## Round 1 v Florida VK

### 1NC – T

#### Interpretation – “financial incentive” is a distinct category that requires a cash transfer, not a tax credit

Manage 6 (12 Manage, management portal which contains over 400 methods and theories along with more than 1500 management terms, “Incentives,” 3-9, http://www.12manage.com/description\_incentives.html)

Definition Incentives. Description.

An Incentive is any extrinsic reward factor that motivates an employee or manager or team to achieve an important business goal on top of his/her/their intrinsic motivation. It is a factor aiming to shape or direct behavior. In an optimal form, executives and employees should be remunerated well (but cost-effectively) where they deserve it, and not where they do not. Pay-offs for failure should be kept to a minimum. Furthermore, to be effective, a layered or gradual approach is better than an all-or-nothing incentive. A smart executive reward scheme is one of the pillars to ensure entrepreneurial behavior and maximizing shareholder value (Compare: Value Based Management). An incentive is unlike coercion, in that coerced work is motivated by the threat or use of violence, punishment or negative action, while an incentive is a positive stimulation. Incentives can also be used as Anti Hostile Takeover Mechanisms.

categories of incentives. Classes

Financial Incentive. Also called, Remunerative Incentive, this category involves offering a material reward (often in the form of money) in exchange for certain results or behavior. In business, this is the most important category. The many variants include:

Profit sharing (the traditional, oldest approach).

Merit pay (merit wage or salary increase, often depending on the results of an appraisal).

Scientific Management (Taylor) and Piece-Rate systems (very effective on productivity, but may lead to quality issues).

Pay for Performance or Gain Sharing.

Moral Incentive. Where a particular behavior is widely regarded as the right thing to do, or as particularly admirable, or where the failure to act in a certain way is condemned as indecent.

Coercive Incentive. Where a failure to behave in a certain way or to achieve certain results can be expected to result in physical force being used.

Furthermore, incentives can be either a:

Personal Incentive (motivating a specific individual person).

Social Incentive (motivating any individual in certain circumstances).

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – each category is massive, they explode the topic by allowing hundreds of new, conceptually distinct incentives – makes neg research impossible.

#### B. Ground – different generics apply by category – forcing the aff to spend government money is the only stable mechanism for disad links and counterplan competition.

### 1NC – CP

#### Text: The 50 state governments of the United States should substantially increase the domestic production of oil by establishing a CO2 tax credit for carbon capture and sequestration for the use in enhanced oil recovery.

#### State-level financial incentives for EOR solve – reduce capital costs, provide financial certainty, and incentivize tech investment and adoption

**NEORI 12** (National Enhanced Oil Recovery Initiative along with Center for Climate and Energy Solutions and the Great Plains Initiative, "CARBON DIOXIDE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY: A CRITICAL DOMESTIC ENERGY,

ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL OPPORTUNITY," February, http://www.neori.org/NEORI\_Report.pdf)

C. OVERVIEW OF MODEL STATE INCENTIVES FOR CO2-EOR DEPLOYMENT TO COMPLEMENT FEDERAL SUPPORT Several states have incentives to encourage CO2capture and transport from power plants and industrial facilities, which complement federal grants, tax credits, and other support mechanisms. States with these incentives **have provided critical support** for projects to advance toward deployment. Furthermore, as with the new federal tax credit recommended in this report, **state incentives for commercial CO2capture and pipeline projects have the potential to be revenue positive, stimulate local oil production, and spur economic activity** at a time when most states face profound fiscal challenges. NEORI recommends consideration, adoption or adaptation of the following state policies to complement federal policy and encourage commercial deployment of CO2capture and transport technologies.Severance tax reduction and/or extension of existing severance tax reduction for oil produced with CO2from anthropogenic sources. This policy provides a percentage reduction in the severance tax for oil production, if the taxpayer uses CO2-EOR techniques and/or uses anthropogenic CO2for EOR. **It creates an incentive to pursue CO2-EOR** and use CO2from man-made sources, although it would only work for states with a production or severance tax. Cost recovery approval for regulated entities. This policy enables regulatory approval by public utility commissions for a utility to recover certain costs associated with CO2capture through rates paid by customers. Cost recovery approval **provides significant financial certainty** to attract the private investment necessary for a project to proceed to construction and commercial operation.Off-take agreements. This policy enables projects to enter into long-term contracts for supply of a project’s output (e.g., electricity). Long-term off-take agreements provide significant financial certainty, similar to regulatory cost recovery.Tax credits, exemptions, or abatements. This policy provides credits, exemptions, and abatements for taxes that would otherwise be incurred, such as property tax abatement, franchise tax credits, and sales tax exemption for sale of captured CO2. **Such tax policies reduce the incremental capital cost** of capture, compression, infrastructure, and purchase of manmade CO2.State-level bonding of CO2pipeline projects and/or capture and compression facilities. This policy supports project financing, development, and planning of infrastructure or facilities deemed to be in the public interest. Public infrastructure authorities commonly may issue bonds, make grants/loans, plan/coordinate infrastructure, or participate in infrastructure build-out (e.g., own, construct, maintain, and operate a facility). Inclusion in Portfolio Standards. This policy requires that a certain percentage of all electricity generated in a state must come from specific sources, such as power plants with CCS. Portfolio standards that include CCS are an effective tool to establish financial certainty through state policy requirements, by allowing for regulatory cost recovery of investments made to meet statutory obligations.A more detailed description of model state policies can be found in Appendix C, including state-by-state links to specific policies to serve as a resource to state policy-makers.

### 1NC – DA

#### Electricity prices are declining

**Burtraw 12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common–resources.org/2012/falling–emissions–and–falling–prices–expectations–for–the–domestic–natural–gas–boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow–growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt–hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### Using CO2 capture for EOR means higher electricity prices – California proves

Summit Power 12 ("NEW GHG RULES SEEN AS KEY TO FIRST CALIFORNIA NATURAL GAS CCS PROJECTS," 5/15, http://www.summitpower.com/story/new–ghg–rules–seen–as–key–to–first–california–natural–gas–ccs–projects/)

Companies considering the development of novel natural gas–fired power plant carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) projects in California say new regulations are essential to advance such projects, especially by enabling companies to generate greenhouse gas (GHG)–reduction credits under the state’s cap–and–trade program. The projects would propose to permanently sequester underground carbon dioxide (CO2) for enhanced oil recovery (EOR), and likely would be located in the central and southern parts of the state where oil wells are abundant. The potential for CCS projects at existing and new natural gas–fired power plants in California could not only establish the proving grounds for commercial–scale CCS technologies, but provide regulatory and policy models for states that may eventually pursue their own GHG programs or join regional efforts such as the Western Climate Initiative, sources say. One of the companies currently considering a number of different natural gas–CCS projects in California is Summit Power Group, LLC, a clean–energy company based in Seattle, WA. The company is exploring retrofitting existing natural gas–fired power plants with CCS capability, or potentially building new natural gas power plants with CCS, according to a source with the company. However, a key consideration before projects likely would advance is whether California officials will clarify how they would regulate the facilities, and how they could become eligible to generate significant quantities of GHG–reduction credit under the state’s cap–and–trade program, the source says. Summit Power Group is working with technology companies that have commercially ready systems to capture CO2 from natural–gas fired power plants in California, where the CO2 is then transported to nearby oil fields for EOR, the company source says. The technologies can reduce CO2 from these power plants by as much as 90 percent, the source says. How the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) GHG cap–and–trade program will treat “ultra–low carbon gas” the facilities would be using, as well as the CO2 that is permanently stored underground, is critical to whether and how such projects may advance, the source says. “This is not defined very well yet, so we’re working on getting a better handle on those issues because they’re critical to making any project work. We are optimistic that CARB will put together rules that allow CCS to participate in the cap–and–trade program in a way that’s commercially practicable.” A CARB spokesman says there is “language in the cap–and–trade regulation that would allow a covered entity to net out any sequestered carbon if there was a board–approved methodology.” However, “we have no board–approved methodology at this time. CCS tends to be site–specific, so it may take awhile and more resources for CARB to develop such a quantification methodology.” CO2–reduction and CCS technologies have “progressed much faster than people originally thought,” the company source says, making it even more important that CARB take regulatory action. Conditions in California — including aggressive GHG–reduction targets, abundant EOR potential, high electricity prices and the need for base–load generating capacity — “have the potential to be very conducive to ultra–low carbon base–load power” from natural gas power plants with CCS, the source says.

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas–energy–jackpot–industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike. After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low–priced natural gas. Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025. MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale–based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well–paying, shovel–ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity–generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy–based stimulus to the economy. Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low–cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy–intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer–funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Manufacturing strength is key to military power

Ettlinger and Gordon 11 (Michael and Kate, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute and Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress. Most recently, Kate was the co–director of the national Apollo Alliance, where she still serves as senior policy advisor. Former senior associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf–)](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-))

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well–being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private–sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle–class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard–working, middle–skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.–based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher–skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher–skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher–skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Heg solves multiple scenarios for nuke war

Kagan 7 (Robert, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “End of Dreams, Return of History: International Rivalry and American Leadership”, Policy Review, August/September, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10>)

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would–be nations is a second defining feature of the new post–Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying —  its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not only on the goodwill of peoples but also on American power. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War II would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe ’s stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that ’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world ’s great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China ’s neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. Conflicts are more likely to erupt if the United States withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore  to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of “offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances.

### 1NC – DA

#### Immigration reform will pass, Obama’s pushing, and it’s a top priority

Global Times 2-20 (Obama reaches out to GOP on immigration, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/762877.shtml>)

US President Barack Obama on Tuesday reached out to Republican lawmakers, calling to discuss comprehensive immigration reform, said the White House. According to a White House statement, Obama placed calls to Senators Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Marco Rubio to discuss "their shared commitment to bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform." The senators were key members of the so-called Gang of 8, which was working to overhaul the immigration system. During the calls, Obama "reiterated that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles on reform." Obama also said the reforms need to include strengthening border security, creating an earned path to citizenship, holding employers accountable, and streamlining legal immigration. The White House also said Obama is "prepared to submit his own legislation if Congress fails to act." The Gang of 8 is working to get a bill to the Senate floor as early as May. In a statement, Rubio spokesman Alex Conant said the Florida senator "appreciated receiving President Obama's phone call to discuss immigration reform," and told Obama that he "feels good about the ongoing negotiations in the Senate, and is hopeful the final product is something that can pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support." Earlier in the day, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney was questioned repeatedly during a briefing about whether Obama had personally contacted Republican lawmakers on immigration reform, a top priority on the president's second term agenda.

#### Plan unpopular

Pirog 12

[Robert, Specialist in Energy Economics, 3/2/12, <http://budget.house.gov/uploadedfiles/crsr42374.pdf>]

The Obama Administration, in the FY2013 budget proposal, seeks to eliminate certain tax expenditures that benefit the oil and natural gas industries. Supporters of these tax provisions see them as comparable to those affecting other industries and supporting the production of domestic oil and natural gas resources. Opponents of the provisions see these tax expenditures as subsidies to a profitable industry the government can ill afford, and impediments to the development of clean energy alternatives. The FY2013 budget proposal outlines a set of proposals, framed as the termination of tax preferences, that would potentially increase the taxes paid by the oil and natural gas industries, especially those of the independent producers. These proposals include repeal of the enhanced oil recovery and marginal well tax credits, repeal of the current expensing of intangible drilling costs provision, repeal of the deduction for tertiary injectants, repeal of the passive loss exception for working interests in oil and natural gas properties, elimination of the manufacturing tax deduction for oil and natural gas companies, increasing the amortization period for certain exploration expenses, and repeal of the percentage depletion allowance for independent oil and natural gas producers. In addition, a variety of increased inspection fees and other charges that would generate more revenue for the Department of the Interior (DOI) are included in the budget proposal.

#### PC k2 immigration – public pressure and fractures Republicans

Page 2-21 (Susan, “Obama supported on guns, debt; Divided and dissatisfied with both sides, public is less aligned with Republicans,” Lexis)

For Obama, having higher ratings than congressional Republicans doesn't guarantee passage of any legislation, given the polarization in a divided Congress. But it does put him in a stronger position to bring public pressure on lawmakers. And it complicates Republican efforts to unite a fractured party behind a message that will appeal to voters.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**2012** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC – Warming

#### Too late --- CCS cannot solve in time.

**Rochon** et. al, May **2008** (Emily, Erka Bjureby, Paul Johnston, Robin Oakley, David Santillo, Nina Schulz, Gabriela von Goerne, False Hope: Why Carbon Capture and Storage Won’t Save the Climate, Greenpeace Report, p. 6)

CCS cannot deliver in time The urgency of the climate crisis means solutions must be ready for large-scale use as soon as possible. CCS simply cannot deliver in time. As the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) says “CCS will arrive on the battlefield far too late to help the world avoid dangerous climate change”8 At present, there are no large-scale coal-fired power plants in the world capturing carbon, let alone any that are integrated with storage operations.9 The earliest CCS may be technically feasible at utility scale is 2030.10 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) does not expect CCS to become commercially viable until at least the second half of this century.11 Even then, plants responsible for 40-70% of electricity sector CO2 emissions will not be suitable for carbon capture’.12 Despite this, CCS is being used as an excuse by power companies and utilities to push ahead with plans to build new coal-fired power plants; branding them “captureready.” The International Energy Agency (IEA) describes a “capture-ready” plant as one “which can be retrofitted with CO2 capture when the necessary regulatory or economic drivers are in place”.13 This definition is broad enough to make any station theoretically “capture-ready”, and the term meaningless. The very real danger of “capture-ready” power stations is that promises to retrofit are unlikely to be kept. Retrofits are very expensive and can carry such high efficiency losses that plants become uneconomic.14 Furthermore, even if a plant is technically suitable for carbon capture there is no guarantee that there will be accessible storage locations. In the UK, a proposed new coal-fired power plant at Kingsnorth, Kent, is being sold as “capture ready”; able to incorporate CCS should the technology ever become available in the future. However, no one has any idea if and when this might be. In the meantime, and possibly for its entire lifetime, Kingsnorth (if built) will pump out around 8 million tonnes of CO2 per year, an amount equivalent to the total annual CO2 emissions of Ghana.15 If CCS is ever able to deliver at all, it will be too little, too late.

#### They don’t solve the threshold set by their GCC evidence – that was cross-x

#### Earthquakes make CO2 leaks inevitable.

**Zoback and Gorelick**, 6/18/**2012** (Mark – Department of Geophysics at Stanford University, and Steven – Department of Environmental Earth System Science at Stanford University, Earthquake triggering and large-scale geologic storage of carbon dioxide, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, p. http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/06/13/1202473109.full.pdf+html)

Our principal concern is not that injection associated with CCS projects is likely to trigger large earthquakes; the problem is that even small to moderate earthquakes threaten the seal integrity of a CO2 repository. In parts of the world with good construction practices, it is unusual for earthquakes smaller than approximately M 6 to cause significant human harm or property damage. Fig. 2 uses well-established seismological relationships to show how the magnitude of an earthquake is related to the size of the fault that slipped and the amount of fault slip that occurred (16). As shown, faults capable of producing M ∼6 earthquakes are at least tens of kilometers in extent. (The fault size indicated along the abscissa is a lower bound of fault size as it refers to the size of the fault segment that slips in a given earthquake. The fault on which an earthquake occurs is larger than the part of the fault that slips in an individual event.) In most cases, such faults should be easily identified during geophysical site characterization studies and thus should be avoided at any site chosen for a CO2 repository. (Faults in crystalline basement rocks might be difficult to recognize in geophysical data. We assume, however, that any site chosen as a potential CO2 repository would be carefully selected, avoiding the possibility of pressure changes in the CO2 repository from affecting faults in crystalline basement.) The problem is that site characterization studies can easily miss the much smaller faults associated with small to moderate earthquakes. Although the ground shaking from small- to moderate-sized earthquakes is inconsequential, their impact on a CO2 repository would not be. Most of the geologic formations to be used for long-term storage of CO2 are likely to be at depths of approximately 2 km—deep enough for there to be adequate sealing formations to isolate the CO2 from the biosphere but not so deep as to encounter formations with very low permeability. Given large volumes of CO2 injected into selected formations for many decades, if a small to moderate earthquake were to be triggered in a geologic formation at approximately 2 km depth, it could jeopardize the seal integrity of the storage formation. For example, if a M ∼4 earthquake were to be triggered by CO2 sequestration (17)—an event that would be widely felt in a populated area but for which shaking would be unlikely to cause harm or damage—it would be associated with several centimeters of slip on a fault several kilometers in size. Because laboratory studies show that just a few millimeters of shear displacement are capable of enhancing fracture and joint permeability (18), several centimeters of slip would be capable of creating a permeable hydraulic pathway that could compromise the seal integrity of the CO2 reservoir and potentially reach the near surface.

#### Global warming won’t cause species extinction – most evidence suggests warmer climates increase extinction resistence

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf, Chetan]

Results of other studies also suggest the model-based species extinction hypothesis is unlikely to occur. In a review paper published in Current Biology, for example, Erwin (2009) explored past epochs and the myriad nooks and crannies of contemporary Earth, all in a search for the primary trigger of speciation. His conclusion? Warmth is the fire that fuels the process by which species originate, whereas cold tends to destroy what warmth produced. Headquartered in the Department of Paleobiology at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC (USA), Erwin writes, ―some of the best evidence for a link between biodiversity and climate comes from latitudinal gradients in diversity, which provide an avenue to explore the more general relationship between climate and evolution.‖ In reviewing that evidence, he indicates ―among the wide range of biotic hypotheses, those with the greatest empirical support indicate that warmer climates [1] have provided the energetic foundation for increased biodiversity by fostering greater population size and thus increased extinction resistance, [2] have increased metabolic scope, [3] have allowed more species to exploit specialized niches as a result of greater available energy, and [4] have generated faster speciation and/or lower extinction rates.‖ He states ―in combination with geologic evidence for carbon dioxide levels and changing areas of tropical seas, these observations provide the basis for a simple, first-order model of the relationship between climate through the Phanerozoic and evolutionary patterns and diversity,‖ and he adds ―such a model suggests that we should expect greatest marine diversity during globally warm intervals,‖ as is typically also found to be the case for terrestrial diversity. Erwin notes ―the three best-studied mass extinction events are associated with sharp changes in climate and support the contention that rapid shifts in climate can reduce global diversity,‖ which sounds much like the mantra of the IPCC with respect to global warming. However, the climate shifts Erwin cites consist mostly of cooling, and it is not only the shift to cooling but stagnating in a cool state that bodes badly for Earth‘s biodiversity. As Erwin describes it, ―the long interval of stagnant evolution during the Permo-Carboniferous glaciation is consistent with studies of modern-day latitudinal diversity that [indicate] rates of evolutionary innovation and diversification are higher in highenergy climates than in low-energy climates.‖ In further explanation of this conceptual framework, Erwin notes ―contemporary studies suggest a positive relationship between high-energy climates and [1] increased diversification rates, [2] increased number of niches because of increased metabolic scope, and [3] more specialized niches, and possibly because of [4] niche construction.‖ Indeed, he states ―studies showing that the tropics are a cradle of diversity, pumping clade representatives into higher latitudes, as well as evidence of increased ordinal level originations in the tropics, and of the sudden appearance of several mammalian groups during the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum suggest an asymmetric pattern of innovations associated with high-energy climate regimes.‖ Erwin‘s parting comment in this regard is his statement, ―there is an intriguing possibility that diversity does not track climate, but rather builds up during warm intervals but without falling by proportional amounts when climates turn cooler,‖ with the result that ―warmer climates may serve as an evolutionary diversification pump with higher diversity persisting [throughout following cooler periods], at least for a time.‖ Whatever the details may be, two generalizations clearly can be made: warmth typically begets speciation, whereas cold tends to lead to species extinctions.

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### Increased CO2 is key to crop fertilization that prevents famine and solves extinction

Idsos 10 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Food Security: The Real Planetary Problem ”, Volume 13, Number 51: 22 December 2010, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N51/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

In a paper recently published in the Journal of Proteome Research, Sarkar et al. (2010) write that "increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made 'food security' a burning issue in the 21st century," echoing sentiments much like those expressed by Farrell (2009), who has noted that "the alarming increase in biofuel production, the projected demand for livestock products, and the estimated food to feed the additional 700 million people who will arrive here by 2016, will have unprecedented consequences," among which are likely to be the unsavory facts that "arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected," and not in a positive manner. Furthermore, when the human population of the globe reaches 8.7-11.3 billion by the year 2050 (Bengtsson et al., 2006), the situation will become truly intolerable, unless something is done, far in advance of that date, to dramatically mitigate the situation. Thus, as Sarkar et al. suggest, "a normal approach for any nation/region is to strengthen its agricultural production for meeting future demands and provide food security." But a major difficulty, which could well spoil mankind's ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's ozone concentration, which is the subject of Sarkar et al.'s new paper. In a study designed to elucidate the many ways in which ozone (O3) is harmful to plants, the eight researchers grew two high-yielding cultivars (Sonalika and HUW 510) of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) out-of-doors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India's Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers that they maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25% and 50% above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of fifty days, during which period they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. So what did they find? Sarkar et al. determined, among several other things, that the moderate increases in the air's O3 concentration resulted in higher foliar injury, a reduction in photosynthetic efficiency, induced inhibition in photochemical efficacy of photosystem II, lowered concentrations of photosynthetic pigments and proteins, plus what they describe as "drastic reductions" in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting that major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also "drastically reduced." In discussing the results of their study, the scientists from India, Japan and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a "major environmental pollutant of our time," while noting that some are predicting it to be an even "greater problem for the future." And adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond, humanity's future is not looking good. In fact, it's incredibly bleak. So what can be done to help us weather this potentially devastating perfect storm? Sarkar et al. suggest that we focus on "engineering crops for future high O3," concentrating on maintaining "effective stomatal conductance of plants which can avoid O3 entry but not hamper their productivity." We agree. But not knowing to what extent we will be successful in this endeavor, we need to do something else that we know will work; and that is to allow the air's CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of climate alarmists who would curtail anthropogenic CO2 emissions in the guise of fighting what they claim is anthropogenic-induced global warming. This contention is largely theoretical and wholly unproven; but we know that atmospheric CO2 enrichment nearly always acts to increase both the productivity and water use efficiency of nearly all plants, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, while it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Clearly, we are going to need all of the help we can possibly get to make it unscathed through even the first half of the 21st century; and we cannot afford to throw away any of the means we have at our disposal to help us in this great effort. We have got to see carbon dioxide for what it truly is -- the elixir of life: one of the two raw materials (the other being water) that combine during the process of photosynthesis to produce the substances of plant tissues that provide the food for nearly all human and animal life on the planet, either directly, in the case of herbivores, or indirectly in the case of other life forms. And that makes carbon dioxide just the opposite of what the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently declared it to be -- a dangerous air pollutant. Shame on them! ... and on all those who demonize this life-giving molecule that we expel to the air every time we exhale.

#### Famine sparks World War 3

Calvin 98 (William H. Calvin, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Washington, January 1998, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop,” The Atlantic Monthly, Ebsco Host]

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands – if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end : eliminating competitors for the remaining food.      This would be a worldwide problem – and could lead to a Third World War – but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### 1NC – China

#### Current cooperation solves

CCJ 11 (Carbon Capture Journal, “China's financing may give Texas carbon-capture project a boost,” 2011,

<http://www.ccstlm.com/News.aspx?id=371>)

China became a major player yesterday in a Texas carbon capture and sequestration project that is vying to become one of the world's first commercial demonstrations of the technology. At an oil and gas forum in San Antonio, Texas, Summit Power Group announced that the Export-Import Bank of China will be the sole financial lender of the $2.5 billion Texas Clean Energy Project, which envisions capture of 90 percent of the carbon dioxide from an advanced coal plant. Summit Power said that the loan amount would be sufficient to meet all of the project's debt needs and would be contingent on the Chinese bank's "due diligence" and completion of an engineering contract. The energy developer also announced it intends to award an engineering contract to a subsidiary of Sinopec, the Chinese petrochemical giant. The announcement provides more financial certainty for an initiative that has faced money hurdles. It is also likely to raise eyebrows about China's influence in the U.S. energy sector. But the United States and China face similar energy problems. They both have an abundance of coal and traditionally have relied on it to make electricity, but re-engineering their power systems to take the CO2 out of coal emissions has been a major technological and economic challenge. To date, financing has been the biggest obstacle in the United States for proposed carbon capture and sequestration projects generally, with many companies canceling planned demonstrations before they could break ground. The influx of China's money would put the Texas Clean Energy Project, along with Southern Co.'s Kemper project in Mississippi and FutureGen 2.0 in Illinois, in the running to be the first global project that would capture CO2 from a coal plant at commercial scale.

#### U.S. will block joint ventures on CCS.

Center for American Progress, November **2009** (A Roadmap for U.S.-China Collaboration on Carbon Capture and Sequestration, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2009/11/pdf/china_ccs.pdf>)

While support for action on climate change is growing in the United States, substantial obstacles still persist.43 A complicating factor in the CCS debate is the United States’ relationship with the major carbon emitting countries in the developing world, especially those with whom it has a competitive trade relationship.44 Many Americans and their representatives refuse to support a price on carbon or mandatory emissions reductions for fear of creating a competitive disadvantage for the United States. Given the existing political climate in the United States, any collaboration with China will have to navigate a number of barriers to overcome such fears. Congress will most likely oppose the use of U.S. tax dollars to fund collaborative projects in China unless they bring substantial co-benefits to American workers. The United States trade deficit with China and its continued reliance on Beijing to finance U.S. budget deficits are topics that tend to dominate the bilateral economic relationship. The fact that the Chinese economy appears to be recovering more quickly from the global financial crisis than that of the United States reinforces a perception of those imbalances and creates further resistance against funding collaborations.45

#### CO2-EOR only has a limited application in China.

Center for American Progress, November **2009** (A Roadmap for U.S.-China Collaboration on Carbon Capture and Sequestration, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2009/11/pdf/china_ccs.pdf>)

CO2 can, and has long been, used for enhancing oil extraction from fields by displacing oil through the injection of pressurized CO2 gas. CO2 has other limited industrial uses that carry a positive secondary economic benefit. But demand from all of these potential CO2 sinks is nowhere near enough to sequester the carbon dioxide emissions that must be mitigated to slow down the rate of climate change. Some analysts in China believe that enhanced oil recovery, or EOR , has the potential to create and improve initial commercial opportunities for CCS in China. However, the market potential for EOR will likely be limited. China’s seven largest oil fields can likely store only between 10-20 million tons CO2 per year. This volume could be met in the near term with pure CO2 streams from coal-to-chemical plants in a handful of locations. Such sources could be captured, transported, and used for EOR for $5-10 per ton—mainly the cost of compression and pipelines—and might be suitable for near-term purchase agreements between PetroChina and CO2 suppliers. But EOR cannot be counted on for large annual emissions reductions and will not incent more than a limited number of projects.

#### There’s no impact to China-Japan war in the 1ac – their evidence doesn’t even say Japan

#### No US-China war – economics

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

#### No China-Japan conflict --- tensions are deescalating.

Financial Times, **1/25**/2013 (China and Japan attempt to ease tensions, p. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f8db2044-66a4-11e2-b967-00144feab49a.html#axzz2LcLKSimW>)

China and Japan have taken the first diplomatic step in easing tensions over a bitter territorial dispute that has damaged trade between the two countries and threatened to spill over into military conflict. Xi Jinping, China’s new Communist party leader, and Natsuo Yamaguchi, a senior member of Japan’s ruling coalition, on Friday held the first high-level meeting between the neighbours since the dispute over a group of Japanese-controlled islands in the East China Sea erupted in September. “We should, like the old generation of leaders in our two countries did, show national responsibility, political wisdom and historical courage,” said Mr Xi. He was referring to the decision in 1972 by Beijing and Tokyo to shelve disputes and normalise bilateral relations. The conciliatory tone from the man who is expected to become president in March raises hopes for a new diplomatic effort to resolve the crisis over the islands, which are known as Senkaku in Japan and Diaoyu in China, and claimed by both. Mr Yamaguchi, head of New Komeito, the coalition partner of Japan’s ruling Liberal Democratic party, gave Mr Xi a letter from Shinzo Abe in which the new prime minister expressed his willingness to work towards a “mutually beneficial strategic relationship”. “That senior leaders can meet is a turning point,” said Xu Yiping, director of the Japan Research Centre at Beijing Foreign Studies University. “That Mr Yamaguchi could come shows Japan’s sincerity in wanting to solve problems. And that Xi Jinping could see him shows the same sincerity on his side.” He added that he would now expect the two sides to come up with more concrete steps to lower tension.

### 1NC – Grid

#### New developments sure up grid stability

Kemp 12 -- Reuters market analyst (John, 4/5/12, "COLUMN-Phasors and blackouts on the U.S. power grid: John Kemp," http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/05/column-smart-grid-idUSL6E8F59W120120405)

The hoped-for solution to grid instability is something called the North American SynchroPhasor Initiative (NASPI), which sounds like something out of Star Trek but is in fact a collaboration between the federal government and industry to improve grid monitoring and control by using modern communications technology. More than 500 phasor monitoring units have so far been installed across the transmission network to take precise measurements of frequency, voltage and other aspects of power quality on the grid up to 30 times per second (compared with once every four seconds using conventional technology). Units are synchronised using GPS to enable users to build up a comprehensive real-time picture of how power is flowing across the grid (www.naspi.org/Home.aspx and). It is a scaled-up version of the monitoring system developed by the University of Tennessee's Power Information Technology Laboratory using inexpensive frequency monitors that plug into ordinary wall sockets. Tennessee's FNET project provides highly aggregated data to the public via its website. The systems being developed under NASPI provide a much finer level of detail that will reveal congestion and disturbances on individual transmission lines and particular zones so that grid managers can act quickly to restore balance or isolate failures ()

#### -- Blackouts won’t hurt the economy

Gaylord 3 (Becky, “Blackout Blues Hit Local Industries”, The Plain Dealer, 8-16,

http://www.cleveland.com/blackout/index.ssf?/blackout/more/1061038185297290.html)

The biggest blackout in U.S. history will pinch the nation’s economy **only modestly**, but for some Northeast Ohio manufacturers, the setbacks may linger for weeks. The $10 trillion U.S. economy is **so resilient** that the power outage’s impact **shouldn’t shave significant growth** from third-quarter output, economists predicted. Federal tax refunds and consumer spending have fueled recent growth, and much of the productivity disrupted by the brief blackout can be **made up through overtime and other measures**, said Stuart Hoffman, chief economist at PNC Bank in Pittsburgh. But the outages walloped some industries crucial to this region, such as steel and automotive. “For the individual companies that have problems, they are colossal,” said Ken Mayland, president of ClearView Economics in Pepper Pike.

