaintiffs were successful in halting operations of a wind farm sited in an area home to endangered Indiana bats. [n49](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n49) After exhaustive presentations by expert witnesses, the federal court found, "there is a virtual certainty that Indiana bats will be harmed, wounded, or killed imminently by the Beech Ridge Project, in violation of section 9 of the ESA ...." [n50](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n50) The court held that until the developer undergoes the Incidental Take Permitting process through the Fish and Wildlife Service, no new turbines could be approved by the agencies or constructed for the project. [n51](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n51)¶ The Beech Ridge case was the first wind farm conflict decided under the Endangered Species Act, and demonstrates the need for federal agencies to actively oversee the development of wind farms. [n52](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n52) In order to avoid costly litigation at every turn, the Beech Ridge holding shows that the myriad of federal agencies involved in approving wind farms must develop comprehensive standardized siting and permitting criteria. While the Fish [\*331] and Wildlife Service has been spearheading a collaborative effort to develop wind farm guidelines, only draft voluntary siting guidelines have been published. [n53](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n53)¶ The two most noteworthy examples of environmental groups opposing wind farms, differ dramatically in terms of location, technology, rationale of opposition, and timing. However, in both cases the wind developer has continued to press forward with development and operations. The first case involves the Altamont Pass, located just east of the San Francisco Bay Area, which was a massive experiment in wind energy begun in the 1970s. [n54](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n54) The second case involves the Cape Wind project, which is more modest in size, but located in a high-visibility area of Nantucket Sound. [n55](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1344988943875&returnToKey=20_T15322965001&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.221529.4818699054" \l "n55) The projects are instructive as to the broad range of claims opponents have levied against wind farms. Both cases have directly and indirectly driven a host of solutions to the environmental and local problems generated by wind farms.

#### The environmental vote will decide the election

Lehrer, 12

(Eli, "How Mitt Romney can win the environmental vote", 6/11, Huffington Post,¶ http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/-http://rstreet.org/op-ed/how-mitt-romney-can-win-the-environmental-vote/

Since the (few) positives in Obama’s record and the incumbency are unalterable, the Romney camp can only win by shaving parts of Obama’s base.¶ And environmentalists are one place big place where it could work. Stanford University researchers have found that about 38 million Americans care a lot about the environment and might vote on it. Assuming that environmental voters turn out at roughly the same rate as other citizens who can vote, this means that somewhere between 15% and 19% of the electorate will vote partly on environmental issues.¶ Although there’s no current, detailed polling, it’s likely that Obama currently stands to get around 75% of this group — taking 50% of it would probably be enough to put Romney over the top. So how can he do it?

#### China label kills relations and the economy

Roach 8-28

Stephen is a lecturer at Yale University’s School of Management and Jackson Institute for International Affairs. He is also a Senior executive with Morgan Stanley, “How Romney Could go Wrong from Day 1,” <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/c74802de-f0f9-11e1-89b2-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25ue916Yz>

True to his word as a candidate, a few hours after taking office as US president on January 20, 2013, Mitt Romney issued his first executive order, declaring China guilty of currency manipulation. In accordance with the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, President Romney’s act triggered immediate negotiations between US and Chinese officials. But the negotiations stalled and both parties blamed the other in press releases.¶ In early February, in his first State of the Union address, Mr Romney said: “Enough is enough. It is high time for China to play by our rules.” Congress roared its approval and within a week, overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses passed the Defend America Trade Act of 2013. Modelled on the currency manipulation “remedies” of countervailing tariffs first proposed in 2005, DATA was signed into law on President’s Day, February 18 2013. China was quickly deemed to be in violation of the new statute.¶ More¶ At that point negotiations took on a new urgency. But the new leaders in both countries were in no mood for compromise and the talks failed. In accordance with the provisions of DATA, Washington slapped immediate tariffs of 20 per cent on all Chinese products entering the US.¶ As plants shut down across China, Beijing declared this to be an act of economic war and filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization. Li Keqiang, newly installed as premier, announced after the National People’s Congress in March that China had no patience to endure a WTO dispute process that could take anywhere from two to five years to run its course.¶ China’s Ministry of Commerce then announced retaliatory tariffs of 20 per cent on all US exports to China. This hit growth-starved America right between the eyes. With $104bn of American-made goods sold in Chinese markets in 2011, China had become the US’s third-largest and its fastest-growing export market. To add insult to injury, China-dependent Walmart announced average price increases of 5 per cent. Other retailers followed suit. Talk of stagflation was in the air and hard-pressed American consumers hunkered down further.¶ US financial markets swooned. The stock market was hit by pressures on profit margins, growth and inflation. The bond market was also unnerved by the realisation that the Federal Reserve was seriously behind the curve. With good reason. After its meeting in June 2013, the Fed reaffirmed its ever-extending commitment to keep its benchmark policy rate near zero through 2015, and even dangled the possibility of yet another round of quantitative easing, QE4. Yields on 10-year Treasuries moved back above 4 per cent and stocks fell sharply further.¶ Feeling the heat from financial markets, Washington turned up the heat on China. Mr Romney called Congress back from its Independence Day holiday into a special session. By unanimous consent, Congress passed an amendment to DATA – upping the tariffs on China by another 10 percentage points.¶ At that point an indignant China turned to its own version of the big bazooka. The biggest foreign buyer of US debt was nowhere to be seen at the Treasury’s August 2013 auction. Long-term interest rates spiked and within weeks yields on 10-year Treasuries hit 7 per cent. The dollar plunged and the US stock market went into free fall.¶ Just like that, the so-called exorbitant privilege of the haven asset vanished. When asked at a press conference why China would willingly engage in actions that would undermine the value of more than $2tn in Treasuries and other dollar-based holdings, Zhou Xiaochuan, retiring governor of the People’s Bank of China, said: “This is not about risk-adjusted portfolio returns. We are defending our people against an act of economic war.”¶ By the autumn of 2013 there was little doubt of the severity of renewed recession in the US. Trade sanctions on China had backfired. Beleaguered American workers paid the highest price of all, as the unemployment rate shot back up above 10 per cent. A horrific policy blunder had confirmed that there was no bilateral fix for the multilateral trade imbalance of a savings-starved US economy.¶ In China, growth had slipped below the dreaded 6 per cent threshold and the new leadership was rolling out yet another investment stimulus for a still unbalanced and unstable Chinese economy. As the global economy slipped back into recession, the Great Crisis of 2008-09 suddenly looked like child’s play. Globalisation itself hung in the balance.¶ History warns us never to say never. We need only look at the legacy of US Senator Reed Smoot and Representative Willis Hawley, who sponsored the infamous Tariff Act of 1930 – America’s worst economic policy blunder. Bad dreams can – and have – become reality.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Harris and Burrows, 09 –

