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### 1 – Immigration Reform DA

CIR will pass---bipartisan support but congressional backlash empirically ruins the deal.

CNBC 1/27 (“Obama Turns Focus This Week to Immigration Reform” http://www.cnbc.com/id/100410666)

Immigration reform will take center stage this week with President Barack Obama giving a major policy speech to relaunch his push for reform while a bipartisan group of senators is also expected to release its own ideas for new legislation. Amid the fiercely partisan discussions over fiscal issues that have dominated Washington since the election, there are indications of solid cross-party support for some form of immigration reform, with several leading Republicans urging the party to back significant changes. The center piece of any new legislation is likely to be the establishment of a mechanism for the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants currently in the US to obtain legal status. However, previous reform efforts have foundered despite enjoying strong support, and the tense atmosphere between the White House and some congressional Republicans could yet present an insurmountable obstacle. Mr Obama, who pledged to introduce new legislation during the election campaign, will give a speech on immigration reform on Tuesday in Las Vegas, the first major policy address of his second term. Bob Menendez, the New Jersey senator who met the president on Friday to discuss the issue, said Mr Obama had made it clear that it was "a top legislative priority for him in this session of the Congress" and that creating a pathway to "earned legalization" would be a central part of any immigration reform bill. Mr Menendez is part of a group of six senators from both parties expected this week to introduce their own set of ideas for what a reform package will contain. On the Republican side, some of the groundwork has already been laid by Florida senator Marco Rubio. "There's a new appreciation on both sides of the aisle including, maybe more importantly on the Republican side of the aisle, that we have to enact comprehensive immigration reform," John McCain, another of the Republican senators in the bipartisan group, said on ABC's This Week. Mr McCain added: "Look at the last election. We are losing dramatically the Hispanic vote, which we think should be ours, for a variety of reasons, and we've got to understand that."

Energy push requires massive political capital---Obama doesn’t have time and energy to get energy and immigration reform

Davenport-energy correspondent for National Journal-12/6/12

How Obama and Congress Could Find Common Ground on Energy

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/how-obama-and-congress-could-find-common-ground-on-energy-20121206>

AGAINST THE CLOCK One big obstacle is time. A second-term president has about two years to push through major legislation before the next presidential campaign begins. In addition, two huge issues are already on the docket: immigration and tax reform. A sweeping overhaul of the nation’s tax code, which could easily absorb Congress through 2014, offers the first opportunity for major energy reform. Some lawmakers will probably insert a carbon-tax swap proposal in a broader tax-reform package, although for now the carbon tax seems unlikely to succeed. Democrats will also try to end tax breaks for the oil industry while extending those for renewable energy. But if the tax-reform debate ends without comprehensive new energy provisions, it may be too late to enact an energy overhaul. “If President Obama has victories on immigration and the deficit, that’s two potentially momentous victories for the president in a second term, where victories are not typical,” says historian Alfred Zacher, author of Trial and Triumph: Presidential Power in the Second Term. “It’s difficult to believe he’d win three.” Still, Zacher says, “because of his desire for a legacy, and the fact that he won’t need to worry about his base or reelection, he could come up with some unexpected environmental solutions. He’ll have to be a very capable politician, but if he can pull it off, he’ll be revered.” Ultimately, as Dorgan puts it, “there needs to be a will to do it, and it needs to come from the president and the leaders of Congress. If there’s not a will on the part of the president and the leaders of the House and Senate, it won’t happen. He needs to make it a priority.” If President Obama wants a legacy on energy, he’ll have to bring to the issue the same passion that candidate Obama once did.

Obama needs political capital to pass comprehensive reform---Democrats will block high skilled only legislation

Politico.com 1/15/13

HEADLINE: Lawmakers divided over immigration Jessica Meyers

Key lawmakers see opportunity this session to address immigration reform but remain stymied on a central issue: whether to tackle it in chunks or in one complete package. "Every member of Congress will find something in a comprehensive bill that they will not like," Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) said at Tuesday's POLITICO Pro Tech Deep Dive focused on Immigration, Technology and the 113th Congress. "We should have a series of bills -- four, five or six bills -- that we debate separately but that we vote together on the House floor." (PHOTOS: 20 quotes on immigration reform) Labrador accused the White House of aiming for a "political victory" instead of a "policy victory." Silicon Valley Democrat Zoe Lofgren redirected the blame to Congress. "I have had Republicans say they don't want Obama to do a bill because they want flexibility, but if he doesn't do a bill, he's criticized," she said. "I'm waiting for a signal from the speaker on what he wants to do. It's not that tough, it's just the decision to do it." Tech companies are lobbying hard for immigration reforms that would allow foreign employees to fill unmet demand and ensure they maintain global competitiveness. And all three lawmakers agree the system needs fixing. The difficulty lies in figuring out how to do it. But the issue is a special challenge for Republicans, who must reconcile shifting demographics and a history of no-mercy enforcement. "The Republicans have been really pathetic, quite frankly, to communicate our position on this," Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) said. Chaffetz pushed a bill last session that would have lifted the country caps on visas for high-skilled workers. Tech companies like Microsoft and Google embraced the bill. The legislation passed the House but failed in the Senate. And Labrador has become a leading GOP voice on immigration changes, saying his decision to run for governor hinges on whether Congress implements reforms. He and Chaffetz advocated last session for legislation that would have granted up to 55,000 visas to noncitizens who complete certain science, technology, engineering and math degrees at American universities. Democrats lambasted the bill, known as the STEM Jobs Act, as a token Republican move to garner minority support. The Senate shot the bill down. "I want us to be known as the pro-immigration party," Labrador said. "I want us to be known that we welcome people to this country, that we want people to be successful. I want our party to take this lead on immigration reform." Democrats in both chambers are pushing for more overarching legislation, calling smaller attempts political posturing. "Everybody wants their piece," Lofgren said. "You talk to the ag people, you can't do the tech thing because we need migrant farm workers. You've got husbands and wives separated for half a decade. What's that do for our country? We have 2 million migrant farm workers who don't have their papers, and without them we don't have an agricultural industry." Lofgren has advocated for encompassing legislation that would grant citizenship to some undocumented immigrants who came to the United States at an early age and go on to college or the military. "I know these guys want to get something done," she said. "The Republicans are going to lose, lose, lose if they don't change on this issue. But it's not the same political calculation within districts." President Barack Obama has vowed to prioritize the issue this session, likely in one comprehensive bill. This would avoid Republican attempts to break it into smaller bits and address highly skilled workers, younger illegal immigrant and farm workers in separate bills. Immigration groups have voiced angst that the president has not moved faster to enact substantial reform. The administration has deported record numbers of illegal immigrants. But it also has started to make significant strides to expedite changes -- even without Congress. Obama signed an executive order in June that ordered Homeland Security officials to halt deportation proceedings against immigrants who entered the country as children and who have finished high school or joined the military. Similar legislation known as the DREAM Act has stalled in Congress. Obama is expected to lay out his plans as soon as his State of the Union speech next month. A bipartisan group of senators also is working on a reform bill.

#### Comprehensive immigration reform is key to the economy and highly skilled workers

Farrell 12/13/12 (Chris, a contributing editor for Bloomberg Businessweek. From 1986-97, he was on the magazine's staff, as a corporate finance staff and department editor and then as an economics editor. Farrell wrote Right on the Money: Taking Control of Your Personal Finances and Deflation: What Happens When Prices Fall? Among Farrell's many awards are a National Magazine Award, two Loeb Awards, and the Edward R. Murrow Award. Farrell is a graduate of the London School of Economics and Stanford University. “Obama’s Next Act: Immigration Reform” <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-12-13/obamas-next-act-immigration-reform>)

Washington won’t get much of a reprieve from verbal pyrotechnics once the drama of the fiscal cliff is over. Up next: major immigration reform. President Obama has made it clear that a comprehensive overhaul of the nation’s badly frayed immigration system is a second-term priority. Many Republican lawmakers are convinced the big takeaway from the 2012 election results is that conservatives need to rethink their hard-line stance on immigration—including illegal immigrants. Here’s what Washington should do before tackling the tough job of rewriting the immigration laws: Create a quicksilver path to citizenship for the 11 million to 12 million undocumented workers in the U.S. (excluding the small number convicted of violent crimes or multiple felonies). The shift in status acknowledges that these foreign-born newcomers, like previous generations of immigrants, overcame significant obstacles to come to the U.S. to make a better life for their families. Illegal immigrants are neighbors heading off to work, sending their kids to school, and attending church. Their everyday lives would vastly improve by moving from the shadows of society into the mainstream. More important from a public-policy perspective, the change would give a boost to the economy’s underlying dynamism. “What you’re doing in the short run is making it easier for workers to move between jobs, a relatively small effect,” says Gordon Hanson, a professor of economics at the University of California at San Diego. “The larger effect from eliminating uncertainty for these immigrants is creating incentives for them to make long-term investments in careers, entrepreneurship, education, homes, and community.” Let’s state the obvious: A rapid transformation of illegal immigrants into legal immigrants isn’t in the cards. Amnesty—let alone citizenship—is an anathema to large parts of the electorate. Too bad, since the scholarly evidence is compelling that immigrants—documented or not, legal or illegal—are a boon to the net economy. “Competition fosters economic growth,” says Michael Clemens, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development in Washington. The economic return from attracting skilled immigrants to the U.S. is well known. Foreign-born newcomers account for some 13 percent of the population, yet they are responsible for one-third of U.S. patented innovations. The nation’s high-tech regions such as Silicon Valley, the Silicon Hills of Austin, Tex., and Boston’s Route 128 rely on immigrant scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs, and employees. Better yet, economist Enrico Moretti at the University of California at Berkeley calculates that a 1 percent increase in the share of college-educated immigrants in a city hikes productivity and wages for others in the city. Less appreciated is how much the economy gains from the efforts of less-skilled immigrants, including illegal workers. Throughout the country, foreign-born newcomers have revived beaten-down neighborhoods as immigrant entrepreneurs have opened small businesses and immigrant families have put down stakes. Immigrant workers have played a vital role keeping a number of industries competitive, such as agriculture and meatpacking. Cities with lots of immigrants have seen their per capita tax base go up, according to David Card, an economist at UC Berkeley. Despite the popular impression that a rising tide of immigrants is associated with higher crime rates, research by Robert Sampson of Harvard University and others offer a compelling case that it’s no coincidence that the growing ranks of immigrants tracks the reduction in crime in the U.S. But don’t newcomers—legal and illegal—drive down wages and job opportunities for American workers? Not really. A cottage industry of economic studies doesn’t find any negative effect on native-born wages and employment on the local level. On the national level the research shows the impact on native-born Americans doesn’t drift far from zero, either positively or negatively. “In both cases, immigrants are more likely to complement the job prospects of U.S.-born citizens than they are to compete for the same jobs as U.S.-born citizens,” Giovanni Peri, an economist at the University of California at Davis, writes in Rationalizing U.S. Immigration Policy: Reforms for Simplicity, Fairness, and Economic Growth. The counterintuitive results reflect a numbers of factors. Immigrants expand the size of the economic pie by creating new businesses, new jobs, and new consumers. Middle-class families find it easier to focus on careers with affordable immigrant labor offering gardening, child care, and other services. Many illegal immigrants aren’t fluent in English, so they don’t compete for the same jobs as native-born workers. Another factor behind the lack of direct competition is the higher educational level of native-born Americans. In 1960 about half of U.S.-born working-age adults hadn’t completed high school, while the comparable figure today is about 8 percent. The real downside concern is on the fiscal side of the immigrant ledger. Yes, more taxes would go into Social Security, Medicare, and the like with legalization, but more people would qualify for Medicaid, welfare, and other benefits. At the local level, many school districts are strained financially from educating immigrant children, legal and illegal. That said, the prospect of fiscal costs would diminish as newly legalized immigrant workers move freely around the country seeking jobs, entrepreneurs are comfortable expanding their payrolls, and immigrant parents push their children to live the American Dream. “Over time, as entrepreneurs emerge and families are better able to get their kids through high school and college, you’re reducing the long-run fiscal claim of the group,” says Hanson. There is no economic evidence that making roughly 6 percent of the workforce illegal will benefit the economy. Plenty of research supports the opposite case. A fast track to legality offers Washington a rare twofer: a just move that’s economically efficient.

**Decline goes nuclear**

**Harris and Burrows 09** PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) & member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit

Mathew, and Jennifer “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>

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

### 2 – States CP

#### The fifty states and all relevant territories should

#### -deem enhanced oil recovery by means of carbon dioxide in the public interest and include the process in underground energy law, all surface and subsurface rights necessary and useful should be authorized.

#### - include in the Unit Agreement the extension of the oil and gas leases beyond termination of the Unit and through a future potential CO2 storage term which term would be until the CO2 storage project itself were actually permanently terminated and sealed

#### -establish an Anti-Recession Budget Reform Initiative, create State Reserve Banks and fund the counterplan with these mechanisms plus creating job insurance contributions for the unemployed in times of recession.

#### -form interstate compacts to construct a carbon dioxide pipeline network

#### -provide tax incentives for enhanced oil recovery that uses industrial carbon dioxide.

#### The cp solves increased co2 eor

Martson and Moore 8 (Philip M. Marston Patricia A. Moore Mr. Marston is an energy regulatory attorney in Alexandria, Virginia, practicing as Marston Law, and Ms. Moore is an oil and gas attorney in Dallas, Texas. Each of the authors has over three decades of experience in their respective aspects of energy law and regulation. “FROM EOR TO CCS: THE EVOLVING LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE” http://www.marstonlaw.com/index\_files/from%20eor%20to%20ccs.pdf

In the case of Mississippi, the underground natural gas storage law was amended in 1991 to include “compressed air,” defined as nonhydrocarbon gas.256 This statute discussed earlier not only provides for all surface and mineral consents (fifty-one percent) that should be required, it recognized the need to store and withdraw the natural gas or compressed air for the public interest.257 With regard to the institutional issue of allocating regulatory responsibility within the state, the statute provided for the approvals to be administered by the State Board of Oil and Gas.258 Consistent with its recognition that these activities are in the public interest, it further authorizes eminent domain to acquire all surface and subsurface rights necessary and useful for the purpose of storing natural gas or compressed air.259 Amending the storage statutes of other states to include analogous provisions might also further the transition from EOR-based interim storage of CO2 to incremental storage for CCS purposes. When an activity is deemed to be in the public interest, it is easier to establish the legal basis for obtaining condemnation rights. Indeed, most of the early case law260 justifying unitization statutes for enhanced oil and gas recovery turned on the fact that the pooling of an owner‟s mineral interests to achieve increased recovery of the oil and gas reserves for the benefit of the state and the owners was deemed more important than an individual‟s right not to join in such a project.261 This is exactly the same type of legal reasoning that underlies statutory eminent domain rights in the public interest for rights of way for construction of roadways and power lines, for example. If the public is benefited by the storage of anthropogenic CO2, and if the use of this anthropogenic CO2 in EOR commences such storage, then laws similar to that of Mississippi could provide a near-term solution if: (a) they were amended to include CO2, and (b) added an eminent domain procedure allowing condemnation of the surface and subsurface pore space for either the temporary storing and withdrawal of CO2, or for more permanent storage of CCS.