#### Meltdowns don’t cause extinction (empirics)

WNA 12(World nuclear association members are responsible for 95% of the world's nuclear power outside of the U.S., as well as the vast majority of world uranium, conversion and enrichment production, “Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors”, March 2012, WNA, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf06.html>)

In the 1950s attention turned to harnessing the power of the atom in a controlled way, as demonstrated at Chicago in 1942 and subsequently for military research, and applying the steady heat yield to generate electricity. This naturally gave rise to concerns about accidents and their possible effects. However, with nuclear power safety depends on much the same factors as in any comparable industry: intelligent planning, proper design with conservative margins and back-up systems, high-quality components and a well-developed safety culture in operations. A particular nuclear scenario was loss of cooling which resulted in melting of the nuclear reactor core, and this motivated studies on both the physical and chemical possibilities as well as the biological effects of any dispersed radioactivity. Those responsible for nuclear power technology in the West devoted extraordinary effort to ensuring that a meltdown of the reactor core would not take place, since it was assumed that a meltdown of the core would create a major public hazard, and if uncontained, a tragic accident with likely multiple fatalities. In avoiding such accidents the industry has been very successful. In over 14,500 cumulative reactor-years of commercial operation in 32 countries, there have been only three major accidents to nuclear power plants - Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima - the second being of little relevance to reactor design outside the old Soviet bloc. It was not until the late 1970s that detailed analyses and large-scale testing, followed by the 1979 meltdown of the Three Mile Island reactor, began to make clear that even the worst possible accident in a conventional western nuclear power plant or its fuel would not be likely to cause dramatic public harm. The industry still works hard to **minimize the probability of a meltdown accident, but it is now clear that no-one need fear a potential public** health catastrophe simply because a fuel meltdown happens. Fukushima has made that clear, with a triple meltdown causing no fatalities or serious radiation doses to anyone, while over two hundred people continued working on the site to mitigate the accident's effects. The decades-long test and analysis program showed that less radioactivity escapes from molten fuel than initially assumed, and that most of this radioactive material is not readily mobilized beyond the immediate internal structure. Thus, even if the containment structure that surrounds all modern nuclear plants were ruptured, as it has been with at least one of the Fukushima reactors, it is still very effective in preventing escape of most radioactivity. It is the laws of physics and the properties of materials that mitigate disaster, more than the required actions by safety equipment or personnel. In fact, licensing approval for new plants now requires that the effects of any core-melt accident must be confined to the plant itself, without the need to evacuate nearby residents. The three significant accidents in the 50-year history of civil nuclear power generation are: Three Mile Island (USA 1979) where the reactor was severely damaged but radiation was contained and there were no adverse health or environmental consequences Chernobyl (Ukraine 1986) where the destruction of the reactor by steam explosion and fire killed 31 people and had significant health and environmental consequences. The death toll has since increased to about 5 Fukushima (Japan 2011) where three old reactors (together with a fourth) were written off and the effects of loss of cooling due to a huge tsunami were inadequately contained. A table showing all reactor accidents, and a table listing some energy-related accidents with multiple fatalities are appended. These three significant accidents occurred during more than 14,000 reactor-years of civil operation. Of all the accidents and incidents, only the Chernobyl and Fukushima accidents resulted in radiation doses to the public greater than those resulting from the exposure to natural sources. The Fukushima accident resulted in some radiation exposure of workers at the plant, but not such as to threaten their health, unlike Chernobyl. Other incidents (and one 'accident') have been completely confined to the plant. Apart from Chernobyl, no nuclear workers or members of the public have ever died as a result of exposure to radiation due to a commercial nuclear reactor incident. Most of the serious radiological injuries and deaths that occur each year (2-4 deaths and many more exposures above regulatory limits) are the result of large uncontrolled radiation sources, such as abandoned medical or industrial equipment. (There have also been a number of accidents in experimental reactors and in one military plutonium-producing pile - at Windscale, UK, in 1957, but none of these resulted in loss of life outside the actual plant, or long-term environmental contamination.) See also Table 2 in Appendix.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### Alt causes to competitiveness - Labor gaps

Bartlett 6 (David L., President – Global Economics Company, “Building a Competitive Workforce: Immigration and the US Manfacturing Sector”, 8-23, http://www.ilw.com/articles/2006,0823-bartlett.shtm)

Shortages of skilled labor constitute the foremost challenge confronting U.S. manufacturers who face growing competition from manufacturers in Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere. Demand for professionals with university degrees is rising as manufacturing becomes increasingly high tech. But the U.S. educational system is not producing enough highly educated native-born manufacturing workers to meet this growing demand. Moreover, the pending retirements of Baby Boom generation workers will further constrain the growth of the manufacturing labor force. Bridging this gap between the supply and demand for skilled workers requires new investments in the U.S. educational system and the formulation of immigration policies that respond to the labor needs of the U.S. economy. Yet current immigration policies, especially since 9/11, have made it more difficult for highly skilled professionals from abroad to enter the United States.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### 1. CCS is too expensive ---- lack of carbon pricing makes it uncompetitive.

**Gillingham and Sweeney**, February **2012** (Kenneth – Assistant Professor of Economics at Yale University, and James – Professor of Management Science and Engineering at the Precourt Energy Efficiency Center at Standford University, Barriers to Implementing Low Carbon Technologies, Forthcoming in Climate Change Economics, p. 10-11)

Carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies present the promise of using fossil fuels in a low carbon fashion. With CCS technologies, central generation coal and natural gas could conceivably be very low carbon electricity generation sources. However, there are numerous barriers to implementation of CCS technologies. The most fundamental barrier to implementation of CCS technologies is simply the high cost of capture and storage of the carbon. Creating a further barrier is the absence of a sufficiently high carbon price anywhere in the world. Even in Europe, where carbon dioxide emissions fall under the European Union Emissions Trading System (ETS), there are no active CCS plants beyond the demonstration phase, except for carbon dioxide injection used to extract oil. The high cost of CCS stems from several factors. First, the capture technology is still a relatively early‐stage technology. Second, the process of carbon capture is a highly energy intensive process. Thus, the efficiency of fossil fuel electricity generation is significantly reduced by capturing and storing the carbon, with the extra generation requirements ranging from 10 percent to up to 40 percent depending on the technology (IPCC 2005). Storage uses additional energy which thus is not available for end uses.

#### 2. The sale price of carbon is less than the capture cost.

**Crooks**, 11/11/**2012** (Ed, Energy: Carbon capture is an opportunity ripe for exploitation, Financial Times, p. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/a462f6b8-22a7-11e2-8edf-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2LCdYlTYZ)

Without clear economic incentives, companies will not invest in the technology and, with finances strained in both the public and private sectors across the developed world, it is hard for governments to provide those incentives. As a result, the greatest progress in carbon capture is now being made on projects where the carbon dioxide is used for some other purpose, most often enhanced oil recovery. Since the 1970s oil companies have been injecting carbon dioxide into reservoirs to squeeze out more crude. In Texas, they pay about $30 per tonne to get it, largely from natural sources. That is still less than the cost of capturing carbon using many of the methods available but there are widespread hopes that the costs can fall.

#### 3. Utility companies will choose to shift to natural gas plants rather than CCS-plants.

Congressional Budget Office, June **2012** (Federal Efforts to Reduce the Cost of Capturing and Storing Carbon Dioxide, p. i-ii)

But the demand for electricity in the United States is growing slowly, and even if DOE’s cost reduction target was attained, coal-fired power plants equipped with CCS technology would not be competitive with coalfired plants that lacked it unless policies restricting CO2 emissions or imposing a price on them were adopted. Consequently, under current laws and policies, utilities are unlikely to build that much new generating capacity—that is, more than 200 GW—or invest in adding CCS technology to much of their existing capacity for many decades. If, however, new policies restricted or imposed a price on CO2 emissions, the domestic stock of electricity generation plants would turn over more rapidly, and CCS technology would become more competitive economically, increasing the potential for construction of CCS-equipped plants in the United States. Nevertheless, investors already have several options for generating electricity—nuclear power, wind, biomass, other renewables, and natural gas—that produce few, if any, CO2 emissions. The amount of investment in CCS would depend on how costs for the different alternatives compared with costs for electricity generation without CCS. Reductions in costs for CCS-equipped power plants could also come from experience outside the United States. Demand for electricity is growing rapidly in other parts of the world—for example, China and India—and those countries are increasing their capacity to satisfy it. If plants that were equipped with early versions of the CCS technology were built abroad or if some coal-fired power plants now in operation in other countries were retrofitted with CCS, the cost of generating electricity at plants that were subsequently built or retrofitted in the United States would be expected to be lower than the cost of generating electricity at the plants that were built initially. At present, however, foreign investment in CCS, like investment in the technology in the United States, centers not on building full-scale CCS-equipped commercial plants but on conducting research and development, carrying out small-scale demonstrations of the technology’s feasibility, and building pilot plants. Until now, most efforts to develop CCS have focused on coal-fired power plants. However, the price of natural gas has dropped substantially in recent years, and the share of electricity generated by natural gas-fired plants has expanded and is likely to continue to grow. The cost of producing electricity with a natural gas-fired plant equipped with CCS could be lower, depending on future prices for coal and natural gas, than the cost of producing electricity with a coal-fired CCS plant. At present, though, regulatory action to curb CO2 emissions is more likely to shift electricity production from coal to natural gas (without CCS) and other low-emission fuels, such as biomass, rather than to CCS-capable plants.

#### 4. The CO2 pipeline infrastructure is too small but cannot expand --- that takes out solvency.

**Mack and Endemann** **2010** (Joel – partner at Latham & Watkins LLP and Buck – Associate at Latham & Watkins LLP, Making carbon dioxide sequestration feasible: Toward federal regulation of CO2 sequestration pipelines, Energy Policy 38, p. 736)

The magnitude of this challenge cannot be underestimated. Using the above production figures, coal-fired power plants in the United States emit approximately 900 billion cubic meters of CO2 annually.5 The current CO2 pipeline system, though, handles only 45 million metric tons of CO2 per year over 3500 miles of pipe (Nordhaus and Pitlick, 2009).6 Thus, to the extent that the United States has a policy goal of sequestering and transporting any appreciable fraction of CO2 emissions from coal-fired power plants, the required infrastructure investment will require at least a 40-fold increase.7 While such an undertaking presents obvious practical and economic challenges, it demonstrates that a new vision is required if the United States is going to develop a sequestration infrastructure to meet this challenge on any time frame that is reasonably coincident with reducing near- to medium-term impacts from global climate change.8 This article will focus on geologic sequestration,9 in which the CO2 is removed and then transported via pipeline to a location where it is either beneficially used (e.g., in enhanced oil recovery) or placed in long-term storage, in both cases in deep underground geologic formations that prevent its release to the atmosphere. These geologic features are often similar to those in which oil or natural gas are also found, such as salt domes, coal seams not otherwise economic for mining, and similar structures. Although CO2 can be transported by truck or rail, pipeline transportation presents the most economic method for transporting large volumes of gas without indirect carbon emissions and associated handling requirements. This article will focus on geologic sequestration and the pipeline infrastructure that it will require in order to achieve our carbon reduction objectives. CO2 has commercial uses in a variety of products and services, such as enhanced oil recovery (‘‘EOR’’), carbonated beverages, and other industrial processes. Small networks of CO2 pipelines already support these uses. However, this infrastructure largely serves existing EOR operations near the Gulf Coast and the Southwest, and almost none of these pipelines are located proximate to the bulk of the nation’s large coal-fired generation: the Midwest, East Coast, and Intermountain regions.10 As a result, and as discussed above, any substantial investment in carbon sequestration technologies is going to require a very large and rapid investment in CO2 pipeline infrastructure.

## Round 3 v UCF JV

### 1NC

#### A. Interpretation – debate is a game that requires the aff to defend USFG action on energy policy –

#### - ‘resolved’ means to enact a policy by law

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### --“United States Federal Government should” means the debate is solely about the outcome of a policy established by governmental means

Ericson 3 (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### B. Violation – they claim to win for reasons other than the desirability of that action

#### C. Reasons to prefer:

#### 1. Education – debate as a competitive political game is the best framework to solve dogmatism and human brutality

Carter 8 – prof @ The Colorado College, research support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the staff of the Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Benezet Foundation at The Colorado College (Lief H, 2008, "LAW AND POLITICS AS PLAY," Chicago-Kent Law Review, 83(3), http://www.cklawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/vol83no3/Carter.pdf)

Vico asked his audience at the University of Naples in 1708 to debate two competing ways of knowing: Cartesian rationality versus the poetic world of the ancients. Vico, the “pre-law advisor” of his day, saw law as a rhetorical game. That is, he understood the civic (ethical) value of competi-tion itself.12 He understood that Cartesian rationality, like religious and ideological fundamentalism, generates a kind of certainty that shuts down robust debate. Vico’s comprehensive vision suggests, in effect, that people should practice law and politics not as the search for the most rational or logically correct outcomes but rather as passionate and embodied yet peaceful competitive play. Vico inspires this vision of law and politics as play because he sees that all things in the human mind, including law and politics, are at one with the human body. As Vico put it as he concluded his 1708 address, “[T]he soul should be drawn to love by means of bodily images; for once it loves it is easily taught to believe; and when it believes and loves it should be inflamed so that it wills things by means of its normal intemperance.”13 Vico had no hope that such abstract moral principles as liberty, equality, justice, and tolerance could effectively offset the “crude and rough” nature of men.14 The Holy Bible and the Qur’an contain normative principles of love, tolerance, equal respect, and peace, but these commands have not forestalled ancient and modern religious warfare. This essay proposes that humans learn how to keep the peace not by obeying the norms, rules, and principles of civil conduct but by learning how to play, and thereby reintegrating the mind and the body. People do law, politics, and economic life well when they do them in the same ways and by the same standards that structure and govern good competitive sports and games. The word “sport” derives from “port” and “portal” and relates to the words “disport” and “transport.” The word at least hints that the primitive and universal joy of play carries those who join the game across space to a better, and ideally safer, place—a harbor that Vico him-self imagined. This essay’s bold proposition honors Vico in many ways. Its “grand theory” matches the scope of Vico’s comprehensive and integrated vision of the human condition. It plausibly confirms Vico’s hope for a “concep-tion of a natural law for all of humanity” that is rooted in human historical practice.15 Seeing these core social processes as play helps us to escape from arid academic habits and to “learn to think like children,” just as Vico urged.16 Imagining law and politics as play honors Vico above all because, if we attain Ruskin’s epigraphic ideal,17 we will see that the peace-tending qualities of sports and games already operate under our noses. Seeing law and politics as play enables us “to reach out past our inclination to make experience familiar through the power of the concept and to engage the power of the image. We must reconstruct the human world not through concepts and criteria but as something we can practically see.”18 If at its end readers realize that they could have seen, under their noses, the world as this essay sees it without ever having read it, this essay will successfully honor Vico. As Vico would have predicted, formal academic theory has played at best a marginal role in the construction of competitive games. Ordinary people have created cricket and football, and common law and electoral politics and fair market games, more from the experience of doing them than from formal theories of competitive games. When they play interna-tional football today, ordinary people in virtually every culture in the world recreate the experience of competitive games. Playing competitive games unites people across cultures in a common normative world.19 Within Vico’s social anthropological and proto-scientific framework, the claim that competitive play can generate peaceful civic life is purely empirical: law and politics in progressively peaceful political systems already are nothing more or less than competitive games. All empirical description operates within some, though too often ob-scured, normative frame. This essay’s normative frame is clear. It holds, with Shaw’s epigraph, above: Human brutalities waged against other hu-mans—suicide bombings, genocides, tribal and religious wars that provoke the indiscriminate rape, murder, torture, and enslavement of men, women, and children, often because they are labeled “evil”—are the worst things that we humans do. We should learn not to do them. In Vico’s anti-Cartesian, non-foundational world, no method exists to demonstrate that this essay’s normative core is “correct,” or even “better than,” say, the core norm holding that the worst thing humans do is dishonor God. Readers who reject Shaw’s and this essay’s normative frame may have every reason to reject the essay’s entire argument. However, this essay does describe empirically how those whose core norm requires honoring any absolute, including God, above all else regu-larly brutalize other human beings, and why those who live by the norms of good competitive play do not. People brutalize people, as Shaw’s Caesar observed, in the name of right and honor and peace. Evaluated by the norm that human brutality is the worst thing humans do, the essay shows why and how the human invention of competitive play short circuits the psy-chology of a righteousness-humiliation-brutality cycle. We cannot help but see and experience on fields of contested play testosterone-charged males striving mightily to defeat one another. Yet at the end of play, losers and winners routinely shake hands and often hug; adult competitors may dine and raise a glass together.20 Whether collectively invented as a species-wide survival adaptation or not, institutionalized competitive play under-cuts the brutality cycle by displacing religious and other forms of funda-mentalist righteousness with something contingent, amoral, and thus less lethal. Play thereby helps humans become Shaw’s “race that can under-stand.”

#### 2. Decision-making – debate gaming through dramatic rehearsal strengthens decision-making – only maintained by a confined educational space

Haghoj 8 – PhD, affiliated with Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, asst prof @ the Institute of Education at the University of Bristol (Thorkild, 2008, "PLAYFUL KNOWLEDGE: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming," PhD dissertation @ Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, University of Southern Denmark, http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf)

Joas’ re-interpretation of Dewey’s pragmatism as a “theory of situated creativity” raises a critique of humans as purely rational agents that navigate instrumentally through meansendsschemes (Joas, 1996: 133f). This critique is particularly important when trying to understand how games are enacted and validated within the realm of educational institutions that by definition are inscribed in the great modernistic narrative of “progress” where nation states, teachers and parents expect students to acquire specific skills and competencies (Popkewitz, 1998; cf. chapter 3). However, as Dewey argues, the actual doings of educational gaming cannot be reduced to rational means-ends schemes. Instead, the situated interaction between teachers, students, and learning resources are played out as contingent re-distributions of means, ends and ends in view, which often make classroom contexts seem “messy” from an outsider’s perspective (Barab & Squire, 2004). 4.2.3. Dramatic rehearsal The two preceding sections discussed how Dewey views play as an imaginative activity of educational value, and how his assumptions on creativity and playful actions represent a critique of rational means-end schemes. For now, I will turn to Dewey’s concept of dramatic rehearsal, which assumes that social actors deliberate by projecting and choosing between various scenarios for future action. Dewey uses the concept dramatic rehearsal several times in his work but presents the most extensive elaboration in Human Nature and Conduct: Deliberation is a dramatic rehearsal (in imagination) of various competing possible lines of action… [It] is an experiment in finding out what the various lines of possible action are really like (...) Thought runs ahead and foresees outcomes, and thereby avoids having to await the instruction of actual failure and disaster. An act overtly tried out is irrevocable, its consequences cannot be blotted out. An act tried out in imagination is not final or fatal. It is retrievable (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). 86 This excerpt illustrates how Dewey views the process of decision making (deliberation) through the lens of an imaginative drama metaphor. Thus, decisions are made through the imaginative projection of outcomes, where the “possible competing lines of action” are resolved through a thought experiment. Moreover, Dewey’s compelling use of the drama metaphor also implies that decisions cannot be reduced to utilitarian, rational or mechanical exercises, but that they have emotional, creative and personal qualities as well. Interestingly, there are relatively few discussions within the vast research literature on Dewey of his concept of dramatic rehearsal. A notable exception is the phenomenologist Alfred Schütz, who praises Dewey’s concept as a “fortunate image” for understanding everyday rationality (Schütz, 1943: 140). Other attempts are primarily related to overall discussions on moral or ethical deliberation (Caspary, 1991, 2000, 2006; Fesmire, 1995, 2003; Rönssön, 2003; McVea, 2006). As Fesmire points out, dramatic rehearsal is intended to describe an important phase of deliberation that does not characterise the whole process of making moral decisions, which includes “duties and contractual obligations, short and long-term consequences, traits of character to be affected, and rights” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Instead, dramatic rehearsal should be seen as the process of “crystallizing possibilities and transforming them into directive hypotheses” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Thus, deliberation can in no way guarantee that the response of a “thought experiment” will be successful. But what it can do is make the process of choosing more intelligent than would be the case with “blind” trial-and-error (Biesta, 2006: 8). The notion of dramatic rehearsal provides a valuable perspective for understanding educational gaming as a simultaneously real and imagined inquiry into domain-specific scenarios. Dewey defines dramatic rehearsal as the capacity to stage and evaluate “acts”, which implies an “irrevocable” difference between acts that are “tried out in imagination” and acts that are “overtly tried out” with real-life consequences (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). This description shares obvious similarities with games as they require participants to inquire into and resolve scenario-specific problems (cf. chapter 2). On the other hand, there is also a striking difference between moral deliberation and educational game activities in terms of the actual consequences that follow particular actions. Thus, when it comes to educational games, acts are both imagined and tried out, but without all the real-life consequences of the practices, knowledge forms and outcomes that are being simulated in the game world. Simply put, there is a difference in realism between the dramatic rehearsals of everyday life and in games, which only “play at” or simulate the stakes and 87 risks that characterise the “serious” nature of moral deliberation, i.e. a real-life politician trying to win a parliamentary election experiences more personal and emotional risk than students trying to win the election scenario of The Power Game. At the same time, the lack of real-life consequences in educational games makes it possible to design a relatively safe learning environment, where teachers can stage particular game scenarios to be enacted and validated for educational purposes. In this sense, educational games are able to provide a safe but meaningful way of letting teachers and students make mistakes (e.g. by giving a poor political presentation) and dramatically rehearse particular “competing possible lines of action” that are relevant to particular educational goals (Dewey, 1922: 132). Seen from this pragmatist perspective, the educational value of games is not so much a question of learning facts or giving the “right” answers, but more a question of exploring the contingent outcomes and domain-specific processes of problem-based scenarios.

#### Decisionmaking is a trump impact—it improves all aspects of life regardless of its specific goals

Shulman 9, president emeritus – Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, (Lee S, Education and a Civil Society: Teaching Evidence-Based Decision Making, p. ix-x)

These are the kinds of questions that call for the exercise of practical reason, a form of thought that draws concurrently from theory and practice, from values and experience, and from critical thinking and human empathy. None of these attributes is likely to be thought of no value and thus able to be ignored. Our schools, however, are unlikely to take on all of them as goals of the educational process. The goal of education is not to render practical arguments more theoretical; nor is it to diminish the role of values in practical reason. Indeed, all three sources—theoretical knowledge, practical knowhow and experience, and deeply held values and identity—have legitimate places in practical arguments. An educated person, argue philosophers Thomas Green (1971) and Gary Fenstermacher (1986), is someone who has transformed the premises of her or his practical arguments from being less objectively reasonable to being more objectively reasonable. That is, to the extent that they employ probabilistic reasoning or interpret data from various sources, those judgments and interpretations conform more accurately to well-understood principles and are less susceptible to biases and distortions. To the extent that values, cultural or religious norms, or matters of personal preference or taste are at work, they have been rendered more explicit, conscious, intentional, and reflective. In his essay for this volume, Jerome Kagan reflects the interactions among these positions by arguing: We are more likely to solve our current problem, however, if teachers accept the responsibility of guaranteeing that all adolescents, regardless of class or ethnicity, can read and comprehend the science section of newspapers, solve basic mathematical problems, detect the logical coherence in non-technical verbal arguments or narratives, and insist that all acts of maliciousness, deception, and unregulated self-aggrandizement are morally unacceptable. Whether choosing between a Prius and a Hummer, an Obama or a McCain, installing solar panels or planting taller trees, a well-educated person has learned to combine their values, experience, understandings, and evidence in a thoughtful and responsible manner. Thus do habits of mind, practice, and heart all play a significant role in the lives of citizens.

### 1NC

#### The struggle of 21st century politics is not a struggle oriented around race; rather, it is the very concept of race which has come to inhibit and constrain radical politics. The affirmative’s deployment of the concept of race as the organizational focus of political struggle is a smokescreen which obscures the dynamics of oppression – the very deployment of race as a concept itself is the lynchpin of racialized oppression

Darder and Torress 4 [Antonia Darder – Professor of Education Policy Studies at the University of Illinois and Rodolfo Torress – Associate Professor of Latino Studies at UC Irvine, “After Race: Racism after multiculturalism”, p. 1-2]

Over a century ago, W E. B. Du Bois in The Souls of Black Folk proclaimed one of his most cited dictums: “The problem of the 20th Century is the problem of the color line” (1989, 10). In this book we echo his sentiment, but with a radical twist. The problem of the twenty-first century is the problem of “race”—an ideology that has served well to successfully obscure and disguise class interests behind the smokescreen of multiculturalism, diversity, difference, and more recently, whiteness. Whether the terms of analysis are “race,” “racial identity,” “race consciousness,” or “political race,” the category of “race” and its many derivatives function as the lynchpin of racism, which “forbids its objects to be other than members of a race” (Fields 2001, 49). As Barbara Fields has noted with respect to African Americans, Afro-Americans themselves have fought successively for different ways of naming themselves as people. . . . Each name, once accepted into the general public vocabulary, has simply become a variant word for Afro Americans’ race. A sense of peoplehood, nationhood, or comradeship in struggle may be available to others; but, for persons of African descent, all reduces to race, a life sentence for them and their issue in perpetuity. (50) 1 To radically shift directions and speak “against race,” as Paul Gilroy (2000) suggests, or “after race” as we attempt to do here, is to uncompromisingly refuse to accept or legitimate any longer the perpetual racialized demarcations of “raced” (Guinier and Torres 2002) or “problem” (Du Bois 1989) populations. Our intention is to contest the notion that the color of a person’s skin, and all it has historically come to signify within the sociological, political, or popular imagination, should continue to function as such. We seek to shatter dubious claims that essentialize the responses of populations, whether they exist as objects or subjects of racism; and by so doing, acknowledge the complexity of the world in which we negotiate our daily existence today. To be clear we are not arguing in the tradition of the color-blind conservatives or political pundits who would have us believe that the structures and practices that have formidably embedded racism as a way of life for centuries in the United States and around the world have been undone and that the problem of racism has been ameliorated. Our position, in fact, is diametrically opposed to this argument. Instead, the political force of our analysis is anchored in the centrality of “race” as an ideology and racism as a powerful, structuring, hegemonic force in the world today. We argue that we must disconnect from “race” as it has been constructed in the past, and contend fully with the impact of “race” as ideology on the lives of all people—but most importantly on the lives of those who have been enslaved, colonized, or marked for genocide in the course of world history.

#### Second, their politics reduces all struggles to a chain of equivalences: Their analysis of power relations through the lens of race makes redressing injustice impossible – by making capitalism just another part of a chain of equivalences of oppression, rather than the totalizing social system which materially underpins oppression, they derail any real political movement.

Darder and Torress 4 [Antonia Darder – Professor of Education Policy Studies at the University of Illinois and Rodolfo Torress – Associate Professor of Latino Studies at UC Irvine, “After Race: Racism after multiculturalism”, p.]