PhD in European History @ Cambridge and Counselor of the US National Intelligence Council AND Member of the National Intelligence Council’s Long Range Analysis Unit (Mathew J. and Jennifer, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis,” April, Washington Quarterly, <http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr_Burrows.pdf>)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the **Great Depression** is not likely to be repeated, the **lessons** to be drawn from that period **include the harmful effects on** **fledgling** **democracies** and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) **and** on the sustainability of **multilateral institutions** (think League of Nations in the same period). **There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first** as much as in the twentieth **century.** For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for greater conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt **in a** constantly **volatile economic environment** as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism**’s appeal **will decline if** economic **growth continues** in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the **diffusion of technologies** and scientific knowledge **will place** some of **the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach**. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity **conflict** and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella **could lead to an unintended escalation** and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close **proximity of** potential **nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions **may place more focus on preemption** rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises**. 36 Types of **conflict** that the world continues to experience, such as **over resources, could reemerge,** particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. **Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity** will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this **could result in interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, **cooperation** to manage changing water resources **is** likely to be increasingly **difficult** both within and between states **in a** more **dog-eat-dog world.**

## 4th off

#### THE WORKING CLASS MUST COALESCE IN MATERIAL ACTION AGAINST FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION ESPECIALLY IN THE CONTEXT OF ENERGY PLANNING. THE AFF’S NOTION OF AGENCY UNIQUELY UNDERMINES THE MATERIALIST ANTI-CAPITALIST REVOLUTIONARY KNOWLEDGE KEY TO SURVIVAL.

Callinicos 2k10

[Alex, Bonfire of Illusions: The Twin Crisis of the Liberal World, Polity, professor of European studies King’s College – London, DPhil – Oxford, p. 139-43]

There are other strong reasons to press for a break with the logic of competitive accumulation. The scientific evi-dence that the emission of greenhouse gases - most notably C02 - caused by human activity is generating profound and irreversible processes of climate change is now beyond dispute. It is also very widely agreed that preventing these processes reaching a disastrous scale requires the rapid adoption and implementation of drastic targets for cutting CO2 emissions. But while the targets, particularly since the eclipse of the Bush gang, have become more ambitious, the actual emissions have continued to rise. The most plausible explanation appeals to the logic of competition.