The cp solidifies a legal framework for eor---allows its implementation

Martson and Moore 8 (Philip M. Marston Patricia A. Moore Mr. Marston is an energy regulatory attorney in Alexandria, Virginia, practicing as Marston Law, and Ms. Moore is an oil and gas attorney in Dallas, Texas. Each of the authors has over three decades of experience in their respective aspects of energy law and regulation. “FROM EOR TO CCS: THE EVOLVING LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE” http://www.marstonlaw.com/index\_files/from%20eor%20to%20ccs.pdf

This existing legal and institutional structure means that an operator planning ahead for future potential use of the reservoir for incremental storage of CO2 need only take one more step than has been traditional in the past in preparing for unit operations. That additional step is to initially solicit and incorporate into the traditional EOR unitization documents the agreements of the working interest and mineral interest owners to the future potential use for CCS storage. This could be done by including in the Unit Agreement the extension of the oil and gas leases beyond termination of the Unit and through a future potential CO2 storage term, which term would be until the CO2 storage project itself were actually permanently terminated and sealed (comparable to the “post-closure” period in the IOGCC report at which time ownership would transfer to a governmental or quasi-governmental entity). This action alone would allow the operator to later produce commercially available oil under future technology or produce oil that might be associated with produced CO2 that could be withdrawn for other use. It could also provide the mechanism whereby the mineral interest owner consents to his residual pore space being utilized for CO2 storage. Likewise, the Unit Operating Agreement could be expanded to include new definitions for a CO2 storage Unit Operation post EOR, so that the operator would have early approval of those owners required by a regulatory agency for future approval of a CO2 storage project. With the inclusion of the surface owner(s) in this early development planning, the progression of an EOR project into a carbon dioxide storage project can be handled reasonably seamlessly with only slight additions to, or tweaking of, current state oil and gas and property laws.247 Assuming changes to the EPA‟s existing regulations to allow incremental injections of CO2 to continue following oil and gas operations, this scenario could thus be undertaken under the current statutory and case law, with careful drafting of the Unit Agreement, Unit Operating Agreement, and the necessary future leases and grants of storage rights with the mineral and surface owners. Moreover, unlike an underground site developed only for permanent CCS storage, an EOR-based site may accommodate incremental storage beyond the life of an enhanced recovery project without totally precluding the future potential of additional enhanced recovery. When one ponders the technological accomplishments of the oil and gas industry in just the last twenty years, it is easy to realize how important it is for oil and gas attorneys to plan ahead for further potential advances a decade or two or three ahead. The key element for inducing surface owners to join in such a progressive project is that even though they may suffer some actual surface intrusions while the enhanced recovery project takes place, they have the prospect of having future compensable ownership interest in the site. The mineral owners, on the other hand, even after the project transitions from incidental CO2 storage to incremental CO2 storage, can still look forward to the possibility of future oil and gas production and royalty payments if recovery technologies can be utilized to economically justify returning the oil and gas reservoir to an enhanced recovery project. Under current technology there are always residual hydrocarbons that remain in the unitized formation at the time it becomes uneconomic to continue production. Hence, if technology, economics and the price of oil were to justify a return to oil and gas production, the operator could proceed to do just that – if he had planned ahead and obtained all the contractual owner approvals evidenced in his Unit Agreement and Unit Operating Agreement as well as the proper storage rights. Again, many oil and gas producing states have the necessary legal and regulatory framework to allow for this to occur under current law. For those that do not, it could very well be a simple matter to legislatively get them up to speed. What most state conservation and property laws do not include at this time, however, is a clear definition of the rules that will govern the site when the reservoir is full of the additional CO2 and is unable to take any more volume (i.e. the “closure” and “post-closure” periods in the terminology of the report). Such rules will be needed for a permanent storage project of incremental volumes injected for the sole purpose of underground storage. Currently, when an EOR project terminates, the production and injection wells are plugged pursuant to applicable state regulations, surface facilities are removed and abandoned, and all operations come to an end. Under existing rules, there is no further monitoring for leakage or potential migration, nor is there further use of the reservoir (at least under current technology). If an existing unitization project is to transition from an enhanced oil and gas recovery project with incidental storage of CO2 to a permanent CCS storage site for incremental volumes, the states will have to determine what entity will be liable for the future oversight and maintenance of such a project, for how long this may occur, and who will pay for permanent, virtually perpetual caretaking (as well as how to fund potential future remediation operations in the event they are required).

### 3 –

#### ---The affirmative’s embrace of Carbon Capture Storage defines “energy crisis” as a fundamental threat to systems of capital rather than a serious consideration of the material effects of fossil fuel consumption. This reifies rather than challenges structural oppression.

Rahi 2010

George, International Student at University of British Colombia, Linguistic Difficulties with “Energy,” September 22nd, http://blogs.ubc.ca/landscapesofenergy/2010/09/22/linguistic-difficulties-with-energy/

Ivan Illich’s lecture, titled “the social construction of energy”, looks back to the physicist’s role in trying to encompass into a word the concept of that which is inexhaustible and always conserved. Illich classifies this denotation of energy as the scientist’s “e”, differentiated by the popular term “energy”, which having left the defined space of the laboratory, has taken on vast connotations. Illich takes issue with the way founders of mainstream classical economics have claimed a monopoly on the term ‘energy’, defining it as “nature’s ability to do work” in a world presupposed to be governed by scarcity. In such a world, appropriating energy, like work itself, is a moral duty. But Illich, imparting these warnings in the 1980s, asserts that society is headed towards a future of “an energy-obsessed low-energy society in a world that worships work but has nothing to do for people” (17). (see structural unemployment). In discussing energy from a social and spatial perspective, I hope to engage with the subtle, yet crucial, characteristics of our energy extraction, production and consumption that are often left out in mainstream discussions of energy issues. In regards to oil, when industry experts and spokespeople use the impoverished language of “efficiency” and prices per barrel as their primary indicators for discussing the future direction of the resource’s use, what other aspects are omitted? How do we go about taking account of the space(s) resource networks traverse in order to make it to the pump? How can we elevate the importance of the livelihoods of those living in Iraq (among other places) within our perspective? When discussing energy issues, these omissions play a major role in how we define the scope of the problem. For instance: The diversity of tactics in combating climate change on the ground, whether its market-driven Carbon-Capture-Storage (CCS- pumping metric tons of carbon dioxide into the ground) or international social movements demanding climate justice and a moratorium on further fossil-fuel exploitation, speaks to the huge gulfs in how different groups go about defining the “crisis”. Is the “energy crisis” about running out of the massive subsidy of easy-to-extract oil and facing the true environmental/social costs of an industrially-packaged lifestyle, or is it about the dangerous abundance of fossil-fuels, whose rapid exploitation and combustion has pushed the climate into “crisis”, or something entirely different? How we define the crisis creates the scope of solutions. CCS appears to be a coping strategy designed to purge fossil-fuel intensive industries of their most undesirable characteristics (carbon emissions) while preserving its fundamental nature (the insistence on the growth of a fossil-fuel based economy) and is symptomatic of a limited view of the issues at hand.

#### ---The affirmative’s conception of energy as abstract interchangeable units eliminates limits to consumption and risks extinction by implicitly removing the structure of fossil fuel consumption from contestation. Reject the aff --- Only a withdrawl from energy opens the space to challenge the annihilation of the environment and exploitation of billions.

Hildyard Lohmann & Sexton 2012

Nicholas, founder and Director of The Corner House, Larry, author of the book “Carbon Trading: A Critical Conversation on Climate Change, Privatization and Power” & works at the British NGO The Corner House, Sarah, a director of The Corner House, Energy Security For What? For Whom? The Corner House, http://www.thecornerhouse.org.uk/resource/energy-security-whom-what

In sum, encouraging a rational debate about “energy security” necessitates understanding what is meant not only by the phrase, but also by its composite parts. The term “energy,” despite its apparent simplicity, presents particular challenges. During the past two centuries, the vernacular, varied, lower-case “energies” of commons regimes have been joined by a new, abstract, upper-case Energy evolved in industrialised societies. Exploring the difference between “energies” and Energy is crucial to understanding the international politics of “energy security”. Abstract, monolithic, seemingly limitless Energy is something that only became possible with fossil-fuelled productivism and the machines, networks and institutions that came with it. This Energy, like lowercase “energies”, can deliver the basic necessities of life, at least to some, lending a certain plausibility to politicians’ claims that their worries about “energy security” centre on keeping the lights on and homes warm. But its underlying logic is different. Upper-case Energy is a transformation and commensuration of specific energies into a general capacity to maximise the ability of human bodies to make stuff. As the First Law of Thermodynamics (developed at the same time as industrial capitalism) recognises, any form of energy can be transformed into others and used to do work (but cannot be created or destroyed). Just as the invention of an absolute Time independent of daylight variations and traditional holidays helped discipline early industrial workers into the regular rhythm of a long working day, so too the subsequent development of an abstract Energy was key to intensifying their productivity further and harnessing them to the pace of the machine. For this upper-case Energy, survival is incidental except insofar as it supports the production imperative. Whereas specific “energies” know their limits, of Energy there can never be too much. Other things being equal, the more there is, the more can be produced, and the more money business can make, without limit. Lower-case “energies” and Big-E Energy are not only different: they are also, in many senses, enemies to each other. In order that fragmented “energies” do not become an obstacle to the mobilisation of economic value, they have to be folded into abstract Energy under the care of dedicated disciplines and institutions (bureaucrats, engineers, statisticians, laboratories, economics departments, inventors, investors, armies). Obsessed with quantitative growth for growth’s sake, Energy tends to treat the right of all to a warm home (or a cool one in hotter climes), cooked food, electric light as a nuisance. It heralds a world that is not only unequal, but also unable to respect the common right to subsistence. Nowhere is this clearer than in the case of agrofuels, whose “interchangeability” with oil under the rubric of a unitary Energy makes routine the replacement of subsistence agriculture with industrial cropping aimed at fuelling cars and airplanes. It is also plain in India’s development plans, which call for US$100 billion to be spent on a burgeoning number of large Energy projects – coal, oil, hydropower and renewables – that will serve above all to boost the profits of industrialists but leave less than 2 per cent for the household use of the 700 million who lack modern services. And it can be seen in South Africa’s policy of providing some of the cheapest electricity in the world to smelting companies while many township residents are forced to pirate electricity illegally because the price is out of their reach. Well over a century into the era of electrification, more than a billion people, about one-quarter of the world’s population, have no access to electricity or other non-biotic forms of energy (and many will never have under fossil-fuelled capitalism). If fossil-fuelled capitalism has defined what we mean by energy, then merely to use the word uncritically is to make a commitment to certain assumptions about scarcity, foreclose certain alternatives and cover up some of the most important issues that need to be discussed. Paradoxically, having a serious discussion about “energy security” requires taking a therapeutic step back from the modern concept of Energy itself. For example, the seemingly innocent query “How can we have energy security in a post-fossil world?” is not so much a question as an ultimatum. The question implies that however we organise our societies in future, it will have to be on the model that fossil capitalism built, with its threats to the right to survive of both humans and nonhumans (and the associated threats to “security” itself, on a commons understanding). A more fruitful question would be: “Is the world that is defined (in part) by the modern concept of Energy the world that we want?” It is just such questions that policymakers and social movements must ask when initiating any discussion of energy security.

### 4

#### High oil prices are key Saudi relations and middle east stability

Freidman, CEO of Stratfor, 8 (George, is an American political scientist and author. He is the founder, chief intelligence officer, financial overseer, and CEO of the private intelligence corporation Stratfor “The Geopolitics of $130 Oil” <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/geopolitics_130_oil>)

As we have already said, the biggest winners are the countries of the Arabian Peninsula. Although somewhat strained, these countries never really suffered during the period of low oil prices. They have now more than rebalanced their financial system and are making the most of it. This is a time when they absolutely do not want anything disrupting the flow of oil from their region. Closing the Strait of Hormuz, for example, would be disastrous to them. We therefore see the Saudis, in particular, taking steps to stabilize the region. This includes supporting Israeli-Syrian peace talks, using influence with Sunnis in Iraq to confront al Qaeda, making certain that Shiites in Saudi Arabia profit from the boom. (Other Gulf countries are doing the same with their Shiites. This is designed to remove one of Iran's levers in the region: a rising of Shiites in the Arabian Peninsula.) In addition, the Saudis are using their economic power to re-establish the relationship they had with the United States before 9/11. With the financial institutions in the United States in disarray, the Arabian Peninsula can be very helpful.