Since the 1970s, much of the progressive literature on subordinate cul tural populations has utilized the construct of “race” as a central category of analysis for interpreting social conditions of inequality and marginal ization. In turn, this literature has adhered to a perspective of “race” as identity. This “raced” identity has received overwhelming attention in both the sociological and political arenas. Unfortunately, the unrelenting emphasis on “identity” unleashed a barrage of liberal and conservative political movements that unwittingly undermined the socialist project of emancipation in this country and abroad. Radical mass organizations that had once worked to spearhead actions for economic democracy, human rights, and social justice were crippled by the fury. In the midst of the blinding celebratory affirmations of identity, neoliberal efforts to seize greater dominion over international markets proliferated and globalization became the policy buzzword of U.S. economic imperialism at the end of the twentieth century. Given this legacy, it is not surprising that many of the theories, practices, and policies that inform the social science analysis of racialized pop ulations today are overwhelmingly rooted in a politics of identity. Consequently this approach—steeped in deeply insular perspectives of “race” and representation—has often ignored the imperatives of capitalist mulation and the presence of class divisions among racialized populations, even though, as John Michael (2000) reminds us, “identity cate gories and groups are always [racialized] and gendered and inflected by class” (29). As we have previously stated, much of the literature on critical race theory lacks a substantive analysis of class and a critique of capitalism, and when class issues are mentioned, the emphasis is usually on an un differentiated plurality that intersects with multiple oppressions. Unfor tunately, this “new pluralism” fails to grapple with the relentless totaliz ing dimension of capitalism and its overwhelming tendency to homoge nize rather than to diversify human experience (Wood 1994). Strongly influenced by a politics of identity, critical race theorists in corporate the intersectionality argument’ to refer to their examination of race, sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation and how the com bination of these identities plays out in various settings (Delgado and Ste fancic 2001). This school of thought, common to progressive scholarship, generally includes a laundry list of oppressions (race, class, gender, ho mophobia, and the like) that are to be engaged with equal weight in the course of ascribing pluralized sensibilities to any political project that proposes to theorize social inequalities. Hence, inadvertently in the name of recognizing and celebrating difference and diversity, this analytical construct reduces “the capitalist system (or the ‘economy’) to one of many spheres in the plural and heterogeneous complexity of modern society” (Wood 1995, 242). Wood argues that the intersectionality argument represents a distorted appropriation of Antonio Gramsci’s notion of “civil society,” which was explicitly intended to function as a weapon against capitalism by identi fying potential spaces of freedom outside the state for autonomous, vol untary organization and plurality. However, as used by many on the left to link multiple oppressions to specific plural identities, the concept has been stripped of its unequivocal, anticapitalist intent. Wood speaks to the danger inherent in this analytical twist. Here, the danger lies in the fact that the totalizing logic and the coercive power of capitalism is reduced to one set of institutions and relations among many others, on a conceptual par with households or voluntary associations. Such a reduction is, in fact, the principal distinctive feature of “civil society” in its new incarnation**.** Its effect is to conceptualize away the problem of capitalism, by disaggregating society into fragments, with no overarching power structure, no totalizing unity, no systemic coercion—in other words, no capitalist system, with its expansionary drive and its capacity to penetrate every aspect of social life. (Wood 1995, 245) This denial of the totalizing force of capitalism does not simply substantiate the existence of plural identities and relations that should be equally privileged and given weight as modes of domination. The logic of this ar gument fails to recognize that “the class relation that constitutes capital, is not, after all, just a personal identity, nor even just a principle of ‘stratification’ or inequality. It is not only a specific system of power rela tions but also the constitutive relation of a distinctive social process, the - dynamic of accumulation and the self-expansion of capital” (Wood 1995, 246). Furthermore, such logic ignores the fact that notions of identity result from a process of identification with a particular configuration of histor ically lived or transferred social arrangements and practices tied to mate- - rial conditions of actual or imagined survival. The intersectionality argu ment fails to illuminate the manner in which commonly identified diverse social spheres or plural identities exist “within the determinative force of capitalism, its system of social property relations, its expansionary im peratives, its drive for accumulation, its coinmodification of all social life, its creation of the market as a necessity, and so on” (Wood 1995, 246). There is no question but that racism as an ideology is integral to the process of capital accumulation. The failure to confront this dimension in an analysis of contemporary society as a racialized phenomenon or to continue to treat class as merely one of a multiplicity of (equally valid) - perspectives, which may or may not “intersect” with the process of racial ization, is a serious shortcoming. In addressing this issue, we must recognize that even progressive African American and Latino scholars and ac tivists have often used identity politics, which generally glosses over class differences and/or ignores class contradictions, in an effort to build a po litical base. Constructions of “race” are objectified and mediated as truth to ignite political support, divorced from the realities of class struggle. By so doing, race-centered scholars have unwittingly perpetuated the vacu ous and dangerous notion that politics and economics are two separate spheres of society which function independently—a view that firmly anchors and sustains prevailing class relations of power in society.

#### Our alternative creates a new standpoint on analysis of inequalities. Rather than beginning with the framework of race and racism to orient our political struggle, politics should begin with a critique of capitalism – only understanding the way in which capitalism produces race in the first place can we create truly effective politics

Darder and Torress 4 [Antonia Darder – Professor of Education Policy Studies at the University of Illinois and Rodolfo Torress – Associate Professor of Latino Studies at UC Irvine, “After Race: Racism after multiculturalism”, p.98-101]

There is no question but that the issues raised by critical race theorists in education, policy studies and the social sciences are significant to our un derstanding of the conditions that plague racialized student populations in U.S. schools today. However, one of our major concerns with the use of critical race theory to buttress educational-political debates of racial ized oppression or racism is directly linked to the use of “race” as the central unit of analysis. Coupled with an uncompromising emphasis on “race” is the conspicuous absence of a systematic discussion of class and, more importantly, a substantive critique of capitalism. Let us be more specific here. In contending with questions of “race” and institutional power, references are indeed made to “capitalism” or “2class” in some works by critical race theorists and, in particular, Latino critical race theorists, who acknowledge that “attention to class issues has a pending, but as yet underdeveloped, trajectory in the future evolution of LatCrit theory and the consolidation of LatCrit social justice agendas” (Iglesias 1999, 64). However, these efforts to explore the ways in which socioeconomic interests are expressed in the law or education are generally vague and undertheorized. Because of this lack of a theo retically informed account of racism and capitalist social relations, criti cal race theory has done little to further our understanding of the politi cal economy of racism and racialization. In addition, much of critical race theory’s approach is informed by ambiguous ideas of “institutional racism” or “structural racism,” which, as Miles (1989) points Out, are problematic due to the danger of conceptual inflation. Our aim here is not to dismiss this important body of work but to point out an important analytical distinction we make in our intellectual and political project. Our analysis of racism in contemporary society be gins with the capitalist mode of production, classes, and class struggle. The mode of production, which is the site of class relations, is the point of departure in our interrogation of racism as an ideology of social ex clusion. In contrast, critical race scholars attribute constitutive power to the American legal system itself. Hence, the “relative autonomy” of legal institutions is invoked to stress the power of “race” and to set their work apart from critical legal scholars, who “could not come to grips with the continuing problems of deeply embedded racism” (Guinier and Torres 2002, 34). We maintain that the legal system (the state) is located in a given economic context and is shaped by the imperatives of capital. Our critique, then, is tied to the continued use of the traditional language of social theory, which has always been inadequate in problematizing notions of “race” in both research and popular discourse. In essence, we argue that the use of “race” has been elevated to a theoretical construct, despite the fact that the concept of “race” itself has remained under theorized Hence to employ alternative constructs derived from legal theory to shape arguments related to educational policy and in stitutional practices, although well meaning and eloquent, is like beating a dead horse. No matter how much is said, it is impossible to enliven or extend the debate on educational policy with its inherent inequalities by using the language of “race.” Even a brief overview of the most prominent writings in critical race theory shows how little movement there has been in furthering our understanding of the concept or redirecting the debate. Overall, most of the work is anchored in the popular intersectionality argument of the postructuralist and postmodernist era, which maintains that “race,” gender, and class should all receive equal attention in our understanding of soci. ety and our development of institutional policies and practices. More re. cently, Guinier and Tortes (2002), in an apparent effort to push through the limits of the intersectionality argument, proposed to advocate for what they term “racial literacy” from which “to identify patterns of in. justice that link race to class, gender, and other forms of power.” (29) Despite their innovative use of “race,” its traditional analytical use remains intact. Our concerns with critical race theory go beyond the desire to construct intellectual abstractions. Rather, our concerns are grounded in political questions such as: Where exactly does an antirace theory of society lead us in real political struggles for social justice, human rights, and eco. nomic democracy? How do we launch a truly universal emancipatory po. lineal project anchored primarily upon a theory of “race”? Where is a cri tique of capitalism or an explicit anticapitalist vision in a critical theory of “race”? Can we afford to overlook the inherent existence of a politics of identity in the foundational views that led to the construction of critical race theory? We are also troubled by the confusion with respect to the, terms critical race theorists use to frame their analysis. In this context, it is important to distinguish between how we under stand the construct of “race” and its genesis. In our analysis, “race,” simply put, is the child of racism. That into say, racism does not exist because there is such a thing as “race.” Rather notions of “race” are a fundamental ideological construction of racism or a racialized interpretation of phenotypically and, may we add, regionally different human beings. The process of racialization, then, is at work in all relations in a capitalist so ciety. Alternatively, we might say that the empire is not built on “race’ but on an ideology of racism—this being one of the primary categories by which human beings are sorted, controlled, and made disposable at the point of production.

#### Capitalism causes extinction while entrenching racist and sexist violence, outweighs everything about the aff

Brown 5 — Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan (Charles Brown, http://www.mail-archive.com/pen-l@sus.csuchico.edu/msg04868.html)

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or exacerbates all major social ills of our times. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, which can destroy all humanity, grows with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian and Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. Racist violence and the poison of racist ideas victimize all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and male supremacist ideology perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

### 1NC

#### All humans are inherently interconnected --- we share a common bond of consciousness and our identities only form through co-creation. This recognition must ground our reaction to domination and oppression. The affirmative’s challenge to white supremacy is rooted in dualism between self and other, white and black. This denies the fundamental truth of interconnectedness and re-creates the oppression that the affirmative seeks to challenge. Only a shift in consciousness towards a politics of love can fundamentally transform society.

Michele Carrie Butot, 2004. B.Ed. University of Calgary, 1985; B.S.W. University of Calgary, 1988; MA Social Work University of Victoria. “Love as Ernancipatory Praxis: An Exploration of Practitioners' Conceptualizations of Love in Critical Social Work Practice,” Masters Thesis, Proquest Thesis and Dissertation Database.

Non-judging and non-interference in the Buddhist view do not imply non-engagement. In Chodron's discussion with hooks about Buddhism and working to end racism and sexism - hooks , a critical feminist and race analyst, struggles to know how to begin where she is and how the world is, and still have a vision of how it might be different. Chodron suggests it is less a situation of hoping for change (where there is too much hope, she contends, one often begins to have a "strong sense of enemy" or 'other'), but of aspiring to an end to suffering for all beings. She says: "I give up both the hope that something is going to change and the fear that it isn't. We may long to end suffering but somehow it paralyses us if we're too goal-oriented. Do you see the balance there?" (Chodron & hook, 1999, pp. 1-2). This is similar to the paradox we d hear participants &cuss in the interpretive chapter on critical practice, about hoping for change and spealung one's own truth without being attached to how the change ought to unfold, and without trying to change the other. Other critical-feminist Buddhst authors also take up the concept of aspiration towards change, along with non-interference and its implicit notion of engaged non-attachment. Klein (1996), for example, argues that: ... self-awareness and simple self-acceptance is the foundation of all practice. Buddhists call it mindfulness, and it involves among other things the ability to just see what is, without rushing in to criticize, enhance, or change. Just see. Just be. (p. 40) The ability to just be is basic and healing ... we have to start from where we are. And to do th we must accept the person we are at this very moment, in all its unglory, is the perfect place for us to start from. (p. 41) She also contends that it is crucial to be able to make effort toward something without at the same time belittling ourselves because t h has not yet been accomplished (p. 42). Thich Nhat Hanh is a Vietnamese Buddhist monk, teacher, writer and peace activist who embodies the principles he teaches. He suggests the need for "mindfulness, insight, and altruistic love as the only sustainable bases for political action" (Thich Nhat Ha&, 1993, p. 155). He was mentioned by two of the participants during our dialogues as someone who understood, stood for, and lived the principles about which we were speaking. Coincidentally, although I am not a Buddhist, and had not mentioned him to participants, h writings, which I had not reviewed for several years, were fundamental in my own early understandings of love in practice; and be1 hooks, whom I have cited extensively, considers him one of her key teachers. In his work on non-violent resistance to war, Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) discusses ahimsa, Sanskrit for 'non- harming', a concept also key in yoga philosophy. In parallel with Hart (l999), and participants who we will hear speak of the need for ongoing self-work before and alongside work with others, he states that ahimsa must first be practiced in relation to oneself, not as an achievable goal, but as a guide of the direction in which to proceed. His argument that "Among the three individual, society, and nature - it is the individual who begins to effect change" (p. 123) echoes the words of Chodron above. Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) adds another critical notion to this discussion, complicating the notion of intersubjectivity. In congruence with participants and other theorists who spoke of interconnection, he speaks of "interbeing" (1993, pp. 67-8; see also 1998, p. 134) as a holistic approach to activism. Through the practice of non-harming, he says, we can come to an understanding and experience of "interbeing", recognizing the roots of violence and oppression in all of us, not just those termed the 'oppressor' or the 'enemy' (p. 67). In concert with hooks, he suggests that if we are able to recognize this intrinsic interconnection, we will naturally stop creating an 'other' to blame, argue with, harm, kill (p. 68). In the concept of interbeing, we hear echoes of Ermine and Hart's (1999) 'interconnection' and 'enmeshment', and a connection point with Leonard's (2001) notion of a constant dialectical tension between interdependence and diversity. This notion of interbeing is absolutely key to my inquiry because it speaks eloquently to the apparent contradiction between the universal and the particular: "All phenomena are interdependent ... but if we truly realm! the interdependent nature of the dust, the flower, and the human being, we see that unity cannot exist without diversity. Unity and diversity interpenetrate each other freely. Unity is diversity, and diversity is unity. This is the principle of interbeing" W c h Nhat Hanh, 1993, p. 129). While he consciously connects Buddhist beliefs to ddferent faith tdtions, each of which he perceives as containing the 'elements' of each other (p. 136), and while he asserts that some concepts, such as the notion of 'no-enemy' is "enshrined in all the great spiritual, humanist, and religious traditions of the world" (pp. 143-4), he also sides with Baskin (2002) in her critique of the absence of spirituality in structwahst social work, saying: "We know there is no place for spiritdty in Marxism" (Thich Nhat Hanh, 1993, p. 57). In keeping with the Aboriginal belief, cited earlier in this conceptual chapter, and by participants in the next, of the intrinsic value of all beings, he states: "Each person is important. Each being is important. Each moment is important" (p. 99). As we will hear participants in later chapters discuss love as a guiding force, and non-judging and truth-telltng as coexistent, lhch Nhat Hanh, speaking of the juxtaposition of a strongly nonviolent stance andworking activelyfor peace and other justice issues, names compassion as a guide in knowing how to be and do (or not do) in each moment. "[In] confronting the situation and having compassion in our hearts, ways of acting c[o]me by themselves ... If you are alert and creative, you will know what to do and what not to don (p. 45). "In many circumstances, non-action can help a lot ... sometimes it is best not to say anything ... [but wlhen we see social injustice, if we practice nonaction, we may cause harm" (p. 69). Like Chodron, Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) suggests the possibility of movements for social justice that do not dehumanize or demonize our oppressors and enemies. The keys to social action he suggests are embodied deep listening, non-harming, loving kindness and discernment (pp. 68-71; see also 1998, p. 1 16). The recognition of interbeing, he asserts, is a way towards sustainability of the work for social and ecological justice (1993, p. 138). In her work on 'contemplation and transformation' hooks (1996) takes up contemplative engagement practices as congruent with a critical conceptualization of love and with the notion of interbeing. She conceptualizes love as beyond dualism, and makes a strong link between deep engagement and activism. Her work is so eloquent, and feels so critical to t h discussion that I cite some of the text here in detail as a ground from which to move into the rest of the inquiry: Love as an active practice - whether Buddhist, Christian, or Islamic mysticism - requires that one embraces being a lover, being in love with the universe ... To commit to love is fundamentally to commit to a life beyond dualism. That's why, in a culture of domination**,** love is so sacred. It erodes dualisms - the binary oppositions of black and white, male and female, right and wrong. Love transforms. (hooks, 1996, p. 287) She goes on to describe a loving stance as a way of dissolving dualities. In a loving stance, she argues, we recognize the complexity of life, and must come to our critical and political engagements both actively and from contemplative stdhess: If we are concerned with dissolving these apparent dualities we have to identify anchors to hold onto in the midst of fragmentation, in the midst of loss of grounding. My anchor is love. It is life-sustaining to understand that things are always more complex than they seem. This is what it means to see clearly. Such understanding is more useful and more difficult than the idea that there is a right and a wrong, or a good or bad, and you only have to decide what side you're on. In real love, real union or communion, there are no simple rules. (p. 289) Not only does she argue that love is life-sustaining, as we will hear participants agree later, hooks also suggests that it has the potential to lead us to deeper engagement and clarity in our work towards social justice. Participants will be heard to speak to this as well, suggesting that a loving stance demands that we engage deeply, and that such a loving stance requires the self-care and selfwork that hooks contends contemplation can provide. Love as a foundation also takes us more deeply into practice as action in the world ... love leads to a greater commitment and involvement with the world, not a turning away from the world. The wisdom I seek is that which enables us to know what is needed at a given moment in time. When do I need to reside in that location of stillness and contemplation, and when do I need to rise and do whatever is needed to be done in terms of physical work, or engagement with others, or confrontation with others? (p. 289) It is not useful to rank one type of action over the other. (hooks, 1996, p. 290) What is required, she concludes, and what love might provide to our work for social justice, is a "fundamental shift in consciousness": A fundamental shift in consciousness is the only way to transform a culture of domination and oppression into one of love. Contemplation is the key to this shift. There is no change without contemplation ... here [she is referring to the Buddha under the Bodhi tree] is an action taking place that may not q w r t o be a meaningful action. Yet it transforms. (p. 292, italics in original) Whether this shdt in consciousness is defined as spiritual is, I thmk a matter of preference for the practitioner, but the transformative relationship between love, critical practice and interconnection that hooks refers to is key it brings me back to the notions of intersubjectivity explored earlier.

#### Our alternative allows for a non-adversarial reaction to domination that recognizes that oppression is bad for both the oppressed and the oppressor. This produces a more effective foundation for social ethics – without it global violence is inevitable

Ethan Mills, 2006. Department of Philosophy, University of New Mexico. “Review of Being Benevolence: The Social Ethics of Engaged Buddhism,” Journal of Buddhist Ethics 13, <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/04/mills-review.pdf>

The movement known as Engaged Buddhism has emerged in the last several decades as one of the most original and fascinating developments in recent Buddhist history; therefore, it is fitting that a volume on the subject should be part of the Topics in Contemporary Buddhism Series, published by the University of Hawai'i Press. Sallie B. King, a specialist in the study of Engaged Buddhism, has previously co-edited an anthology that was more descriptive and informational in nature (Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia, 1996). In this volume, however, King presents what may be the first book-length philosophical treatment of the social ethics underlying the movement as a whole, a task whose time has come given the movements influence in contemporary Buddhism. Concentrating on Asian Engaged Buddhists, including A. T. Ariyaratne, Aung San Suu Kyi, Buddhadasa Bhikkhu, the Dalai Lama and Thich Nhat Hanh, King notes that there are differences in idiom (e.g., Theravāda vs. Mahāyāna) and some differences of interpretation among Engaged Buddhists. However, the basic ethical structure of Engaged Buddhism can be summarized as an effort to put Buddhist concepts such as interdependence, loving-kindness, and compassion into action in social and/or political spheres as opposed to the rather individualistic, withdrawn outlook of some traditional forms of Buddhism. King's most prominent thesis, supported throughout the book, is that Engaged Buddhism is a native Buddhist reformist development. This is important, as Engaged Buddhism has often been dismissed as merely a product of Western influence rather than an authentically Buddhist movement. While it is true that many Engaged Buddhists adopt Western terminology such as talk about human rights or justice, King shows that this is always done via Buddhist interpretations and with Buddhist motivations. Thus, Engaged Buddhism is an organic outgrowth of the Buddhist tradition. Chapters two, three and four are concerned with the fundamentals of Engaged Buddhist ethics, while chapters five, six and seven apply these insights to human rights, nonviolence and justice and reconciliation respectively. Chapter two shows how Engaged Buddhists have reinterpreted classic features of Buddhist philosophy such as dependent origination, the four noble truths, and meditation techniques. Dependent origination proves to be one of the most important reinterpretations and King returns to it throughout the book. The idea here is that "… human beings are social beings—that is, each one of us lives in a condition of interdependence within society." (p. 13) This social interpretation proves to have dramatic and far-reaching effects on a large range of Engaged Buddhist theories from responsibility and punishment to nonviolence and economic justice. Chapter three places Engaged Buddhism in the context of debates about which Western ethical theory most closely resembles Buddhist ethics. King suggests that Engaged Buddhism exhibits features of several Western systems while showing the prevalence of such ideas as natural law, holism and an outlook that is nonadversarial and pragmatic. Chapter four shows how a holistic, socially interdependent theory of the relationship between the individual and society has emerged. Largely expanding on Engaged Buddhist interpretations of dependent origination and no-self, the most interesting discussion of the chapter focuses on a reaction to the Western debate between free will and determinism. King argues that neither the free will nor determinist positions are suitable and shows how Engaged 3 Journal of Buddhist Ethics Buddhists think about moral responsibility given their theories about causality, no-self and personal development. The more practically oriented chapters begin with a discussion of human rights, centered on the debate about whether human rights can be defended in an Asian Buddhist context (often referred to as the "Asian values debate"). While most Western interpretations of human rights are too individualistic and adversarial for Engaged Buddhism, some Engaged Buddhists have argued for the pragmatic necessity of human rights to end suffering, especially in countries such as Cambodia or Myanmar/Burma. Others have argued that human rights can be interpreted as expressing a nonadversarial stance, namely that violation of human rights is morally good neither for the abused nor the abuser. While acknowledging that all Engaged Buddhists promote nonviolence, chapter five details a spectrum of views from principled to pragmatic nonviolence, often along similar lines of nonviolence found outside of Buddhism. Aside from the more familiar views of personal nonviolence as developed in the tradition, the chapter includes an innovative discussion of the role of violence in the military and how Engaged Buddhists may or may not promote a defensive military force. In the chapter called "Justice/Reconciliation," King notes that Engaged Buddhists have tended not to use language of justice as much as that of human rights. However, she finds that almost all Engaged Buddhists are concerned with economic justice out of their efforts to promote equality and to eradicate the greed caused by economic models of perpetual growth and the suffering caused by extreme poverty. In terms of political justice, King suggests that Engaged Buddhists move more toward a model of reconciliation in which both sides of a conflict benefit. This does not mean, however, that Engaged Buddhists have no concepts of blame and punishment, as the section on criminal justice details. Here Engaged Buddhists opt for a rehabilitative model rather than a retributive model, although King adds that there is much work to be done to fully develop this model in Buddhist terms.

### 1NC

#### Identity politics fractures warming movements---reformism is necessary

George Monbiot, English Writer and Environmental and Political Activist, 9-4-2008, “Identity Politics in Climate Change Hell,” <http://www.celsias.com/article/identity-politics-climate-change-hell/>

If you want a glimpse of how the movement against climate change could crumble faster than a summer snowflake, read Ewa Jasiewicz’s article , published on the Guardian’s Comment is Free site. It is a fine example of the identity politics that plagued direct action movements during the 1990s, and from which the new generation of activists has so far been mercifully free. Ewa rightly celebrates the leaderless, autonomous model of organising that has made this movement so effective. The two climate camps I have attended – this year and last – were among the most inspiring events I’ve ever witnessed. I am awed by the people who organised them, who managed to create, under extraordinary pressure, safe, functioning, delightful spaces in which we could debate the issues and plan the actions which thrust Heathrow and Kingsnorth into the public eye. Climate camp is a tribute to the anarchist politics that Jasiewicz supports. But in seeking to extrapolate from this experience to a wider social plan, she makes two grave errors. The first is to confuse ends and means. She claims to want to stop global warming, but she makes that task 100 times harder by rejecting all state and corporate solutions. It seems to me that what she really wants to do is to create an anarchist utopia, and use climate change as an excuse to engineer it. Stopping runaway climate change must take precedence over every other aim. Everyone in this movement knows that there is very little time: the window of opportunity in which we can prevent two degrees of warming is closing fast. We have to use all the resources we can lay hands on, and these must include both governments and corporations. Or perhaps she intends to build the installations required to turn the energy economy around - wind farms, wave machines, solar thermal plants in the Sahara, new grid connections and public transport systems - herself? Her article is a terryifying example of the ability some people have to put politics first and facts second when confronting the greatest challenge humanity now faces. The facts are as follows. Runaway climate change is bearing down on us fast. We require a massive political and economic response to prevent it. Governments and corporations, whether we like it or not, currently control both money and power. Unless we manage to mobilise them, we stand a snowball’s chance in climate hell of stopping the collapse of the biosphere. Jasiewicz would ignore all these inconvenient truths because they conflict with her politics. “Changing our sources of energy without changing our sources of economic and political power”, she asserts, “will not make a difference. Neither coal nor nuclear are the “solution”, we need a revolution.” So before we are allowed to begin cutting greenhouse gas emissions, we must first overthrow all political structures and replace them with autonomous communities of happy campers. All this must take place within a couple of months, as there is so little time in which we could prevent two degrees of warming. This is magical thinking of the most desperate kind. If I were an executive of E.On or Exxon, I would be delighted by this political posturing, as it provides a marvellous distraction from our real aims. To support her argument, Jasiewicz misrepresents what I said at climate camp. She claims that I “confessed not knowing where to turn next to solve the issues of how to generate the changes necessary to shift our sources of energy, production and consumption”. I confessed nothing of the kind. In my book Heat I spell out what is required to bring about a 90% cut in emissions by 2030. Instead I confessed that I don’t know how to solve the problem of capitalism without resorting to totalitarianism. The issue is that capitalism involves lending money at interest. If you lend at 5%, then one of two things must happen. Either the money supply must increase by 5% or the velocity of circulation must increase by 5%. In either case, if this growth is not met by a concomitant increase in the supply of goods and services, it becomes inflationary and the system collapses. But a perpetual increase in the supply of goods and services will eventually destroy the biosphere. So how do we stall this process? Even when usurers were put to death and condemned to perpetual damnation, the practice couldn’t be stamped out. Only the communist states managed it, through the extreme use of the state control Ewa professes to hate. I don’t yet have an answer to this conundrum. Does she? Yes, let us fight both corporate power and the undemocratic tendencies of the state. Yes, let us try to crack the problem of capitalism and then fight for a different system. But let us not confuse this task with the immediate need to stop two degrees of warming, or allow it to interfere with the carbon cuts that have to begin now. Ewa’s second grave error is to imagine that society could be turned into a giant climate camp. Anarchism is a great means of organising a self-elected community of like-minded people. It is a disastrous means of organising a planet. Most anarchists envisage their system as the means by which the oppressed can free themselves from persecution. But if everyone is to be free from the coercive power of the state, this must apply to the oppressors as well as the oppressed. The richest and most powerful communities on earth - be they geographical communities or communities of interest - will be as unrestrained by external forces as the poorest and weakest. As a friend of mine put it, “when the anarchist utopia arrives, the first thing that will happen is that every Daily Mail reader in the country will pick up a gun and go and kill the nearest hippy.” This is why, though both sides furiously deny it, the outcome of both market fundamentalism and anarchism, if applied universally, is identical. The anarchists associate with the oppressed, the market fundamentalists with the oppressors. But by eliminating the state, both remove such restraints as prevent the strong from crushing the weak. Ours is not a choice between government and no government. It is a choice between government and the mafia. Over the past year I have been working with groups of climate protesters who have changed my view of what could be achieved. Most of them are under 30, and they bring to this issue a clear-headedness and pragmatism that I have never encountered in direct action movements before. They are prepared to take extraordinary risks to try to defend the biosphere from the corporations, governments and social trends which threaten to make it uninhabitable. They do so for one reason only: that they love the world and fear for its future. It would be a tragedy if, through the efforts of people like Ewa, they were to be diverted from this urgent task into the identity politics that have wrecked so many movements.

#### Extinction

Mazo 10 (Jeffrey Mazo – PhD in Paleoclimatology from UCLA, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122)

The best estimates for global warming to the end of the century range from 2.5-4.~C above pre-industrial levels, depending on the scenario. Even in the best-case scenario, the low end of the likely range is 1.goC, and in the worst 'business as usual' projections, which actual emissions have been matching, the range of likely warming runs from 3.1--7.1°C. Even keeping emissions at constant 2000 levels (which have already been exceeded), global temperature would still be expected to reach 1.2°C (O'9""1.5°C)above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century." Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation." What is certain is that there is no precedent in human experience for such rapid change or such climatic conditions, and even in the best case adaptation to these extremes would mean profound social, cultural and political changes.

### 1NC

#### Text: The United States federal government should site a relatively larger share of coal refineries in non-minority neighborhoods

#### The CP solves the aff – it forces whites to come to terms with the environmental racism of the status quo but doesn’t link to our nuclear power disads

#### Expansion of nuclear makes accidents inevitable – safe reactor designs don’t solve

**Tickell, 8/20**/12 – British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative (Oliver, “Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis?” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis>)

That does not mean it's impossible to build 11,000 reactors in 35 years if the world dedicates sufficient resources to the task. At a construction cost of about US$10 billion per reactor, we would need to dedicate US$110 trillion, or about two years' gross world product, while also providing for long-term liabilities. But before we seriously consider doing so, we should ask what an 11,000-reactor world would be like. For a start, it would be much more radioactive than it is now. Routine radioactive discharges, for example of gaseous fission products like xenon-133, would be 25 times greater. Serious accidents, such as those at Windscale, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima – the last of which came very close to making Tokyo uninhabitable for decades to come – would become commonplace events. To date the nuclear industry has produced one major radiation release for every 3,000 years of reactor operation. On that basis our 11,000 reactors would give us four such events a year. Safer reactor design would reduce the danger, but as nuclear power reaches into countries where safety standards are not so exacting as in the UK, the US, Russia and Japan, and where suitably trained personnel may be hard to recruit, the risk would surely rise.

#### Accidents cause extinction

Wasserman 2 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, Earth Island Journal, Spring, www.earthisland.org/eijournal/new\_articles.cfm?articleID=457&journalID=63)

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack.  Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation?  If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations must be shut down.