The problem is, yet again, one of collective action. Evi- dently it is in everyone's interest to avoid drastic climate change. But no individual capital or state is willing to shoulder the additional costs involved in moving to a low- carbon economy. In international negotiations, the leading states play a game of pass-the-parcel - the US demanding that India and China adopt tough targets, the latter asking why they should bear the burden of two centuries of industrialization mainly in the North. The EU, despite its pre- tensions to be a master of 'soft power' that has transcended bad old nationalism, is particularly ineffectual. Germany has vocally and largely successfully defended its car firms against what they regarded as excessively tough targets. And the economic crisis has provided many governments with a perfect excuse to go slow in reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The logic of competitive accumulation here threatens the future of the human species.20 The implication is that any sustainable alternative to •capitalism has to be based, not on the market, but on democratic planning. In a democratically planned economy the allocation of resources would be the outcome of a democratic political process that would set overall priori- ties for the economy. There are some models of how this could work. One is Albert's Parecon, or participatory economics. This involves an economy of workers' and consumers' councils in which individuals and enterprises submit proposals for their share of society's resources and a process of gradual adjustments (Albert calls them 'iterations') takes place while technical experts come up with a plan that would give everyone as much as possible of what they want. The main weakness of this model is that it mimics a bit too closely the workings of a market economy, in which claims on resources are driven by individual demands. Albert is an anarchist, and his commitment to decentralization here goes too far. The allocation of society's resources isn't a neutral technical issue. It's a political question that requires some sort of collective and democratic decision-making process to choose between what would often be competing views of the priorities of the society in question. From this perspective, Pat Devine offers a superior model of what he calls negotiated coordination. Here the allocation of resources is largely the outcome of discussion between producers, consumers and other affected groups, but within the framework of overall decisions about economic priorities made democratically at the national and international level.21 Plainly there is much more to be said - and, above all, to be done - about democratic planning. All the same, the importance of the kind of work being done by Albert Devine and others is that they begin to break down the prejudice against planning and to sketch out how an economy that rejected the market could manage to be both democratic and efficient. But any break with capitalism couldn't take the form of an instantaneous leap into a fully planned economy. Marx long ago argued in the 'Critique of the Gotha Programme' that a new workers' state would inherit a society deeply marked by capitalism. Initially, it would have to make compromises with the old order, and gradually move towards a society governed by the communist principle 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!'22 Similarly today a government breaking with capitalism would need to make a decisive shift towards an economy in which priorities were decided democratically rather than left to the anarchy of competition. This would involve critically taking control of the financial markets, nationalizing under workers' control key sectors of the economy, and extending social provision on the basis of a progressive tax system that redistributed wealth and income from rich to poor. These measures, radical though they are, would still leave in place many aspects of a market economy. Large sectors would remain in private hands. Continuous pressure and the introduction of new mea- sures would be necessary to move the economy as a whole towards the principles of democratic planning. One key step would be to weaken the power of the capitalist labour market, which today rules our lives. In my view, the best way to do this would be to intro- duce universal direct income. In other words, every resi- dent of the country would receive, as of right, an income that met their basic needs at a relatively low but neverthe- less decent level. This would serve two goals. First, it would ensure a basic level of welfare for everyone much more efficiently than existing systems of social provision. (People with greater needs because they had children or were disabled or whatever would receive a higher basic income.) Secondly, having a guaranteed basic income would greatly reduce the pressure on individuals to accept whatever job was on offer on the labour market. One of the main presuppositions of capitalism - that workers have no acceptable alternative to wage labour - would be removed. The balance of power between labour and capital would shift towards the workers, irrespective of the nature of their employer.23 More broadly, the question of power is crucial. One obvious challenge to the kind of vision of change I have just sketched out is how to ensure that the direction of change would be towards a democratically planned economy rather than back to market capitalism or maybe to the kind of state capitalism that ended up dominating the Soviet Union. The only guarantee that counts is that levers of political power are in the hands of the workers and the poor themselves. As long as the state takes the form that it does today, of a bureaucratically organized, hierarchical set of apparatuses whose managers' interests are bound up with those of capital, any improvement in society can only be temporary and fragile. This is why the strategy of ignoring the state advocated by Holloway is so badly mistaken. If we are to move towards a democratically planned economy, then the existing state has to be confronted and broken. This task can only be achieved through the development of a different kind of power, one based on the self- organization of workers and other poor people that devel- ops out of their struggles against capital. The great revolutionary movements of the twentieth century offered some glimpses of this power - from the workers' and sol- diers' councils of the Russian Revolution of October 1917 to the workers' shoras during the Iranian Revolution of 1978-9. The self-organization displayed by the Bolivian popular movement during the insurrections of October 2003 and May-June 2005 showed that the contemporary movements against neoliberalism can generate this kind of power as well.24 A democratically planned economy would be the core of a self-managing society, one in which directly elected workplace and neighbourhood councils took responsibil- ity for their own affairs and linked together to make deci- sions for society at large. The key insight that Marx had during the Paris Commune of 1871 was that these forms of organization would develop before the new society was created, in the process of fighting the old society. The same methods of self-organization that would be the basis of a self-managing society are needed by the exploited and oppressed to resist and, ultimately, to overthrow capital itself. The overthrow of capital is itself a process. The dilemma that Albert imagines confronting a workers' cooperative in a market economy would face any society that was beginning to introduce the principles of democratic plan- ning in a world still ruled by capitalism. It was responsible for the corruption and eventual destruction of the Russian Revolution of October 1917. Any breakthrough in one part of the world could only survive by spreading and progressively overturning the logic of capital on a global scale. The globalization of capital has produced a global- ization of resistance. Struggles in different parts of the world contaminate each other. Chiapas and Seattle had global reverberations. The two European countries with the most advanced and combative social movements, France and Greece, have exerted a degree of mutual influ- ence on one another. The movements in Latin America have become a beacon to all those fighting neoliberalism. "We are still a very long way from overturning capitalism even in one country. Indeed, the more one seeks to elabo- rate on the shape of an alternative to capitalism the more one is overawed by the immensity of the task. The biggest immediate obstacle that confronts anyone seeking to address it is the chronic political weakness of the radical anticapitalist left on a global scale. Nevertheless, the present crisis has torn a huge hole in neoliberalism both as an ideology and as a mode of organizing capital- ism. The market no longer seems like a second nature unamenable to change or control. Those who are prepared to seize this moment boldly can help to ensure that the boundaries of the possible really are widened, allowing the billions of victims of capitalism finally to escape.

#### Text: VOTE NEGATIVE TO REJECT THE 1AC IN FAVOR OF MATERIALIST REVOLUTIONARY KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AGAINST CAPITALISM.

#### AND, ECOLOGICAL CATASTROPHE NECESSITATES MATERIALIST REVOLUTIONARY DIALECTICS AGAINST CAPITALISM’S EXPLOITATION TO ENSURE SURVIVAL.