#### **The plan assures Saudi backlash---causes terrorism, independently turns heg**

Cantu 12 (Quentin, is a International Practice at Raptor Strategies, LLC was a research Assistant at Ronald Marks Intern at SUNY Legislative Strengthening Program Intern at Transparency International “Why We Shouldn't be Worrying About Peak Oil” <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Why-We-Shouldnt-be-Worrying-About-Peak-Oil.html>)

Many U.S. politicians and security wonks are fond of the assertion that Americans contribute to insecurity at home and around the world by our dependence on foreign oil. By this line of reasoning, our addiction to energy from the likes of Saudi Arabia and Venezuela has effectively bought us our own enemies. This analysis fails to confront such realities that, as a 2009 RAND study concluded, terrorist attacks are so inexpensive that a decrease in Middle Eastern oil revenues would have virtually no impact on al-Qaeda’s fundraising capabilities. To see the irony in the dubious assertions that we fund our own enemies, imagine the kinds of retaliation a state like Saudi Arabia would engage in if we banned their imports. It is not difficult to picture King Abdullah reacting with such scorn and fury as to create an actual national security threat to the United States. Furthermore, two of the largest suppliers of crude to the United States are Canada and Mexico, among our staunchest allies and countries that are hardly terrorist breeding grounds. All of the talk about the benefits of choking malevolent countries from U.S. oil demand borders on ignorant isolationism. Because oil is a global commodity, prices are established globally and oil buyers will seek producers that boast the lowest cost. Thus there is no doubt that Venezuela could simply reap an equal amount of petroleum revenues from China in the event that the U.S. embargoed its oil supplies. The prospect of more Chinese involvement in our own hemisphere means that this is hardly a win-win situation.

#### Middle east war goes global and nuclear

Primakov 9 (Yevgeny, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry – Russian Federation, Member – Russian Academy of Science, “The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations”, Russia in Global Affairs, 3, July/September, [*http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/n\_13593*](http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/n_13593))

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS Liberty was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict. The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

#### High prices and dependence pacify North African uprisings

Zakaria, boss, 12 (Fareed is an Indian-American journalist and author. From 2000 to 2010, he was a columnist for Newsweek and editor of Newsweek International. In 2010 he became editor-at-large of Time magazine. He is also the host of CNN's Fareed Zakaria GPS, and a frequent commentator and author about issues related to international relations, trade and American foreign policy.[1] “Zakaria: Why oil prices will stay high” http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/01/15/zakaria-why-oil-prices-will-stay-high/)

You see, traders worry about risk. And the biggest risk to oil supplies is the threat of war in the Persian Gulf. Meanwhile, in Nigeria mass protests are raising worries about the supply of fuel from there. Venezuela is in a slow-motion collapse because of Hugo Chavez's mismanagement. There have also been protests in Russia, the world's top oil producer. And remember the fallout of the Arab Spring - Libya's oil production in 2011 was severely curtailed. Iraq continues to disappoint with its oil output and its recent political tensions certainly haven't made things any better. So a mix of war rhetoric and local troubles in key oil states are factors driving up the price of crude. And that translates to higher prices at the pump. Now that logic suggests that prices will fall when the news calms down. But perhaps not. Perhaps oil producers want these sky high prices. Usually the major oil producers understand that keeping prices too high in the short term means people start finding alternatives to oil. They start driving more efficiently; they start looking for alternate energies. But this time, oil states face crucial challenges. Look closer at the Arab Spring. The only oil rich country that has been forced into regime change is Libya. Why? The **Gulf states lavish subsidies and salary increases on their citizens**. ***They've upped spending to record levels to suppress any popular discontent***. I saw some striking numbers this week: Look at the "break-even" costs for the world's top oil producers. That is the minimum price at which these countries need to sell oil so that they can balance their budgets. Russia now needs oil at $110 a barrel to manage its finances. For Iraq, the number is $100. Even Saudi Arabia now needs oil to trade around $80 a barrel just to balance its budgets. The numbers are also high for Algeria, Qatar, and Oman. Only a decade ago Saudi Arabia was able to balance its budget with oil prices averaging around $25 a barrel. So now it is in these countries' interest to keep oil prices high, which they do by curtailing supply in one way or the other. This is perhaps the most lasting impact of the year of global protest: High oil prices.

**Those will collapse the EU**

**The Economist 11** (“The next European crisis: boat people” http://www.economist.com/blogs/charlemagne/2011/04/north\_african\_migration)

FOR THE past year excessive sovereign debt has endangered the European project. For the coming year it may be north African boat people who present the greatest danger to European unity. The turmoil over illegal migrants is a consequence of the Arab pro-democracy awakening on the far side of the Mediterranean and, perhaps, of the Western military intervention in Libya. According to UNHCR, more than 20,000 boat people have landed on the Italian island of Lampedusa this year, almost all of them from Tunisia. More than 800 have arrived in Malta, mostly from Libya. At today's meeting of the European Union's interior ministers in Luxembourg, Italy and Malta called on the EU to activate a 2001 directive to grant temporary protection to migrants in cases of “mass influx” and to share the burden of absorbing the newcomers. But ministers flatly turned down the proposal. The European Commission described the call as “premature”, but said the EU was offering “solidarity” in other ways, including money and additional surveillance teams provided by the EU's Frontex border agency. Malta would be helped on a voluntary basis in resettling boat people, given its small size and the fact that most of its newcomers are people fleeing war in Libya. Italy is confronted by a bigger wave, but its boat people are mainly economic migrants rather than refugees who have taken to the sea because of the economic crisis in Tunisia after its pro-democracy revolution, and because border controls have become laxer after the downfall of President Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali. In any case, say fellow ministers, the flow of migrants to Italy is nothing like the influx of refugees into Europe (mainly Germany) during the Balkan wars, in response to which the EU directive was adopted. Nonetheless, Roberto Maroni, the Italian interior minister, complained bitterly that the EU had abandoned Italy (video here, in Italian). “I ask myself if it makes sense to continue in this position: of continuing to be part of the European Union, an institution that is activated immediately to save banks, to declare war—but when it is a matter of expressing solidarity with a country in difficulty, such as Italy, it hides.” He said that his country had been told: “Dear Italy. It's your business. Manage it on your own.” If this is the attitude of the EU, he declared, “we are better off alone than in bad company.” Such comments are not entirely unexpected from a leading member of the anti-immigrant and Eurosceptic Northern League, except that Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian prime minister, had offered similar sentiments a day earlier during a visit to Lampedusa: “Either Europe is something concrete, or it would be best to part ways”. Nobody expects Italy, a founding member of the EU, to begin proceedings to withdraw. Its lashing out at outside foes may be a sign of a political system that is in fibrillation because of the multiple legal cases against Mr Berlusconi (he was in court today, denouncing "leftist" magistrates). Yet the anti-Europe mood has been harsh enough to alarm President Giorgio Napolitano (report here, in Italian). Italy is resorting to a ruse that other countries suspect is a blatant attempt to export its problem: granting all arrivals from Tunisia temporary protection in Italy. In theory this would allow them to travel freely throughout the passport-free Schengen area, and most can be expected to take the opportunity to slip across the Alps to other countries, above all to France. Over the weekend, the Italian finance minister, Giulio Tremonti, seemed to issue a veiled warning: “A cheque that needs to be honoured has arrived in Italy, but it will not stop in Lampedusa. It will arrive in Germany, in the north and all over Europe.” French authorities have already stepped up identity checks in areas near the border with Italy. Claude Guéant, the French interior minister, said about 2,800 Tunisians had been caught so far in the past month, of whom about 1,700 have been expelled back to Italy. He and Mr Maroni met last week to smoothe over their row over the handling of migrants, agreeing to conduct more joint patrols in the Mediterranean. But Mr Guéant would not yield on the substance of the disagreement. Italy had a right to issue temporary permits, he said; France had a right to check whether Tunisians arriving from Italy had a proper passport as well as funds to support themselves, as stipulated under Schengen rules. Every country in Schengen had to bear its responsibilities, he said. Italy was not the only country with a migration problem: France had to contend with thousands of illegal Afghan and Pakistani migrants who congregate around Calais to try to slip across the Channel to Britain. Others have been more openly critical of Italy. “I was quite dissatisfied with Italy's surprise decision to pass on its problems to all the others without prior notice,” said Gerd Leers, the Dutch minister for immigration and asylum. Austria's interior minister, Maria Fekter, said her country would investigate means of stopping migrants from crossing its borders. Similarly, the German states of Bavaria and Hesse said they might introduce border checks. Migration is likely to be a contentious issue at June's European summit (see this paper by the Centre for European Reform). With anti-immigrant parties on the rise across Europe, the dispute has great potential to degenerate. Like the euro, which requires mutual trust among members about their readiness to preserve sound public finances, the Schengen area relies on mutual trust about the capacity of members to control their borders and migration flows. But Italy threatens all that: rather than acting as a dam and reservoir for migrants, it would rather be a weir, allowing the human flow to pass over it. In the euro crisis, creditors and debtors alike wondered whether they would be better off without the other. Now it is the countries of the Schengen borderless travel area that are starting to question another of Europe's great integration projects.

**EU strength solves extinction**

John Bruton, Deputy, Joint Committee on European Affairs, 10/2001, The Future of the European Union, www.irlgov.ie/committees-02/c-europeanaffairs/future/page1.htm

As the Laeken Declaration put it, "Europe needs to shoulder its responsibilities in the governance of globalisation" adding that Europe must exercise its power in order "to set globalisation within a moral framework, in other words to anchor it in solidarity and sustainable development". 2.6 Only a strong European Union is big enough to create a space, and a stable set of rules, within which all Europeans can live securely, move freely, and provide for themselves, for their families and for their old age. Individual states are too small to do that on their own. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with the globalised human diseases, such as AIDS and tuberculosis. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalised criminal conspiracies, like the Mafia, that threaten the security of all Europeans. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalised environmental threats, such as global warming, which threaten our continent and generations of its future inhabitants. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalised economic forces, which could spread recession from one country to another and destroy millions of jobs. Only a strong European Union is big enough to regulate, in the interests of society as a whole, the activities of profit seeking private corporations, some of which now have more spending power than many individual states. 2.7 These tasks are too large for individual states. 2.8 Only by coming together in the European Union can we ensure that humanity, and the values which make us, as individuals, truly human, **prevail over blind global forces** that will otherwise overwhelm us.

### Warming (impact defense)

#### No company or lender is willing to invest in CCS – even after regulations

Johnson 6-11

Steve, “Co-op Rep: EPA Off Base on Carbon,” http://www.ect.coop/public-policy-watch/energy-environment/electric-cooperative-epa-carbo-reduction-rule/45194

A Mid-Atlantic G&T official told a congressional panel that a federal carbon reduction standard impairs the plans of his cooperative and other electric utilities for future baseload generation. David Hudgins said the Environmental Protection Agency has failed to state a clear benefit to its proposed limits on greenhouse gases at new fossil-fuel plants and wrongly assumes that utilities can rely on unproven carbon capture and storage technology to meet them. “No company will take the risk to invest billions of dollars into a power plant in the hopes that CCS technology will be developed,” said Hudgins, director of member and external relations at Old Dominion Electric Cooperative. “Additionally, financial lending institutions will not lend money to construct a plant without a viable technology to demonstrate compliance,” he said. Hudgins testified June 6 at a House Subcommittee on Energy and Environment hearing on environmental regulations, with an emphasis on the costs and benefits of EPA’s new source performance standards for new fossil-fuel power plants. That’s a major matter of concern for Glen Allen, Va.-based ODEC, which serves 11 distribution co-ops in three states. To meet growing demand, it is planning a $5 billion, state-of-the-art baseload plant in southeast Virginia that uses coal and renewable biomass. ODEC has been working on carbon sequestration research, but Hudgins said the technology is unlikely to be commercially viable within a decade, as the agency insists.

#### CCS costs prevent solvency

Rochon et al 08Peer Reviewed, Greenpeace International: Greenpeace is an independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace, Authors include: Dr Erika Bjureby, Dr Paul Johnston, Robin Oakley, Dr David Santillo, Nina Schulz, Dr Gabriela von Goerne(Emily, May 2008, “False Hope: Why carbon capture and storage won’t save the climate,” [http://www.probeinternational.org/False%20Hope%20--%20Why%20carbon%20capture%20and%20storage%20won%92t%20save%20the%20climate.pdf](http://www.probeinternational.org/False%20Hope%20--%20Why%20carbon%20capture%20and%20storage%20won%92t%20save%20the%20climate.pdf)//DR)

**CCS is too expensive**

Cost estimates for CCS vary considerably depending on factors such as power station configuration, CCS technology, fuel costs, size of project and location. One thing is certain, **CCS** is expensive. It **requires significant funds to construct the power stations and necessary infrastructure to transport and store carbon.** The IPCC sets costs between US$15-75 per ton of captured CO2.127 A recent US DOE report found installing carbon capture systems to most modern plant technologies resulted in a near doubling of plant costs.128 **Such costs are estimated to increase the price of electricity anywhere from 21-91%.**129

For transport, pipeline networks will need to be built to move CO2 to storage sites. **The construction of a network of pipelines for CCS is likely to require a considerable outlay of capital.**130 **Costs will vary depending on a number of factors, including pipeline length, diameter and specific steel components** (corrosion-resistant) **as well as the volume of CO2 to be transported. Pipelines built near population** centres or on difficult terrain (such as marshy or rocky ground) **are more expensive.**131 The IPCC estimates a cost range for pipelines between US$1-8/ton of CO2 transported (see Table 5).132 A United States Congressional Research Services report calculated capital costs for an 11-mile (18 km) pipeline in the midwestern part of the country at approximately US$6 million. The same report estimates that a dedicated interstate pipeline network in North Carolina would cost upwards of US$5 billion due to the limited geological sequestration potential in that part of the country.133

Storage and subsequent monitoring and verification costs are estimated to range from US$0.5-8/tCO2 injected and US$0.1-0.3/tCO2 injected, respectively.134 **The overall cost of CCS could serve as another barrier to its deployment.**135 EOR has been suggested as a way to offset the costs but as “Oil fails to pay for CCS” (page 28) shows, in reality this is questionable.136

C02 will leak

Johnson et al. 10 – PhD in Atmospheric Science

Andrew Simms, policy director of New Economics Foundation, UK think tank, and head of NEF's Climate Change Programme, Dr. Victoria Johnson, researcher for the climate change and energy programme at NEF, MSc with distinction in Climate Change from the University of East Anglia and PhD in Atmospheric Physics at Imperial College, London and Peter Chowla, Policy and Advocacy Officer at the Bretton Woods Project. “Growth isn’t possible”. New Economics Foundation, January 25,2010. http://www.neweconomics.org/sites/neweconomics.org/files/Growth\_Isnt\_Possible.pdf

As journalist Jeff Goodell writes in his book Big Coal, tens of thousands of people may be destined to live above a giant bubble of CO2 and since ‘CO2 is buoyant underground it can migrate through cracks and faults in the earth, pooling in unexpected places.’300 A sudden release of large amounts of CO2 due to, for example, an earthquake resulting in the fracturing or pipeline failure could result in the immediate death of both people and animals, since asphyxiation can result from inhalation of CO2 at just a 20 per cent concentration. Because CO2 is a colourless, odourless and tasteless gas; a large leak would be undetected. An example of just how catastrophic a leak could be is the natural limnic eruption of CO2 in 1986 from Lake Nyos in Cameroon. The sudden release of 1.6 Mt CO2 resulted in the asphyxiation of around 1,700 people and 3,500 livestock. If this rules out the storage of CO2 in land-based geological sites, let us consider sequestration in ocean saline aquifers, such as Sleipner in Norway. Slow, gradual leakage of CO2 could result in the dissolution of CO2 in shallow aquifers, causing the acidification of groundwater and undesirable change in geochemistry (i.e., mobilisation of toxic metals), water quality (leaching of nutrients) and ecosystem health (e.g., pH impacts on organisms).301 Transportation of captured carbon could also be problematic. CCS involves a process of converting CO2 to something else, or moving it somewhere else. Taking the transport of natural gas as an example, we can estimate how secure CO2 transportation might be. The world’s largest gas transport system, 2,400km long running through Russia (the Russian gas transport system), is estimated to lose around 1.4 per cent (a range of 1.0–2.5 per cent).302 This is comparable to the amount of methane lost from US pipelines (1.5 ± 0.5 per cent). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that CO2 leakage from transport through pipelines could be in the order of 1.5 per cent. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that around 9 per cent of all natural gas extracted is lost in the process of extraction, distribution and storage.