### 1NC – Case

#### Siting decisions are based on non-racial factors – your author

Kevin 97 Environmental analyst at the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in Berkeley, California J.D., Golden Gate University Law School (1986); Doctoral Candidacy, University of California, Berkeley (1982); M.A., University of California, Berkeley (1975); B.A., University of California, Santa Cruz (1973), was an analyst with the U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment from 1979 to 1987, and worked with private sector environmental consulting firms from 1987 to 1996. 8 Vill. Envtl. L.J. 121 "ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM" AND LOCALLY UNDESIRABLE LAND USES: A CRITIQUE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE THEORIES AND REMEDIES, Lexis

Nondiscriminatory factors account for disparate results in the great majority of formal siting decisions. Some hazardous waste landfill sites which are often cited as examples of environmental racism, such as Emelle, Alabama and Warren County, North Carolina, may be technically superior to alternate sites. n92 For example, when Chemical Waste Management made its decision to site a hazardous waste landfill, Emelle was the only county east of the Mississippi River evaluated by EPA and listed as one of the ten most desirable counties for a landfill. n93 Factors accounting for its desirability as a landfill included the sparse population surrounding the site, reliable access to the site, and arid temperature in the site's location. n94 Most importantly, Emelle was underlain by dense natural chalk forming a good barrier between waste disposal activities and aquifers. n95 Other factors being equal, and independent of racism, siting proponents seek out areas where the costs of siting are low relative to comparable areas. n96 Minority communities are often in areas [\*140] with lower land values. n97 In addition, although the assertion that "no one likes to live near a waste site" n98 is probably correct, in some instances there has not been strong opposition from minority communities that have been or would be affected by a LULU siting. n99 It is reasonable to conclude that lack of opposition has resulted from the same factors that have been cited in the cases of white communities which have solicited LULUs; as well as potential problems, LULUs can bring potential benefits to communities in jobs, revenues and direct provision of social services. n100 In some cases, not only has there been a lack of local opposition to LULU sitings, but community leaders have actively sought out or welcomed such sitings. For example, the Campo Band of Mission Indians has supported the construction of a solid waste landfill on reservation land in San Diego County, California. n101 Permitting and environmental standards for the landfill would meet, at a minimum, applicable EPA standards. n102 The landfill [\*141] would bring great economic benefits to the Campo Band. n103 Tribal sources estimated that the landfill would directly create at least fifty-five permanent jobs for at least thirty-five members of the Campo Band, almost eliminating tribal unemployment. n104 Here, the most sustained and politically effective opposition to siting the landfill has come from several white neighbors of the Campo Reservation. n105 Unfortunately, LULUs have been sited despite considerable opposition from minority communities. Siting in the face of local opposition, however, is not limited to minority communities. A prominent example of LULU siting in spite of objections from non-minority communities is the decision to place a high-level radioactive waste repository in Nevada. n106 Conversely, other communities with white majorities have lobbied to have facilities, which most people would consider to be LULUs, sited in their jurisdictions in order to gain jobs and other benefits during difficult economic times. n107 In both situations, non-racial factors better explain the outcomes than intentional or societal racism.

#### They don’t solve alt causes that their 1ac kevin evidence cites - that’s cross-x

#### Federal guidelines mean nuclear plants must be located in low-population zones

AP 11, 6-27, “AP: Populations around U.S. nuclear plants soar”, http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2011-06-27-Nuclear-plants-population-evacuation\_n.htm

In 1998, federal guidelines said low-population areas were "generally preferred" because they limit exposure to radiation accidents. This was viewed as part of the NRC's philosophy of multiple layers of accident safeguards. NRC regulations continue to require "low population zones" around prospective nuclear sites.

#### Most nuclear plants are built along affluent beachfront property – the need the water for cooling

Dedman 11 Bill Dedman, reporter for MSNBC, “Nuclear neighbors: Population rises near US reactors”, April 4, 2011, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/42555888/ns/us\_news-life/t/nuclear-neighbors-population-rises-near-us-reactors/#.UGB7wI1lSAo

Why would the population rise sharply near nuclear power plants, even in lower-growth states outside the Sun Belt? One reason could be normal population expansion, with previously unoccupied areas being filled in. Another reason: Nuclear reactors use water for cooling, from lakes, rivers or oceans, so the reactors are typically built on waterfront property. Is the sun rising or setting over the ocean any less beautiful if you can also see a cooling tower? On a recent spring evening, two boys were shooting hoops in the driveway of a beachfront house on Millstone Beach in Waterford, a Connecticut town on Long Island Sound midway between New York City and Boston. The neat houses look out on glorious sunrises. And if you turn your head to the right, the orange-and-white-striped tower of the Millstone Power Station reaches high above the white sand. The estimated population within 10 miles of Millstone grew 30 percent in the past decade, to 123,482. The population within 50 miles grew to 3 million, an increase of 10 percent, much faster than the state's general growth rate of 4.9 percent. The father of one of the boys, Paul Van der Putten, 49, bought his home in 2003 for $378,000. It has increased roughly 75 percent in value since. He said he isn't worried about the nuclear plant, which is about six-tenths of a mile away, the length of 10 football fields. It has two operating nuclear reactors as well as a third reactor, mothballed but still a storehouse for nuclear fuel rods.

#### Whiteness isn’t a monolithic root cause---they shut off productive debate over solutions – means the alt fails

Shelby 7 – Tommie Shelby, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity

Others might challenge the distinction between ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage, on the grounds that we are rarely, if ever, able to so neatly separate these factors, an epistemic situation that is only made worse by the fact that these causes interact in complex ways with behavioral factors. These distinctions, while perhaps straightforward in the abstract, are difficult to employ in practice. For example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the members of a poor black community to determine with any accuracy whether their impoverished condition is due primarily to institutional racism, the impact of past racial injustice, the increasing technological basis of the economy, shrinking state budgets, the vicissitudes of world trade, the ascendancy of conservative ideology, poorly funded schools, lack of personal initiative, a violent drug trade that deters business investment, some combination of these factors, or some other explanation altogether. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to determine when the formulation of putatively race-neutral policies has been motivated by racism or when such policies are unfairly applied by racially biased public officials.¶ There are very real empirical difficulties in determining the specific causal significance of the factors that create and perpetuate black disadvantage; nonetheless, it is clear that these factors exist and that justice will demand different practical remedies according to each factor's relative impact on blacks' life chances. We must acknowledge that our social world is complicated and not immediately transparent to common sense, and thus that systematic empirical inquiry, historical studies, and rigorous social analysis are required to reveal its systemic structure and sociocultural dynamics. There is, moreover, no mechanical or infallible procedure for determining which analyses are the soundest ones. In addition, given the inevitable bias that attends social inquiry, legislators and those they represent cannot simply defer to social-scientific experts. We must instead rely on open public debate—among politicians, scholars, policy makers, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens—with the aim of garnering rationally motivated and informed consensus. And even if our practical decision procedures rest on critical deliberative discourse and thus live up to our highest democratic ideals, some trial and error through actual practice is unavoidable.¶ These difficulties and complications notwithstanding, a general recognition of the distinctions among the ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage could help blacks refocus their political energies and self-help strategies. Attention to these distinctions might help expose the superficiality of theories that seek to reduce all the social obstacles that blacks face to contemporary forms of racism or white supremacy. A more penetrating, **subtle, and empirically grounded analysis is needed to comprehend the causes of racial inequality and black disadvantage**. Indeed, these distinctions highlight the necessity to probe deeper to find the causes of contemporary forms of racism, as some racial conflict may be a symptom of broader problems or recent social developments (such as immigration policy or reduced federal funding for higher education).

#### [ ] Three mile island is the only plant within 10 miles of a dense population

Gilbert 11, 3-24, “Plants Face New Worries”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703362904576219031025249872.html

Just one of the U.S.'s 104 commercial nuclear reactors is within 10 miles of a densely populated city—the Three Mile Island facility near Harrisburg, Pa. But 29 are within 25 miles of such metropolitan areas. And almost half of the nuclear reactors in the U.S. are within 50 miles of a metropolitan area with more than 500,000 people.

#### Foucaultian genealogy is trapped in a double bind: its extreme relativism either undercuts its political usefulness or a new master discourse is produced.

Habermas 87- Permanent Visiting Professor at Northwestern (Jürgen, The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity, p. 279)

Foucault's historiography can evade relativism as little as it can this acute presentism. His investigations are caught ex­actly in the self-referentiality that was supposed to be excluded by a naturalistic treatment of the problematic of validity. Ge­nealogical historiography is supposed to make the practices of power, precisely in their discourse-constituting achievement, accessible to an empirical analysis. From this perspective, not only are truth claims confined to the discourses within which they arise; they exhaust their entire significance in the func­tional contribution they make to the self-maintenance of a given totality of discourse. That is to say, the meaning of valid­ity claims consists in the power effects they have. On the other hand, this basic assumption of the theory of power is self-referential; if it is correct, it must destroy the foundations of the research inspired by it as well. But if the truth claims that Foucault himself raises for his genealogy of knowledge were in fact illusory and amounted to no more than the effects that this theory is capable of releasing within the circle of its ad­herents, then the entire undertaking of a critical unmasking of the human sciences would lose its point. Foucault pursues ge­nealogical historiography with the serious intent of getting a science underway that is superior to the mismanaged human sciences. If, then, its superiority cannot be expressed in the fact that something more convincing enters in place of the convicted pseudo-sciences, if its superiority were only to be expressed in the effect of its suppressing the hitherto dominant scientific discourse *in fact,* Foucault's theory would exhaust itself in the politics of theory, and indeed in setting theoretical-political goals that would overburden the capacities of even so heroic a one-man enterprise. Foucault is aware of this. Con­sequently, he would like to single out his genealogy from all the rest of the human sciences in a manner that is reconcilable with the fundamental assumptions of his own theory. To this end,; the dif­ference that can establish its preeminence above all the other human sciences is to be demonstrated in the history of its he turns genealogical historiography upon itself own emergence.

## Round 5 v Kentucky GR

### 1NC

#### First off is topicality

#### Restrictions on production must mandate a decrease in the quantity produced

Anell 89Chairman, WTO panel

"To examine, in the light of the relevant GATT provisions, the matter referred to the

CONTRACTING PARTIES by the United States in document L/6445 and to make such findings as will assist the CONTRACTING PARTIES in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in Article XXIII:2." 3. On 3 April 1989, the Council was informed that agreement had been reached on the following composition of the Panel (C/164): Composition Chairman: Mr. Lars E.R. Anell Members: Mr. Hugh W. Bartlett Mrs. Carmen Luz Guarda CANADA - IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON ICE CREAM AND YOGHURT Report of the Panel adopted at the Forty-fifth Session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES on 5 December 1989 (L/6568 - 36S/68)

http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\_e/dispu\_e/88icecrm.pdf

The United States argued that Canada had failed to demonstrate that it effectively restricted domestic production of milk. The differentiation between "fluid" and "industrial" milk was an artificial one for administrative purposes; with regard to GATT obligations, the product at issue was raw milk from the cow, regardless of what further use was made of it. The use of the word "permitted" in Article XI:2(c)(i) required that there be a limitation on the total quantity of milk that domestic producers were authorized or allowed to produce or sell. The provincial controls on fluid milk did not restrict the quantities permitted to be produced; rather dairy farmers could produce and market as much milk as could be sold as beverage milk or table cream. There were no penalties for delivering more than a farmer's fluid milk quota, it was only if deliveries exceeded actual fluid milk usage or sales that it counted against his industrial milk quota. At least one province did not participate in this voluntary system, and another province had considered leaving it. Furthermore, Canada did not even prohibit the production or sale of milk that exceeded the Market Share Quota. The method used to calculate direct support payments on within-quota deliveries assured that most dairy farmers would completely recover all of their fixed and variable costs on their within-quota deliveries. The farmer was permitted to produce and market milk in excess of the quota, and perhaps had an economic incentive to do so. 27. The United States noted that in the past six years total industrial milk production had consistently exceeded the established Market Sharing Quota, and concluded that the Canadian system was a regulation of production but not a restriction of production. Proposals to amend Article XI:2(c)(i) to replace the word "restrict" with "regulate" had been defeated; what was required was the reduction of production. The results of the econometric analyses cited by Canada provided no indication of what would happen to milk production in the absence not only of the production quotas, but also of the accompanying high price guarantees which operated as incentives to produce. According to the official publication of the Canadian Dairy Commission, a key element of Canada's national dairy policy was to promote self-sufficiency in milk production. The effectiveness of the government supply controls had to be compared to what the situation would be in the absence of all government measures.

#### On is exclusively targeted

Dictionary.com No Date

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on?s=t

“ON”:16. (used to indicate a source or a person or thing that serves as a source or agent): a duty on imported goods; She depends on her friends for encouragement.

#### Production means extraction of oil

Barrett, JD – University of Oklahoma College of Law, ‘93

(Beverly M., 46 Okla. L. Rev. 745)

In such a royalty clause, as a precondition of sale, the oil and gas must be physically removed from the ground. n93 In fact, the oil and gas industry and most courts define production in terms of physical severance of the minerals from the ground. n94 When a pipeline makes take-or-pay payments, unless recoupment gas is physically taken, there is no production and thus no royalty owed. Obviously it would be easier to seek royalty payments under a royalty clause in which the terms "produced" or "production" are not used. n95

#### Violation - Exon-Florio is not a restriction on production—it’s a regulation on foreign investment

Douglas William Nigh 98, associate professor of international business at the University of South Carolina, and Douglas P. Woodward, associate professor of economics at the University of South Carolina, Foreign Ownership and the Consequences of Direct Investment in the United States: Beyond Us and Them, 1998, p. 144

How did the U.S. government respond to the influx of FDI that dates from the 1970s? The answer is “favorably,” with only nominal institutional constraints on investment flows. At the federal level, the institution directly responsible for addressing issues relating to FDIUS is the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS). Created by President Gerald Ford as an oversight body in 1975, CFIUS monitors and regulates FDIUS from the standpoint of protecting national security. It is an interagency body composed of officials from the Departments of State, Commerce, Defense, and Justice, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers; it is usually chaired by a Treasury official.

#### Export restrictions are not production restrictions

Shih 9 Wen-chen Shih is an associate professor of law in the Department of International Trade at National Chengchi University, Taiwan. "ARTICLE: Energy Security, GATT/WTO, and Regional Agreements" Natural Resources Journal Spring, 2009 Natural Resources Journal 49 Nat. Resources J. 433 lexis

Such an argument has been questioned by others. Broome cautions that a material distinction remains between export restrictions and production restrictions. n91 He argues that oil in its natural state--oil still in the ground--cannot be characterized as a "product" within the meaning of Article XI, as it has not gone through a production process. n92 Only oil in commerce--oil that is extracted and produced for consumption can be regarded as falling under the GATT jurisdiction. n93 Therefore, only when OPEC countries restrict the quantity of oil in commerce made available for export to foreign consumers could they then violate Article XI:1. n94 He further points out that, while the jurisprudence tends to interpret Article XI:1 broadly, absurd and unintended consequences could arise if the panel or the Appellate Body does not pay attention to such differences; when a WTO Member took some measure to reduce domestic production in a particular industry, any WTO Member could complain that the country was violating Article XI:1 by influencing prices via supply restrictions. n95 In other words, "any measure that prevents an industry from operating at maximum capacity might constitute an export restriction." n96 Broome, thus, concludes that the production quotas maintained by OPEC countries should not constitute quantitative restrictions that contravene Article XI:1. n97

#### Voting issue ---

#### 1. Limits --- restriction by effect explodes the topic: any law that changes relative economics could increase production --- they make thousands of new unpredictable cases topical and force the Neg to research outside of core energy policy --- makes preparation impossible

#### 2. Ground --- energy-specific restriction good is core ground --- they steal links to politics, biz con, prices, regulation CPs and other generics --- crushes fairness

### 1NC

#### Immigration reform will pass, Obama’s pushing, and it’s a top priority

Global Times 2-20 (Obama reaches out to GOP on immigration, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/762877.shtml>)

US President Barack Obama on Tuesday reached out to Republican lawmakers, calling to discuss comprehensive immigration reform, said the White House. According to a White House statement, Obama placed calls to Senators Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Marco Rubio to discuss "their shared commitment to bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform." The senators were key members of the so-called Gang of 8, which was working to overhaul the immigration system. During the calls, Obama "reiterated that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles on reform." Obama also said the reforms need to include strengthening border security, creating an earned path to citizenship, holding employers accountable, and streamlining legal immigration. The White House also said Obama is "prepared to submit his own legislation if Congress fails to act." The Gang of 8 is working to get a bill to the Senate floor as early as May. In a statement, Rubio spokesman Alex Conant said the Florida senator "appreciated receiving President Obama's phone call to discuss immigration reform," and told Obama that he "feels good about the ongoing negotiations in the Senate, and is hopeful the final product is something that can pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support." Earlier in the day, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney was questioned repeatedly during a briefing about whether Obama had personally contacted Republican lawmakers on immigration reform, a top priority on the president's second term agenda.

#### The plan is a political firestorm

Stephen Rademaker, Podesta Group, Former Assistant Secretary of State, 7/28/11, The Return of CFIUS (Again), http://www.podesta.com/pulse/return-cfius-again

In the midst of terrorist threats, financial crises and political infighting in this country, “foreign ownership” of American companies whose products or services raise national security concerns is becoming an emotionally charged issue. That’s why overseas investors -- and the domestic companies in which they invest -- need erudite assistance in navigating the little-known federal committee that is responsible for reviewing potential foreign investments in the US. Consisting of 12 agencies and chaired by the Department of the Treasury, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) administers the Exon-Florio Amendment of 1988 to the Defense Production Act, which authorizes the President to block foreign investment transactions that would impair US national security. Typically, CFIUS focuses on proposed foreign investments in US firms engaged in sensitive activities, such as manufacturing items that cannot be exported without a US government license due to national security concerns, or contracting with the Department of Defense or other national security agencies. Any foreign investment that would result in “foreign control” of a US business – generally understood as acquiring 10 percent of the equity -- can be subject to CFIUS review. Although the work of CFIUS remained relatively obscure until 2006, the issue of foreign control of security-sensitive businesses attracted national attention during that year, when Dubai Ports World, a firm owned by the United Arab Emirates, sought to acquire a British firm that operated six port terminals in the US. CFIUS had already approved this transaction when several members of Congress became alarmed about possible Arab control of US port facilities, portrayed as a potential threat to the security of America’s seaports in the post 9/11 environment. As a result of the ensuing controversy, and the threatened enactment of legislation by Congress, Dubai Ports World divested itself of the six American ports. After this high-profile controversy, potential investors from Middle Eastern countries, China and Russia, seeking to avoid the kind of political firestorm that had upended the Dubai Ports World transaction, sought expert assistance to ensure that their investments did not trigger a similar reaction. Savvy government relations teams – adept at advising clients on how to structure proposed transactions with minimal political risks and explaining proposed investments to potential critics in Congress, the administration and the news media – were suddenly invaluable to any successful foreign investment strategy. The economic crisis beginning in 2008 substantially reduced the volume of foreign investment into the US, thereby reducing the number of transactions subject to CFIUS review. Further, the need to attract foreign capital to the US made some foreign investors complacent about the CFIUS process. But following the 2010 congressional elections, national security sensitivities about foreign investment have re-emerged. This was underscored in October 2010, when the ranking Republican members of the House Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Homeland Security and Armed Services sent a joint letter to the Treasury Department objecting to a proposed investment by a Russian uranium mining firm in a Canadian company with uranium mining assets in the US (http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/press\_display.asp?id=1618). This was the kind of congressional reaction that compelled the Dubai Ports World incident.

#### PC k2 immigration – public pressure and fractures Republicans

Page 2-21 (Susan, “Obama supported on guns, debt; Divided and dissatisfied with both sides, public is less aligned with Republicans,” Lexis)

For Obama, having higher ratings than congressional Republicans doesn't guarantee passage of any legislation, given the polarization in a divided Congress. But it does put him in a stronger position to bring public pressure on lawmakers. And it complicates Republican efforts to unite a fractured party behind a message that will appeal to voters.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**2012** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC

#### The United States Federal Government should:

#### -establish a new committee\* that attains burden of proof, as a subsection of CFIUS, to analyze foreign investment projects in crude oil and natural gas based on FDI, and then chooses to initiate Exon-Florio reviews based off analyst

#### -amend Exon-Florio reviews to include a renegotiation phase before the crude oil and natural gas transactions are released to Congress

#### -assign additional personnel to CFIUS that act as liaisons between the committee and oil and gas businesses and maintain daily communication with and provide legal training to foreign business throughout the investigation process

#### -mandate that CFIUS create a pooled, public database of past mitigation agreements for oil and gas transactions and add new mitigation agreements to the database after a transaction is reviewed

#### It solves –

#### The aff bypasses CFIUS reviews which guarantees politicization – the CP includes a renegotiation phase – that avoids the NB and guarantees CFIUS approval

Sud 6 (Gaurav, Associate in the Mergers and Acquisitions Group – Shearman & Sterling LLP, Former Executive Managing Editor – Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law “From Fretting Takeovers to Vetting CFIUS: Finding a Balance in U.S. Policy regarding Foreign Acquisitions of Domestic Assets Note,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, 39 Vand. J. Transnat'l L. 1303 (2006), p. Hein Online)

C. Revamping the CFIUS Process When a transaction is reviewed under CFIUS, there are obviously two immediate options: either the transaction will be approved, or not. If it is approved, of course, the parties are free to carry on negotiating the terms of the transaction and go forward with the deal. If the CFIUS review results in less than satisfactory findings, however, this reform proposal suggests that the parties be given an opportunity to amend the terms of the transaction before the issue goes to Congress. Allowing the parties to step in and renegotiate key terms at this point will maintain the trust of private ordering aspect of U.S. merger law.175 The parties will have a chance to make adjustments to the terms of their transaction in the hope that they can alleviate the national security or economic concerns raised during the CFIUS review process. Returning to the Unocal/CNOOC paradigm scenario, a need for this type of mechanism is evidenced by the letter transmitted from CNOOC CEO Fu Chengyu to the U.S. Congress amidst the opposition to CNOOC's bid.176 As previously referenced, Mr. Chengyu made several assurances to the U.S. Congress in that letter that Congress's concerns regarding national security and a loss of employment for U.S. workers were unfounded and went on to list several reasons supporting these assurances. 177 Had the parties been given the opportunity to discuss the specifics of the terms themselves, and put the results of their negotiations into the proposed merger agreement, it is likely that members of Congress who opposed the transaction going forward would have been left with a considerably diminished platform on which to stand. Again, the parties would have been able to rely on private ordering to come to an agreement that suited both parties. Further, involvement by Congress would not have been a factor because the parties themselves would have been given a chance to address the concerns raised in the CFIUS process. Although it is nearly impossible in this era to separate matters of business and matters of politics, this system would prevent a business transaction from becoming an explicitly political matter-which the world witnessed during the failed Unocal/CNOOC transaction. In the interest of efficiency, the time that the parties are given to renegotiate the terms of their transaction should be limited to either a thirty-day or sixty-day window. This would prevent the interested parties from dragging their feet and keep the process moving smoothly towards resolution. The determination of the precise window of time should be made based on the level and severity of the CFIUS issues that arise. Perhaps a thirty-day window, with the possibility that the parties can apply for a thirty-day extension pending CFIUS approval, would be the most sensible approach. CFIUS approval of the extension would be based on the Committee's own assessment of the severity and complexity of its objections to the proposed transaction. Once the opportunity to amend the terms of the transaction has been given to the parties, then they could resubmit the revised plan of merger to CFIUS for a secondary review. Again, if CFIUS approves the terms of the transaction (arguably the ideal outcome if this system is to function as intended), the transaction can go forward as the parties have delineated in the merger agreement. If, however, CFIUS still has objections to the transaction on any substantive grounds, the review process should continue at this point in the same fashion as it has historically. Though this process is lengthy and thus may contravene the efficiency goal to some extent, it would be used only after the parties had been given the opportunity to avoid it within a relatively controlled time frame. Admittedly, this type of process would result in companies being required to give at least as much attention to international trade and security policies in structuring transactions as they do to more traditional areas of concern such as tax, pension, and environmental policies.178 Among the variables that can and should be considered are: "expected participation in the transaction by non-U.S. parties; connections between parties and compliance-sensitive activities, such as whether a party is a defense contractor, technology company, oil company, or financial company; connections between parties and compliance-sensitive areas of the world, such as the Middle East, Central or Southeast Asia, or Africa; and a party's heavy reliance on export markets.'179 It is most efficient to shift much of this burden onto the parties themselves, rather than allowing them to become overly reliant on the government's newly-implemented mechanisms for resolving these issues.180 If the parties take the time to negotiate the merger terms, even where they did not find that necessary in the past, and conduct "particularly intensive due diligence," the burden on the government will be less, and the cross-border merger process will sacrifice as little as possible in terms of efficiency.'8

#### CP strikes a perfect balance – maintains investor confidence and avoids politicization

Scissors 1-28 (Dr. Derek, Senior Research Fellow – Heritage Foundation, “A Better Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States,” Heritage Foundation, 2013, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/01/enhancing-the-committee-on-foreign-investment-in-the-united-states-cfius)

The major controversy involving CFIUS in 2012 involved a Chinese firm, Ralls. CFIUS rejected Ralls’s acquisition of wind farm assets in Oregon on the grounds they were too close to a U.S. Navy facility, and Ralls sued. Perhaps the most telling feature of the case is that, if Ralls had simply started its own project nearby as a “greenfield” investment, CFIUS would not have had the legal mandate to investigate and block the deal. Whatever one thinks of the Ralls outcome, this makes no sense. The nature of the transaction is not what is important; the national security risk is. The CFIUS mandate should be expanded so that the committee is able to legally and easily investigate any domestic transaction involving a foreign entity. It should, for example, be able to investigate certain equipment contracts, with telecom equipment the principal focus in light of cybersecurity issues. This expansion is long overdue. A more difficult question is whether outside actors should have standing to prompt CFIUS. The obvious candidates are Members of Congress, who frequently express concerns about investments while referring to national security. The present, informal contribution of Congress to the CFIUS review may allow security concerns to be adequately raised, but it does so in highly politicized fashion. Politicization can be reduced. As a result, transactions with little security risk are effectively blocked by protectionism masked as invocations of national security. This undermines the legitimacy of the national security review and breeds retaliation against American companies. There is a danger of a cure being worse than the disease, and any new mechanism for congressional communication with CFIUS should be carefully considered. Still, the rise of Chinese investment, especially, makes clear that the current system can be harmful to American prosperity. Chinese manufacturers have seen one investment ignored while another becomes a political football, with no warning or apparent logic. Overseas, the U.S. seeks clear and quick review processes when its companies pursue foreign investments, but one is not yet available here and will not be until the congressional role is better defined. Threats to Prosperity The additional CFIUS investigations that could be triggered by such reforms breed the opposite concern: CFIUS will either bar or effectively discourage foreign companies from American business. Unjustified prohibitions are unlikely; the presumption is still and should remain that investments proceed and that the standards to judge security risk are unchanged. As Congress considers reforms, it needs to be aware that merely extending the flaws of the CFIUS mechanism could make matters worse. The solution, however, is not to limit the scope of a flawed process. How many transactions CFIUS reviews is far less important than how it reviews them. For investors, two vital attributes of government reviews are transparency and speed. In light of an expanded mandate, CFIUS should set new maximum times to determine whether a transaction should be altered or blocked. More important, most inquiries should be concluded in less time. Notification deadlines are necessary but not sufficient to ensure that foreign investors are well-treated. Some sort of performance metric is necessary to respond properly to complaints about CFIUS performance, starting with how quickly it acts. Responsiveness is another criterion. Some CFIUS personnel need to be shielded from outside influence, but the suppression of personnel names, other than inaccessible Cabinet secretaries, can confound communication for foreign firms and inhibit accountability. There should be a liaison between foreign business and CFIUS decision makers, shielding the former but assisting the latter. This role is currently played essentially by private-sector actors who may have skewed incentives. This will require additional personnel assigned to CFIUS and more intense inter-agency cooperation. The alternatives—let foreign firms run free or block foreign investment and contravene long-standing American principles—are far less pleasant. Most important, the review itself should be transparent. Notifications to the parties should come as early as possible, and frequent updates should be provided even if they merely confirm that the investigation is ongoing. The American government denies charges of low transparency, but there is inadequate information available even to evaluate foreign complaints. The U.S. market is more open than almost any other—and far more open than some—but U.S. multinationals would complain loudly if some CFIUS features were replicated elsewhere.

#### The new committee is key – it removes mandatory investigations, creates efficiencies, limits the scope of national security, and avoids politicization

Cox 8 (Jason, JD Candidate – University of Iowa College of Law, “Regulation of Foreign Direct Investment After the Dubai Ports Controversy: Has the U.S. Government Finally Figured Out How to Balance Foreign Threats to National Security Without Alienating Foreign Companies?,” Journal of Corporation Law, 34(1), http://blogs.law.uiowa.edu/jcl/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/A6\_Cox1.pdf)

B. Creation of a Separate Committee to Review All FDI Transactions and Initiate CFIUS Reviews Congress should create a separate committee—in addition to the CFIUS—to study all FDI, report the findings to Congress, and initiate CFIUS reviews. CFIUS reviews have increased exponentially since the DP World controversy, 137 further depleting the CFIUS‘s limited resources. By requiring the CFIUS to conduct a study of FDI, and allowing any member to initiate a CFIUS review, FINSA increases the responsibility of the CFIUS, which could cause the CFIUS to lose focus on investigating the transactions already in front of it. Separating the functions of investigating specific transactions and reviewing all FDI transactions to determine which ones should be subject to further investigation will create a more efficient and effective process. Assigning a separate committee to initiate CFIUS reviews will also mitigate any ulterior motives that could affect CFIUS members, such as reducing workloads, political motivations, and favoritism of certain companies. To prevent these same motives from affecting the initiation process, Congress should require a majority of CFIUS members to approve a review and construct this separate committee with different members. Not only will this new committee increase the focus of the CFIUS, it will also serve as a check on the CFIUS‘s activities. This new committee should be composed of members that have more of a focus on national security than the CFIUS. Instead of the Secretary of the Treasury as chairperson, the Secretary of Homeland Security should head this committee. Other members should include the Secretary of Defense, along with the directors of the CIA and the FBI. The goal of this committee would be to better define which transactions actually could have a direct impact on critical infrastructure and technologies in the United States. By forming a separate committee, the CFIUS would be allowed to focus only on the specific review and possible investigation of transactions forwarded by this committee or voluntarily submitted by the companies in the transaction, instead of the current system, which requires the CFIUS to catch any suspicious transactions and subject them to a mandatory review.