Foster 2k11

[john bellamy,  professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review, Since the Great Financial Crisis hit in 2008, Foster has been sought out by academics, activists, the media, and the general public as a result of his earlier prescient writings on the coming crisis. He has given numerous interviews, talks, and invited lectures, as well as written invited commentary, articles, and books on the subject]

In the twenty-first century it is customary to view the rise of planetary ecological problems as a surprising development scarcely conceivable prior to the last few decades. It is here, however, that we have the most to learn from the analysis of nineteenth-century thinkers who played a role in the development of ecology, including both early ecological scientists and classical historical materialists. Science has long warned of the negative, destructive side of the human transformation of the earth—a warning which the system, driven by its own imperatives, has continually sought to downplay. Indeed, what distinguishes our time from earlier centuries is not so much the conservation of catastrophe, which has long been recognized, but rather the accelerated pace at which such destruction is now manifesting itself, i.e., what I am calling the accumulation of catastrophe. The desertification arising in pre-capitalist times, partly through human action, manifested itself over centuries, even millennia. Today changes in the land, the atmosphere, the oceans, indeed the entire life-support system of the earth, are the product of mere decades. If in the past, Darwin was struck that in a mere three centuries after European colonization, the ecology of the island of St. Helena had been destroyed to the point that it was reduced to “desert”—today, in only two generations, we have altered the biogeochemical processes of the entire planet.28The absence of a historical perspective on the conservation, even accumulation, of catastrophe is a major barrier to needed change in our time. Many environmentalists, including some who perceive themselves as being on the left, persist in believing that we can address our immense and growing ecological problems without altering our fundamental social-production relationships. All that is necessary in this view is the combined magic of green technology and green markets. Short-term fixes are presumed to be adequate solutions, while society remains on the same essential course as before. Indeed, the dominant perspective on ecology can be characterized, I believe, as consisting of three successive stages of denial: (1) the denial altogether of the planetary ecological crisis (or its human cause); (2) the denial that the ecological crisis is fundamentally due to the system of production in which we live, namely capitalism; and (3) the denial that capitalism is constitutionally incapable of overcoming this global ecological threat—with capital now being presented instead as the savior of the environment.The first stage of ecological denial is easy to understand. This is the form of denial represented by Exxon-Mobil. Such outright denial of the destructive consequences of their actions is the automatic response of corporations generally when faced with the prospect of environmental regulations, which would negatively affect their bottom lines. It is also the form of absolute denial promoted by climate-change denialists themselves, who categorically reject the reality of human agency in global climate change. The second stage of denial, a retreat from the first, is to admit there is a problem,while dissociating it from the larger socioeconomic system. The famous IPAT formula, i.e. Environmental Impact = Population x Consumption x Technology (which amounts to saying that these are the three factors behind our environmental problems/solutions), has been used by some to suggest that population growth, the consumption habits of most individuals, and inappropriate technology carry the totality of blame for environmental degradation. The answer then is sustainable population, sustainable consumption, and sustainable technology. This approach, though seemingly matter-of-fact, and deceptively radical, derives its acceptability for the vested interests from the fact that it generally serves to disguise the more fundamental reality of the treadmill of capitalist production itself.29 The third stage of denial, a last-ditch defense, and exhibiting a greater level of desperation on the part of the established order, is, I would argue, the most dangerous of all. It admits that the environmental crisis is wrapped up with the existence of capitalism, but argues that what we need is an entirely new kind of capitalism: variously called “sustainable capitalism,” “green capitalism,” “natural capitalism,” and “climate capitalism” by thinkers as various as Al Gore, Paul Hawken, Amory and L. Hunter Lovins, and Jonathon Porritt.30 The argument here varies but usually begins with the old trope that capitalism is the most efficient economic system possible—a form of “spontaneous order” arising from an invisible hand—and that the answer to ecological problems is to make it more efficient still by internalizing costs on the environment previously externalized by the system. Aside from the presumed magic of the market itself, and moral claims as to “the greening of corporations,” this is supposed to be achieved by means of a black box of technological wonders. Implicit in all such views is the notion that capitalism can be made sustainable, without altering its accumulation or economic growth imperative and without breaking with the dominant social relations. The exponential growth of the system ad infinitum is possible, we are told, while simultaneously generating a sustainable relation to the planet. to the planet. This of course runs up against what Herman Daly has called the Impossibility Theorem: If the whole world were to have an ecological footprint the size of the United States we would need multiple planets.31 The idea that such a development process can persist permanently on a single planet (and indeed that we are not at this point already confronting earthly limits) is of course an exercise in delusion, bordering on belief in the supernatural. “Capitalism,” as the great environmental economist K. William Kapp once wrote, is “an economy of unpaid costs.”32 It can persist and even prosper only insofar as it is able to externalize its costs on the mass of the population and the surrounding environment. Whenever the destruction is too severe the system simply seeks to engineer another spatial fix. Yet, a planetary capitalism is from this standpoint a contradiction in terms: it means that there is nowhere finally to externalize the social and environmental costs of capitalist destruction (we cannot ship our toxic waste into outer space!), and no external resources to draw upon in the face of the enormous squandering of resources inherent to the system (we can’t solve our problems by mining the moon!).