#### Capture isn’t close to ready

EPA 10

“Report of the Interagency Task Force on Carbon Capture and Storage,” http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/downloads/CCS-Task-Force-Report-2010.pdf

As discussed above, CO2 removal technologies are not ready for widespread implementation on coal-based power plants, primarily because they have not been demonstrated at the scale necessary to establish confidence for power plant application (Kuuskraa, 2007). Since the CO2 capture capacities used in current industrial processes are generally much smaller than the capacity required for the purposes of GHG emissions mitigation at a typical power plant, there is considerable uncertainty associated with process scale-up. For example, maintaining adequate gas and/or liquid flow distribution in the larger absorption and regeneration reactors required for power plant applications could prove difficult. Other technical challenges associated with the application of these CO2 capture technologies to coal-based power plants include high capture and compression auxiliary power loads, capture process energy integration with existing power system, impacts of flue gas contaminants (NOx , SOx , PM) on CO2 capture system, increased water consumption and cost effective O2 supply for oxy-combustion systems (see Appendix A, Table A-3) (Kuuskraa, 2007). The following is a brief summary of two of the more significant technical challenges of applying these technologies.

#### Storage liability undermines all of CCS

Tady 7 - national political reporter

Megan, “Carbon Capture: Miracle Cure for Global Warming, or Deadly Liability?,” Alternet, http://www.alternet.org/environment/68490/?page=4

Benefits aside, the stored carbon dioxide is like a hot potato -- nobody wants to have the liability of ensuring hundreds of billions of tons of carbon dioxide that stays buried for hundreds of years. "Who pays for it if there's a leak?" asked Jackson of Duke University. Leonard thinks he knows. "[Industry has] been very upfront to Congress that there's no way that carbon sequestration will move forward unless the federal government assumes all liability for that project. It's very similar to what's happening to nuclear waste; industry is very happy to create it, but they themselves don't want to be stuck with the liability of what to do with that waste because they know it's dangerous."

Empirics and studies prove c02-eor and ccs do not line up---no way the plan can solve warming

Department of Energy 10 (“CO2-driven Enhanced Oil Recovery as a Stepping Stone to What?” http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\_reports/PNNL-19557.pdf)

Though it runs contrary to conventional wisdom regarding the foundational nature of CO2-EOR for commercial scale CCS deployment, our research suggests that CO2-EOR is dissimilar enough from true commercial-scale CCS – in the vast majority of configurations likely to deploy – that it is unlikely to significantly accelerate large scale adoption of the technology. Additionally, past experience with CO2-EOR operations and the incentives that have driven the development of the industry over the past four decades do not directly translate to form a robust basis for informing public policy or investment in a world defined by stringent and mandatory greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction intended to stabilize atmospheric concentrations of these gases and avert the worst aspects of anthropogenic climatic change. This paper presents what the authors believe to be some of the critical, though seldom discussed, complexities surrounding many of the purported benefits of expanded CO2-EOR, as well as a discussion of why CO2-EOR may not be the stepping stone to full-scale CCS deployment that many assume (or hope) it will be. 2. CO2-EOR and CCS Before embarking on analyses of the purported cost savings potential, energy security, and environmental benefits of CO2-EOR, it is important to briefly clarify the distinction between CO2-EOR and CCS. CO2-EOR represents the process by which CO2 is injected into depleting oil fields for the purpose of enhancing the recovery fraction of the oil that remains in the field following primary and secondary production methods (Meyer, 2007). According to recent survey data by Koottungal (2010), there are 129 CO2-EOR projects operating around the world, with 114 of those in the U.S. Given the lack of binding GHG constraints in the countries where these CO2-EOR operations are taking place, one must assume that each of these projects is focused on optimizing oil recovery. The vast majority of CO2-EOR projects inject CO2 produced from natural underground accumulations; in the U.S. and Canada, naturally-sourced CO2 provides an estimated 83% of the CO2 injected for EOR, with anthropogenic sources providing the rest (Moritis, 2010). Though it shares some technical characteristics and methods with CO2-EOR, CCS represents technologies focused on a different objective: the long-term isolation of CO2 in the deep subsurface as a means of mitigating the risks of global climate change. There are a number of potential target geologic formations being examined for sequestering CO2 deep in the subsurface including depleted oil and gas fields, as well as deep saline-filled reservoirs (IPCC, 2005). Depleted oil and gas fields are attractive options given their proven capability of securely trapping fluids and gas over geologic timescales, but carry with them additional concerns and risks because of the number of wellbore penetrations. A number of studies have examined the candidate CO2 storage resources available around the world, and deep saline formations (DSFs) consistently provide the bulk of the CO2 storage potential, orders of magnitude higher than the volumes likely to be found in depleted oil and gas fields (Dahowski et al., 2005; Dahowski et al., 2010; IPCC, 2005; NETL, 2007; Takahashi et al., 2009). For CCS to truly make a difference in the global challenge to reduce emissions, storage in DSFs has been shown repeatedly to be the primary reservoir application for CCS (Edmonds et al., 2007; IPCC, 2005; MIT, 2007; Wise et al., 2007). Still, CCS coupled with CO2-EOR could be attractive in locations with significant available capacity and where conditions are amenable to both long-term CO2 storage and EOR (see for example Ambrose et al., 2008; ARI, 2010).However, CO2-EOR as commonly practiced today does not meet the emerging regulatory thresholds for CO2 sequestration, and considerable effort and costs may be required to bring current practice up to this level. Of the four large complete end-to-end commercial CCS facilities on the planet today, only one employs CO2-EOR: the Dakota Gasification - Weyburn CCS project. Given that the world today lacks the kind of long term commitment to progressively tighter greenhouse gas constraints (a requirement to stabilize atmospheric CO2 concentrations, see Wigley, et al., (1996)) that would be needed to motivate large scale CCS deployment, the fact that only the Dakota Gasification - Weyburn CCS project makes use of its CO2 for EOR suggests that CO2-EOR represents one of a larger set of possible CCS configuration rather than a critical stepping stone for component CCS technologies. The In Salah, Sleipner, Snøvit and (in the near future) Gorgon CCS projects all dispose of their CO2 into “non-value-added” DSFs and therefore do not generate revenue via recovered hydrocarbons. If the rents associated with selling CO2 for use in CO2-EOR were so compelling and necessary for CCS projects then it seems counterintuitive that the majority of these early CCS facilities fail to make use of this valuable revenue stream.

#### Even so it would take 100,00 years

Bullis 9 (Kevin Bullis Senior Editor, Energy “A Reality Check for Carbon Capture” http://www.technologyreview.com/view/413398/a-reality-check-for-carbon-capture/)

There's been some speculation online recently about a new company called C12 Energy that's received $4.5 million from Sequoia Capital. The president of the company is Kurt Zenz House, who, as a PhD candidate at Harvard, worked out the details of a plan to sequester carbon dioxide from the atmosphere by speeding up natural processes. These processes could counteract global warming on their own, although they'd take a long time--about 100,000 years--to do it. (The process has kept the temperature on Earth, over its long history, within a narrow band, even as the brightness of the sun has changed significantly, he says.) House's idea is to hurry the process along using electrolysis. He published the idea in the fall of 2007, and he's applied for a patent on the idea. This has led to speculation that the company, which is known to be involved in carbon dioxide sequestration, was founded to commercialize this particular technology. This is something that House will not confirm, although he continues to be excited about his work at Harvard, which he's continuing now as a research fellow (PDF) at MIT. But this likely isn't what C12 Energy is up to. The process faces some large obstacles to becoming a practical way to sequester significant amounts of carbon dioxide. For example, the amount of seawater that would need to be electrolytically treated would be huge--on the order of 6,000 cubic meters per second if it were to offset 15 percent of global emissions. This sort of volume is conceivable for some processes, but electrolysis is expensive. What's more, the process would be very energy intensive and produce ozone-destroying compounds. But ultimately, the problem is that more cost-effective ways to sequester carbon dioxide already exist. House says that these challenges could be overcome. He proposes selling by-products of the process for use in manufacturing PVC piping or cement. But David Keith, the director of the Energy and Environmental Systems Group at the University of Calgary, says that schemes relying on the sale of by-products will be hard to deploy at large scales because the markets for these products quickly become saturated. This isn't to say that the process doesn't work--it does, Keith says. It's just expensive and uses a lot of energy. "The energy cost is just deadly," he says. There might be technical fixes to these issues, and it's exciting that House is continuing to work on it. But for now, at least, it seems like an idea better suited to the lab than to a commercial enterprise.

#### The skwo is already going to solve warming, but the plan risks tradeoffs making it worse

LA times 12 (citing Mark Zoback, a geophysicist at Stanford University, “Underground carbon dioxide storage likely would cause earthquakes” http://www.latimes.com/news/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-carbon-storage-may-cause-earthquakes-20120618,0,5073255.story)

And, Zoback added, in order to make any sort of dent in emissions, some 3,500 CCS sites would have to be found and injected, a process that would take decades and cost trillions of dollars. As a result, he said he believes our resources are better spent on other technologies and approaches to mitigating climate change. “I take the greenhouse gas problem and climate change very seriously, and I’d like to see our effort focused on approaches that will be more effective,” he said. “Let’s do all of those things that we know will be beneficial and will have long term payback. Wind and solar are now getting competitive with fossil fuels. Natural gas is cheaper than coal now. In 40 years we could be using all renewables. I think CCS in comparison is just too expensive and too risky.”

CCS doesn’t solve---no way to sequester the main contributions

Richard 6 (Michael has been with TreeHugger since 2005. He started out as a part-time writer, but after about a year (circa February 2006) he made the transition to full-time editor-in-chief, citing Timothy Flannery, the Chief Commissioner of the Australian [Climate Commission](http://www.climatecommission.gov.au), an independent body providing information on climate change to the Australian public. is currently a professor at [Macquarie University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macquarie_University). He is also the chairman of the [Copenhagen Climate Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Climate_Council), an international climate change awareness group. “Important! Why Carbon Sequestration Won't Save Us” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/important-why-carbon-sequestration-wont-save-us.html)

Carbon sequestration, also known as geosequestration, seems like a good deal. "Have your carbon cake and eat it too." In principle, it works this way: You capture CO2 emissions at the source before they are released into the atmosphere, compress them until they become liquid and then inject them in deep underground holes. What could be simpler? It certainly sounds like a good tool to fight global warming while enjoying the Earth's huge coal reserves. I used to think that it would indeed be one of the many solutions used to save ourselves from catastrophic climate change, but not anymore. In fact, I now think that it might be a counter-productive red herring. What has made me change my mind? What's the problem? Read on, please. Tim Flannery, in his highly recommended book The Weather Makers, dedicates a chapter to engineering solutions to global warming. In it, he gives an overview of carbon sequestration technology, the problems that have to be solved before it can work, and what the coal industry has been doing so far. Here are the problems in order: First, from the smokestack: The stream of CO2 emitted there is relatively dilute, making CO2 capture unrealistic. The coal industry has staked its future on a new process known as coal gasification. These power plants resemble chemical works more than conventional coal-fired power plants. In them, water and oxygen are mixed with the coal to create carbon monoxide and hydrogen. The hydrogen is used as a fuel source, while the carbon monoxide is converted to a concentrated stream of CO2. These plants are not cheap to run: around one-quarter of the energy they produce is consumed just in keeping them operating. All indications suggest that building them on a commercial scale will be expensive and that it will take decades to make a significant contribution to power production. So about 25% of the energy they make is used just to keep them operating, they are more expensive and it will take decades (an amount of time we don't have) before they make a significant contribution. Meanwhile, old coal power plants have an average lifetime of 60 years.