#### The public database solves – streamlines and creates accountability with CFIUS – avoids politicization

Feng 9 (Yiheng, JD – NYU Law, “Consequences of the Congressional Politicization of Foreign Direct Investment on National Security Grounds,” International Law and Politics, Volume 42, <https://www.law.nyu.edu/ecm_dlv4/groups/public/@nyu_law_website__journals__journal_of_international_law_and_politics/documents/documents/ecm_pro_064915.pdf>)

The first change is one that FINSA has already implemented in part: the power for CFIUS to enter into mitigation

agreements (“MAs”). 298 The effectiveness of the mitigation process is well established. Even before the passage of FINSA, most transactions flagged for CFIUS review also underwent pre-filing mitigation discussions that addressed national security concerns by amending transactions or limiting the scope of acquisitions. 299 This in turn reduced the likelihood of additional periods of investigation and provided a more streamlined review process. Additionally, the mitigation process was case-by-case, avoiding the need for what Deputy Treasury Secretary Robert Kimmett referred to (post-FINSA) as “blunt tools, such as sectoral restrictions.” 300 Making this process more robust and open could further reduce the risks of congressional interference and also signal to foreign investors that CFIUS possesses the structure and consistency that it has been accused of lacking in the past. 301 Due to the secret nature of the pre-FINSA mitigation process, pre-filing negotiation with CFIUS was not always enough to ensure smooth sailing through the regulatory process. Sometimes, the mitigation process succeeded in allaying fears, as in the 2004 acquisition of IBM by Lenovo, another Chinese corporation with state ties. 302 Like the CNOOC deal a year later, the Lenovo transaction raised alarms in Washington, in this case regarding China’s ability to access information on IBM’s government customers and potential access to government computer systems. The deal only succeeded after Lenovo entered into a MA promising, among other things, that Lenovo would be physically barred from certain buildings in IBM’s North Carolina office park (thus addressing concerns of industrial espionage). 303 Politicization, however, can trump the effectiveness of mitigation. DP World was a nearly picture- perfect example of the mitigation process, with weeks of prenotification communication with CFIUS and research by all sides. 304 As subsequent history showed, however, the mitigation process was conducted in vain. With FINSA’s explicit codification of the mitigation process, one would hope that the failures of DP World-P&O and CNOOC-Unocal would be a thing of the past. However, FINSA’s approach to mitigation is still ex post, in that Congress really only deals with mitigation in its receipt of CFIUS’s annual report. As a result, FINSA leaves open the possibility that Congress could still step into an ongoing transaction and scuttle it. 305 Recently released Treasury regulations 306 are basically silent on the nature of the mitigation process under FINSA, and I would argue that the mitigation process could be improved by making MAs of completed transactions more easily accessible to the public. These MAs could then be pooled to create a structured public database. 307 Such a database would be organized according to economic sector, foreign country, and nature of acquisition. Additionally, it would include the actions taken by the investing entity to address particular national security concerns and would indicate the issues that CFIUS was particularly concerned about during its review. In many ways such a database of MA’s would merely be a broader, more streamlined version of CFIUS’s report to Congress under FINSA. 308 With the creation of a public MA database, there would be increased movement towards self-oversight by companies considering transactions, as CFIUS would have appropriate incentives to act consistently with its previous actions or risk attack from the public or Congress. 309 Given this self-oversight effect, the MA database would become a reliable source of information and would allow Congress to view mitigation from an ex ante position, comparing past MAs in order to determine the legitimacy of current MAs. Users of the database would have to be careful not to treat any particular MA as binding precedent, given the numerous factors that make each transaction different from the next. But the database would at least provide Congress with what it has lacked up until now: insight ex ante into the Exon-Florio process. 310 This transparency would in turn reduce congressional concerns that CFIUS is not successfully reviewing transactions, reducing the likelihood that Congress would attack CFIUS or its decisions. A database of MAs would also address the investor-side fear of uncertainty. Since every transaction is unique, the records in the MA database could not be relied upon to make precise predictions, but over time the database would create guiding precedents for transactions in particular sectors. Foreign investors could analyze past CFIUS MAs regarding the sectors in which they were interested and hopefully identify specific concerns and points of contention ahead of time. [As more MAs were added to the database, the “unknown” nature of the CFIUS process would be minimized. This would reduce the risk of every future acquisition as foreign entities would essentially learn what needs to be done to get a transaction approved, at least at a fundamental level.]

### 1NC

#### Next off is the Arab relations DA

#### The plan causes politicization and distrust that spills over – collapses US-Arab relations. The CP solves.

Mostaghel 7 (Deborah M., “Dubai Ports World under Exon-Florio: A Threat to National Security or a Tempest in a Seaport?,” Golden Gate University School of Law, Albany Law Review, 70 Alb. L. Rev. 583, http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1120&context=pubs)

Largely because of the uproar over the DP World deal, CFIUS conducted a forty-five-day review of another Dubai-owned company's transaction. 265 Dubai International Capital LLC wanted to acquire Doncasters Group Ltd., a U.K. engineering company that supplies parts to makers of aircraft and jet engines with plants in the United States. 266 The President approved the transaction on the recommendation of CFIUS,267 after receiving "assurances that the military supply chain would not be broken."268 Unlike the DP World situation, where congressional opposition ultimately derailed the transaction, congressional response was muted. According to House aides, "lawmakers from both parties on the relevant committees had been briefed on the deal .... [T]here had been numerous contacts with the administration."269 Charles Schumer, a Senator from New York who had been a vocal opponent of the DP World transaction, found two differences between the Doncasters takeover and the previous failed DP World transaction. Schumer stated that "this went through the process in a careful, thoughtful way and, second, this is a product, not a service, and the opportunity to infiltrate and sabotage is both more difficult and more detectable."27o Apparently some tweaking of the process was at work in the approval of this deal as lawmakers felt they were kept informed of the progress of the CFIUS review. Lawmakers also apparently believed that a company that provided products was more controllable than one that provided services. But perhaps a third factor was also at work. Perhaps legislators realized that they needed to tone down the rhetoric or face the risk of alienating potential allies in the war on terror. While the CFIUS review of the Doncasters takeover was pending, a former senior intelligence official suggested that Congress should consider the possible implications for cooperation in intelligence gathering between Arab governments and the United States. 271 Unwarranted congressional opposition could have reduced such cooperation.272 Pro-Western sentiment in Dubai had apparently changed to bitterness after the negative views of Arabs and Islam that were exposed in the rejection of the DP World dea1. 273 Congressional opposition to a foreign takeover should be based on real threats, not on opportunities for posturing. Fear of terrorism must not be the controlling criterion for judging a foreign investment transaction. Failing to achieve a balance between the neutral and the emotional views threatens a fourth backlash-cynicism and distrust. The publisher of Harper's Magazine described the Democratic Party's reaction to the DP World transaction as a "cashin on 'Portgate,'" finding the controversy "replete with irony" since neither party had cared much about port security earlier. 274 While Senator Hillary Clinton sounded alarms, former President Bill Clinton had advised Dubai on how to handle the situation. 275 On the Republican side, President Bush exhibited an "aggressive, rapid-action defense of the ports' purchasers."276 Ironically, "[President Bush's] slow-motion response to Hurricane Katrina [was] so striking that it made you wonder what's so urgently important about the deal's [sic] going through."277 Responding to the political reaction against the transaction, DP World announced that it would sell its U.S. operations to a U.S. company.278 But in an interview, Simon Romero of the New York Times stated: [O]f the top eight terminal operations companies in the world that do ... this type of work at ... big international ports, only one is American. And that company is based out of Seattle. It is called SSA Marine. It is a family-owned company. But it's not nearly of the same scale as ... Dubai Ports World or its competitor in bid for ... P&O, which was a company that was controlled by Singapore's government. 279 Following up, Norman Ornstein, a congressional watcher for the American Enterprise Institute, said that the Bush Administration ha[s] got a dilemma now, because there simply aren't American companies that have the know-how and the breadth to do this. Interestingly, and perhaps ironically, what I had heard earlier in the day, as they were looking at those that have the ... kind of resources, Halliburton was a name that came up. And Democrats, I'm sure, are saying, please, God, let that happen.28o This reference to the company that Vice President Dick Cheney led during the 1990s suggests that many would see the whole deal as a vehicle for the amassing of private wealth at the public's expense. Distrust is also a problem. In response to the DP World transaction, DIMP held a hearing on April 27, 2006 to evaluate the CFIUS process. 281 In the opinion of an invited speaker, Georgetown Law Professor Daniel K. Tarullo, the "most important development framing the terms of current debate over the CFIUS process - the development that ha[d] led to your hearings in March and today [was that] Congress ha[d] obviously lost confidence in the Administration's handling of Section 721 cases."282 The loss of confidence stemmed largely because "the public still d[id] not have a complete explanation of the Administration's decision not to take action."283 In discussing the requirement that CFIUS protect sensitive information, Tarullo stressed the need for communication between the Executive and the public. According to Tarullo: [P]articularly in light of the current emphasis upon homeland security, the American public deserves to know what approach to national security reviews CFIUS has taken. As the DP World situation made abundantly clear, in the current environment if the Administration does not adequately explain its actions, Congress, the press, and the public will draw their own conclusions - without the benefit of full information. 284 Lacking information, Congress, while championing a transaction that seemed counterintuitive to homeland security, concluded that the President was not protecting the nation.

#### Collapse of US-Arab relations causes biological and nuclear terrorism – resentment actively generates recruitment and resources for terrorism

Albright and Armitage 9 (Madeleine, Principal – Albright Group and Former US Secretary of Defense, and Richard, President – Armitage International and Former US Deputy Secretary of Defense, “Changing Course - A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World,” Leadership Group, February, http://www.usmuslimengagement.org/storage/usme/documents/Changing\_Course\_Second\_Printing.pdf)

Improving relations with Muslim majority countries and communities is one of the most important foreign policy and national security challenges facing the United States. In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the U.S. sought to strengthen its own security. Despite our leaders’ insistence that we had no conflict with Islam or Muslims, and despite a long history of U.S. action to protect and aid Muslims affected by war or natural disaster, our responses to 9/11 have sparked fear, mistrust, and hostility among many Muslims. Antipathy toward the U.S. has risen not only in the countries most directly affected by U.S. military action (Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan), but in many others around the world. In turn, violent extremist groups that claim to act in the name of Islam have used the climate of distrust to gain support for further attacks on U.S. assets and allies. Though majorities in both the U.S. and Muslim countries around the world want to reverse this spiral of violence, many fear that it will continue to escalate. The extremists who seek to harm and destroy the U.S. represent a very small minority of Muslims, operating, for the most part, independent of governments, through loose networks of social, financial, and logistical support. Given their strong convictions, and the limited ability of the U.S. and its allies to identify and target them, they are difficult to dissuade or deter. Were an extremist group to use a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon, or sabotage a hazardous facility in a populated area in the U.S., it could kill tens of thousands or more.1 This Report begins with the premise that the U.S. must work with Muslim counterparts who share our interest in improving mutual security to minimize the risk of such a scenario. Responsibility for peaceful coexistence rests equally with U.S. and Muslim leaders worldwide. For the U.S., counterterrorism operations are a necessary part of the strategy to keep Americans safe. However, these operations treat the symptoms rather than the causes of conflict. There is a deep reservoir of grievances against the U.S. among Muslims around the world. Whether or not these grievances are justified, the climate of hostility makes it possible for extremist groups to recruit and operate with relative ease in many countries and communities. To reduce the risk of conflict, now and in the future, the U.S. must not only defend itself against attacks, but also build more positive relations with key countries and counterparts across the Muslim world. Today, the U.S. stands at a crossroads in its relations with the global Muslim community. There is still a strong set of shared values and interests among American and Muslim leaders and publics. Together, we can rebuild trust and address the core causes of tension. There are numerous diplomatic, political, economic, and people-to-people initiatives on which to build. But if we continue on our current course, time is not on our side. The U.S. government, in concert with business, faith, education, and civic leaders, needs to undertake major initiatives to address the causes of tension. Working with Muslim counterparts, we can achieve substantial joint gains in peace and security, political and economic development, and respect and understanding. The alternative is to increase our reliance on military action and counterterrorism in alliance with unpopular authoritarian governments. Doing so will raise the risk that our worst fears will be realized. For the sake of our own national security, values, and aspirations, and those of more than a billion Muslims around the world, we must forge a new approach. This Report presents the consensus of 34 American leaders in the fields of foreign and defense policy, politics, business, religion, education, public opinion, psychology, philanthropy, and conflict resolution. We come from different walks of life, faiths, political perspectives, and professional disciplines. Our shared goal is to develop and work to implement a wise, widely supportable strategy to make the U.S. and the world safer, by responding to the primary causes of tension with Muslims around the world. We believe that a strategy that builds on shared and complementary interests with Muslims in many countries is feasible, desirable, and consistent with core American values. The Report also reflects dialogue with hundreds of American leaders and counterparts in Muslim countries, and research on the views of millions of citizens in the U.S. and in Muslim countries whose perspectives and preferences we have explored. We have used the process of dialogue and public opinion research not only to build a leadership consensus, but also to craft a strategy that can win broad public and political support in the U.S., and build partnerships with Muslim leaders and people across the world. This project was convened, facilitated, and supported by two organizations with expertise in building consensus on difficult public issues: Search for Common Ground and the Consensus Building Institute. In addition, more than a dozen foundations, corporations and individuals have generously funded our work. U.S. relations with Muslim countries and communities are critically important for several reasons: the size of the global Muslim population; the geopolitical significance of key Muslim countries and regions; the persistence of conflict in these strategically important regions over several decades; the dramatic rise in tension and violence between the U.S. and a number of Muslim countries and groups during the past decade, and the risk of further conflict escalation; and the potential for both the U.S. and Muslim countries to prosper from improved relations and new partnerships. Roughly one-fifth of the world’s population, or about 1.3 billion people, is Muslim. Muslims form the majority in 56 countries across North Africa; the Middle East; Asia Minor; and Central, South and Southeast Asia.1 That geography spans major oil producing regions, key land and sea trade routes, and areas of high political sensitivity and instability. Muslims also form important minority communities in countries across Europe, North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Australia, and parts of Asia. As with all major religious and ethnic communities, there is great diversity in beliefs, values, cultures, political systems, and living standards among the world’s Muslim communities. Given this broad range of circumstances and the equally broad range of U.S. interests and relations with Muslim countries, Muslims’ views about U.S. policy have traditionally varied widely. There is, however, a clear trend. Since the 1940s, and more rapidly since the first Gulf War in the early 1990s, more Muslims have become concerned about the U.S. role in supporting authoritarian governments. More have become angry at the U.S. and its allies for their presence in Muslim lands. More feel resentful over the U.S. role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and more feel humiliated by the sense that Americans do not understand or respect Islamic values or cultures. During the past six years, this set of concerns has become even more widespread, consistent and intense. Today, the U.S. faces an extraordinarily strong and widely shared set of negative perceptions among Muslim peoples and their leaders.2 From a security standpoint, the primary U.S. focus is on armed extremist groups in Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine.3 However, the U.S. must also consider how our policies and actions in those countries, their neighbors, and other Muslim countries around the world shape the ability of extremists to recruit, operate and destabilize governments and societies. Addressing not only the immediate threat of terrorist and insurgent groups, but also their broader bases of support and sympathy, should be a top national priority for four reasons: • Muslim public hostility toward the U.S. is generating resources, recruits, and operational opportunities for extremist groups that seek to harm the U.S., its allies, and assets. It is also undermining mainstream Muslim leaders who seek tolerance, nonviolence, and constructive change in relations with the U.S.4 • Most Muslims’ primary grievances and concerns are about “what the U.S. does,” rather than “who we are.” At the same time, the U.S. has options for meeting its own interests in ways that are more compatible with most Muslims’ interests and values. It is possible to change our relationships to enhance mutual security, meet shared and complementary political goals, generate joint economic gains, and demonstrate mutual respect for each others’ core values. • By adopting a comprehensive strategy and implementing it now, it is likely that the U.S. can significantly change perceptions and behavior among mainstream and politically activist Muslims in key countries before attitudes and beliefs become “locked in” for a generation. On the other hand, failure to act soon will likely lead to a hardening of attitudes, reinforcing extremists’ claims that violent resistance to the U.S. is the best path to autonomy, respect, and justice. • Fighting a long-term conflict with extremists in many Muslim countries will demand continued sacrifice from the U.S. military, carry high economic costs, continue the political acrimony that has divided the country for the past several years, and require the U.S. to use much of its international political capital to maintain alliances. As a result, the U.S. will have fewer resources to address pressing needs at home or other critical challenges abroad.

#### Bioterror causes extinction

Steinbrunner 97 (John, Senior Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22, Lexis)

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

### 1NC – Investment

#### Trade doesn’t solve war

Martin et. al. 8(Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### No protectionism

Ahearn 9 [Raymond, CRS Specialist in International Trade and Finance, “The Global Economic Downturn and Protectionism,” March 23, 2009, http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/19395.pdf]

There are a number of reasons why the threat of a return to protectionist, beggar-thy-neighbor policies could be vastly overstated. Unlike the 1930s, today’s global economy has several strong firewalls to prevent governments from raising trade barriers that result in a cycle of retaliation and counter-retaliation. These firewalls include more institutionalized obstacles to protectionism built into the WTO system, more policy instruments to address the economic slowdown, and a more interdependent and open world economy than existed in the 1930s. In addition, some in today’s media may tend to overstate the threat of protectionism by not always distinguishing between protectionist actions and protectionist pressures and/or by equating legitimate forms of protection with protectionism. The fact that there is ample room for increases in trade measures and barriers that are consistent with the rules and obligations of the WTO often may go unappreciated in some press coverage. These trade measures and barriers include increases in applied tariffs to bound rates, and imposition of countervailing and antidumping duties, so-called ‘defensive’ trade measures.4 Protection for limited periods of time and under prescribed conditions is built into the rules of the WTO as a political safety valve and as a recognition of the human and social costs that are associated with the often wrenching adjustments that accompany increased trade competition. Firewalls Against Protectionism WTO rules today serve to keep a lid on trade barriers of its 153 members through an elaborate set of mutual obligations and dispute settlement procedures. Unlike the 1930s when countries could impose higher trade barriers unilaterally without violating any international agreements or anticipating a foreign reaction, under today’s rules members can take their disputes to the WTO for settlement rather than engaging in reciprocal retaliatory actions. The fact that countries violating WTO obligations can face WTO-sanctioned retaliation helps constrain outbreaks of unilateral actions that could be mutually harmful.5 Pressures for protection are also dampened by a world economy that is much more interdependent and integrated than in the 1930s.6 Leading producers have become so international in their production operations and supply chains that they have developed a vested interest in resisting protectionism.7 Many industries that have faced import competition in the past – such as televisions and semiconductors—have found that international diversification or joint ventures with foreign partners are a more profitable way of coping with global competition than blocking goods at the border. In addition, many domestic industries have less incentive to ask for import restrictions because foreign rivals now produce in the domestic market, eliminating the benefits of trade barriers for domestic firms.8 Unlike the early 1930s, when governments took little responsibility for propping up financial institutions and were unable to pursue expansionary monetary policies due to fixed exchange rates under the gold standard, policymakers around the world today are adopting expansionary fiscal and monetary policies. These expansionary policies, in turn, have the capability of dampening protectionist pressures and demands that stem from job losses and related economic hardship with lower interest rates and increased expenditures on unemployment benefits and health care benefits.9 A related consideration is that today’s world economy is much more open than the world economy of the 1930s. Average tariffs on world trade have come down from the 50% range in the 1930s, to the 25% range in the 1980s, and to less than 10% today.10 Under these circumstances, it would require tremendous increases in protection to get the world back to anywhere near the conditions of the 1930s, although a major increase in tariffs (e.g. a doubling) would be disruptive even if it left tariffs well below the 1930s levels. Scorecard of Protective Measures To Date Empirical support exists for the view that existing legal, economic, and political firewalls are restraining today’s protectionist pressures. Most importantly, Pascal Lamy, the WTO’s Director General, reported in January 2009 that most WTO members have successfully kept domestic protectionist pressures under control “with only limited evidence of increases in trade restricting or trade distorting measures” taken during the last six months of 2008. This assessment was based on the first report of the WTO secretariat on the trade effects of the global economic crisis. The report found only “limited evidence” of an increase in tariffs, non-tariff barriers or trade-remedy actions by member countries, but noted that the most significant actions taken in response to the global crisis have involved “financial support of one kind or another to banks and other financial institutions and to certain industries, notably the automobile industry.”11 The WTO report notes tariff increases on selected products being implemented by India, Russia, Ecuador, and Ukraine. Countries adopting non-tariff measures include Indonesia (port of entry barriers) and Argentina (import licensing requirements). Argentina was cited for measures that attempt to boost exports of selected products. But the report indicates that there has been “no dramatic increase” in antidumping investigations in the second half of 2008 compared to first half of 2008, but raised the possibility of increased trade remedy actions in 2009.12 The World Bank, which has also been monitoring trade restrictions proposed and adopted since the beginning of the financial crisis, reached a conclusion similar to that of the WTO. Its initial report determined that there have been 47 trade restrictive measures imposed since the financial crisis began last summer, including 17 from G-20 countries, but that “these measures have probably had only marginal effects on trade flows to date.” In addition to the measures cited by the WTO, the World Bank report cited China’s import ban on various food products from the EU, and export subsidies provided by the EU, China, and India. Contrary to the WTO report, the World Bank report determined that “the number of antidumping cases (both investigations initiated and imposition of duties) surged in 2008.”13

#### WTO fights trigger the impact

Felsenthal 9/17/12

Mark Felsenthal and Tom Miles, Reuters staff writer, MSNBC, September 17, 2012, "China, U.S. issue tit-for-tat WTO trade complaints", http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/49063033/ns/business-autos/t/china-us-issue-tit-for-tat-wto-trade-complaints/#.UGpxUk3A-So

WASHINGTON/GENEVA (Reuters) - China filed a trade complaint on Monday to challenge a new U.S. law allowing duties on subsidized goods from China in a tit-for-tat exchange with the United States after Washington said it would launch a complaint against Beijing's support for car exports. The two cases could shift the focus to President Barack Obama's management of the sometimes contentious U.S. relationship with China and his support for the auto industry in the final weeks before a close election. Beijing's complaint to the World Trade Organization about "countervailing duties", or tariffs intended to combat export-promoting subsidies, came a few hours after the White House said it would launch a trade complaint against China over what it says is Beijing's unfair backing of its auto industry. China's complaint potentially affects close to 30 products that have previously been targeted by U.S. duties, a trade official familiar with the case said. In a brief statement, the WTO said the products included steel, tires, magnets, chemicals, kitchen appliances, wood flooring and wind towers.

#### Their evidence goes the wrong way --- it concludes that despite low FDI, China is a bright spot.

**Caruso-Cabrera**, **1/2**/2013 (Michelle, Chinese Investment in US May Break Record in 2013, CNBC, p. <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100349194>)

Investors around the world may be cooling on the U.S., but not China. Chinese investment in the United States will likely break another record in 2013, according to research firm Rhodium Group. That's after a record year in 2012 with deals worth more than $6.5 billion, a 12 percent increase from the previous record of $5.8 billion in 2010. The number reflects direct investment in U.S. businesses and does not include the estimated $2 Trillion in U.S. Treasurys held by the Chinese government. "Given that we already have $5 billion worth of deals lined up it is very likely that 2013 will be another record year. Policy action in China that demonstrates commitment to structural reforms could further add to the momentum, as Chinese firms are seeking access to technology and know-how to prepare for a new era of Chinese growth," said Thilo Hanemann, author of a new Rhodium report about Chinese foreign direct investment in the United States. In fact, the Chinese seem to be some of the few willing to increase investment in the United States since the financial crisis. From the first three quarters of 2007 to the first three quarters of 2012, Middle East Investment in the US is down 86 percent, Canada down 75 percent, and Europe down 49 percent, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. But China? It's up 321 percent in the same time period. (Read More: Why One of China's Richest Men Is Squaring Off With Obama.) Hanemann thinks the government data undercounts the number, because it does not include flows through offshore financial centers. Rhodium estimates the increase in Chinese investment to the U.S. is actually a whopping 1300 percent.

#### Chinese restrictions make it inevitable

Marchick 12

David M. Marchick is a managing director at the Carlyle Group, where he is global head of external affairs. He is the author of U.S. National Security and Foreign Direct Investment. Daniel R. Bowles is an associate at the Carlyle Group and assisted in the preparation of this article, Council on Foreign Relations, February 2012, "Fostering Greater Chinese Investment in the United States", <http://www.cfr.org/china/fostering-greater-chinese-investment-united-states/p27310>

A number of hurdles to investment in the United States are internal to China. State-owned enterprises (SOEs) accounted for approximately 70 percent of China's global OFDI stock in 2009. Most SOEs are internally focused, risk-averse, and lack professional management capabilities to run complex international operations. SOEs also require government approval of specific overseas investments, a process in conflict with the frequent fast pace of bidding processes for companies. Outside of SOEs, many successful Chinese companies remain small. Their expansion plans are typically limited to neighboring cities or provinces, not distant continents. They have neither the wherewithal nor the desire to invest heavily in the United States.

#### CFIUS doesn’t impact FDI

Tyson 8/2

Laura Tyson, a former chair of the US President's Council of Economic Advisers, is a professor at the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, Project Syndicate, August 2, 2012, "The Benefits of Chinese FDI", http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-benefits-of-chinese-fdi-by-laura-tyson

Many Chinese investors view the CFIUS screening process as protectionist and targeted at them, but there is no evidence of this. The United Kingdom, Canada, France, and Israel accounted for more than half of all CFIUS cases reviewed in 2008-2010, while China accounted for only about 5%. Only a small fraction of Chinese FDI in the US is subject to CFIUS review, and most of these projects, like most reviewed by CFIUS, are approved, sometimes with mitigation measures. CFIUS does not review greenfield investments, which account for about 50% of Chinese FDI in the US.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

### 1NC – Gas

#### Chinese shale is a pipedream – and U.S. expertise won’t help

Ngo 5/11/12

http://energyinasiablog.com/2012/05/11/3-reasons-why-shale-gas-is-a-pipe-dream-in-china-part1/

Diana Ngo holds a Masters in International Affairs from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (IHEID) in Geneva, Switzerland and a Double Bachelors in Political Science and Global Studies from the University of California- Los Angeles (UCLA). As an Energy Analyst with the U.S. Department of Energy- Beijing in the Winter of 2010-2011, Diana directed a project analyzing China’s future energy supply and demand, the country’s current energy security strategies, and potential opportunities for foreign governments and companies. This project was considered by the U.S. Embassy in Beijing as a theme for bilateral talks and is now being used as the “China Energy Primer” for the U.S. Department of the State and the U.S. Department of Energy. As the Energy and Environmental Analyst with UNESCO- Bangkok in the Summer of 2010, Diana identified public policy challenges and options to increase energy equity and environmental security to developing countries in Southeast Asia. Her work lead her to speak at the Fifth UNESCO Asia-Pacific School of Ethics Roundtable entitled “Mundialization, Bioethics, and Policy” in Singapore, where her research was well-received by academics, government officials, and climate change experts. Her interest in energy stems from her need to uncover the political, geographical, environmental and diplomatic constraints that limited resources bring to the global economy. While her passion in Asia stems from a lifelong interest in the cultures, languages, and cuisines of the region. Currently living in Beijing, Diana hopes to meet like-minded individuals and explore exciting new opportunities.

3 Reasons Why Shale Gas is a Pipe Dream in China China dreams of energy independence via shale gas, but challenges abound due to geography, infrastructure, and water. In recent years, much attention has been paid to shale gas, an unconventional natural gas that was traditionally found to be too expensive to extract. But with rising fossil fuel costs and technological innovation, the United States has made shale gas into a serious game-changer for the future trade of natural gas around the world. Countries, such as China, are now finding ways to tap into this resource to boost their national energy security. But how accessible is Chinese shale gas and what problems does the production of this unconventional gas face in the People’s Republic of China? n April 2011, the U.S. Department of Energy’s Energy Information Administration (EIA) released estimates on the world’s technically recoverable shale gas reserves. The report garnered mixed reviews as it placed China as the leading holder of shale gas reserves in the world with “36 trillion cubic meters,” while the United States followed closely behind at “23.4 trillion cubic meters.” But can China actually dominate the shale gas market? EIA’s claims were unfounded as China was only beginning to identify and explore domestic shale rock basins. Since then, however, Beijing has been able to suggest that 2 out of the country’s 7 shale rock basins (Tarim and Sichuan Basins) could be commercially produced. With the help of joint ventures with BP (Sinopec), Total (CNPC), and Royal Dutch Shell (PetroChina), China began exploratory drilling in Sichuan in 2010. These joint ventures have found “major shale gas reserves in… [the]western Sichuan region” and have helped Chinese energy companies practice shale gas technologies. More importantly, these initial drillings have helped the government, specifically the Ministry of Land and Resources (MLR), survey China’s actual recoverable shale gas reserves. MLR now believes China holds “25 trillion cubic meters” of exploitable onshore shale gas. This is 11 trillion cubic meters less than the estimate EIA had proposed earlier, dropping China’s abilty to meet demand (at current rate of consumption) from about 400 to 300 years. Difficulties in Commercially Developing Shale Gas in China Faced with criticism to reduce carbon emission and reduce dependence on foreign fossil fuels, the Chinese government is set to move ahead with shale gas exploration and production. Earlier this year, the government has set targets for “developing 6.5 bcm of shale gas per year by 2015” and moving exponentially “up to 60-100 bcm by 2020.” However, are these targets practical? More important, what difficulties does China face in making shale gas commercially available in the near future? Difficulties in Geography The production of shale gas is technologically challenging since “water, sand, and chemicals” are used to blast deep into wells to allow shale gas to come to the surface. This technology, also known as hydraulic fracking, is the key element that has drastically changed the unconventional natural gas industry in the U.S. However, unlike the U.S., China’s shale rock is much more geographically challenging. Chinese shale gas is found in much rougher terrain and is found much deeper underground than American shale gas. American shale gas can be typically found within “two to six kilometers deep, whereas in China some key deposits are found six kilometers deep.” To developers, this means that experiences learned in the U.S. may not be readily applied to China as the geographical challenge will require more experienced personnel, additional equipment, technological innovation, and increased costs. This will be especially the case when exploring and developing Sichuan Province, an area prone to earthquakes. The quality of the shale rock and gas in China is also different than the U.S. The shale rock, for instance, is “non-marine” and contains much larger amounts of clay than its North American counterpart. This means that it is “more difficult to be fractured” and will require much more energy and highly skilled human capital to produce the same amount of gas. Chinese shale gas is also inferior to American shale as it contains much more “non-hydrocarbon gasses.” The lower quality gas may be costly in the long-term as China may be forced to develop ways in which to refine the gas into a more usable state. Lack of Infrastructure Many of China’s shale gas reserves are located in rural areas that lack basic infrastructure such as roads, railways, electricity, and gas pipelines. Without these transportation features, each level of shale gas development will be stalled. For example, without substantial roads, developers will be unable to carry in the necessary vehicles, sand, chemicals, and steel needed to create exploratory wells. China also faces a bottleneck in transporting shale gas as the country lacks an extensive gas pipeline network. More pipelines or liquefied natural gas centers will need to be built near shale gas wells in order to make the unconventional gas more commercially viable. In addition, China will need to adopt or develop infrastructure that can safely dispose of the contaminated material used to “frack” the shale rock. This will protect the environment, as well as help reclaim land that was used to drill into the earth. These factors are important as they will reduce costs caused by environmental damage and the chances of earthquakes occurring in the future. Moreover, these precautionary steps will also help China exponentially speed up their well development timeline (PetroChina took 11 months to complete the country’s first horizontal well). Water Shortages and Suitability One of the larger problems facing shale gas development in China is the shortage of water. Water is a necessary component in the process of hydraulic fracking, with no other alternative at the moment. In shale gas rich Sichuan Basin, this is of extreme concern due to the region’s agricultural heritage which provides the country with about “7 percent of China’s rice, wheat, and other grains.” Diverting water from the agricultural sector to shale gas could be devastating, especially if the contaminated water also contaminates China’s farmlands. For other shale gas basins in Tarim, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia, water shortage is a real challenge due to the arid and hot climate. Shale gas development will require water to be transported from other parts of the country, a feat that is expensive as it is momentarily impossible.