Market-based solutions to climate change, such as emissions trading, have been shown to promote profits, and to facilitate economic growth and financial wealth, while increasing carbon emissions. From an environmental standpoint, therefore, they are worse than nothing—since they stand in the way of effective action. Nor are the technologies most acceptable to the system (since not requiring changes in property relations) the answer. So-called “clean coal” or carbon capture and storage technologies are economically unfeasible and ecologically dubious, and serve mainly as an ideological justification for keeping coal-fired plants going. Worse still, are geoengineering schemes like dumping sulfur particles in the atmosphere or iron filings in the ocean (the first in order to deflect the sun’s rays, the second in order to promote algal growth to increase ocean absorption of carbon). These schemes carry with them the potential for even greater ecological disasters: in the first case, this could lead to a reduction of photosynthesis, in the second the expansion of dead zones. Remember the Sorcerer’s Apprentice!33 The potential for the accumulation of catastrophe on a truly planetary level as a result of geoengineering technology is so great that it would be absolute folly to proceed in this way—simply in order to avoid changes in the mode of production, i.e., a fundamental transformation of our way of life, property relations, and metabolism with nature. Science tells us that we are crossing planetary boundaries everywhere we look, from climate change, to ocean acidification, to species destruction, to freshwater shortages, to chemical pollution of air, water, soil, and humans. The latest warning sign is the advent of what is called “extreme weather”—a direct outgrowth of climate change. As Hansen says: “Global warming increases the intensity of droughts and heat waves, and thus the area of forest fires. However, because a warmer atmosphere holds more water vapor, global warming must also increase the intensity of the other extreme of the hydrologic cycle—meaning heavier rains, more extreme floods, and more intense storms driven by latent heat.” Scientists involved in the new area of climate-attribution science, where extreme weather events are examined for their climate signatures, are now arguing that we are rapidly approaching a situation where the proverbial “‘hundred-year’ flood” no longer occurs simply once a century, but every few years. Natural catastrophes are thus likely to become more severe and more frequent occurrences in the lives of all living beings. The hope of some scientists is that this will finally wake up humanity to its true danger.34 How are we to understand the challenge of the enormous accumulation of catastrophe, and the no less massive human action required to address this? In the 1930s John Maynard Keynes wrote an essay entitled “Economic Possibilities of Our Grandchildren,” aimed at defending capitalism in response to revolutionary social challenges then arising. Keynes argued that we should rely for at least a couple more generations on the convenient lie of the Smithian invisible hand—accepting greed as the basis of a spontaneous economic order. We should therefore continue the pretense that “fair is foul and foul is fair” for the sake of the greater accumulation of wealth in society that such an approach would bring. Eventually, in the time of our “grandchildren”—maybe a “hundred years” hence (i.e., by the early 2030s)—Keynes assumed, the added wealth created by these means would be great enough that we could begin to tell the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. It would then be necessary for humanity to address the enormous inequalities and injustices produced by the system, engaging in a full-scale redistribution of wealth, and a radical transformation of the ends of production.35 Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is fairer—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

## Econ

#### New bond program to help the economy

Seeking Alpha, 9/17

[“QE3 Should Be Good For The Economy, U.S. Consumers” http://seekingalpha.com/article/867331-qe3-should-be-good-for-the-economy-u-s-consumers]

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke delivered what the markets yearned for, another round of quantitative easing.¶ ¶ At the end of its two-day meeting on Thursday, the Fed announced the launch of a new bond buying program. This is the third round of bond buying program that the Fed has implemented in its efforts to stimulate the U.S. economy. QE3, as the new bond buying program is popularly known as, is the Fed's most aggressive stimulus program since the financial crisis of 2009.¶ ¶ The Fed said that it will purchase $40 billion of mortgage-backed debt each month until there is a significant improvement in the labor market. With this, the central bank has basically put economic growth ahead of its mandate of maintaining price stability. Chairman Bernanke said that the Fed is looking for ongoing, sustained improvement in the labor market.¶ ¶ Bernanke had raised concerns over the labor market at the Fed's annual symposium last month, and hinted that the central bank was open to another round of quantitative easing. As I had said previously, the Fed would likely go ahead with another round of quantitative easing if the August nonfarm payrolls data is weak. The report released last week showed that nonfarm payrolls rose only 96,000 in August. With such dismal numbers, there was no way that the central bank was going to hold back.¶ ¶ Risk assets rallied on Thursday as investors cheered Bernanke's decision, with the benchmark indexes in U.S. finishing at multi-year highs. Gold prices also surged and are close to their 2012 high. Risk assets had rallied in the previous two rounds of quantitative easing, so the rally on Thursday does not come as a surprise. The Fed's decision to implement QE3 is likely to result in a strong year-end rally in equity markets. But the big question is: will QE3 have the desired impact on the economy? I think it will.

#### Manufacturing sector dead now

AP, 9/4

[“Manufacturing Activity Declined in August” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/05/business/economy/us-factory-output-shrinks.html]

WASHINGTON (AP) — American factory activity shrank for the third straight month in August as new orders, production and employment all fell. The report adds to other signs that manufacturing is struggling around the globe as the economy remains sluggish. ¶ The Institute for Supply Management, a trade group of purchasing managers, said on Tuesday that its index of manufacturing activity fell to 49.6. That’s down from 49.8 in July and the lowest reading in three years. A reading below 50 indicates contraction.¶ Weak consumer spending and steady declines in business orders for large machinery and other capital goods are slowing factory output.¶ The report followed other data that showed manufacturing has slowed overseas. A measure of factory activity in China fell to its lowest level in more than three years last month. Manufacturing in Europe has also stagnated.¶ In another sign of slow growth, a separate report showed that construction spending fell in July by the largest amount in a year.¶ Paul Dales, senior United States economist at Capital Economics, said uncertainty caused by the recession in Europe, the slowdown in Asia and impending tax increases and spending cuts in the United States “is taking its toll on activity.”¶ Mr. Dales told clients that the latest reading of the I.S.M. factory index was consistent with “growth in the third quarter of between 1.5 percent and 2 percent.”¶ The manufacturing index typically needs to fall to about 43 to suggest the broader economy is shrinking, according to the I.S.M. Growth at or below 2 percent is not enough to significantly lower the unemployment rate, which was 8.3 percent in July. The Labor Department will report on August employment on Friday.¶ American factories have been a crucial source of jobs and growth since the recession ended in June 2009. But the sector has shown signs of weakness in recent months.