The plan causes earthquakes---that takes out any solvency for warming

Orcutt 12 (Mike, technology review research editor “Will Carbon Capture Be Ready on Time?” http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428355/will-carbon-capture-be-ready-on-time/)

Information about the global storage capacity is limited, but a 2012 study by MIT researchers found that in the United States, underground rock formations called deep saline aquifers could hold at least a century's worth of carbon dioxide emissions from the nation's coal-fired power plants. Many of the candidate reservoirs, however, are untested, and it's not clear how they might respond to large volumes of injected carbon dioxide. "The problem in a lot of these places (within deep saline aquifers) is that the permeability is very low," making it harder to get the fluid into the rock, says Mark Zoback, a professor of geophysics at Stanford University. Inserting fluid causes pressure changes that can induce seismicity, and "you can't inject these super-large volumes without the potential for triggering earthquakes." Even small quakes that might occur on faults "*easily missed"* during EPA-required site characterization studies could let the greenhouse gas escape, he says

#### Earthquakes spark great power war

**Brancati 7** (Dawn, Academic Employment - Harvard University, Institute for Quantitative Social Science; 2007; "Political Aftershocks: The Impact of Earthquakes on Intrastate Conflict", 51-5, http://jcr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/51/5/715)

Earthquakes, I argue, promote intrastate conflict by increasing competition among groups for scarce resources (e.g., food, water, housing, medicine, and relief aid). Scarcities, in turn, provoke frustrations, which lead to anger and violence. Their effects are greater in economically developing countries than in developed ones since earthquakes have more severe consequences in the former than in the latter. Earthquakes also have larger effects in countries already experiencing conflict since rebels can capitalize on earthquakes to attract popular support, recruit soldiers, and finance campaigns.

### 1NC D

#### Oceans resilient

Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD. (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### Nuclear winter outweighs and turns warming, faster, no adaptation.

Starr 2008

Steven, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Director of Clinical Laboratory Science Program, University of Missouri-Columbia, Catastrophic Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, Bulletin 28 April 2008, http://www.inesap.org/bulletin-28/catastrophic-climatic-consequences-nuclear-conflict

Climatic changes resulting from nuclear conflict would occur many thousands of times faster – and thus would likely be far more catastrophic – than the climatic changes predicted as a result of global warming.40 The rapidity of the war-induced changes, appearing in a matter of days and weeks, would allow human populations and the whole plant and animal kingdoms no time to adapt. It is worth noting that the same methods and climate models used to predict global warming were used in these studies to predict global cooling resulting from nuclear war. These climate models have proved highly successful in describing the cooling effects of volcanic clouds during extensive U.S. evaluations and in international intercomparisons performed as part of the Fourth Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.41 Predicted drops in average global temperatures caused by small, moderate, and large nuclear conflicts are contrasted with the effects of global warming during the last century in Figure 4 and with average surface air temperatures during the last 1,000 years in Figure 5. There are, of course, other important considerations which must be made when estimating the overall environmental and ecological impacts of nuclear war. These must include the release of enormous amounts of radioactive fallout, pyrotoxins, and toxic industrial chemicals into the ecosystems. A decade after the conflict, when the smoke begins to clear, there will also be massive increases in the amount of deadly ultraviolet light which will reach the surface of the Earth as a result of ozone depletion. All these by-products of nuclear war must be taken into account when comparing the danger of nuclear conflict to other potential dangers now confronting humanity and life on Earth. Conclusions We cannot allow our political and military leaders to continue to ignore the potential cataclysmic climatic and environmental consequences posed by the use of nuclear weapons. Civilization remains at risk from nuclear winter despite a three-fold reduction in global nuclear arsenals during the last 20 years. This is due in part to the fact that nuclear arms control agreements have focused primarily on the dismantlement of delivery systems and have failed to include the verified dismantlement of nuclear warheads. Future negotiations must consider all the potential effects of the total number of nuclear weapons in the nuclear arsenals.44 The U.S. and Russia must recognize the senselessness of continued planning for a nuclear first-strike which, if launched, would make the whole world including their own country uninhabitable. As a first step, they should end their preparations for the pre-emptive use of their nuclear arsenals, stand-down their high-alert strategic nuclear forces, and eliminate the standard operating procedure of launch-on-warning.45 It is essential that all the nuclear weapon states be convinced of the need to honor their commitments under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to “act in good faith” to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. As long as they ignore this commitment and maintain nuclear weaponry as the cornerstone of their military forces, they confer validity to the false idea that nuclear weapons provide security to those who possess them, and thus encourage non-nuclear weapon states to follow in their footsteps. The unalterable conclusion is that a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought. Nuclear weapons must be seen not only as instruments of mass murder, but as instruments of global annihilation which put all humanity and civilization under a common threat of destruction.

#### Also there are methane hotspots in other areas the aff can’t solve

Livermore 10/22/09 (Michael A., executive director of the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. He is the author, with Richard L. Revesz, of Retaking Rationality: How Cost-Benefit Analysis Can Better Protect the Environmental and Our Health. “Methane leakage runs up a $50 billion bill” <http://grist.org/article/2009-10-22-methane-leakage-runs-up-a-50-billion-bill/>)

The irony here is — no one benefits from these leaks. Companies certainly don’t profit from the lost revenue. So if no one benefits, and we will be charged $50 billion for the privilege, why not enforce monitoring and sealing of these leaks? As the Times noted, next year Japan will release data from the Gosat satellite which will most likely show hot spots of methane gas pouring into the skies from the worst offenders: Russia, the United States, Ukraine, and Mexico. We’ll be confronted with the images of our total emissions of this global warming gas, and it’s probably not a pretty picture. Leaky methane is only part of the overall problem, but the cost-benefit analysis on fixing it is a no-brainer.

#### **Alternative cause – Antarctica**

Bump 8/29/12 (Philip, staffwriter, <http://grist.org/news/methane-trapped-in-antarctic-ice-will-be-a-great-help-to-the-horrible-warming-feedback-loop/>)

As Arctic permafrost thaws, methane is released. Last December, we got the bad news that the release could be 2.5 times more than originally estimated. The more methane released, the more the global-warming impact — and the faster ice melts and ground thaws, and the more methane released. Permafrost was primarily a concern in the Arctic, not the Antarctic. Today, bad news: The amount of methane released by a melting Antarctic may be equivalent. The Antarctic Ice Sheet could be an overlooked but important source of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, according to a report in the August 30 issue of Nature by an international team of scientists. That’s according to the University of California at Santa Cruz, which released the findings earlier today. In the Arctic, the gas is in the soil. In the Antarctic, it’s also in the ice itself. The science team estimated that 50 percent of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (1 million square kilometers) and 25 percent of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet (2.5 million square kilometers) overlies pre-glacial sedimentary basins containing about 21,000 billion metric tons of organic carbon. “This is an immense amount of organic carbon, more than ten times the size of carbon stocks in northern permafrost regions,” [study coauthor Jemma] Wadham said. “Our laboratory experiments tell us that these sub-ice environments are also biologically active, meaning that this organic carbon is probably being metabolized to carbon dioxide and methane gas by microbes.” … [The researchers] calculated that the potential amount of methane hydrate and free methane gas beneath the Antarctic Ice Sheet could be up to 4 billion metric tons, a similar order of magnitude to some estimates made for Arctic permafrost. The predicted shallow depth of these potential reserves also makes them more susceptible to climate forcing than other methane hydrate reserves on Earth. So that’s 4,000,000,000 metric tons — an amount equivalent to the Arctic permafrost — of accumulated methane hydrate (an ice-like solid) and free gas under the Antarctic surface ice, along with 21,000,000,000,000 metric tons of permafrost-like sediment. If substantial methane hydrate and gas are present beneath the Antarctic Ice Sheet, methane release during episodes of ice-sheet collapse could act as a positive feedback on global climate change during past and future ice-sheet retreat. Cool. In some good news, prices of canned goods and survival shelters remain relatively low, for now.

#### An international group of scientists agrees that your methane impact is non-unique

Stephens 8/29/12 (Tim, a graduate student in Earth and planetary sciences at the University of California, “Study suggests large methane reservoirs beneath Antarctic ice sheet” <http://news.ucsc.edu/2012/08/antarctic-methane.html>)

The Antarctic Ice Sheet could be an overlooked but important source of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, according to a report in the August 30 issue of Nature by an international team of scientists. The new study demonstrates that old organic matter in sedimentary basins located beneath the Antarctic Ice Sheet may have been converted to methane by micro-organisms living under oxygen-deprived conditions. The methane could be released to the atmosphere if the ice sheet shrinks and exposes these old sedimentary basins. Coauthor Slawek Tulaczyk, a professor of Earth and planetary sciences at UC Santa Cruz, said the project got its start five years ago in discussions with first author Jemma Wadham at the University of Bristol School of Geographical Sciences, where Tulaczyk was on sabbatical. "It is easy to forget that before 35 million years ago, when the current period of Antarctic glaciations started, this continent was teeming with life," Tulaczyk said. "Some of the organic material produced by this life became trapped in sediments, which then were cut off from the rest of the world when the ice sheet grew. Our modeling shows that over millions of years, microbes may have turned this old organic carbon into methane." The science team estimated that 50 percent of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (1 million square kilometers) and 25 percent of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet (2.5 million square kilometers) overlies pre-glacial sedimentary basins containing about 21,000 billion metric tons of organic carbon. "This is an immense amount of organic carbon, more than ten times the size of carbon stocks in northern permafrost regions," Wadham said. "Our laboratory experiments tell us that these sub-ice environments are also biologically active, meaning that this organic carbon is probably being metabolized to carbon dioxide and methane gas by microbes." The researchers numerically simulated the accumulation of methane in Antarctic sedimentary basins using an established one-dimensional hydrate model. They found that sub-ice conditions favor the accumulation of methane hydrate (that is, methane trapped within a structure of water molecules, forming a solid similar to regular ice). They also calculated that the potential amount of methane hydrate and free methane gas beneath the Antarctic Ice Sheet could be up to 4 billion metric tons, a similar order of magnitude to some estimates made for Arctic permafrost. The predicted shallow depth of these potential reserves also makes them more susceptible to climate forcing than other methane hydrate reserves on Earth. Coauthor Sandra Arndt, a NERC fellow at the University of Bristol, who conducted the numerical modeling, said, "It's not surprising that you might expect to find significant amounts of methane hydrate trapped beneath the ice sheet. Just like in sub-seafloor sediments, it is cold and pressures are high, which are important conditions for methane hydrate formation." If substantial methane hydrate and gas are present beneath the Antarctic Ice Sheet, methane release during episodes of ice-sheet collapse could act as a positive feedback on global climate change during past and future ice-sheet retreat.

### Oil

#### Status quo production solves

Everly 9-17

Steve, Kansas City Star, U.S. getting closer to energy independence http://www.kansascity.com/2012/09/17/3820371/us-getting-closer-to-energy-independence.html#storylink=cpy

“No matter who is elected, we will be more energy independent every year for the next decade, unless there are some extreme policy changes,” said James Williams, an analyst for WTRG Economics. There is a range of forecasts to show the point. The Energy Information Administration has one of the more conservative outlooks. The federal agency expects that by 2024 the United States will produce enough petroleum and biofuels to meet 62 percent of demand. Toss in what Canada delivers, and it could rise to 75 percent. The American Petroleum Institute, an oil industry trade group, wants to unleash the drilling rigs, including into current off-limits areas. By 2024, it says, U.S. production could provide 74 percent of the country’s liquid fuels and biofuels 10 percent more. Toss in a growing contribution from Canada, and the United States wouldn’t need petroleum from any other country.

#### Oil drilling and production is at an all-time high---the status quo solves

Ungar 12 (Rick, is a contributor to Forbes.com and the Washington Monthly where he writes on American health care policy and politics. “The Truth About Obama, Oil And The Gasoline Blame Game-Part I”http://www.forbes.com/sites/rickungar/2012/03/14/the-truth-about-obama-oil-and-the-gasoline-blame-game-part-i/3/)

We’ve been hearing it for years—if presidents would only stop listening to wing-nut environmentalists and take advantage of the oil reserves that rest beneath our public lands and waters, we’d be energy independent and pay less at the gasoline pump. But is it true? According to WTRG Economics, the number of drilling rigs in action today are roughly twice as many as when Barack Obama moved into the White House in 2009. Indeed, the same organization reports that—with the exception of a brief spike in drilling activity in 2008—we’ve got more rigs operating on U.S. soil and water today that at any time since the early 1980s. And it gets better. After a decades long trend of producing less oil each year, the United States began producing more crude oil in 2008 than the year immediately preceding it and has increased that productivity ever since. The result of this increased production, coupled with tougher fuel efficiency standards designed to lessen our use of oil products, has resulted in our reducing net imports of oil by 10 percent this past year, bringing our current oil imports to just 45 percent of our petroleum needs versus the 57 percent we purchased overseas in 2008.

**Even if they are jerks about the rise disputes wont escalate**

**Siebels 10** (Dirk, is a **Senior Consultant at Xiphias Consulting**Demographic info

“Containing China? How the U.S. and its allies should deal with the new East Asian security environment” <http://www.xiphiasconsulting.com/fileadmin/reports/east_asia/containing_china_position_paper.pdf>)

Overall, economic growth allows China to spend more money on its military in absolute terms, but neither is it militarising its economy nor **is it increasingly using military power to solve disputes**. The rise of China has the potential to create many challenges for East Asia and beyond, but the use of force in conflicts over territory is unlikely to be the leading cause of regional instability. Diplomatic repercussions of increased military spending are most likely bigger than the actual military impact. Moreover, the country is increasingly contributing to U.N. peacekeeping missions, currently deploying about 2,000 troops, mostly military observers, engineers and medical personnel.