#### Europe solves

Zhang, Analyst, International Market & Strategy Analysis Group, Institute of Energy Economics, Japan, June 2010

(Yue, “The Shale Gas Boom Shift to China,” http://eneken.ieej.or.jp/data/3179.pdf)

Besides the US, recently, **European majors** seeing shale gas exploration positively **are** also **working** together **actively in Chinese companies to develop shale** gas reserves **in China**. After Shell and PetroChina signed an agreement on shale gas development in the Sichuan area last December, since the beginning of this year, **BP and Sinopec have been discussing developing shale** gas reserves **in Guizhou** province **and Jiangsu** province as well.

#### No China-Russia war

Spears, chief foreign policy writer – Brooks Foreign Policy Review, 5/1/’9

(Collin, <http://brooksreview.wordpress.com/2009/05/01/leery-bear-rising-dragon-life-along-the-sino-russian-border/>)

Although China is facing water shortages and will need inordinate amounts of resources to keep its economy growing, there is no evidence the Chinese government is purposefully moving “settler populations” into Russia to prepare for impending annexation of the Far East or Siberia. In addition, China has shown no interest in territorial expansion since the Qing Dynasty. For the last decade, China’s primary interest has been to secure a stable border to its West and North, where it can gain access to energy supplies and expand its political and economic reach into East and Southeast Asia. Any move at colonization by China could result in a very destruction war that could become nuclear. In fact**,** Russia’s vast nuclear deterrent is its security guarantee for the region, as China has proved to be a rational actor.

#### No China-India war

Kemp 10

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 223

However, conflict between China and India appears even less likely than war between India and Pakistan, and economics is the reason. Bilateral trade increased from a paltry $2.3 billion in FY 2001 to $25.7 billion in FY 2007.22“ Furthermore, both nations recognize the need to maintain stability in order to attract foreign investment.“ Since 1981, India and China have held thirty—one rounds of peace talks. In April 2005 alone, India and China agreed on eleven new accords and agreed to a “strategic partnership.” In 2006, called the Year of India-China Friendship, that partnership progressed as the two economic powers agreed to secure oil resources and reopened the Nathu La border; in addition, the Chinese premier visited India.“ Furthermore, recent discussions and confidence measures between India, China, and Pakistan have decreased tensions over Kashmir. Nevertheless, low-level tension remains over the border dispute in Arunachal Pradesh and the fact that India harbors Tibet’s government in exile.

#### No CCP collapse—the government represses instability

Pei 9(Minxin, Senior Associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3/12. “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### China’s buying contracts now

China Daily 1-7 (Chinese company buys into US shale oil and gas assets, 2013, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2013-01/07/content\_16092067.htm)

A private Chinese company, Lanzhou Haimo Technologies, signed a deal with Houston-based Carrizo Oil & Gas to buy into the American company's shale oil and gas assets in Colorado. It marks the first investment by a private Chinese company into shale oil and gas exploration in an American oil field. Under the agreement, signed in Beijing, the Chinese company will pay 27.5 million dollars for a 14.29 percent stake in Carrizo's Niobrara shale oil and gas assets. These include six thousand acres located primarily in Weld and Adams Counties in Colorado, as well as oil and gas wells and associated infrastructure. Haimo Technologies is a world leader in well testing services, and is listed on the Shenzhen Stock Exchange's Growth Enterprise Market. It's stocks rose 3.7 percent today. NASDAQ-listed Carrizo holds 60 thousand acres in the Niobrara basin, and produces 1,850 barrels of oil-equivalent per day.

#### Plan isn't sufficient

Carroll, AFF Author, 09

James Carroll, Emory International Law Review, COMMENT: BACK TO THE FUTURE: REDEFINING THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACT'S CONCEPTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY, 23 Emory Int'l L. Rev. 167)

On July 26, 2007, President Bush signed FINSA into law. 120 The new legislation modified Exon-Florio in several aspects, most notably by broadening the definition of national security to encompass “homeland security,” and also by including critical infrastructure, energy assets, and critical technologies under the umbrella of FINSA. 121 FINSA added the Secretary of Energy as a voting member of the CFIUS 122 and made investigations mandatory when either an acquisition is made by an entity controlled by a foreign government or the transaction could result in the control of any critical infrastructure, including major energy assets, by a foreign business. 123 This requirement is excepted if the Secretary of the Treasury and the head of the lead agency jointly determine that the transaction will not impair national security. 124 Thus, the burden of proof to show that a controlling acquisition of “critical infrastructure” does not threaten national security has arguably shifted from the government to the companies. 125 FINSA does define critical infrastructure as “assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems or assets would have a debilitating impact on national security.” 126 But this definition still allows uncertainty, as the federal government has promulgated multiple evolving and expanding definitions of what constitutes critical infrastructure, 127 which could encompass more than a quarter of the national economy. 128 The Treasury regulations implementing FINSA do not attempt to define or limit the scope of critical infrastructure. 129 Such a broad grab of power for the CFIUS by Congress represents a major intervention into the economy with potentially negative consequences for foreign direct investment. 130 FINSA also includes a requirement that the CFIUS file a report with Congress at the completion of any 30-day review or 45-day investigation, 131 which increases transparency and the likelihood of congressional involvement. Taken together, the FINSA reforms represent a victory for Congress in the long-running struggle between congressional attempts to broaden Exon-Florio to include economic factors, and the executive efforts to limit the review to issues directly relating to national defense. 132 While there is no explicit economic security factor added to the national security determination in FINSA, Congress achieved nearly the same end insofar as critical infrastructure is a broad enough term that practically any industry could be covered by it. 133

#### They don't solve wind restrictions - kills solvency - newest ev

Forden 9/28

Sarah Forden, staff writer, San Francisco Chronicle, September 28, 2012, " Obama Blocks Chinese-Owned Company on Oregon Wind Farms ", http://www.sfgate.com/business/bloomberg/article/Obama-Blocks-Chinese-Owned-Company-on-Oregon-Wind-3903196.php

Sept. 28 (Bloomberg) -- President Barack Obama barred a Chinese-owned company from building wind farms near a U.S. Navy installation in Oregon, the first time in 22 years a president has blocked a transaction on national security grounds. “The president’s action demonstrates the administration’s commitment to protecting national security while maintaining the United States’ longstanding policy on open investment,” the U.S. Treasury said in a statement today. The ruling “is specific to this transaction and is not a precedent with regard to any other foreign direct investment from China or any other country.” Obama’s decision confirms an order handed down in July by the government’s Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., or CFIUS, which reviews acquisitions of domestic companies by non- U.S. entities. CFIUS referred the matter to the president after the Chinese-owned company, Ralls Corp., sued to overturn its ruling. “I thought this case would have been ripe for some sort of mitigation agreement, which would have limited access by the parties but still allow them to obtain the benefit of their purchase,” Greg Jacobs, a lawyer with Reed Smith LLP in Washington, said in an interview before the announcement. “Some will view this as a closed-door to Chinese investment.”

## Quarters v Emory AB

### 1NC

#### Interpretation – “financial incentive” is a distinct category that requires a cash transfer

Manage 6 (12 Manage, management portal which contains over 400 methods and theories along with more than 1500 management terms, “Incentives,” 3-9, http://www.12manage.com/description\_incentives.html)

Definition Incentives. Description.

An Incentive is any extrinsic reward factor that motivates an employee or manager or team to achieve an important business goal on top of his/her/their intrinsic motivation. It is a factor aiming to shape or direct behavior. In an optimal form, executives and employees should be remunerated well (but cost-effectively) where they deserve it, and not where they do not. Pay-offs for failure should be kept to a minimum. Furthermore, to be effective, a layered or gradual approach is better than an all-or-nothing incentive. A smart executive reward scheme is one of the pillars to ensure entrepreneurial behavior and maximizing shareholder value (Compare: Value Based Management). An incentive is unlike coercion, in that coerced work is motivated by the threat or use of violence, punishment or negative action, while an incentive is a positive stimulation. Incentives can also be used as Anti Hostile Takeover Mechanisms.

categories of incentives. Classes

Financial Incentive. Also called, Remunerative Incentive, this category involves offering a material reward (often in the form of money) in exchange for certain results or behavior. In business, this is the most important category. The many variants include:

Profit sharing (the traditional, oldest approach).

Merit pay (merit wage or salary increase, often depending on the results of an appraisal).

Scientific Management (Taylor) and Piece-Rate systems (very effective on productivity, but may lead to quality issues).

Pay for Performance or Gain Sharing.

Moral Incentive. Where a particular behavior is widely regarded as the right thing to do, or as particularly admirable, or where the failure to act in a certain way is condemned as indecent.

Coercive Incentive. Where a failure to behave in a certain way or to achieve certain results can be expected to result in physical force being used.

Furthermore, incentives can be either a:

Personal Incentive (motivating a specific individual person).

Social Incentive (motivating any individual in certain circumstances).

#### The aff only reverses a ruling – doesn’t provide monetary incentives for plan action

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – each category is massive, they explode the topic by allowing hundreds of new, conceptually distinct incentives – makes neg research impossible.

#### B. Ground – different generics apply by category – forcing the aff to spend government money is the only stable mechanism for disad links and counterplan competition.

### 1NC

#### Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case

Buell 3Frederick—cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books, *From Apocalypse To Way of Life,* pages 185-186

Looked at critically, then, crisis discourse thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a political liability almost as much as an asset. It calls up a fierce and effective opposition with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too vulnerable to refutation by events. It also exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “total solution” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “final solution.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into inhumanist authoritarianism; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit depoliticizes people, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, people need to delink from nature and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to further indifference to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “total solution.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode;** eco-authoritarianism was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

#### Causes global destruction

**Der Derian 98** (James, Professor of Political Science – University of Massachusetts, On Security, Ed. Lipschutz, p. 24-25)

No other concept in international relations packs the metaphysical punch, nor commands the disciplinary power of "security." In its name, peoples have alienated their fears, rights and powers to gods, emperors, and most recently, sovereign states, all to protect themselves from the vicissitudes of nature--as well as from other gods, emperors, and sovereign states. In its name, weapons of mass destruction have been developed which have transfigured national interest into a security dilemma based on a suicide pact. And, less often noted in international relations, in its name billions have been made and millions killed while scientific knowledge has been furthered and intellectual dissent muted. We have inherited an ontotheology of security, that is, an a priori  argument that proves the existence and necessity of only one form of security because there currently happens to be a widespread, metaphysical belief in it. Indeed, within the concept of security lurks the entire history of western metaphysics, which was best described by Derrida "as a series of substitutions of center for center" in a perpetual search for the "transcendental signified." Continues... [7](http://libcat1.cc.emory.edu:32888/20050307122932441313c0=www.ciaonet.org:80/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html#note7) In this case, Walt cites IR scholar Robert Keohane on the hazards of "reflectivism," to warn off anyone who by inclination or error might wander into the foreign camp: "As Robert Keohane has noted, until these writers `have delineated . . . a research program and shown . . . that it can illuminate important issues in world politics, they will remain on the margins of the field.' " [8](http://libcat1.cc.emory.edu:32888/20050307122932441313c0=www.ciaonet.org:80/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html#note8) By the end of the essay, one is left with the suspicion that the rapid changes in world politics have triggered a "security crisis" in security studies that requires extensive theoretical damage control. What if we leave the desire for mastery to the insecure and instead imagine a new dialogue of security, not in the pursuit of a utopian end but in recognition of the world as it is, other than us ? What might such a dialogue sound like? Any attempt at an answer requires a genealogy: to understand the discursive power of the concept, to remember its forgotten meanings, to assess its economy of use in the present, to reinterpret--and possibly construct through the reinterpretation--a late modern security comfortable with a plurality of centers, multiple meanings, and fluid identities. The steps I take here in this direction are tentative and preliminary. I first undertake a brief history of the concept itself. Second, I present the "originary" form of security that has so dominated our conception of international relations, the Hobbesian episteme of realism. Third, I consider the impact of two major challenges to the Hobbesian episteme, that of Marx and Nietzsche. And finally, I suggest that Baudrillard provides the best, if most nullifying, analysis of security in late modernity. In short, I retell the story of realism as an historic encounter of fear and danger with power and order that produced four realist forms of security: epistemic, social, interpretive, and hyperreal. To preempt a predictable criticism, I wish to make it clear that I am not in search of an "alternative security." An easy defense is to invoke Heidegger, who declared that "questioning is the piety of thought." Foucault, however, gives the more powerful reason for a genealogy of security: I am not looking for an alternative; you can't find the solution of a problem in the solution of another problem raised at another moment by other people. You see, what I want to do is not the history of solutions, and that's the reason why I don't accept the word alternative. My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. The hope is that in the interpretation of the most pressing dangers of late modernity we might be able to construct a form of security based on the appreciation and articulation rather than the normalization or extirpation of difference. Nietzsche transvalues both Hobbes's and Marx's interpretations of security through a genealogy of modes of being. His method is not to uncover some deep meaning or value for security, but to destabilize the intolerable fictional identities of the past which have been created out of fear, and to affirm the creative differences which might yield new values for the future. Originating in the paradoxical relationship of a contingent life and a certain death, the history of security reads for Nietzsche as an abnegation, a resentment and, finally, a transcendence of this paradox. In brief, the history is one of individuals seeking an impossible security from the most radical "other" of life, the terror of death which, once generalized and nationalized, triggers a futile cycle of collective identities seeking security from alien others--who are seeking similarly impossible guarantees. It is a story of differences taking on the otherness of death, and identities calcifying into a fearful sameness.

#### The alternative is to reject dominant security discourse – no one policy solves every problem – good theory now drives better policies later

Bruce 96 (Robert, Associate Professor in Social Science – Curtin University and Graeme Cheeseman, Senior Lecturer – University of New South Wales, Discourses of Danger and Dread Frontiers, p. 5-9)

This goal is pursued in ways which are still unconventional in the intellectual milieu of international relations in Australia, even though they are gaining influence worldwide as traditional modes of theory and practice are rendered inadequate by global trends that defy comprehension, let alone policy. The inability to give meaning to global changes reflects partly the enclosed, elitist world of professional security analysts and bureaucratic experts, where entry is gained by learning and accepting to speak a particular, exclusionary language. The contributors to this book are familiar with the discourse, but accord no privileged place to its ‘knowledge form as reality’ in debates on defence and security. Indeed, they believe that debate will be furthered only through a long overdue critical re-evaluation of elite perspectives. Pluralistic, democratically-oriented perspectives on Australia’s identity are both required and essential if Australia’s thinking on defence and security is to be invigorated. This is not a conventional policy book; nor should it be, in the sense of offering policy-makers and their academic counterparts sets of neat alternative solutions, in familiar language and format, to problems they pose. This expectation is in itself a considerable part of the problem to be analysed. It is, however, a book about policy, one that questions how problems are framed by policy-makers. It challenges the proposition that irreducible bodies of real knowledge on defence and security exist independently of their ‘context in the world’, and it demonstrates how security policy is articulated authoritatively by the elite keepers of that knowledge, experts trained to recognize enduring, universal wisdom. All others, from this perspective, must accept such wisdom or remain outside the expert domain, tainted by their inability to comply with the ‘rightness’ of the official line. But it is precisely the official line, or at least its image of the world, that needs to be problematised. If the critic responds directly to the demand for policy alternatives, without addressing this image, he or she is tacitly endorsing it. Before engaging in the policy debate the critics need to reframe the basic terms of reference. This book, then, reflects and underlines the importance of Antonio Gramsci and Edward Said’s ‘critical intellectuals’.15 The demand, tacit or otherwise, that the policy-maker’s frame of reference be accepted as the only basis for discussion and analysis ignores a three thousand year old tradition commonly associated with Socrates and purportedly integral to the Western tradition of democratic dialogue. More immediately, it ignores post-seventeenth century democratic traditions which insist that a good society must have within it some way of critically assessing its knowledge and the decisions based upon that knowledge which impact upon citizens of such a society. This is a tradition with a slightly different connotation in contemporary liberal democracies which, during the Cold War, were proclaimed different and superior to the totalitarian enemy precisely because there were institutional checks and balances upon power. In short, one of the major differences between ‘open societies’ and their (closed) counterparts behind the Iron Curtain was that the former encouraged the critical testing of the knowledge and decisions of the powerful and assessing them against liberal democratic principles. The latter tolerated criticism only on rare and limited occasions. For some, this represented the triumph of rational-scientific methods of inquiry and techniques of falsification. For others, especially since positivism and rationalism have lost much of their allure, it meant that for society to become open and liberal, sectors of the population must be independent of the state and free to question its knowledge and power. Though we do not expect this position to be accepted by every reader, contributors to this book believe that critical dialogue is long overdue in Australia and needs to be listened to. For all its liberal democratic trappings, Australia’s security community continues to invoke closed monological narratives on defence and security. This book also questions the distinctions between policy practice and academic theory that inform conventional accounts of Australian security. One of its major concerns, particularly in chapters 1 and 2, is to illustrate how theory is integral to the practice of security analysis and policy prescription. The book also calls on policy-makers, academics and students of defence and security to think critically about what they are reading, writing and saying; to begin to ask, of their work and study, difficult and searching questions raised in other disciplines; to recognise, no matter how uncomfortable it feels, that what is involved in theory and practice is not the ability to identify a replacement for failed models, but a realisation that terms and concepts – state sovereignty, balance of power, security, and so on – are contested and problematic, and that the world is indeterminate, always becoming what is written about it. Critical analysis which shows how particular kinds of theoretical presumptions can effectively exclude vital areas of political life from analysis has direct practical implications for policy-makers, academics and citizens who face the daunting task of steering Australia through some potentially choppy international waters over the next few years. There is also much of interest in the chapters for those struggling to give meaning to a world where so much that has long been taken for granted now demands imaginative, incisive reappraisal. The contributors, too, have struggled to find meaning, often despairing at the terrible human costs of international violence. This is why readers will find no single, fully formed panacea for the world’s ills in general, or Australia’s security in particular. There are none. Every chapter, however, in its own way, offers something more than is found in orthodox literature, often by exposing ritualistic Cold War defence and security mind-sets that are dressed up as new thinking. Chapters 7 and 9, for example, present alternative ways of engaging in security and defence practice. Others (chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8) seek to alert policy-makers, academics and students to alternative theoretical possibilities which might better serve an Australian community pursuing security and prosperity in an uncertain world. All chapters confront the policy community and its counterparts in the academy with a deep awareness of the intellectual and material constraints imposed by dominant traditions of realism, but they avoid dismissive and exclusionary terms which often in the past characterized exchanges between policy-makers and their critics. This is because, as noted earlier, attention needs to be paid to the words and the thought processes of those being criticized. A close reading of this kind draws attention to underlying assumptions, showing they need to be recognized and questioned. A sense of doubt (in place of confident certainty) is a necessary prelude to a genuine search for alternative policies. First comes an awareness of the need for new perspectives, then specific policies may follow. As Jim George argues in the following chapter, we need to look not so much at contending policies as they are made for us but at challenging ‘the discursive process which gives [favoured interpretations of “reality”] their meaning and which direct [Australia’s] policy/analytical/military responses’. This process is not restricted to the small, official defence and security establishment huddled around the US-Australian War Memorial in Canberra. It also encompasses much of Australia’s academic defence and security community located primarily though not exclusively within the Australian National University and the University College of the University of New South Wales. These discursive processes are examined in detail in subsequent chapters as authors attempt to make sense of a politics of exclusion and closure which exercises disciplinary power over Australia’s security community. They also question the discourse of ‘regional security’, ‘security cooperation’, ‘peacekeeping’ and ‘alliance politics’ that are central to Australia’s official and academic security agenda in the 1990s. This is seen as an important task especially when, as is revealed, the disciplines of International Relations and Strategic Studies are under challenge from critical and theoretical debates ranging across the social sciences and humanities; debates that are nowhere to be found in Australian defence and security studies. The chapters graphically illustrate how Australia’s public policies on defence and security are informed, underpinned and legitimised by a narrowly-based intellectual enterprise which draws strength from contested concepts of realism and liberalism, which in turn seek legitimacy through policy-making processes. Contributors ask whether Australia’s policy-makers and their academic advisors are unaware of broader intellectual debates, or resistant to them, or choose not to understand them, and why?

### 1NC

#### Using visual metaphors negatively characterizes disability in opposition to knowledge– this ableist practice should be rejected.

**Ferri & May 5** [Beth – Assoc Prof Disability Studies, Syracuse Univ; Vivian – Asst Prof Women’s Studies, Syracuse Univ; , “Fixated on Ability: Ableist metaphors in feminist theories of resistance,” Prose Studies, v27, http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/160692/Fixated\_on\_Ability\_Questioning\_Ableist\_Metaphors\_in\_Feminist\_Theories\_of\_Resistance]

**A range of disabilities are employed for their "metaphoric" value**. In her poem, "Tomorrow I Am Going To Re–write The English Language," Lois Keith suggests a need to replace "striving ambulist metaphors/ Of power and success" (which include standing on your own two feet, making great strides, standing up for yourself, and standing tall) with alternatives that mirror her way of being and moving through space (57 59). Likewise, Georgina Kleege provides us with a litany of **common figurative uses of the word blind, including: blind faith, blind trust, blind spot, blindside, blind leading the blind, and following blindly** (21 22). Nancy Mairs also highlights "the extent to which we equate physical vigor with positive moral qualities: ... |keep| 'your eyes open' (alertness); .. .(standj 'tall' (pride); ... 'see eye to eye' (accord); 'run rings around' (superiority)" *(The View* 215). Conversely, Mairs notes, "physical debility connotes vice, as in 'sit on your ass' (laziness), 'take it lying down' (weakness), 'listen with half an ear' (inattention), and get left 'without a leg to stand on' (unsound argument)" (215). In other words, **when disability shows up in our everyday language it almost always signals ignorance, confusion, lack, absence, and ineptitude**. **Ableist metaphors also slip into scholarly discourse as evidence of any number of negative qualities or attributes.** As Lennard Davis reminds us, **academics "routinely turn a** 'deaf ear' |or **[‘a blind eye] or find** |**a**n argument) 'lame' or a **political act 'crippling**"' (87). **Unfortunately, scholars within interdisciplinary areas of study**, as well as those in the traditional disciplines, **have been slow to recognize disability studies as a legitimate area of inquiry. This inability to analyze disability through a critical framework further demonstrates the problems with passive empathy or identification, analogic bridging, and assuming the reversibility of experiences.** As Iris Marion Young reminds us, "the idea of reversing perspectives assumes that the perspectives brought to a situation are equally legitimate. Where structural social injustice exists, this may not be true" (48). Thus Davis wonders if "critics of the future will be astounded, puzzled, and disturbed" that works by some of our most known and highly regarded critical scholars "managed to steer so completely away from any discussion of disability" (87). With Davis' question in mind, we are particularly troubled by the ubiquitous use of ableist metaphors in feminist discourses. In fact, our interest in this project grew as we noticed how frequently scholars whom we otherwise greatly admire use disability in problematic ways. It is important to note that we have focused our attention primarily on some of our most favorite contemporary scholars those whose work we have found to be provocative, insightful, critical, and creative. In addition, we find ourselves troubled by close colleagues and friends (as well as our own oversights)—in other words, we butt up against ableist practices in feminism on a daily basis, whether through peer interaction or on the page. For example, recently one of us had to interrupt her feminist theory reading group to request that discussants please stop using blind, blindness, paralyzed, and deafness to critique the perceived deficiencies and oversights in that week's readings. The room stopped dead, she was stared at in total incomprehension, and then the group continued on without a second thought to the request or its meaning. Recently, a similar situation occurred on a feminist philosophy listserv we subscribe to. In response, Shelley Tremain requested that list participants stop relving on ableist notions of disability as a means of critiquing homophobia and conservative backlash at the state and federal level. She wrote: 1 am quite surprised that contributors to this thread have been tossing around the terms 'insane,' 'sane,' 'delusional,' [and| 'mental illness' so uncritically, carelessly, and sarcastically.. ..1 wonder if any of the contributors to the thread (about Virginia outlawing same–sex marriage contracts] have a political analysis of disability, of psychiatrization, |or] of forcible confinement.. ..Should feminists begin the practice of pathologizing individuals (even if only in jest) in order to deal with social problems? (April 27, 2004 FEAST–L). **We offer these examples not as extraordinary, but as rather mundane**. **What they suggest is a problem of understanding.** As philosopher Susan Babbitt explains, understanding frequently operates according to a binary (either something fits ready–made frames of reference or it is incommensurable, outside of logic). In situations where marginalized experience and knowledge are concerned, Babbitt therefore argues that it is often *not* a "matter of being ignored or even misunderstood" that is the core problem. Rather, it is a matter of "being understood all too well in a way that disallows recognition that there is still something that needs to be understood" (303). In other words, **what is missing in much feminist discourse that seems to so easily use disability without a second thought as to its meaning is both a "cognitive need" and a "shifted orientation" toward experiences and knowledges that are different and that do not conform to sedimented frames of reference or epistemic models,** 'Thus Babbitt argues for the need to develop a cognitive awareness of a *lack of understanding* (in this case, of disability as complex and as intersecting with other layers of power and identity) in order for change to be possible (311). This lack of understanding of disability, or a presumed understanding of disability that fixes its meaning in stereotypical ways, is all too common, but **we have noticed two predominant trends in feminist and critical race theorizing: the tendency to characterize disability in opposition to knowledge or insight** (this characterization can be both negative/stigmatized or positive/romanticized); **and the use of disability**\* to identify and describe objects of remediation (**to critique dominant ideologies which are imbued with unacknowledged power and privilege** or to name and reject the effects of oppression). Constructing Disability in Opposition to Knowledge Surprisingly, **many theorists continue to rely on disability as a metaphor for ignorance, stupidity**, **oversight**, **or general incompetence** as a knower. **For example, mixing metaphors of muteness and blindness to underscore exclusions in feminist thinking, Ann DuCille critiques "the silence (and the blindness) of feminism**" (247). **bell hooks uses ableist metaphors to highlight sexist thinking on the part of** Paulo **Freire**. She writes: "For me this Ipatriarchal paradigm of liberation) is always a source of great anguish for it represents a blind spot in the vision of men [like Freire) who have profound insight" (49). Here, Freire's blind spot is his lack of awareness of sexism, which hooks places in opposition to his great insight and otherwise redeemable vision about the politics of race, ethnicity, and social class resistance. Of course, hooks is not alone in her use of visual metaphors for knowing or insight, For example, we found that we, too, relied on the notion of sight to signify understanding in an earlier co–authored article on disability and him (May and Herri 135). Yet **equating visuality and knowing is not innocent it has**, of course, **a history**. For instance, **many have argued that it is an episteme foundational to practices empire building and colonial cartography, of'looking out" over or surveying lands and their inhabitants as property to be conquered or developed** (e.g., Duncan). **Moreover, by reinscribing vision as knowledge** (and, directly or indirectly, blindness as ignorance), **visual metaphors for knowing or insight can reinforce Manichean dualisms of mind/body, I/not–1 in the name of liberation politics**. **Equating visual acuity with knowing is one common way to place disability in opposition to knowledge**. But many others are equally as frequent, including dualisms between mental illness and rationality and/or characterizations of faulty knowledge models as "pathologies" or "illnesses." For example, because Frederic Jameson relies heavily on ableist notions of schizophrenia and pathological illness in his critique of the postmodern subject, these ideas infiltrate Chela Sandoval's reading and critique of Jameson. Sandoval writes that for Jameson, the "euphoria" of the postmodern subject "marks the onset of a new form of mass cultural pathology. It is 'schizophrenic' in nature charged with hallucinogenic intensity" (21). Similarly, June Jordan (in Collins, *Fighting* 150) describes constructivist approaches to identity as a "delusional disease." In asserting her own social theory\*, Patricia Hill Collins writes that deconstructivist theory can be "crippling" because it "runs in circles" and fosters nihilism (Fighting 189). Once again, disability is enlisted to represent foolishness and despair.