#### Wind affects 58,000 jobs- Congressional investigation of data proves

Linowes ’12

Executive Director of the Industrial Wind Action Group, “Wind Energy Jobs: Are the Numbers Pulled from Thin Air,” <http://www.dailyenergyreport.com/2012/07/wind-energy-jobs-are-the-numbers-pulled-from-thin-air/>

The American Wind Energy Association has made extending the Production Tax Credit (‘PTC’) its primary focus this year. Documents available on the trade group’s website show that about $4 million of its 2012 budget ($30 million) was directed toward securing extension of the PTC. With job growth the number one political issue in the United States, AWEA’s strategic plan calls for rebranding of the wind industry as an economic engine that will produce steady job growth, particularly in the manufacturing sector.¶ The problem for AWEA is that the industry’s own record on job growth lacks credibility. Accurate information available in the public suggests the industry has inflated its overall job numbers.¶ Section 1603 and Jobs¶ Seventy-five percent of the Section 1603 largesse was lavished on big wind, yet, despite billions in public funding, the wind sector experienced a net loss of 10,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2010 bringing AWEA’s reported total to 75,000 jobs[1].¶ In April, NREL released its estimates of direct and indirect jobs created by projects receiving 1603 funding. The agency relied on the JEDI model[2] to estimate gross jobs, earnings, and economic output supported through the construction and operation of solar photovoltaic (PV) and large wind projects.¶ But an investigation by the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations rightly objected to NREL’s conclusions. The Subcommittee found that NREL overstated the number of jobs created under 1603, that it failed to report on the more important net job creation, and ignored potential jobs that would be created given alternative spending of Federal funds. The key sticking point was that NREL did not validate its models using actual data from completed projects.¶ The Subcommittee concluded that models used to estimate job creation were no substitute for actual data and added: “The Section 1603 grant program was sold to the American people as a necessary stimulus jobs program, and yet, the Treasury and Energy Departments do not have the numbers to back up the Obama Administration’s claims of its success in creating jobs.”¶ The problem with JEDI¶ A footnote in NREL’s report provides a useful explanation for why the JEDI model offers no meaningful information when assessing the employment benefits of government subsidies.¶ The footnote states:¶ As a gross analysis, this analysis does not include impacts from displaced energy or associated jobs, earnings, and output related to existing or planned energy generation resources (e.g., jobs lost in the operation of natural gas or coal plants due to the need for less electricity production from these plants, given increased generation from wind) or increases or decreases in jobs related to changes in electric utility revenues and consumer energy bills, among other impacts.¶ In other words, the model is one-sided, only considering the benefit side of a cost-benefit comparison and ignores everything else.¶ Validating AWEA Job Data¶ So what data do we have on wind industry jobs? Not much.¶ Apparently, AWEA is the only source of nationwide employment statistics in the United States for wind-related jobs. Of thepurported 75,000 direct and indirect jobs, the majority (around 60%) work in finance and consulting services, contracting and engineering services, and transportation and logistics. Twenty thousand are employed in wind-related manufacturing with the remaining jobs tied to construction and O&M.¶ But validating this information is not possible since no industry codes exist that isolate wind power establishments or wind turbine and wind components establishments. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) bundles wind-related manufacturers under the same code as the “Turbine and Turbine Generator Set Units” manufacturing industry (NAICS 333611), which includes “establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing turbines (except aircraft) and complete turbine generator set units, such as steam, hydraulic, gas, and wind.”¶ At the end of 2010, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported 26,800 total jobs in this industry. It’s not credible that AWEA’s estimated manufacturing jobs could represent the vast majority of employment under the NAICS 333611 classification.[3]¶ Navigant’s Magic¶ In December, Navigant Consulting, Inc. released a study commissioned by AWEA that analyzed the impact of the PTC on job growth in the wind industry. Navigant considered two scenarios, one where the PTC is extended for 4 years (2013-2016); the other where the PTC expires at the end of this year.¶ The study found that extension of the PTC would provide a stable economic environment and allow the wind industry to grow to nearly 100,000 American jobs over four years, including a jump to 46,000 manufacturing positions. Expiration of the PTC showed a loss of 37,000 jobs.¶ The message to Congress was clear: extend the PTC or you will be blamed for American jobs being lost.¶ But statements by AWEA prompted us to look at the numbers more closely. In May, AWEA’s Denise Bode told Windpower Monthly that “Of the estimated 75,000 wind jobs, at least 30,000 are manufacturing jobs”. Somehow, wind manufacturing jobs jumped by 10,000 after Navigant released its report.¶ Where did the additional jobs come from?¶ As it turns out, Navigant tabulated direct and indirect jobs but also quietly added INDUCED jobs — those jobs created when the overall level of spending in an economy rises due to workers newly receiving incomes.¶ Addition of ‘induced employment’ is a radical departure from job figures previously provided by AWEA. All prior reports, as well as the newer NREL study, only looked at direct and indirect jobs. We could find no documentation that explained this change nor was the change footnoted in the Navigant study.¶ In looking at the Navigant numbers, it appears the wind industry currently only provides 58,000 direct and indirect jobs, not 75,000! A four-year extension of the PTC could result in a possible 70,000 direct and indirect jobs — 5,000 less than the number touted by AWEA before it started including induced jobs.¶ Conclusion¶ The change in job counts raises serious credibility issues about the industry’s employment strength. But the absolute numbers tell only a piece of the story. Since Navigant’s study is based on JEDI, the job figures represent gross numbers and do not consider them in the context of the larger economy. In that sense, Navigant’s findings, like NREL’s study, tell us nothing about the true impact of the PTC.¶ But one thing does appear to be true: AWEA’s job figures, dating back to least 2009, may be nothing more than figures pulled from thin air.¶ UPDATE: Windaction spoke with a representative of Navigant who suggested AWEA might have been treating ‘induced jobs’ as ‘indirect jobs’ in its prior reports. If the case, this would not explain the jump in manufacturing jobs. AWEA now supports Navigant’s job numbers.