#### US presence is not key to stability

**Kang 5** (David Kang Government Department Dartmouth College “ Why China’s Rise Will be Peaceful:

Hierarchy and stability in the East Asian region” <http://www.ou.edu/uschina/SASD/SASD2005/2005readings/Kang-prediction.pdf> //Donnie)

However, China has already been growing rapidly for almost three decades, and there is little evidence that the region is devolving into balancing, nor that China’s rise is causing undue alarm in the region.5 Surely, given the anticipatory nature of the pessimistic arguments -- that states prepare for future contingencies today – China’s growth should already have prompted a reaction from East Asian states. Stability is also not the result of the United States as an offshore balancer that attenuates regional conflicts and balances Chinese power, and which East Asian states welcome. 6 Only Taiwan – and perhaps Japan – clearly rely on a U.S. security umbrella to balance Chinese power. There is a spectrum of relations between the U.S. and China, and while no state is completely allied with China, many states are at least accommodating its rise (Figure 1). States such as Vietnam, Thailand, the Philippines, and even South Korea could be much more focused on aligning with the U.S., but they have chosen not to do so. Indeed, the case of East Asia belies the notion that some states are “too small to balance.” With a potential offshore balancer in the U.S., even small states have a choice about whether or not to balance rising power. If Taiwan, with only 22 million people and close geographic proximity to China, can balance because of a U.S. umbrella, then all the other states in East Asia could, as well. If my argument is right, the direction of state’s alignments will move towards China and away from the U.S., even though they may remain hesitant to clearly choose one side or the other. //Figure 1 here// China’s expected emergence as the most powerful state in East Asia has been accompanied with more stability than pessimists believed because China is increasingly becoming the regional hierarch. 7 On the one hand, China has provided credible information about its capabilities and intentions to its neighbors. On the other hand, East Asian states actually believe China’s claims, and hence do not fear -- **and instead seek to benefit from** – China’s rise. This shared understanding about China’s preferences and limited aims short-circuits the security dilemma.8 One need only to imagine the consequences of Japan attempting to undertake such a role to realize how important is this social understanding about China’s position in East Asia. Furthermore, the U.S. may not be the key to stability in East Asia. **If the U.S. withdraws significantly from the region, East Asia will not become as dangerous or unstable** as the balance of power perspective expects, because other nations will accommodate China's central position in East Asia, rather than balance against it.9 A hierarchic system is one that involves a dominant power that does not fold secondary states under its wing in empire, and yet also does not cause other states to balance against it. Although much of the literature emphasizes that a rising power poses potential costs, just as importantly a rising power also offers potential benefits to secondary states. While a rising power may demand concessions or territory from the secondary state, it may also offer benefits from a growing economy and lower defense spending if relations between the two are warm. 10 Balancing a rising power puts the balancer in a better position to avoid potential costs, if there is conflict. However, balancing will also be more likely to limit the benefits of cooperation with the rising power, and potentially raise costs through added defense expenditures and creating conflict where there may be none to begin with. By contrast, aligning with the rising power puts the smaller state in a more vulnerable position relative to the rising power, but also increases the probability of its enjoying the benefits the rising power can provide.11 Thus, a secondary state’s decision will depend in part on the tradeoff between the costs and benefits the rising power potentially provides. Most Asian states see China’s t

#### Senkaku is a political conflict, not economic.

Moss 2012

Trefor, independent journalist based in Hong Kong. He covers Asian politics, defence and security, and was Asia-Pacific Editor at Jane’s Defence Weekly, For China and Japan: The Perfect Distraction?, 9-17-2012, http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/09/17/for-china-and-japan-the-perfect-distraction/

It might seem absurd, in light of those other matters, that the Diaoyu/Senkaku dispute has captured the public imagination to the point where these islands, which virtually nobody in either country has ever laid eyes on, now tops the agenda in both China and Japan (just as similar disputes continue to dominate the headlines in places like the Philippines, another country that arguably has bigger problems). Of course, the islands do have real value: their owners are entitled to claim fishing grounds and undersea resources in addition to the land itself. But the resources are not the things that most Chinese and Japanese people consider important. Something strange has happened: Symbolism has trumped realism in East Asia’s international discourse. Ordinary people (some of them, anyway) are more agitated about abstractions – national pride, identity and interpretations of history – than about bread-and-butter issues. These self-inflicted mind games can be explained in part by the manipulation of nationalism both by governments and the media. In China, the Communist Party has hitched its legitimacy to issues of national sovereignty. This means two things: that it makes mountains out of territorial molehills; and that it purposefully inflates sovereignty issues in the national consciousness as a means of reinforcing its own perceived relevance. The Chinese media are not the government, but they often serve as a crude megaphone for official policy, both amplifying and simplifying Beijing’s private discussion for public consumption. As such, Chinese nationalism has been turned into an endorsement of the Party, just as the defense of Diaoyu – the idea, if not the real island – has become the Party’s raison d’etre. Of course, Chinese people aren’t allowed to protest publicly about other issues, so it isn’t all that surprising that they should have leapt at the opportunity to protest about this one. And they certainly do hate Japan – the idea, if not the real place. In Japan, where there are other things to complain about, hearts are not beating quite so fast over the Diaoyu/Senkaku islands. But politicians who see nationalism as a vote-winner are doing what they can to quicken pulses. It’s a sorry advert for democracy when Japanese politicians play the nationalism card with all the cynicism of their Chinese counterparts.

#### Zero risk of cooperation – the U.S. will block all investment sharing and technology transfers in terms of oil and gas production

Wilson Center 5-31-12 (Chinese Investment in North American Energy, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/chinese-investment-north-american-energy)

While Chinese foreign energy investment is on the rise, the more notable story is China’s shift from a net importer of capital to a nation of massive capital outflows, said Adam Lysenko of the Rhodium Group. Energy investment—initially stalled in the wake of the aborted acquisition of Union Oil Company of California (UNOCAL) by China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC) in 2005—has increased exponentially with $18.3 billion in bids in 2011 alone. Learning lessons about American protectionism, Chinese firms have changed their strategies since the failed UNOCAL deal and now have made multiple smaller investments that will not attract unwanted political attention. In addition to raw materials, Chinese companies are looking to gain expertise in exploiting these resources for use at home. As for alternative energy, Chinese companies are starting to invest in North American production to get around tariffs. Currently, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) process appears adequate, but the political environment is hurting investment unnecessarily. Lysenko added that many Chinese firms are starting new corporations in the emerging alternative energy industry to avoid CFIUS scrutiny. In order to keep Chinese investments growing, the United States has to find a way to separate national security from politics. While Chinese investment has increased exponentially in the last four years, its total impact should not be exaggerated, said Bo Kong from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. CNOOC’s difficulty in acquiring UNOCAL jaded many Chinese investors from investing in the United States, which significantly slowed the flow of investment in the North American energy industry. Chinese companies’ hesitancy to repeat the failure of the UNOCAL deal and American companies’ concerns about both political interference and intellectual property (IP) theft have tempered Chinese investment in North America. However, smaller and more diverse investments on the part of Chinese companies and more safeguards to protect U.S. IP should help accelerate investment in the future. All three Chinese state-owned oil companies are also listed on the New York Stock Exchange, which indicates a willingness to be more transparent. Getting more Chinese companies involved in research and development will lead to a greater respect for international IP laws. Historically, Japan and South Korea were not good stewards of intellectual property, but as both nations started to develop their own technology, they began to respect IP laws. Many feel that increased investment by Chinese firms in research and development will lead to a similar evolution. While China is a resource-hungry and growing country, the real benefit to North American investment is not the energy extracted but rather the techniques and knowledge gleaned from U.S. and Canadian companies, which will allow China’s companies to better extract resources at home.

## \*\*\*2NC

### \*\*\*Energy Production K

### Overview --- Framework

#### The roll of the ballot is to vote for the best act of knowledge production, the judge is a critic of argument---this is best,

#### a.) debate realism: the plan won’t happen if you vote aff, all you are doing is endorsing a particular educational model, the only portable skill we get from debate is advocacy skills, voting aff means they are doing the better advocating for change, voting neg means they are doing a bad job.

#### If we win any of our link arguments it means they are not doing the better debating because they train us to be good energy forecasters for shell oil which is bad, they assume energy is a homogenous entity where any combination of interchange can occur, that causes energy shortages, resource wars and serial policy failure.

#### b.) the political Our links also turn their policy making good offense, they will result in bad policies and collapse the political by having a solely supply based solution to the energy problem, assuming the only thing that need be changed out of our consumption, infrastructure and mindset problems is our supply brackets off key political discussions and deemphasizes genuine contestation.

#### c.) A focus on policy relevance precludes the structural change necessary to establish energy security for more than just the privileged few.

Levy 2012

Gabriel, Deconstructing “energy security”: some questions, People and Nature, http://peopleandnature.wordpress.com/2012/03/04/deconstructing-energy-security-some-questions/

– On the other hand, the report repeatedly refers to “policymakers” – which to my mind is a generalisation almost as woolly and meaningless as “energy security”. Usually, this word conjours up a picture of besuited smart-alecs in parliamentary offices: the politicians, the assistants who work for them, the academics who construct arguments for them and the lobbyists who lobby them. The idea that such people will effect social change is ridiculous. More insidious, though, is the danger that social movements will get channelled into narrow “political” campaigns, inspired by illusions that “policymakers” can at least be our levers … whereas the big issues posed by the report – e.g. the achievement of energy security as the use of energy by all – can only be addressed by much more sweeping social transformations.

### Link

#### The aff wants to change energy while also keeping it as status quo as possible, fossil fuels is what has caused warming, but we don’t want to stop using them, so we will take the c02 out of the air and shove it deep into the earth. This ignores tons of externalities

---fossil fuels fuck up poor, energy security only for a privledged few

#### Unquestioned embrace of CCS technology risks extinction---questioning consumption patterns is critical to achieve sufficiency instead of sustainability

Cock 11 (Jacklyn Cock is a Professor Emeritus in the Department of Sociology at the University of the Witwatersrand, and an honorary research associate of the Society, Work and Development (SWOP) Institute. She has written extensively on militarization, gender and environmentalism in Southern Africa. Her latest book is The War Against Ourselves. Nature, Power and Justice. (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2007). She has a PhD from Rhodes University and has been a visiting scholar at Wolfson College, Oxford University, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, and the Center for Historical Analysis, Rutgers University“‘Green Capitalism’ or Environmental Justice? A Critique of the Sustainability Discourse” http://www.hsf.org.za/resource-centre/focus-chapters/focus-63-chapters/Jacklyn%20Cock.pdf)