#### Voting Issue – Ableist Speech strengthens oppression and destroys the purposes of public debate

**Wheelchair Dancer 8** (“On Making Argument: Disability and Language”, 4/28/8, http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2008/04/on–making–argument–disability–and.html)

If you are feeling a little bit of resistance, here, I'd ask you to think about it. If perhaps what I am saying feels like a burden –– too much to take on? a restriction on your carefree speech? –– perhaps that feeling can also serve as an indicator of how pervasive and thus important the issue is. As a community, we've accepted that commonly used words can be slurs, and as a rule, we avoid them, hopefully in the name of principle, but sometimes only in the name of civility. Do you go around using derivatives of the b\*ch word? If you do, I bet you check which community you are in.... Same thing for the N word. These days, depending on your age, you might say something is retarded or spastic, but you probably never say that it's gay. I'd like to suggest that society as a whole has not paid the same kind of attention to disabled people's concerns about language. By not paying attention to the literal value, the very real substantive, physical, psychological, sensory, and emotional experiences that come with these linguistic moves, we have created a negative rhetorical climate. In this world, it is too easy for feminists and people of colour to base their claims on argumentative strategies that depend, as their signature moves, on marginalizing the experience of disabled people and on disparaging their appearance and bodies. Much of the blogosphere discourse of the previous weeks has studied the relationships between race, (white) feminism and feminists, and WOC bloggers. To me, the intellectual takeaway has been an emerging understanding of how, in conversation, notions of appropriation, citation, ironization, and metaphorization can be deployed as strategies of legitimation and exclusion. And, as a result, I question how "oppressed, minoritized" groups differentiate themselves from other groups in order to seek justice and claim authority. Must we always define ourselves in opposition and distance to a minoritized and oppressed group that can be perceived as even more unsavory than the one from which one currently speaks? As I watched the discussion about who among the feminist and WOC bloggers has power and authority and how that is achieved, I began to recognise a new power dynamic both on the internet and in the world at large. Feminism takes on misogyny. The WOC have been engaging feminism. But from my point of view, a wide variety of powerful feminist and anti–racist discourse is predicated on negative disability stereotyping. There's a kind of hierarchy here: the lack of awareness about disability, disability culture and identity, and our civil rights movement has resulted in a kind of domino effect where disability images are the metaphor of last resort: the bottom, the worst. Disability language has about it a kind of untouchable quality –– as if the horror and weakness of a disabled body were the one true, reliable thing, a touchstone to which we can turn when we know we can't use misogynistic or racist language. When we engage in these kinds of argumentative strategies, we exclude a whole population of people whose histories are intricately bound up with ours. When we deploy these kinds of strategies to underscore the value of our own existence in the world, we reaffirm and strengthen the systems of oppression that motivated us to speak out in the first place.

### 1NC

#### It will pass, Obama’s pushing, and it’s a top priority

Global Times 2-20 (Obama reaches out to GOP on immigration, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/762877.shtml>)

US President Barack Obama on Tuesday reached out to Republican lawmakers, calling to discuss comprehensive immigration reform, said the White House. According to a White House statement, Obama placed calls to Senators Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Marco Rubio to discuss "their shared commitment to bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform." The senators were key members of the so-called Gang of 8, which was working to overhaul the immigration system. During the calls, Obama "reiterated that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles on reform." Obama also said the reforms need to include strengthening border security, creating an earned path to citizenship, holding employers accountable, and streamlining legal immigration. The White House also said Obama is "prepared to submit his own legislation if Congress fails to act." The Gang of 8 is working to get a bill to the Senate floor as early as May. In a statement, Rubio spokesman Alex Conant said the Florida senator "appreciated receiving President Obama's phone call to discuss immigration reform," and told Obama that he "feels good about the ongoing negotiations in the Senate, and is hopeful the final product is something that can pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support." Earlier in the day, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney was questioned repeatedly during a briefing about whether Obama had personally contacted Republican lawmakers on immigration reform, a top priority on the president's second term agenda.

#### Tons of political opposition to changing tax code

Cardwell 1-30 (Diane, Business Reporter, “Renewable Energy Industries Push for New Financing Options,” New York Times, 2013, <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2013/01/30/renewable-energy-industries-push-for-new-financing-options/>

For years, green energy industries like wind and solar have been telling Congress that they cannot yet compete with fossil fuels without hefty tax breaks intended especially for them. But with antipathy for renewable energy subsidies running high among many Republicans, the industries are bringing a new plea to Washington: allow wind and solar companies to qualify for some of the tax advantages that are used by the oil, gas and real estate industries to raise money from investors. “We’ve made great progress in bringing down the cost of renewable energy technologies like wind turbines and solar panels,” said Dan Reicher, who is executive director of the Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance at Stanford and who has been pushing for the changes. “Where we haven’t made the necessary progress is on bringing down the cost of financing the projects that use that equipment, so the cost of renewable energy is higher than it needs to be.” The industries are looking to two investment structures — the master limited partnership and the real estate investment trust — to help make financing easier and cheaper. Mr. Reicher estimated that opening them up to renewable companies could cut the cost of their energy by a third. There are many challenges to changing the tax code — particularly in an era when many in Washington are trying to raise revenue, not reduce it. But the proposals are receiving serious attention. The Internal Revenue Service is considering allowing at least one company to form a real estate investment trust, or REIT, for a group of renewable energy projects, with a decision expected soon. Wind and other green energy technologies have become cheaper, but the cost of investing has stayed relatively high. And last month, 31 lawmakers, including Senators Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Jerry Moran of Kansas and Representative Ted Poe of Texas, sent a letter to President Obama urging him to support the changes. All three are Republicans supported by gas and oil interests, according to OpenSecrets.org. Senator Chris Coons, a Democrat from Delaware who was a sponsor of a bill on master limited partnerships, or M.L.P.’s, during the last session, said he plans to reintroduce it this year. He said he had been meeting with Obama administration officials and lawmakers and building support for the measure, including among Republicans. Allowing solar and wind firms to use a tax break offered to oil and gas companies fits into the worldview of “an all-of-the-above energy strategy,” he said, “not picking winners and losers in technology.” But the effort may run aground in the larger tax overhaul that Congress and President Obama are pursuing. Although White House officials say they see expanding REITs and M.L.P.’s as keeping with their larger clean energy goals, they are more focused on eliminating direct subsidies and loopholes for fossil fuels and establishing a permanent production tax credit for renewables.

#### Solves inevitable economic collapse

Ozimek 2-7 (Adam, Contributor, “Does An Aging Population Hurt The Economy?” Forbes, 2013, http://www.forbes.com/sites/modeledbehavior/2013/02/07/does-an-aging-population-hurt-the-economy/)

The economic benefit of immigration is in part about how big of a problem our aging population is. Immigrants are in general younger, and our best way to fight against a growing ratio of retirees to workers. But this raises the question of how big of a problem is this ratio and our aging population in general. While many are concerned about this, Dean Baker argues it is not a problem. He agrees that the ratio has increased and will continue to increase in the future as the population ages, but he argues that we haven’t seen any problems yet so we won’t see any later: We have already seen a sharp decline in the ratio of workers to retirees, yet even people who follow the economy and economic policy closely, like Klein, were apparently not even aware of this fact. Since this decline is never cited as factor causing our current economic problems, why would we think the comparatively mild decline in this ratio projected for future decades will be a large burden? Dean is wrong that the ratio of workers to retirees is not cited as a factor in the current economic problems. The most prominent example comes from newly appointed Council of Economic Advisors member James Stock and his co-author Mark Watson. In their paper “Disentangling the Channels of the 2007-2009 Recession” they specifically cite demographic trends as a cause of our slow recovery. The variable Stock and Watson ultimately cite is the decline in labor force participation, and they argue it is driven by the aging of the workforce and the overall distribution of workers by age. Dean may argue that this technically isn’t the dependency ratio, but that would be quibbling: changes in these two measures capture the same basic economic phenomenon of the aging population and a lower percentage of the population working. Not only has the aging population contributed to the slow recovery, Stock and Watson argue there is good reason to believe it will mean slow recoveries in the future too: The main conclusion from this demographic work is that, barring a new increase in female labor force participation or a significant increase in the growth rate of the population, these demographic factors point towards a further decline in trend growth of employment and hours in the coming decades. Applying this demographic view to recessions and recoveries suggests that the future recessions with historically typical cyclical behavior will have steeper declines and slower recoveries in output and employment. Furthermore, this is just the impact of the aging population on business cycles, there is also the very serious problem of how it will affect our finances. Dean knows that by increasing the workforce immigration improves Social Security’s finances. In 2006 he wrote that if future immigration was at 2001-2002 levels instead of at around 900,000 per year it would reduce the Social Security trust fund’s long-term shortfall by 12%. A shortfall means we will reduce benefits or pay for it in higher taxes, and either are going to result in lower welfare for someone.

#### Nuclear war

**Auslin 9** (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

### 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should grant authority for decision making over revenue rulings over locally-planned solar power production to the U.S. states. The 50 U.S. states should issue a revenue ruling establishing that locally-planned solar power production is a real estate investment trust qualified asset class.

#### Devolving control of regulating energy solves better and promotes more efficient production

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life.¶ Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11¶ Critics have identified a host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and fails to encourage more local efforts. n13¶ Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, in many areas, problematic, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18¶ One way of responding to this debate over policy devolution is to try to sort out federal/local roles in environmental policy on a statute-by-statute basis. In the case of air pollution, for example, some regulatory goals require efforts that go beyond the capacity of individual states. The Clean Air Act provides for regional efforts to deal with the long-range transport of ozone pollution from motor vehicles and with haze in national parks and wilderness areas. Pollution problems that cross state [\*7] boundaries and involve interstate transfers can be similarly addressed by several states working together, under the EPA's umbrella. The EPA can maintain responsibility for emission standards for products that are sold in national and international markets, such as motor vehicles. n19 In other areas of implementation, such as permitting, inspection, enforcement, and monitoring, however, the EPA could cut back significantly what it does and help direct political accountability to state and local governments for local environmental quality. It could provide technical assistance, draft model state environmental laws, and disseminate more information about environmental problems and conditions and about innovative policy efforts. n20 The EPA could take on fewer tasks, and then perform those functions more expeditiously.¶ The debate over policy devolution is difficult to resolve in ways that provide clear guidance for what specific policies should be pursued at what level of government. Devolution is not without risks. Political boundaries often conflict with the extension of ecosystems and environmental effects spill over political borders. Urban air pollution problems, for example, are a function of local sources as well as those that are transported long distances. Policy devolution in one area, such as the formulation of local air pollution clean up programs, as is currently provided for by law, must be combined with regional and national programs to deal with the transport of air pollution and emissions from motor vehicles. The goal of giving communities the choice of what mix of risk reduction and economic growth strategies to pursue conflicts with the expectations of a national commitment to protect the health of all Americans, regardless of where they live. There may be some backsliding in some states as more autonomy is delegated to them, and polluting industries may find ways to exercise their political clout more ambitiously in local governments in ways that reduce their regulatory obligations. Proponents of less environmental regulation, of unbridled economic growth and consumption may use devolution arguments to pursue their anti-government agenda. But, in the long run, a more ambitious, pollution-preventing approach to regulation requires more participation and involvement by those whose behaviors are targeted for change, and state and local-level government forums are required for citizens, industry officials, and policy makers to work closely together. Any losses in short-run regulatory stringency (if that is an accurate description of current regulatory efforts) will likely be offset by more fundamental, long-term gains.¶ Despite these problems there is significant support for devolution in environmental policy making. There is clearly some role in environmental [\*8] policy making for all levels of government. International commitments require national legislation, but state and local governments can also contribute to implementation of these agreements. Interstate commerce and pollution flows also require at least a multi-state response. Beyond that, there is a compelling case for allowing states to tailor the implementation of national goals to meet differing ecological, economic, social, and political differences. n21 Economic theories suggest that decentralization of decisionmaking "increases social well-being as compared with a centralized solution requiring more uniform level of public services across all jurisdictions" because of the resultant freedom of people to choose for themselves how to balance competing concerns. n22 Competition among businesses and among states is essential in encouraging innovation, experimentation, and improved policy making. Progressives have also joined the call for devolution, arguing that shifts in power to states can be harnessed to enact better public policies and also nourishes democracy and the opening up of politics to groups that have had little success, at least recently, in shaping national policies. n23¶ Nevertheless, Congressional leaders have largely abandoned, with a few exceptions such as in welfare reform, the promises made in 1994 and 1995 to deliver a smaller federal government and devolve more power to states. n24 Instead, legislation to strengthen the federal role in taxing Internet commerce, property rights, electric industry deregulation, telecommunications, and a host of other areas demonstrate strong Congressional interest in maintaining and even expanding federal power. n25 Members of Congress appear to be much more interested in responding to the demands of business that they be given one set of federal standards to meet, rather than 50 different state requirements. The globalization of the economy and the emphasis on uniform standards provides strong pressure for increased federal policy making rather than policy devolution. n26 The exception of welfare policy seems to prove the rule: in areas where there is strong industry interest in uniform standards, including environmental policy making, there is little devolution; in areas [\*9] where industry has little interest, like welfare, Congress has responded to state demands for more flexibility and discretion.¶ III. RETHINKING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ An alternative approach to sorting out the debate over policy devolution and national regulatory programs is to consider what kinds of changes are needed in environmental laws and policies in order to encourage the transition from the current command and control approach to the idea of sustainable development. However, the next generation of environmental laws and regulatory programs, if they are to be more efficient and effective than their predecessors in preventing pollution, integrating economic and environmental values, and promoting sustainability, will still need to address the arguments made by proponents of devolution. The balance of this paper examines the definition of sustainable development, reviews the case for reshaping environmental regulation toward that goal, and explores the implications of the theory of sustainable development for policy devolution.

### 1NC - Solvency

#### --Solar’s too expensive even if we give away the panels

Zehner 12

Green illusions,
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Free Panels, Anyone? Among the ceos and chief scientists in the solar industry, there is surprisingly little argument that solar systems are expensive.46 Even an extreme drop in the price of polysilicon, the most expensive technical component, would do little to make solar cells more competitive. Peter Nieh, managing director of Lightspeed Venture Partners, a multibillion-dollar venture capital firm in Silicon Valley, contends that cheaper polysilicon won't reduce the overall cost of solar arrays much, even if the price of the expensive material dropped to zero.47 Why? Because the cost of other materials such as copper, glass, plastics, and aluminum, as well as the costs for fabrication and installation, represent the bulk of a solar system's overall price tag. The technical polysilicon represents only about a fifth of the total. Furthermore, Keith Barnham, an avid solar proponent and senior researcher at Imperial College London, admits that unless efficiency levels are high, "even a zero cell cost is not competitive."48 In other words, even if someone were to offer you solar cells for free, you might be better off turning the offer down than paying to install, connect, clean, insure, maintain, and eventually dispose of the modules—especially if you live outside the remote, dry, sunny patches of the planet such as the desert extending from southeast California to western Arizona. In fact, the unanticipated costs, performance variables, and maintenance obligations for photovoltaics, too often ignored by giddy proponents of the technology, can swell to unsustainable magnitudes. Occasionally buyers decommission their arrays within the first decade, leaving behind graveyards of toxic panels teetering above their roofs as epitaphs to a fallen dream. Premature decommissioning may help explain why American photovoltaic electrical generation dropped during the last economic crisis even as purported solar capacity expanded.49 Curiously, while numerous journalists reported on solar infrastructure expansion during this period, I was unable to locate a single article covering the contemporaneous drop in the nation's solar electrical output, which the Department of Energy quietly slid into its annual statistics without a peep.

#### --Complex state and local regulation overwhelms any Federal incentives-discourages solar projects

Walsh 11

Bryan, Energy: The Obstacles to Scaling Up Solar Power, senior writer for TIME and TIME.com, focuses on environmental issues, general interest and national stories

<http://science.time.com/2011/01/31/energy-the-obstacles-to-scaling-up-solar-power/>

President Obama laid down a bold challenge to America in his State of the Union speech last week: get to 80% clean energy by 2035. Clean energy is a deliberately vague goal, since it will likely include nuclear, natural gas and (not really existing) clean coal in the mix. But traditional renewable energy like wind and solar will need to be a big part of the American clean energy transition Obama is planning. In a speech at NDN today (which used to stand for New Democrat Network but now stands for…nothing, as far as I can tell), Democratic Senator Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico reiterated his support for Obama’s energy goals, and raised hopes that a bill with a clean energy standard might be resurrected in this Congress. (Bingaman last year pushed a bill focused on a national renewable energy standard, but with much of the legislative focus placed on a carbon cap bill, Bingaman’s work never earned much momentum.) But he warned that it won’t be easy. “Perhaps no topic garnered more scrutiny during the 2009 markup in our committee than the renewable electricity standard,” he said. But there’s a lot more holding back renewable power in the U.S. than gridlock in Congress. One of the biggest obstacles to scaling up solar power in particular is regulation—not just from the federal government, but at the state, city and even community level. Rules on installing solar systems differ from town to town, and the work of researching and filling out permits adds to the cost of solar power across the country. According to a study by the solar installer SunRun, struggles over permits adds an average of $2,500 to the costs of each solar installation—while an effort to streamline regulations could provide a $1 billion stimulus to the residential and commercial solar markets over the next five years. “The costs to the solar market are really staggering,” says Ed Fenster, CEO of SunRun. SunRun compared U.S. regulations to those in more friendly markets for solar, like Germany and Japan. They found that Germany—which has more streamlined regulations for solar installation, as well as more generous government subsidies—keeps solar installation costs 40% lower than those in the U.S. Not coincidentally, one million new homes have gone solar in Germany over the past two years, while only about 80,000 homes in total have solar in the U.S. “Regulation is a major issue that’s holding us back,” says Lyndon Rive, the CEO of SolarCity, a major California-based solar installer. SolarCity’s experience is constructive. The company—which coves solar installation from design to financing to monitoring—has grown at a healthy clip, employing over 1,000 people and expanding from its base in California to Maryland and Washington, DC. But Rive says that the variety of regulations for solar installation are a major bottleneck on growth. It takes SolarCity a few days at most to actually install a solar system, but it often takes two to three months, if not longer, to get the permits and other preparations ready. If you’re trying to make solar a significant part of the American energy supply—currently it makes up far less than 1% of total U.S. power—red tape isn’t helping. “The wait incurred is annoying and it adds to costs overall,” says Rive. SunRun has shared the report with the Department of Energy and the White House, and the company is urging the federal government to create incentives that would push towns and cities to adopt common codes and fees for solar installation—something countries like Germany and Japan already do. The report argues that such permit standardization could make solar cost competitive for half the homes in the nation within two years. “At some level this is all about local and state governments, but the federal government can nudge things,” says Fenster. “This could drive an economy of scale.” Still, good intentions on the national level don’t always translate to the community, where parochial concerns sometimes win out. (Witness the fight over smart meters in California, which some libertarians on the right and some ultra-greens on the left have opposed over liberty and health fears.) And as important as smoother regulations are, a broad national energy policy is needed to really jump-start solar and other renewables—but climate still remains a divisive political subject. (Just look at Republican Senator John Barrasso’s new bill, which would block greenhouse gas regulations under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act.) The least we can do now is pull the red tape off our solar panels.

#### Utilities discrimination prevents solvency

Sovacool 9

Ben, Rejecting renewables: The socio-technical impediments to renewable electricity in the United States. Energy Governance Program, Centre on Asia and Globalisation, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, Singapore

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421509004212

As a final economic impediment, renewable power sources often directly threaten the market share of utilities, energy companies, and other power operators. Joe Catina (personal interview with author) from Ingersoll-Rand, a manufacturer of distributed generation units, summed it up by stating that “utilities are by nature monopolistic entities that had a charter to provide adequate energy capacity, with near total control over the production of electricity with little responsibility for cost. Now, they are being asked to lose control over the market yet keep costs low. And many are uncomfortable with the issue.” Ordinary consumers have little ability to arbitrage the market power of utilities. The best technique to avoid price discrimination is to buy from other sources, but most consumers cannot do this with electricity. Resale by consumers is implausible, distribution is controlled by central stations and vertically integrated with production, and electricity cannot be stored in large quantities cost-effectively. Customers have little capacity to hedge against the market power of dominant utilities (Yakubovich et al., 2005). Little incentive exists for utilities and system operators to change the system; such actors are less concerned about renewable power technologies, and more worried about competing in the restructured marketplace. Analogously, utilities have actively used their “power of incumbency” to further mold federal and state regulations in favor of large, centralized plants that they own (and disadvantage small, decentralized units that they do not). Alan Crane (personal interview with author) from the National Academy of Sciences elaborated that perhaps the most significant impediment for renewable power systems is an institutional, rather than a technological, dilemma. According to him: System and transmission operators don’t recognize many renewable technologies as being part of their network because they are not dispatchable …. It's not in the “right people's” interest to fix interface problems like interconnection and intermittency when such improvements will do little (in their view) to improve control of the overall system. Technically, these technologies can be incorporated into the grid easily. Socially, much institutional resistance remains. Renewable power providers thus face hurdles when dealing with the administrators of the existing transmission and distribution system, who seek to retain a number of traditional, “time-tested” regulatory and utility practices that have existed for upwards of a century. Seeking to maintain control over a system they (and their predecessors) created, some have made it difficult for new entrants to play on their turf. A few, independent studies have confirmed instances where system operators attempt to retain their control over the electric utility system by employing a wide variety of predatory and discriminatory practices. Such efforts typically begin with the imposition of fees to connect to the grid. In many states that have begun restructuring their utility systems, formerly regulated “natural monopoly” power companies have been permitted to charge customers “stranded costs” (Allen, 2002). These costs are intended to cover a “fair return” on generation and transmission investments made by utilities during the era of regulation, when the investments were viewed as serving all users. Put simply, when a customer decides to install an electric generator independent from the utility, he or she arguably removes part of the grid's existing load requirement and “strands” part of the investment the utility made in the power system. Stranded costs thus enable system operators to charge consumers for an electricity system that they may not even use. But such fees greatly increase the cost of renewable energy systems because customers must pay them in addition to paying for power from the new technology. Utilities also require payment of a host of charges on those who use renewable energy systems that run intermittently. For example, incumbent power providers or transmission operators may ask for high rates for providing backup power for when the intermittent renewable energy technologies do not produce power. They may also charge demand fees (a charge that penalizes customers for displacing demand from utilities) that discourage the use of intermittent power systems. A study undertaken by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) found more than 17 different “extraneous” charges associated with the use of dispersed renewable technologies (Alderfer and Starrs, 2000). These types of charges, the senior editor of the trade journal Public Utilities Fortnightly exclaimed, “are a major obstacle to the development of a competitive electricity market” (Stavros, 1999). Moreover, some renewable energy manufacturers utilize intellectual property rights to solidify market power. General Electric has actively used its patent on variable speed wind turbines to block Enercon (a European manufacturer) and Mitsubishi (a Japanese manufacturer) from entering the American wind market. Thus, the existing electricity landscape in the United States, far from creating incentives for consumers and businesses to invest in cost-effective renewable power technologies, remains prone to multiple and interrelated market failures. Consumers lack capital and knowledge about energy efficiency investments; builders, homeowners, and businesses remain uninterested in energy projects; and utilities and energy companies wield their market power to retain control over the electricity industry

#### Status quo solves

Konrad, PhD, CFA, financial analyst and portfolio manager, 10/21/2012

(Tom, “Why Solar REITs Are A Better Way To Invest In Solar,” http://seekingalpha.com/article/937181-why-solar-reits-are-a-better-way-to-invest-in-solar)

No one was able to tell me anything definite, but there are rumors that a request for an IRS revenue ruling is imminent. In June, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) issued a report, "The Technical Qualifications for Treating Photovoltaic Assets as Real Property by Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs)." **The report concluded that PV meets** many of **the important criteria** to be considered "real property" and hence a proper asset class **for** investment by **REITs**.

The fact that NREL issued this report **suggests that someone in the government is working to prepare the way for a favorable revenue ruling**. David Feldman, an NREL analyst and co-author of the report, said:

We're not trying to make the decision - the Internal Revenue Service will do that. We're giving them the technical information they need to make the decisions.

But somebody asked them to write the report.

Sturtevant says:

My pulse of the situation suggests that there are parties who are moving to place a request to the IRS by election time. If such a request were successful, it could be less than two quarters before a company claiming REIT status is developing solar.

Jabusch has also heard rumors predicting everything "**from year end this year to Q2 2013**."

UPDATE: The Renewable Energy Trust Capital, Inc., a San Francisco, CA based mission-driven company founded in 2011 to "facilitate the transition to a clean and sustainable economy" apparently **already has ruling request** "**on file with the IRS**." I'm seeking an interview with RET to determine if this is a request for a private-letter ruling (most likely since this is not a government entity) and when the request was filed. 10/12: I've published an article about Renewable Energy Trust's request based on my interview here.

Will the IRS Rule in Favor of Solar REITs?

**If there has already been a request to the IRS** for a revenue ruling on PV as real property, **the odds are good that the ruling will be favorable for** those of us who would like to see **Solar REITs**. **According to Sturtevant, enough political will would be sufficient to guarantee a favorable ruling**. **The political will is likely to depend on the outcome of the election on November 6th**.

Giving solar a similarly advantageous investment structure to the MLPs enjoyed by investors in fossil fuels should be a "politically neutral concept," as Sturtevant puts it. Obama has long been in favor of leveling the playing field between alternative energy and fossil fuels, while allowing Solar REITs is seemingly in line with Romney's expressed belief that alternative energy should sink or swim on its own merits: Investors would evaluate each deal on its investment merits, as both Hansen and Schalkwijk implied above. **On the other hand**, Romney has repeatedly called green jobs "fake" or "illusory" while championing the fossil industries, and has plans to sharply cut funding for clean energy. He may have already concluded that PV has no "merits," and hence **might see little point in giving it similar privileges to the extractive industries he promises to promote** in the name of energy independence.

#### Plan not necessary – REIT investment is already possible

Konrad, PhD, CFA, financial analyst and portfolio manager, 10/21/2012

(Tom, “Why Solar REITs Are A Better Way To Invest In Solar,” http://seekingalpha.com/article/937181-why-solar-reits-are-a-better-way-to-invest-in-solar)

A few REITs have dabbled with solar already as a revenue enhancement. **IRS rules allow them to generate up to 25% of their income from sources other than real property**, and this allows some scope for solar on REIT-owned buildings, for instance. Some solar developers are even specifically targeting the traditional REIT market. However, few REITs are likely to use this option to obtain more than a few percent of their income from solar because " the IRS tends to be very wary of anything that doesn't smell right in the context of REITs" and " leads to wariness and conservatism by many REIT managers," according to Sturtevant. REIT managers generally feel that a little extra revenue is not worth risking greater IRS scrutiny.

The conservatism of REIT managers has most likely already proven a barrier to some potential solar installations on REIT property, and a positive revenue ruling would have the added advantage of giving a green light for existing REITs to install solar on their property.

ProLogis, Inc. (PLD) is one of the few REITs not waiting for a ruling. ProLogis had installed 75 MW of solar on its buildings by the end of 2011, and claims to be "just getting started." According to my calculations (using aggressive assumptions of a 20% capacity factor and $0.10 per kWh electricity price), even 75 MW of PV would generate only $13 million in annual revenue, or 0.85% of ProLogis's 2011 total revenue.

Another REIT which might be expected to take advantage of a positive revenue ruling in a big way is Power REIT (PW). Power REIT invests in the embedded real estate of transportation infrastructure and renewable energy installations. PW currently owns only railroad real estate, but its CEO, David Lesser, plans to acquire real estate underlying renewable energy generation (most likely a wind or solar farm) in the near future.

Talking 'Bout a Revolution

ProLogis and Power REIT will undoubtedly continue investing in renewable energy in any case. Lesser says:

**We believe that that there is an attractive investment role** for Power REIT to **play in the renewable energy space with or without a clarification of PV being included as a real estate asset for REIT purposes**.

### Warming

### Warming Irreversible 1NC

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### No international modeling – china already has an energy policy that is not influenced by the plan and developing countries won’t model US

#### Transportation outweighs

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Climate impacts differ by sector. On-road transportation has the greatest negative effect on climate, especially in the short term. This is primarily because of two factors unique to on-road transportation: (1) nearly exclusive use of petroleum fuels, the combustion of which results in high levels of the principal warming gases (carbon dioxide, ozone, and black carbon); and (2) minimal emissions of sulfates, aerosols, and organic carbon from on-road transportation sources to counterbalance warming with cooling effects. Scientists find that cutting on-road transportation climate and air-pollutant emissions would be unambiguously good for the climate (and public health) in the near term. Transportation’s role in climate change is especially problematic, given the dependence on oil that characterizes this sector today. There are too few immediate mobility and fuel options in the United States beyond oil-fueled cars and trucks. U.S. and international policy makers have yet to tackle transportationclimate challenges. In its fourth assessment report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the global transportation sector was responsible for the most rapid growth in direct greenhouse gas emissions, a 120 percent increase between 1970 and 2004. To further complicate matters, the IPCC projects that, without policy intervention, the rapidly growing global transportation sector has little motivation to change the way it operates, because consumer choices are trumping best practices. Herein lies a fundamental mismatch between the climate problem and solutions: transportation is responsible for nearly one of every three tons of greenhouse gas emissions but represents less than one of every twelve tons of projected emission reductions. Clearly this sector is a major contributor to climate change; therefore, it should be the focus of new policies to mitigate warming. Government must lead this effort as the market alone cannot precipitate the transition away from cars and oil, which dominate this sector.