#### Global economy structurally resilient—data proves

Globe and Mail ‘10

(5/31/10, BRIAN MILNER, "While gloom says bear, TIGER points to bull", lexis, WEA)

Even at the height of the remarkable rebound of 2009 that brought stocks back from the dead zone, the bears never retreated to their lairs. Negative sentiment among investors remained stubbornly high, no matter how promising the economic indicators looked. And then along came the Greeks and their little sovereign debt problem, the Chinese and their public hand-wringing over asset bubbles and the North Koreans and their latest idiotic sabre-ratting to remind nervous markets just how fragile the nascent global recovery could turn out to be. The latest survey of American investors last week showed bearish sentiment hovering close to 30 per cent, with plenty of room for an uptick in the months ahead, as the optimists come to realize that a V-shaped recovery was never in the cards after the worst global financial and economic crisis since the Great Depression. The world's most overexposed permabear, Nouriel Roubini, is still grabbing headlines with his dire Greece-is-just-the-tip-of-the-iceberg warnings. (Well, he does have a new book to sell.) And such high-profile Canadian bruins as gold-loving money manager Eric Sprott and eminent strategist and data miner David Rosenberg have never veered from their sombre outlooks. The fact that May turned into a particularly brutal month for just about everything but U.S. Treasuries - even after last week's modest rebound, the Dow posted its worst performance for the month in 70 years - only added fuel to arguments that worse, much worse, is yet to come. I mention all this to Eswar Prasad, when I reach the Cornell University economics professor at his hotel in Beijing. Prof. Prasad is a noted China watcher who once headed the IMF's China division and still keeps in close touch with top government finance officials. But on this call, I'm more interested in one of his other hats as a shrewd analyst of global economic and market trends. "My inclination also is to be a bear," the affable academic says. "But the data don't support my bearishness as much as I would like. One has to be a little cautious, because these are based on a variety of indicators. Some of them certainly show more strength than I had realized." The data he's talking about come out of his work on a new composite index derived from a broad set of economic, market and confidence measures in the G20 countries and designed to provide a quarterly snapshot of the global recovery. "All signs are that the recovery has some momentum," says Prof. Prasad, who developed the index at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank where he is also a senior fellow. "But I wouldn't call it solid enough momentum that we can consider it 'in the bag.'" The new index, cutely named TIGER (Tracking Indices for the Global Economic Recovery), is a joint effort by Brookings and the Financial Times. And TIGER shows that since the world began climbing out of the deep trough about the middle of last year, big emerging economies have roared ahead, while the developed world has experienced much more uneven results. Industrial production and trade have bounced back handsomely - total exports from the big emerging countries now exceed pre-crisis levels - but the employment picture remains cloudy and consumption has yet to develop a new head of steam. "It's much easier at this stage to list all the things that could derail the recovery," Prof. Prasad says. "But all of those things are still conjectural. The reality, and the data, is that things are looking better."

#### Economic decline does not cause shooting wars

Miller 2k

(Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

## Environment

#### Wind increases air pollution- Backup generators

Zycher 8-6

Benjamin is a Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, “The Rathold Eternal,” <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/should-wind-tax-credit-stay-or.php>

- Do we really need to note that the wind does not always blow? It is, in a word, intermittent; but the need for electricity is unrelenting. So backup generating capacity---coal, gas, and nuclear plants---is needed to avoid blackouts as more and more wind turbines are connected to the grid. Suffice it to say that the backup capacity is not free---consumers have to pay for it---and because the coal and gas plants have to be cycled up and down depending on wind conditions, they cannot be operated efficiently. The net effect is higher costs, less reliability, and more---yes, more---air pollution. Thus have we achieved the perfect green trifecta, one of many such fruits of modern environmentalism.

power lines,” the organization said.

#### Can’t solve - we would need millions of square miles of just wind turbines

Snead 2008

James Michael, lead for agile combat support in the AFRL, “The End Of Easy Energy And What To Do About It”, November 19, 2008, http://mikesnead.net/resources/spacefaring/white\_paper\_the\_end\_of\_easy\_energy\_and\_what\_to\_do\_about\_it.pdf

5. Terrestrial sources of sustainable dispatchable electrical power generation will fall significantly short of U.S. and world needs by 2100 and, even, current U.S. needs. Energy is supplied in two primary forms: dispatchable electrical power to meet consumer needs for electricity and modern fuels to power transportation and other systems operating off the electrical power grid. By 2100, the world will need about 18,000 GWe of dispatchable electrical power generation capacity, compared with about 4,000 GW today, with almost all generated by sustainable sources.\* To assess the potential of nuclear fission and terrestrial renewables for meeting this world need, the addition of 1,400 1-GWe conventional nuclear fission reactors , the construction of the equivalent of 1,400 2- GWe Hoover Dams for added hydroelectric power generation, the addition of 1,900 GWe of geothermal electric power generation, and the expansion of wind-generated electrical power to 11 million commercial wind turbines, covering 1.74 million sq. mi., would only be able to supply about 47% of the world’s 2100 need for dispatchable electrical power generation capacity.‡ For the United States, only about 30% of the needed 2100 dispatchable electrical power generation capacity could be provided by these sustainable sources. By 2100, the U.S. and the world would be left with a dispatchable electrical power generation shortfall of 70% and 53%, respectively, with respect to this paper’s projection of the 2100 needs. Further, for the United States, the projected 2100 sustainable generation capacity would only provide about one-half of the current installed generation capacity that relies substantially on non- renewable coal and natural gas.