Green capitalism The ecological crisis is not some future and indeterminate event. It is now generally acknowledged that we are in the first stages of ecological collapse. Capital’s response to the ecological crisis is that the system can continue to expand by creating a new ‘sustainable’ or ‘green capitalism’, bringing the efficiency of the market to bear on nature and its reproduction. These visions amount to little more than “a renewed strategy for profiting from planetary destruction” 1 . The business of ‘sustainability’, in this view, is simply “a new frontier for accumulation in which carbon trading is the model scheme” 2 . The two pillars on which ‘green capitalism’ rests are technological innovation and expanding markets while keeping the existing institutions of capitalism intact. This is Thomas Friedman’s ‘green revolution’ which relies on linking the two. As he insists, green technology represents “the mother of all markets” 3 . More specifically, ‘green capitalism’ involves: • appeals to nature (and even the crisis) as a marketing tool; • developing largely untested clean coal technology through Carbon Capture and Storage, which involves installing equipment that captures carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases and then pumping the gas underground; • the development of new sources of energy such as solar, nuclear and wind, thereby creating new markets; • the massive development of biofuels, which involves diverting land from food production; • the carbon trading regime enshrined in the Kyoto Protocols. Many of these strategies put the onus of solving climate change on changing individual life styles. This individualizing is illustrated by Al Gore’s documentary An Inconvenient Truth and relies heavily on manipulative advertising – ‘greenwash’ – to persuade us of the efficacy of these strategies. Greenwash is also evident in much corporate sustainability reporting as part of their presentation of a benign image of themselves. ‘Sustainability’: the ideological anchor of green capitalism. In South Africa, as elsewhere, there has been a steep growth in the number of companies producing sustainability reports, and in the emergence of various corporate indicators and guidelines. Media coverage is growing with, in 2010 alone, a Financial Times Special Report on Sustainability, the publication of the quarterly Trialogue Sustainability Review as a supplement to the Financial Mail, and the Earth supplement to the daily newspaper, Business Day. The current emphasis is on how sustainability can increase profitability or, in the sanitized language of capital, “can add value to a company”. In 2004, the Johannesburg Stock Exchange introduced the Socially Responsible Investment Index (SRI) to “help crystallize good triple-bottom line and governance policy and practices”. Companies apply to be listed – in 2008, 61 companies made it onto the index, from 105 companies that were reviewed for inclusion 4 . According to an asset manager, “Very important is that [social responsibility] should not mean lower returns. In fact it should sometimes mean higher returns as the profile of some of these investments can be higher risk and lower liquidity” 5 . Chris Laszio’s Sustainable Value: How the world’s leading companies are doing well by doing good emphasizes the importance of a company’s reputation, goodwill and stakeholder relationships. Based on this assumption, Laszio develops a strong business case for taking a systematic approach to building stakeholder value, including shareholder value, through the integration of sustainability in all aspects of a business 6 .The cynicism involved is also illustrated by a statement from a Santam executive, “Even if you don’t believe in climate change, it makes financial sense”. In similar terms it has been claimed that the climate crisis represents “a lucrative entrepreneurial opportunity” 7 .This is congruent with the treatment of disasters (often ecological) as exciting market opportunities, described by Klein as ‘disaster capitalism’ 8 . Similarly, for the JSE, “[I]nvesting in sustainability makes sense” 9 . From July 2010 all companies listed on the JSE are required to publish an integrated sustainability report. Thus the worst corporate polluters in South Africa all now produce lengthy sustainability reports. ArcelorMittal SA’s 2009 sustainability report claims that “[o]ver the last year, we made an even greater commitment to engagement with all stakeholder groups by accelerating interactions with communities, employees, regulators, government and advocacy groups”. This claim, however, is hotly disputed by Phineas Malapela, the chair of the Vaal Environmental Justice Alliance 10 .Other major polluters show a total neglect of environmental factors in their definition of sustainable development. For example, BHP Billiton, “the world’s leading diversified natural resources company,” describes “the company’s vision of Sustainable Development” as follows: “to be the company of choice – creating sustainable value for shareholders, employees, contractors, suppliers, customers, business partners and host communities.” 11 The main concern of the corporations remains profitability: the awareness that shrinking natural resources could damage it, while measures such as energy efficiency could reduce costs, reduce risks and enhance a company’s public image. The former CEO of Walmart recently described sustainability as “the single biggest business opportunity of the 21st century and the next main source of competitive advantage” 12 . Hence the opening claim: the sustainability discourse has been appropriated by neo-liberal capitalism. Critiques of green capitalism Critiques of ‘green capitalism’ are rooted in the understanding that it is capital’s logic of accumulation that is destroying the ecological conditions that sustain life: through the pollution and consumption of natural resources, destruction of habitats and biodiversity, and global warming. The expansionist logic of the capitalist system means it is not sustainable. As Barbara Harris-White claims, “sustainable capitalism is a fiction” 13 . She writes, “sustainability has never been given a testable definition… it has been watered down to ‘resources sustainably available in the environment’ and even leached into mere ‘growth’” 14 . Joel Kovel stresses that the cause of the ecological crisis is the expansionist logic of the capitalist system, and in similar terms, Vandana Shiva stresses, “the same corporate interests that have created the crisis try to offer the disease as the cure – more fossil fuel based chemical fertilizers 15 .” If capitalism continues, the future looks grim. If capitalism remains the dominant social order we can expect unbearable climate conditions, an intensification of social and ecological crises and, as Ian Angus writes, “the spread of the most barbaric forms of class rule, as the imperialist powers fight among themselves and with the global south for continued control of the world’s diminishing resources. At worst human life may not survive 16 .” But – at least in the short run – as ecological breakdown accelerates, the dominant classes will survive, living in protected enclaves in what Foster calls a fortress world. “Fortress World is a planetary apartheid system, gated and maintained by force, in which the gap between global rich and global poor constantly widens and the differential access to environmental resources and amenities increases sharply. It consists of bubbles of privilege amidst oceans of misery 17 .” This retreat into fortified enclaves already exists in South Africa – now the most unequal society in the world – as the powerful and the privileged move into the growing number of gated communities and golf estates.However, the argument that the discourse of sustainability is the ideological anchor of green capitalism does not mean we should throw the baby out with the bathwater: the immediate challenge is to reclaim the notion of sustainability by linking it to considerations of justice. Critique of the concept of sustainable development When the concept of sustainable development was launched at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, 1992, it held out great potential. By the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, the concept had become vacuous and was largely about sustaining economic growth at virtually any ecological cost. The concept of sustainable development says nothing about justice and has been extensively criticised for the vagueness which has enabled it to be incorporated into neo-liberal approaches. It allows environmentalism to be voided of political content and “be defined as a public concern with environmental deterioration - a concern, not necessarily the object of a social struggle, a cause without conflict 18 .” Giddens writes, “‘Sustainable development’ is more of a slogan than an analytical concept” 19 and dismisses it as “something of an oxymoron” 20 .The discourse of sustainable development is, of course, an advance on earlier protectionist models of environmentalism in that it is concerned with ‘human needs’. But it is generally marked by technicist, pragmatic and reformist attempts to bring environmental externalities into the marketplace through ecological modernisation. The discourse of environmental justice provides a radical alternative. As the leading US anti-toxics activist, Louis Gibbs, has argued, “the growing environmental justice movement asks the question, ‘What is morally correct?’ instead of ‘What is legally, scientifically and pragmatically possible?’” This is very relevant for us in South Africa. During the apartheid regime, environmentalism effectively operated as a conservation strategy that neglected social needs. The notion of environmental justice represents an important shift away from this traditional authoritarian concept of environmentalism which was mainly concerned with the conservation of threatened plants, animals and wilderness areas, to include urban, health, labour and development issues 21 . Environmental justice is linked to social justice as an all-encompassing notion that affirms the value of life – all forms of life – against the interests of wealth, power and technology. Linking this broadened notion of justice to sustainability means that we have to rethink the notion of economic growth. Growth has come to mean “primarily growth in profits and wealth for a relative few” 22 . A transition to sustainability poses profound challenges to capital. There are simply not enough resources for all to enjoy the intensely consumerist and waste-creating lifestyles of the advanced industrial nations. As George Monbiot writes, “The continuous growth prescribed by modern economics, whether informed by Marx or Keynes or Hayek, depends on the notion that the planet has an infinite capacity to supply us with wealth and absorb our pollution. In a finite world this is impossible. Pull this rug from under the dominant economic theories and the whole system of thought collapses” 23 .Water Domestic consumption makes up about 12% of South Africa’s water usage. More than half of this goes to the largely white, affluent suburbs with their gardens, swimming pools and golf courses. Meanwhile, in the name of sustainability and cost recovery, pre-paid water meters have been installed in many South African townships. The logic of these technological tools is to restrain use in the context of scarcity. The basic need for water (a right in terms of our post-apartheid constitution) becomes a commodity to be bought and sold. They have had devastating impacts on the poor. The basic allocation of 6,000 litres of free water monthly works out at 25 litres per person per day in an 8 person household, enough to flush the toilet twice. The amount should be compared to the average household consumption of 45 – 60,000 litres in the predominantly white suburbs 24 .The growing numbers of golf courses use an average of one million litres of water a day. For example, the Pecanwood Golf Estate near Johannesburg uses the average amount of 1.5 million litres of water a day 25 . A sight visit in 2009 confirmed that some of the Pecanwood workers, who live in a nearby informal settlement, have to walk 5 km to buy water at R3 for 20 litres. The township residents with pre-paid water meters are fortunate by comparison.Linking justice and sustainability would involve a higher free component funded through a sharply rising block tariff – in other words, a much higher level of crosssubsidisation from the wealthy to the poor. Energy In South Africa almost a quarter of households lack adequate access to electricity, either due to the lack of infrastructure or unaffordable pre-paid meters. They have to rely on dangerous paraffin stoves and candles, or the time consuming collection of firewood. The outcome is shack fires that sweep through informal settlements in South Africa almost every weekend. These are fires in which the poorest of the poor lose all their possessions and sometimes even their lives. Justice demands the provision of affordable energy for all. Instead, the post-apartheid state is prioritising corporate interests: thus the revelation the parastatal, Eskom, has been supplying electricity to multinationals such as BHP Billiton at 12c a kilowatt hour – below the cost of electricity production. Meanwhile, the free allowance of 70 kilowatt hours per household per month is grossly inadequate. Linking justice and sustainability demands that energy takes the form of not only affordable but clean and safe energy – which means renewable energy. Access to both energy and water should involve linking sustainability and justice. The problem is the logic of commodification in the form of the cost recovery policies that constitute the foundation of neo-liberal capitalism. The outcome for the poor is deprivation either in the form of the harsh restrictions imposed by pre-paid meters or the service disconnections for the many households that have fallen into arrears Conclusion We are living in a period when our relationship to nature is being dramatically transformed through this process of commodification. More and more of nature is being framed in terms of exchange value and mediated through the market. According to Burawoy this commodification of nature is the “central feature” of the contemporary period of “third wave marketisation” or neo-liberal capitalism26 . The outcome is a world in which billions are chronically malnourished, lacking access to clean water and electricity. This is surely not a world we want to sustain. For all these reasons, Joel Kovel prefers the term sufficiency. “Sufficiency makes more sense, building a world where nobody is hungry or cold or lacks health care or succor in old age… Sufficiency is a better term than... sustainability, as the latter leaves ambiguous the question of whether what is to be sustained is the existing system or not. 27 ” The threat of ecological collapse means that there is an urgent need for debate and, at least, a questioning of the appropriation of the sustainability discourse by capital, as well as the economistic bias which ignores how the emphasis on growth furthers negative distributional and environmental impacts. This involves challenging what Jane Goodall has termed the ‘dark forces’, particularly the vested interests involved in the fossil fuel industry 28 . The paradigmatic ‘dark force’ at the moment is BP. This is what the ‘prince of darkness’, the CEO of BP, had to say recently about the transition to a low carbon economy: “…we have before us a period of economic transition as great as, if not greater than, the Industrial Revolution” 29 . Our survival depends on how we act now

### Technical Reform Link --- Climate

#### ---Framing global warming as a security issue requiring energy policy reform encourages the restriction of proposed solutions to the technical realm and trading off with a laundry list of environmental problems that each independently risk extinction. Only the alternative’s act of politicization can address and draw connections between instances of ecosystem destruction.

Crist 2007

Eileen, Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse, Telos 141 Winter, pg. 29-55

While the dangers of climate change are real, I argue that there are even greater dangers in representing it as the most urgent problem we face. Framing climate change in such a manner deserves to be challenged for two reasons: it encourages the restriction of proposed solutions to the technical realm, by powerfully insinuating that the needed approaches are those that directly address the problem; and it detracts attention from the planet’s ecological predicament as a whole, by virtue of claiming the limelight for the one issue that trumps all others. Identifying climate change as the biggest threat to civilization, and ushering it into center stage as the highest priority problem, has bolstered the proliferation of technical proposals that address the specific challenge. The race is on for figuring out what technologies, or portfolio thereof, will solve “the problem.” Whether the call is for reviving nuclear power, boosting the installation of wind turbines, using a variety of renewable energy sources, increasing the efficiency of fossil-fuel use, developing carbon-sequestering technologies, or placing mirrors in space to deflect the sun’s rays, the narrow character of such proposals is evident: confront the problem of greenhouse gas emissions by technologically phasing them out, superseding them, capturing them, or mitigating their heating effects. In his The Revenge of Gaia, for example, Lovelock briefly mentions the need to face climate change by “changing our whole style of living.”16 But the thrust of this work, what readers and policy-makers come away with, is his repeated and strident call for investing in nuclear energy as, in his words, “the one lifeline we can use immediately.”17 In the policy realm, the first step toward the technological fix for global warming is often identified with implementing the Kyoto protocol. Biologist Tim Flannery agitates for the treaty, comparing the need for its successful endorsement to that of the Montreal protocol that phased out the ozone-depleting CFCs. “The Montreal protocol,” he submits, “marks a signal moment in human societal development, representing the first ever victory by humanity over a global pollution problem.”18 He hopes for a similar victory for the global climate-change problem. Yet the deepening realization of the threat of climate change, virtually in the wake of stratospheric ozone depletion, also suggests that dealing with global problems treaty-by-treaty is no solution to the planet’s predicament. Just as the risks of unanticipated ozone depletion have been followed by the dangers of a long underappreciated climate crisis, so it would be naïve not to anticipate another (perhaps even entirely unforeseeable) catastrophe arising after the (hoped-for) resolution of the above two. Furthermore, if greenhouse gases were restricted successfully by means of technological shifts and innovations, the root cause of the ecological crisis as a whole would remain unaddressed. The destructive patterns of production, trade, extraction, land-use, waste proliferation, and consumption, coupled with population growth, would go unchallenged, continuing to run down the integrity, beauty, and biological richness of the Earth. Industrial-consumer civilization has entrenched a form of life that admits virtually no limits to its expansiveness within, and perceived entitlement to, the entire planet.19 But questioning this civilization is by and large sidestepped in climate-change discourse, with its single-minded quest for a global-warming techno-fix.20 Instead of confronting the forms of social organization that are causing the climate crisis—among numerous other catastrophes—climate-change literature often focuses on how global warming is endangering the culprit, and agonizes over what technological means can save it from impending tipping points.21 The dominant frame of climate change funnels cognitive and pragmatic work toward specifically addressing global warming, while muting a host of equally monumental issues. Climate change looms so huge on the environmental and political agenda today that it has contributed to downplaying other facets of the ecological crisis: mass extinction of species, the devastation of the oceans by industrial fishing, continued old-growth deforestation, topsoil losses and desertification, endocrine disruption, incessant development, and so on, are made to appear secondary and more forgiving by comparison with “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. In what follows, I will focus specifically on how climate-change discourse encourages the continued marginalization of the biodiversity crisis—a crisis that has been soberly described as a holocaust,22 and which despite decades of scientific and environmentalist pleas remains a virtual non-topic in society, the mass media, and humanistic and other academic literatures. Several works on climate change (though by no means all) extensively examine the consequences of global warming for biodiversity,23 but rarely is it mentioned that biodepletion predates dangerous greenhouse-gas buildup by decades, centuries, or longer, and will not be stopped by a technological resolution of global warming. Climate change is poised to exacerbate species and ecosystem losses—indeed, is doing so already. But while technologically preempting the worst of climate change may temporarily avert some of those losses, such a resolution of the climate quandary will not put an end to—will barely address—the ongoing destruction of life on Earth.

### \*\*\*States CP

### at: conditionality

#### Counter interpretation---the negative gets X conditional advocacies, even if its arbitrary its logical and limited and we should only have to defend what we did

#### ---policy making: all analysts have the option to stick with the status quo, there interpretation is contrived and self serving, makes education less portable.

#### ---negative flexibility: the aff gets the first and last speech and as much prep as they want to find the best cards for their aff, their ground is always more specific and familiar, this counterplan is necessary to reign that in.

---Education-Argument breadth has benefits. If depth were the only value, teams wouldn’t be allowed to debate more than one advantage or disadvanatge per round. Exploring the range of issues on a subject is also intellectualy important.

#### ---doesn’t harm the aff, had to make the blocks anyway, plan key skwo bad.

#### ---Time limits aren’t an answer

A. Time is finite in debate. Running one argument inherently trades off with another.

B. Other arguments make this non-unique. Multipe topicality arguments, two card disads, or kritiks equally distort time.

C. Creating time pressure and making time based decisions is an inherent part of debate strategy. It’s an acceptable part of all other debate arguments.

---Advocacy concerns aren’t decisive.

A. In the real world, policies are attacked from a variety of perspectives. In debate there is only one negative team, so to encompass the true range of potential counter-affirmative advocacy, multiple positions must be allowed.

B. debate practice isn’t consistent with the advocacy paradigm. Strategic concessions by the affirmative and permutations allow the affirmative to advocate multiple positions.

### No link politics

#### No federal role is needed---the states can take care of it

Amann 10 Scholarly Group of Environmental and Energy Experts (Rachel Amann, December 31, 2010, “A Policy, Legal, and Regulatory Evaluation of the Feasibility of a National Pipeline Infrastructure for the Transport and Storage of Carbon Dioxide: Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission,” http://www.sseb.org/downloads/pipeline.pdf)

Today, no federal role is required in order to develop CO2 pipeline projects. The assumption that a federal mandate will produce the desired result (capture, transportation, and storage of nationally produced CO2) may not follow. Other state-based regulatory solutions should be carefully considered before pursuit of an untested federal strategy that could prove harmful to future CO2 pipeline construction.