### No Impact 1NC

#### No impact – 1 – their evidence references past extinctions not anything that could happen currently

#### 2- their evidence laundry lists things but they don’t impact any of them

#### 3 - Long timeframe and adaptation solves

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

### 1NC Warming

#### Solar insufficient in solving warming

Post 12 -- BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, MBA, University of Connecticut. P.E. Connecticut. Consulting Engineer and Project Manager (Willem, 7/1/12, "Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated," http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Solar energy is variable (during a day and during variable cloudiness) and intermittent; usually it is minimal in the morning, maximal at noon about 3-5 hours before the daily peak demand, minimal in the afternoon, minimal during foggy, overcast, snowy days, and zero at night. About 65-70 percent of the hours of a year solar energy is near zero, and it cannot be turned off, as in Southern Germany with about 1 million PV systems, when on sunny summer days solar energy surges to about 12,000 MW to 14,000 MW and has to be partially exported to France and the Czech Republic at fire sale prices, 5.5 euro cent/kWh or less, after having been subsidized at an average of about 50 euro cent/kWh. Example: German solar power is as little as 2% of rated capacity, or 340 MW, on cloudy days and when snow covers the panels. This means there are many hours during a year when no wind or solar energy is generated. Therefore, all conventional generator units will need to be kept in good operating condition, AND staffed 24/7/365, AND fueled to serve the daily demand when wind and solar energy is near zero. Without utility-scale energy storage, wind turbines and solar systems cannot replace any conventional units. All the units that would be needed WITHOUT the existence of wind turbines and solar systems, would also be needed WITH the existence of wind turbines and solar systems. Some of the conventional units would have less energy production with wind and solar energy on the grid, thereby adversely affecting their economics, due to increasingly inefficient start/stop, part-load and part-load-ramping operations, but without wind and solar energy on the grid, the energy production of almost all the conventional units would be needed to serve the daily demand. Building Wind Turbines Everywhere?: There are some (mostly wind turbine vendors, project developers, trade organizations, NRELs, financial types setting up LLC tax shelters for the top 1% of households, etc.) who say that building wind turbines everywhere there is wind, and connecting all of them with a national HVDC overlay grid into a super grid (similar to the US Interstate Highway System overlaying state and local roads), the variation and intermittency of wind energy in the diverse geographical areas will largely be canceling each other out so that the overall energy production will become increasingly steadier as more wind turbines are connected to the super grid, and that therefore there will be little need for balancing plants, and that there will always be wind energy somewhere no matter what the weather conditions in one or more geographical areas. Several National Renewable Energy Laboratories and other entities have made studies of this scheme, using mathematical modeling, as described in the EWITS and NEWITS reports. However, someone went one step further and combined the outputs of 5 widely dispersed geographical areas: - http://transmission.bpa.gov/Business/Operations/Wind/default.aspx Bonneville Power Administration, which serves 3.5 GW of installed capacity in the Pacific Northwest - The Australian Energy Market Operator, which serves 1.8 GW of installed capacity in New South Wales - The Independent Electricity System Operator, which serves 1.2 GW of installed capacity in Ontario - The Alberta Electric System Operator, which serves 0.8 GW of installed capacity in Alberta - http://www.eirgrid.com/operations/systemperformancedata/windgeneration/ EirGrid, which serves 1.4 GW of installed capacity in Ireland The result of the analysis is described in this article which concludes geographical dispersion of wind turbines does not reduce the variation and intermittency of wind energy. http://www.ethiopianreview.com/business/122605 A French energy systems analyst, Hubert Flocard, combined the wind energy outputs of several European nations. The results of his analysis yielded the same conclusion. http://www.dimwatt.eu/index.php/our-campaigns/keeping-the-lights-on/documents/108-ground-breaking-french-study-should-stop-further-expenses-on-the-so-called-super-grid Energy Cost Projections The US Energy Information Administration projects levelized production costs (national averages, excluding subsidies) of NEW plants coming on line in 2016 as follows (2009$) : Offshore wind $0.243/kWh, PV solar $0.211/kWh (higher in marginal solar areas, such as New England), Onshore wind $0.096/kWh (higher in marginal wind areas with greater capital and O&M costs, such as on ridge lines in New England), Conventional coal (base-loaded) $0.095/kWh, Advanced CCGT (base-loaded) $0.0631/kWh. http://www.energytransition.msu.edu/documents/ipu\_eia\_electricity\_generation\_estimates\_2011.pdf IS WIND ENERGY GOOD ENERGY POLICY? Within federal, state and local governments tens of thousands of people are busying themselves promoting renewables by with holding meetings and public hearings, preparing studies, writing reports, energy plans, laws, rules and regulations, monitoring projects for compliance, etc. Outside of government wind turbine vendors (Siemens, GE, Vestas, Iberdrola, etc,), project developers/owners, financiers managing tax shelters, trade organizations, etc., are busying themselves popularizing wind energy as saving the planet from global warming with PR campaigns that claim there would be significant reductions of fossil fuel consumption and CO2 reductions/kWh, that capital costs/MW would decrease, and that wind energy costs/kWh would be at grid parity in the near future. These claims have largely not been realized. Global Warming is a Given: A just-released report from EIA shows the actual world energy consumption data and projected consumption data for the 1990 to 2035 period. The report shows world energy consumption is estimated to increase from 505 quads in 2008 to 770 quads in 2035, a 52% increase. The biggest part of the increase is by (non-OECD nations + Asia). http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/ieo/world.cfm See spreadsheet associated with figure 12 World energy consumption by fuel (quadrillion Btu) Liquids: From 173.2 in 2010 to 225.1 in 2035; 30% more Natural gas: 116.7 to 174.7; 50% more Coal: 149.4 to 209.1; 49% more Nuclear: 27.6 to 51.2; 86% more Renewables: 55.2 to 109.5; 98% more Renewables fraction of total consumption: From 10.6% in 2010 to 15.2% in 2035 Fossil fraction of total consumption: 84.1% to 79.1% The significant increase in projected fossil fuel consumption during the next 24 years means global warming will continue unabated, because (non-OECD + ASIA) will have energy consumption growth far outpacing the energy consumption growth of the rest of the world; i.e., global warming is a given. The above indicates the enormous investments required to achieve the 2035 projected renewables energy production would have practically no benefit regarding global warming.

### 1NC Resources

#### Problem isn't investment – resource production for solar is impossible

EC 12 -- European Commission, DG Environment News Alert Service, edited by SCU, The University of the West of England, Bristol (1/26/12, "Photovoltaic supply falls short of solar power targets," http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/271na7.pdf)

Europe could struggle to meet the target set by the renewable energy sector of 25 per cent of electricity produced by solar energy by 2040 because the supply of materials, including rare metals, needed to produce photovoltaics (PV) is unlikely to meet demand. Production rates need to be drastically improved, according to a new study. Calculations based on available appropriate land, global irradiance and conversions of solar energy to electricity demonstrate that technically, solar energy could provide 7.5 to 9 times the expected electricity demand in 2050. However, several PV technologies employ rare metals, which could limit the capacity for electricity generation. The new study looked at whether current global production of rare metals could support the huge increase in solar panels generation required to meet ambitious energy targets for 2040 laid out by the European Renewable Energy Council (EREC). The scientists looked at the four main PV technologies: crystalline silicon (c-Si), amorphous silicon (a-Si), cadmium tellurium (CdTe) and copper indium gallium diselenide (CIGS). The scientists assumed that by 2040, each technology would have an equal market share of 25 per cent. This reflects the fact that although c-Si currently has the largest share (81 per cent), a shift is already taking place towards the other technologies, which require a thinner layer of PV material. They simulated a 'neutral' future scenario, where moderate technological developments gradually improve the efficiency of electricity generation, in line with current policy expectations. The results showed that the maximum demand for gallium and indium in tonnes per year for use in CIGS technology surpasses current production (2008) by a factor of 7.3 and 2.8, respectively. Even under an 'optimistic' future scenario, in which more ambitious technological advances in cell efficiency require less PV material, demand still outstrips current supply by a factor of 3.9 and 1.5, respectively. Neither cadmium nor copper were found to be seriously limiting, even when the scientists simulated a 'pessimistic' scenario in which technological advances do not meet current expectations. However, the predicted demand for tellurium was found to be 30-180 times higher than today's production rate, depending on the scenario used. Although silicon is the second most abundant element in the earth.s crust, only very high purity silicon is used in the solar industry and production will need to increase by 15 times to meet demand in the neutral scenario and by 10 times in the optimistic scenario. Even bigger shortages may result from competition with the electronics industry, which also uses high-purity silicon. On the other hand, amorphous silicon technology represents the only realistic option for large-scale electricity production since the cumulative demand by 2040 would equal just 20 per cent of production. The research shows that reaching solar power targets for 2040 will not necessarily be limited by known global reserves of silicon and rare metals, but that current production rates will be the limiting factor. Better refining techniques, increased exploitation of deposits and strategic planning of technological shifts are needed to satisfy the demand for PV materials. This poses a challenge as tellurium, indium, gallium, selenium and cadmium are by-products of other processes and are not currently mined separately. New production methods are also likely to take up to 10 years to develop and so research should be initiated soon to meet the anticipated demand.

### 1NC Utilities Reject

#### Increased solar adoption causes utilities to reject net metering – makes solar development impossible

Martin 9/12 -- reporter for Bloomberg News (Christopher, 2012, "U.S. Solar Industry Bracing for Utility Backlash Over Metering,"

Utilities are required to purchase electricity generated by solar panels installed on consumers’ homes under so-called net- metering policies, an arrangement that may become less viable as solar systems become more common, said Rhone Resch, chief executive officer of the Washington-based trade group. California, the largest solar market, capped the amount of panels utilities are required to connect to their grids and other states are considering similar policies. Some utilities see the requirement to buy solar power from every rooftop system as a threat to their profitability, Resch said. “Net metering works for us now, but we’re going to see a backlash from utilities as solar penetration increases over the next few years,” Resch said today in an interview at the Solar Power International conference in Orlando, Florida. California regulators capped the amount of rooftop solar that may be connected to the grid at 5 percent of a utility’s power needs, and is studying the long-term impact upon their profits. Other states may consider similar actions, said Tony Clifford, chief executive officer of Standard Solar Inc., a closely held developer based in Rockville, Maryland. “I’m really concerned about a utility pushback on net- metering,” Clifford said in an interview. “What we need is an honest assessment of the true costs and benefits of managing distributed generation and I don’t think we’ve seen that yet.” Utilities are considering ways to offset the cost of buying solar, including Sempra Energy (SRE)’s San Diego Gas & Electric, which proposed a fee for residential solar customers, said Aaron Hall, president of the San Diego-based developer Borrego Solar Systems Inc. Regulars blocked the proposal in January. “That would have made almost every installation lose money and prevent new projects from getting financing,” Hall said.

### 1NC Picking Winners

#### Turn – picking winners collapses the solar industry

Glover 9/13 -- European associate editor for the independent online magazine Energy Tribune (Peter, 2012, "Solar Eclipsed?" http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm/11672/Solar-Eclipsed)

The global solar power industry is in crisis. The industry blames widespread national subsidy cuts and over productivity; China, in particular, being widely vilified on the second count. However, the real cause of the solar industry’s malaise runs deeper, rooted, as it is, in the inescapable fact that, in terms of current technology, commercial scale solar energy remains a non-viable proposition. Wherever you look the solar power industry is mired in financial problems, all of which lead back to the (life support) of public subsidy, the impact of market-skewing regulations (creating the appearance of commercial viability) and, ultimately, protectionist trade wars (US and Europe v China). In economic good-times, three natural consequences of government-sponsored global industries that can be obfuscated by a network of feed-in tariffs, levies and other ‘green’ taxes to pay for them. But in leaner economic climes, the real cost of ‘free’ energy becomes all too clear. Germany’s solar industry has led the way in Europe. Until recently the country was the world leader in manufacturing solar cells. Half of the world’s total solar power generating capacity is installed in Germany. But, according to Klaus Dieter Maubach, Technology Chairman at the country’s power major EON, Germany’s solar industry is in a death spiral. Speaking to Focus magazine, Maubach states that “not a single company is in the black” and that the entire German solar industry “will disappear within five years”. His bleak prediction merely echoed the view of investment consultants Citigroup who warned in March that Germany’s subsidy cuts would “nearly kill Germany’s solar industry”. Widespread complaints of Chinese solar companies dumping cut price solar panels on the European market have merely added to the malaise. In early September, the European Commission announced a formal inquiry into this allegation that could well trigger a cut-throat solar trade war with China. But as Eon’s Maubach points out with regard to the international solar market, China itself is suffering from precisely the same market problems as all its competitors. While Beijing will attempt to stave off decline through government stimulus, it is only a question of time before the loss of European and US markets for cheap Chinese goods, including solar panels, causes an economic downturn there, too. In fact, the threat of a Europe v China solar ‘war’ is little more than a replay of last year’s dust up between the United States and China. In the wake of the infamous Solyndra scandal (which Solyndra execs blamed on cheap Chinese imports), the U.S. imposed savage protectionist anti-dumping tariffs. These ranged from 31 percent to as high as 250 percent on imported Chinese-made panels. No surprise then that the Chinese companies should turn their attention to key European markets to offload a product they are unable to sell domestically. The problems for U.S. solar cannot be laid at the door of Chinese competition alone. Once the massive infusion of government stimulus cash ran out and subsidies slowed in early 2011, U.S. solar companies had already begun filing for bankruptcy. And Solyndra wasn’t the only company desperate for more cash. One heavily-subsidized firm, First Solar, was even caught using the U.S. taxpayer loan guarantee to sell solar panels to itself. So are the Chinese really the chief villains of the global solar piece? Depends how you look at it. China’s over production only came about because Beijing’s economic stimulus for its solar industry led to explosive growth and, ultimately, unfettered over production. Given enormous government subsidies there was literally no incentive to slow production down. In the game of who could sustain massive public subsidy longest, cash-rich China clearly won. But the fact is that the sun looks to be setting on China’s solar industry, too. Beijing has also become aware it cannot go on subsidizing its solar and renewable industries. China is dumping its solar panels in a bid to at least redeem some of its costs. Meanwhile the dark clouds have gathered over China’s economy too with the solar sector there also now facing bankruptcy. Since 2005, Chinese solar companies saw heady growth receiving significant government support as a “strategic emerging industry”. But since 2010, the price of the key polysilicon wafers crucial to production has fallen by around 75 percent. In recent times, China’s big five firms have all reported disastrous trading losses. Worse still, according to the investment boys at Energy and Capital and others, China’s much-vaunted booming economy, already over-heating, is about to implode. Taken as a whole, government incentive schemes around the world have created a glut of suppliers that the capitalist free market would never have sanctioned. The eclipse of Europe’s solar industry is in truth down to simple economic realities hitting home as commercial scale solar power is simply too expensive a proposition to attract serious private sector investment and end massive public subsidies. In January, Spain’s economic crisis forced it to cut its renewable subsidy regime entirely. In April, a near-bankrupt Italian government estimated that its subsidy regime left it facing a $60 billion bill to photovoltaic generators over the next 20 years. In The Great British Solar Scam I wrote about how the UK’s bid to cuts its ludicrously generous solar subsidy regime saw it prevented from making subsidy cuts by a European court after the UK solar industry inevitably claimed widespread bankruptcies would result(1). What marks out both the entire renewable energy sector for economic decline above all else is the fact that it is effectively an expensive government-sponsored enterprise, not a child of the free and democratic marketplace. Consider again the elements colluding to produce the current crisis: the lifeline of public subsidy, energy levies and taxes and market-skewing regulation dove-tailing with incentivized over-capacity, protectionism and, ultimately, trade wars. All marks of an industry kept afloat by ideological fiat and not free market capitalism geared to meeting actual market need. To gain a final key perspective, a report by United Nations Environment Programme in June announced that global renewable energy investment generally reached $257 billion in 2011 rivalling the $302 billion invested in hydrocarbon power. Germany alone has committed over €100 billion in solar subsidies over the next 20 years – for a power that will produce a very small energy return. In total, renewable energy, of which solar is just a tiny fraction, makes up just 3 percent of our electricity. As the green utopian clouds obscuring the real cost of ‘free’ solar power clear, it’s easy to see why the industry is in eclipse.

### Emissions Declining 1NC

#### Status quo solves – emissions are declining

Levi 9-25 (Michael, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment – CFR, “Why Have U.S. Carbon Dioxide Emissions Plummeted?,” Council on Foreign Relations, 2012, http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/09/25/why-have-u-s-carbon-dioxide-emissions-plummeted/)

U.S. carbon dioxide emissions for January-May are down six percent from 2011 to 2012. Headlines have highlighted the fact that emissions from January-March hit a twenty year low. What explains the shift? That question has been the subject of intense debate. John Hanger argues that 77 percent of that decline can be attributed to the shift from coal to gas. The folks over at CO2Scorecard, looking at January-March data, put that number at a more modest 21 percent. These are drastically different figures. What number should we believe? Part of the discrepancy comes from looking at different time periods. January-March emissions were affected more by the warm winter than April-May ones were. That makes sense because January-March is part of the winter. April-May emissions were affected more by rock bottom natural gas prices than January-March ones were. That makes sense because it was April-May when rock bottom (i.e. sub-two-dollars wellhead) natural gas prices prevailed. Let’s focus on the full January-May span, since it’s now the longest period for which we have 2011 and 2012 data, and do the analysis for ourselves. First the basics: Carbon dioxide emissions fell from 2,303 metric tons (Mt) in 2011 to 2,158 Mt in 2012, a drop of 145 Mt. (To keep things simple, the January-May time period is implicit in all this.) The basic story is that emissions from coal consumption plummeted by 132 Mt. Falling oil emissions chipped in another 18 Mt. Natural gas emissions were nearly flat; they were actually down 5 Mt. This would seem to suggest that natural gas played little role in falling emissions. Instead, it appears to suggest, reduced demand for coal is what did the trick. This’s roughly the intuition behind the conclusion from CO2Scorecard that natural gas has played a modest role in the U.S. emissions decline. Hanger contests this by making three basic points. First, he notes, “about 85% (132 of 144 million tons) of the 2012 U.S. Carbon emission decline is a product of falling emissions from coal.” Second, he argues, the decline in emissions from coal are “almost entirely as a result of more gas displacing coal generation this year. Indeed, coal’s electricity generation market share fell from 42% for all of 2011 to 32% in April and 34% in May.” Third, he observes, “Electricity demand is down 2% in the first 5 months of 2012 compared to 2011 so that is a small reason for declining emissions and probably explains about 10% of the 132 million ton decline of coal emissions.” Hanger puts these together with a few other estimates to come to his conclusion that 77 percent of the emissions decline is due to gas.

### 1NC – Not Anthropogenic

#### CO2 is not the one cause for climate change – solar radiation and ocean interactions are ignored

Patterson 11 [Norman Paterson is a Professional Engineer and Consulting Geophysicist with 60 years’ experience in Mineral and Environmental Geophysics. He obtained his Ph. D in Geophysics at the University of Toronto in 1955, and was elected Fellow, Royal Society of Canada in 1977. “Global Warming: A Critique of the Anthropogenic Model and its Consequences”, Geoscience Canada - Volume 38, Number 1, March 2011, Chetan]

WHAT CAUSES WARMING? It is likely that the cyclical warming and cooling of the earth results from a number of different causes, none of which, taken alone, is dominant enough to be entirely responsible. The more important ones are solar changes (including both irradiance and magnetic field effects), atmosphere–ocean interaction (including both multidecadal climatic oscillations and unforced internal variability), and greenhouse gases. All of these factors have been discussed by IPCC, but the first two have been dismissed as negligible in comparison with the greenhouse-gas effect and man’s contribution to it through anthropogenic CO2 . It is claimed (e.g. Revelle and Suess 1957) that the particular infrared absorption bands of CO2 provide it with a special ability to absorb and reradiate the sun’s longer wavelength radiation, causing warming of the troposphere and an increase in high-altitude (cirrus) cloud, further amplifying the heating process. Detailed arguments against this conclusion can be found in Spencer et al. (2007) and Gerlich and Tscheuschner (2009). These scientists point out (among other arguments, which include the logarithmic decrease in absorptive power of CO2 at increasing concentrations), that clouds have poor ability to emit radiation and that the transfer of heat from the atmosphere to a warmer body (the earth) defies the Second Law of Thermodynamics. They argue that the Plank and Stefan-Boltzman equations used in calculations of radiative heat transfer cannot be applied to gases in the atmosphere because of the highly complex multi-body nature of the problem. Veizer (2005) explains that, to play a significant role, CO2 requires an amplifier, in this case water vapour. He concludes that water vapour plays the dominant role in global warming and that solar effects are the driver, rather than CO2 . A comprehensive critique of the greenhouse gas theory is provided by Hutton (2009).

### 1NC Environmental Degradation

#### -- No extinction

Easterbrook 3 (Gregg, Senior Fellow – New Republic, “We’re All Gonna Die!”, Wired Magazine, July, 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.

#### -- Long time-frame

Kay 1 (Jane, “Study Takes Historical Peek at Plight of Ocean Ecosystems”, San Francisco Chronicle, 7-26, Lexis)

The collapse of ecosystems often occur over a long period. In one example, when Aleut hunters killed the Alaskan sea otter about 2,500 years ago, the population of their natural prey, the sea urchin, grew larger than its normal size. In turn, the urchins grazed down the kelp forests, important habitat for a whole host of ocean life. Then, when fur traders in the 1800s hunted the otters and sea cows almost to extinction, the kelp forests disappeared and didn't start to regenerate until the federal government protected the sea otters in the 20th century. In California, the diversity of spiny lobsters, sheephead fish and abalone kept down the urchin numbers. At present in Alaska, the kelp beds are declining again in areas where killer whales are preying on sea otters. Biologists think the killer whales switched to otters for food because there are fewer seals and sea lions to eat.

### Resource Wars

#### -- Resource ‘conflicts’ don’t escalate – negotiations and compromise are the norm

Goldstone 2 (Jack, Professor of Public Policy – George Mason, “Population and Security: How Demographic Change Can Lead to Violent Conflict”, Journal of International Affairs, 56, Fall, p. 123)

Should we therefore dismiss the environment as a cause of conflict? No, although I believe we can be free of the fear that environmental decay will unleash wars and revolutions across the globe. Rather, what research has shown is that although environmental issues do cause international and domestic conflicts, they are of the kind that are generally settled by negotiation and compromise and do not lead to taking up arms. The reason for that is straightforward. Where the problem faced by two groups, or two nations, is over the degradation or depletion of an environmental resource, war neither solves the problem (it cannot make more of the resource) nor is it an economically efficient way to redistribute the resource (the costs of war almost invariably far outweigh the cost of gaining alternative resources or paying more for a share of the resource). For example, if two nations have a conflict over sharing river water—such as India and Bangladesh over the Ganges, Israel and Jordan over the river Jordan[ [12](http://web.ebscohost.com.ezp1.harvard.edu/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=106&sid=b52b09a2-e198-49a9-9721-f665c7920b18%40sessionmgr109#bib12#bib12)] or Hungary and Slovakia over the Danube they may threaten violence but in fact are most likely to produce non-violent resolution through negotiation or arbitration rather than war (and indeed all of these conflicts led to treaties or international arbitration. The reason is that for one party to insist on all the water would in fact be a casus belli; and to risk a war to simply increase one's access to water is economically foolhardy. Throughout the world, the main use of freshwater (over three-quarters) is for irrigation to produce food. A reduction in water can be compensated either by adopting more efficient means of irrigation (drip rather than ditch); by switching to less water-intensive crops (dry grains rather than rice; tree crops rather than grains); or by importing food rather than producing it. All of these steps, though costly, are far, far, less costly than armed conflict. Thus for both the country with the ability to take more water and the country dependent on downstream flows, the issue will be how to use and negotiate use of the resource most efficiently; resort to war would inevitably be more costly than any gains that could be made from increased access to the resource. No nations have ever gone to war strictly over access to water; nor are any likely to do so in the future.

### 1NC Solar Industry UQ

#### Solar industry strong and domestic demand robust

Andrew 12 -- reporting and writing on a wide range of topics at the nexus of economics, technology, ecology/environment @ Clean Technica (8/27/12, "1H 2012 US Solar PV Installations Grow 120%; US Poised to be World’s 3rd-Largest Market," http://cleantechnica.com/2012/08/27/1h-2012-us-solar-pv-installations-grow-120-us-poised-to-be-worlds-3rd-largest-market/)

Solar photovoltaic (PV) installations in the Americas more than doubled in the first half of 2012 (1H 2012) and will reach nearly 4.3 GW for the year. Solar PV installations rose more than 120% in the Americas in the first six months of 2012, according to IMS Research’s latest quarterly report, to reach 1.7 GW. That compares to 750 MW in the 1H 2011. Looking at the global picture, the German and Americas markets led growth in solar PV installations through June, with global installations exceeding 13 GW for the first time ever. IMS forecasts 3 GW of new solar PV capacity coming on-line for the full year, according to IMS’ “Q3 PV Demand Report.” “Despite the lackluster financial performance of the industry’s suppliers, underlying demand was robust in the first six months of this year, with first half installations 35 percent up on 2011,” commented IMS Research PV Research Director Ash Sharma. “The Americas market, led by the USA was unseasonably strong in the first half and did not show any significant slowdown resulting from the anti-dumping duties.” The US solar PV market will contribute most to growth globally in 2012, making the US the third-largest solar PV market in the world, according to IMS. The US accounted for 40% of new solar PV capacity growth in 1H 2012. The European market, in contrast, is forecast to contract nearly 3 GW for the year despite strong first-half performance in Germany. 1H 2012′s strong growth in US solar PV installations puts paid to the contention that the imposition of anti-dumping tariffs and countervailing duties on imports of crystalline solar PV cells and modules from China would stall growth in US solar PV demand, according to the Coalition for Solar Manufacturing (CASM), which filed the WTO petitions against China with US international trade authorities. “The new report by IMS Research effectively debunks two of the arguments made by Chinese solar manufacturers and their allies regarding the potential impact of tariffs on the U.S. solar market. First, preliminary tariffs did not slow growth of the U.S. solar market in the first half of 2012. Second, they have not had hurt downstream employment,” stated Gordon Brinser, president of SolarWorld Industries America Inc., the Oregon-based subsidiary of Germany’s SolarWorld AG, which leads CASM’s WTO trade litigation effort. “The IMS study notes that demand for solar in the U.S. market grew 120 percent through the end of June, compared with the same period in 2011, and did ‘not show any significant slowdown resulting from the anti-dumping duties.’ “This statement undercuts claims that dumped Chinese panels helped ignite a boom in the U.S. solar market. The fact that demand increased 120 percent – a significantly higher level than in past years, despite significantly reduced Chinese imports over the past three months – shows that there is significant demand for solar, even without dumped and subsidized Chinese products. “At the same time, the 35 percent increase in installations of solar panels cited in the IMS study shows there has been no negative impact on solar employment in the United States,” Brinser continued. “This result undermines the opposition’s prediction of tens of thousands of lost jobs if tariffs were imposed to counter the impact of illegally dumped and subsidized Chinese panels.” Moreover, Brinser added, these early indications show that the penalties being preliminarily imposed on Chinese imports are having the desired effect. “Based on what we are seeing in the marketplace, the U.S. solar market is robust, despite challenges for producers. However, as the Associated Press pointed out, the challenge is greatest for Chinese solar producers who have racked up huge losses in their attempt to dump their way to market dominance over the past two years.” Looking at global solar PV demand going forward, IMS foresees growth in solar PV installations accelerating in the second half of 2012 (2H 2012), despite slowdowns in Germany and Italy, two key European markets. The outlook beyond year-end is uncertain, however, IMS says. “IMS Research remains optimistic about the potential for the US PV market, and we predict it will grow to at least 3.5 GW in 2012 and become the world’s third largest PV market. The longer-term outlook for this market is less certain, although the speed at which it is developing so far in 2012 provides some encouragement,” IMS’ Sharma elaborated.

### Sustainable

#### Growth is sustainable and solves resource depletion

**Emerson 10** (Patrick, Associate Professor of Economics – Oregon State University, “Economic Growth: The Planet's Poor Need Sustainable Expansion,” Oregon Live, 8-7, http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2010/08/economic\_growth\_the\_planets\_po.html)

Does economic growth represent the biggest threat to the planet, or its salvation? In a recent op-ed ("The fallacy of growth in a finite world," Aug. 1), Jack Hart argues that the goal of economic growth is antithetical to a sustainable world. Hart's views reveal a wealthy-country bias about what growth means and fail to appreciate the perspective of poor countries. His characterization of growth is also inaccurate and perpetuates a common misconception about economic growth -- that it necessarily means resource depletion. Finally, his anti-growth agenda would leave the world more imperiled: Economic growth represents the world's best hope to meet the challenges of the future. What does growth mean for the stark realities of life in a low-income society? High-income countries enjoy an average life expectancy of almost 80 years, while in low-income countries it's just 53 years. In developing countries an estimated 900 million people do not have enough food, 1 billion people have no access to safe drinking water, 2.4 billion people have inadequate sanitation and 10,000 children die every day from diseases caused by contaminated water. The infant mortality rate in high-income countries is 7 per 1,000, compared with 114 in low-income countries. These sobering facts of poverty result from a lack of growth. What economic growth has brought to those of us fortunate to live in a wealthy country is not just big TVs and fancy cars, but a safe, secure and long life for ourselves and our children. These statistics are real measures of despair for most of the world's population. The myth of the happy peasant is an arrogant conceit of the wealthy that has existed for centuries to justify income inequality, and it is no truer today than it was in feudal times. Hart argues that the growth of the 19th and 20th centuries has come largely through the depletion and degradation of the earth's natural resources. Growth does not mean resource depletion, however; this is but one way to accomplish growth. Becoming more efficient -- in other words, conserving our resources -- is another. Anything that provides value produces growth. A better, more energy-efficient light bulb, a time-saving personal computer and a better electric car are all ways through which growth can be achieved. Poverty and population growth are highly correlated because poor families in developing countries need children to provide the social safety net that their governments do not. Societies that have experienced economic growth, however, have seen population growth rates decline precipitously. And more people doesn't necessarily represent a problem; it represents a challenge, an incentive and a resource. More people means an increased emphasis on finding more efficient ways to live; it means more potential talent -- brainpower and creativity -- to help solve the very problems we face. Not only does growth not mean resource depletion, but creating more efficient technologies is necessarily growth-enhancing. This is why growth represents the hope of the future, not the challenge to it. Much of the recent growth in developed countries has been achieved not through resource depletion but through the microcomputer and information technology revolution, through designing more efficient buildings and machines, and through substantial improvements in transportation efficiency. This is what will typify 21st century growth: doing more with less. High-income countries, led by the United States, do use the lion's share of the world's energy. But the U.S. produces a lot more value per unit of energy than does China. And high-income countries are making the biggest investment in renewable-energy technology, because our wealth causes us to place increased value on the environment.