#### The environment is indestructible

Easterbrook 95

Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation

**(**Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25)

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### Won’t cause extinction

Easterbrook ‘3

(Gregg, senior fellow at The New Republic, July, Wired Magazine, “We’re All Gonna Die!” <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we’re talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don’t measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn’t be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

## Heg

Heg solves nothing- past two decades prove

Mearsheimer 2011 (John J., R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, The National Interest, Imperial by Design, lexis)

One year later, Charles Krauthammer emphasized in "The Unipolar Moment" that the United States had emerged from the Cold War as by far the most powerful country on the planet.2 He urged American leaders not to be reticent about using that power "to lead a unipolar world, unashamedly laying down the rules of world order and being prepared to enforce them." Krauthammer's advice fit neatly with Fukuyama's vision of the future: the United States should take the lead in bringing democracy to less developed countries the world over. After all, that shouldn't be an especially difficult task given that America had awesome power and the cunning of history on its side. U.S. grand strategy has followed this basic prescription for the past twenty years, mainly because most policy makers inside the Beltway have agreed with the thrust of Fukuyama's and Krauthammer's early analyses. The results, however, have been disastrous. The United States has been at war for a startling two out of every three years since 1989, and there is no end in sight. As anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of world events knows, countries that continuously fight wars invariably build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behavior; and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators. The Founding Fathers understood this problem, as is clear from James Madison's observation that "no nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare." Washington's pursuit of policies like assassination, rendition and torture over the past decade, not to mention the weakening of the rule of law at home, shows that their fears were justified. To make matters worse, the United States is now engaged in protracted wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that have so far cost well over a trillion dollars and resulted in around forty-seven thousand American casualties. The pain and suffering inflicted on Iraq has been enormous. Since the war began in March 2003, more than one hundred thousand Iraqi civilians have been killed, roughly 2 million Iraqis have left the country and 1.7 million more have been internally displaced. Moreover, the American military is not going to win either one of these conflicts, despite all the phony talk about how the "surge" has worked in Iraq and how a similar strategy can produce another miracle in Afghanistan. We may well be stuck in both quagmires for years to come, in fruitless pursuit of victory. The United States has also been unable to solve three other major foreign-policy problems. Washington has worked overtime-with no success-to shut down Iran's uranium-enrichment capability for fear that it might lead to Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons. And the United States, unable to prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons in the first place, now seems incapable of compelling Pyongyang to give them up. Finally, every post-Cold War administration has tried and failed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; all indicators are that this problem will deteriorate further as the West Bank and Gaza are incorporated into a Greater Israel. The unpleasant truth is that the United States is in a world of trouble today on the foreign-policy front, and this state of affairs is only likely to get worse in the next few years, as Afghanistan and Iraq unravel and the blame game escalates to poisonous levels. Thus, it is hardly surprising that a recent Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey found that "looking forward 50 years, only 33 percent of Americans think the United States will continue to be the world's leading power." Clearly, the heady days of the early 1990s have given way to a pronounced pessimism.

Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war – conflicts would be small and managable

Richard Haas (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April 2008 “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” <http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask_the_expert.html>

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

Their evidence overestimates the US’s ability to shape the international system – doesn’t contain conflict and wont shape the new multipolar system

Christopher Layne (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) 2006 “The Peace of Illusions” p 176-7

A second contention advanced by proponents of American hegemony is that the United States cannot withdraw from Eurasia because a great power war there could shape the post conflict international system in ways harmful to U.S. interests. Hence, the United States "could suffer few economic losses during a war, or even benefit somewhat, and still find the postwar environment quite costly to its own trade and investment."sa This really is not an economic argument but rather an argument about the consequences of Eurasia's political and ideological, as well as economic, closure. Proponents of hegemony fear that if great power wars in Eurasia occur, they could bring to power militaristic or totalitarian regimes. Mere, several points need to be made. First, proponents of American hegemony overestimate the amount of influence that the United States has on the international system. There are numerous possible geopolitical rivalries in Eurasia. Most of these will not culminate in war, but it's a good bet that some will. But regardless of whether Eurasian great powers remain at peace, the outcomes are going to be caused more by those states' calculations of their interests than by the presence of U.S. forces in Eurasia. The United States has only limited power to affect the amount of war and peace in the international system, and whatever influence it does have is being eroded by the creeping multipolarization under way in Eurasia. Second, the possible benefits of "environment shaping" have to be weighed against the possible costs of U.S. involvement in a big Eurasian war. Finally, distilled to its essence, this argument is a restatement of the fear that U.S. security and interests inevitably will be jeopardized by a Eurasian hegemon. This threat is easily exaggerated, and manipulated, to disguise ulterior motives for U.S. military intervention in Eurasia.