#### The states have jurisdiction, not the usfg

Wolfe 10Holland and Hart Law Firm, Over 400 Lawyers (Lawrence J. Wolfe, September 30, 2010, “TRANSPORTING CO2 – ACCELERATING PIPELINE INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT,” [http://www.hollandhart.com/articles/Wolfe\_CCSPPT\_SummitWashDC.pdf)](http://www.hollandhart.com/articles/Wolfe_CCSPPT_SummitWashDC.pdf)//DR)

Siting of new CO2 pipelines is not regulated by any Federal agency. Both FERC and the STB (and predecessor agency ICC) have declined jurisdiction over CO2 pipelines.

Siting is currently left to the States.

Rates charged by CO2 pipelines are not regulated by any Federal agency, except the STB will hear complaints about rates.

No Federal eminent domain for CO2 pipelines

#### Interstate compacts provide certainty

Amann 10 Rachel, Scholarly Group of Environmental and Energy Experts, December 31, 2010, “A Policy, Legal, and Regulatory Evaluation of the Feasibility of a National Pipeline Infrastructure for the Transport and Storage of Carbon Dioxide: Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission,” http://www.sseb.org/downloads/pipeline.pdf

Elements of the Status Quo, Multi-state Compact Option, or the Natural Gas Pipeline Models (NGPM) may be useful for further study to determine which are most compatible with the various business models discussed earlier. The status quo where CO2 pipeline regulation is left to the states and handled on a state-by-state basis has resulted in the development of more than 4,000 miles of CO2 pipeline to date. The current level of oversight provided by the federal government through the Office of Pipeline Safety and its safety regulations is both effective and sufficient as indicated by 40 years of safe operation of CO2 pipelines. Although this option is best suited to intrastate networks, there is no indication that continued operation under the current regulatory framework would inhibit interstate or intrastate pipeline development. The multi-state compact option that allows states to act collectively through shared/common regulatory provisions may offer unique advantages over the status quo decentralized system or a future centralized, federal regulatory system. Compacts can be structured uniquely to accommodate any business model. Furthermore, while maintaining state sovereignty, compacts provide a streamlined process for developing interstate infrastructure that encompasses multiple jurisdictions. Pipeline developers would have greater certainty as requirements for operating across multiple jurisdictions would be readily known, thereby saving time in navigating multiple regulatory requirements and expediting and streamlining the permitting process, saving operators both time and money as they seek to permit future CO2 pipelines. However, a disadvantage to the compact option is the potential for creating geographic windows or competing compacts that would diminish regulatory consistency.

### Spending

#### The counterplan solves deficit spending and the multiplier effect---this is a solvency advocate for uniform action.

Attewell 9 (Steven Attewell is completing his PhD in history at the University of California at Santa Barbara, where he specializes in the history of public policy. His dissertation discusses the history of public employment from the New Deal to the rise of Reagan. He co-authors a blog called “The Realignment Project”, which discusses current political developments and proposed policies through the lens of history. “Fifty-State Keynesianism - Part Deux” http://www.economicpopulist.org/content/fifty-state-keynesianism-part-deux)

A 50-State Solution: One of the things that's often puzzled me about the progressive movement is our lack of willingness to use the initiative process to our advantage in both achieving policy ends and mobilizing the electorate - consider the way in which the Republican Party used anti-gay marriage propositions in 2002 and 2004 to gin up their right-wing base, change the political debate from economic issues to their wedge issues, and attack the civil rights and civil liberties of queer Americans. In 2006, we saw a little bit of this strategy on the progressive side, using minimum wage initiatives to increase working class turnout in states like Ohio, but to the best of my knowledge it hasn't become a standard part of the Democratic Party political toolkit. Hence, the first step in establishing "50-state Keynesianism" is to promote, state-by-state an "Anti-Recession Budget Reform Initiative." (if anyone has a better name for it, I'm open to suggestions). This initiative should amend the state constitution's balanced budget requirement to allow the state, when the economy is in recession (i.e, two quarters of negative economic growth) to run a limited deficit (two years maximum) for the purposes of funding counter-cyclical stimulus programs (limited to say, 5-10% of state GDP). We should begin our push in those areas which are deep blue states and which tend to have weaker balanced budget requirements - New England would be a good starting place, especially with Vermont as the lone non-balanced budget state sitting there as a model for how deficit spending won't destroy western civilization. The Rust Belt states that have been especially hit hard, like Michigan or Ohio, would probably be receptive to a message that it's better to spend money to create jobs than to balance a budget by throwing teachers and other state workers out of their jobs. As usual, the major prizes would be New York and California, given their size and political weight. Second, in order to build state capacity for Keynesian economic policy, we should also push for the creation of State Reserve Banks. Here, I really have to credit Ellen Brown over at the Huffington Post for promoting this idea and bringing it to my attention. This amazingly simple yet powerful idea takes its example from, of all places, the state of North Dakota, which has operated the Bank of North Dakota since 1919. It works like this - the state charters a public bank, and instead of placing its reserves, tax revenues, deeds for public lands, and so forth in a variety of state banks (as most states do), it puts all of them in the public bank to act as the bank's capital base. (Note: as long as the bank only circulates U.S dollars, it's perfectly constitutional, avoiding the Article I, Section 10 bar against states issuing coin or bills of credit) The bank then acts like a reserve bank, using the power of "fractional reserve lending" (i.e, that a bank can generate much more money in loans than it keeps in its vaults, thus multiplying many times over its actual reserves, as long as it keeps back a portion to redeem deposits) to generate loans, act as a local "lender of last resort" (thus buttressing the work of the Federal Reserve and FDIC during credit crises), and (this is the key bit) allowing the State to borrow money in order to deficit spend in a recession without relying on the ideologically-biased bond market and the credit agencies who've taken a hammer to state bond ratings while maintaining A ratings for AIG and Lehman Brothers. The State could then use these loans (which would be much cheaper than ordinary bonds, given that its essentially paying interest to itself) to maintain public services and fund public works and other stimulus measures in a recession. Let's take California as an example. The state has a normal workforce of 18.5 million people, of which 2.146 million are currently unemployed (a rate of 11.6%). The objective of a new job insurance system would be to create enough jobs to bring the rate down to an acceptable level - say, by 50% down to 5.8%. (Note, while I would consider 5.8% unemployment to be unnecessarily high, and while we may want to consider ultimately lowering the official "acceptable rate," for the moment, let's consider simply meeting the immediate crisis). In order to create 1,073,000 jobs, the state would need to spend approximately $40 billion (taking into account wages, payroll taxes, and non-labor costs such as equipment, materials and land - although the state would probably require counties and localities to put up at least part of the latter two items). Now, if we were simply to fund this off of Job Insurance contributions, you're looking at $200 a month, which is quite high, although I imagine that it would be affordable for middle class folks and up. However, if you were to split the costs between contributions and State Reserve Bank lending (and/or general fund contributions), you could drop it to $100 a month (50-50), or $33 a month (say, 33/66 or, 33/33 and 33 from general fund). Note that this is the cost if you have to do it all in one go - if we think about this a system to prevent the next recession, you can implement the Job Insurance system in economic good times, and build up a reserve, which would allow you to run the system on still lower job insurance premiums - a $20 a month premium for example, would allow you to build up $4 billion a year, allowing you to build up $20 billion in just 5 years. Moreover, if you create a target for jobs to be created when unemployment grows to a certain level, the lower the level, the cheaper the program. If, for example, California had done this back in October 2008 when unemployment was only 8%, it would only have cost $29.6 billion to reduce the unemployment rate down to 4%, which would have buoyed consumer spending, forestalled foreclosures, and prevented further job losses in the private sector.

### at: 50 state fiat bad

#### Counterintreptatation---the judge is a policy analyst and the negative can fiat state action when the aff defends the usfg---

#### Offense---

#### Advocacy skills---being forced to defend the federal government as the best actor teaches the aff how to defend their policy choice from all angles and encourages through research before deciding to read it, that kind of education outweighs because it is more portable.

Energy policy making---the cp is grounded in the lit and key to good decision making

Brownt, JD-Seattle, 08 (Daniel, Executive Constraint, Judicial Uncertainty, and Legislative Complacency: Washington Responds with a Progressive Approach to Climate Change, Seattle University Law Review, Spring, 31 Seattle Univ. L. R. 707, lexis)

B. Congressional Intervention Is Critical Given the Grave Danger Posed by Global Warming

Congress should empower the states to combat global warming through their use of tax incentives. Global warming poses a grave danger, not only to this nation, but to the international community as well. 207 Moreover, climate change is not strictly an environmental problem; rather it is a "scientific, diplomatic, technological, educational, social, economic, political, and ethical problem unlike any issue that decision makers or society previously have tackled." 208 States should be permitted to address this complex issue with a wide assortment of interrelated policies. Indeed, while energy policy, tax policy, and global warming may seem like unrelated topics at first glance, they are, in fact, inextricably linked. 209 Many states, including Washington, have recognized the inextricable link between energy and tax policy and have begun to combat global warming by promoting renewable energy. Commentators have noted that "a properly designed energy-efficiency policy, including a market incentive to reduce fossil fuel consumption, together with cuts in other taxes, would be beneficial to a substantial majority of U.S. businesses." 210 Significantly, states like Washington have created a hybrid [\*732] approach that combats climate change while stimulating economic growth via tax incentives at the same time.

#### Neg flex---the aff gets the first and last speech and as much prep as they want to find the best cards for their aff, their ground is always more specific and familiar, this counterplan is necessary to reign that in.

#### Future academics---learning about state policy is of vital importance, its increasingly relevant

Watkins 12 – Thesis for partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Departmental Honors in Economics at Wesleyan University [Miles, April 2012, “Party in the House? Examining the Effects of Political Control on State Government Spending,” Page 3-4, <http://wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1796&context=etd_hon_theses>]

Focusing on American state governments, rather than those at the national or local levels, offers *several methodological advantages*. The states together provide a cross-section of data that is consistent over time, where all units face a “common institutional framework and cultural milieu” (Dye 1966 p. 11). This would not be available in a study of federal spending, and allows for the use of more powerful and precise econometric techniques; for example, I am able to eliminate from my regressions the perturbing effects of a state’s culture, geography, and political history. State data also trumps that of local governments, which suffer from incomplete and highly disaggregated information. Especially pertinent to my study is the fact that the majority of municipalities hold nonpartisan elections; this would prevent me from using an unbiased sample in my regressions (Ferreira & Gyourko 2009). Overall, little is sacrificed by choosing to study the states; the results of my study of state governments are largely applicable to local and federal ones as well, since in general there are great similarities in politics between different levels of American government (Gray et al. 1985 p. 89). Beyond those statistical issues, state public policy is also worthy of analysis in and of itself. States provide residents with crucial public goods and services, such as welfare, higher education, and transportation infrastructure. Further, in light of an increasingly polarized and gridlocked Washington, in the coming years state governments will likely take on more importance in determining the economic and social future of the United States (Katz & Bradley 2011).

#### Defense---

#### Reciprocal---they fiat multiple actors as well, the Congress passing the funding, the president signing it and the DOE enforcing it.

#### Predicable, states is on every domestic topic, our 1nc evidence proves people write about it

#### Err neg, this topic is huge and restrictions affs make qpq and free market cp’s impossible, the counterplan is key to check topic explosion which creates ill planned and poorly researched debates.

#### Reject the argument not the team, cp theory is a scope of fiat question, punishment is the wrong method to discourage certain strategies, trying to win the debate is just doing our job

### **\*\*\*Oil Defense**

Thompsan

We see a huge opportunity to partner with China here, to bring lower‑cost Chinese CO2 capture technology to the US. A bigger supply of lower-cost CO2 will in turn help capture more of our oil. In turn, we can **export EOR tech**nology **back to China**.

first

cooperation between the U.S. and China on CCS could be vital for both countries and spur the development of CCS around the world

accelerated technology transfer, particularly for the private sector, are also crucial. Many of these efforts are already underway, and Chinese government officials are open to proposals that can help them meet their targets

zha

Washington should continue to col­laborate with Beijing on China’s energy tech­nology development. The logic for doing so is simple: energy saved in China means an in­crease in worldwide supply and a reduction of pollutants into the air, which migrate across the Pacific Ocean. The areas for action in­clude working to increase the use of nuclear and other cleaner forms of power, improv­ing recovery rates of coal and oil production

Wilson Center 5-31-12 (Chinese Investment in North American Energy, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/chinese-investment-north-american-energy)

While Chinese foreign energy investment is on the rise, the more notable story is China’s shift from a net importer of capital to a nation of massive capital outflows, said Adam Lysenko of the Rhodium Group. Energy investment—initially stalled in the wake of the aborted acquisition of Union Oil Company of California (UNOCAL) by China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC) in 2005—has increased exponentially with $18.3 billion in bids in 2011 alone. Learning lessons about American protectionism, Chinese firms have changed their strategies since the failed UNOCAL deal and now have made multiple smaller investments that will not attract unwanted political attention. In addition to raw materials, Chinese companies are looking to gain expertise in exploiting these resources for use at home. As for alternative energy, Chinese companies are starting to invest in North American production to get around tariffs. Currently, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) process appears adequate, but the political environment is hurting investment unnecessarily. Lysenko added that many Chinese firms are starting new corporations in the emerging alternative energy industry to avoid CFIUS scrutiny. In order to keep Chinese investments growing, the United States has to find a way to separate national security from politics. While Chinese investment has increased exponentially in the last four years, its total impact should not be exaggerated, said Bo Kong from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. CNOOC’s difficulty in acquiring UNOCAL jaded many Chinese investors from investing in the United States, which significantly slowed the flow of investment in the North American energy industry. Chinese companies’ hesitancy to repeat the failure of the UNOCAL deal and American companies’ concerns about both political interference and intellectual property (IP) theft have tempered Chinese investment in North America. However, smaller and more diverse investments on the part of Chinese companies and more safeguards to protect U.S. IP should help accelerate investment in the future. All three Chinese state-owned oil companies are also listed on the New York Stock Exchange, which indicates a willingness to be more transparent. Getting more Chinese companies involved in research and development will lead to a greater respect for international IP laws. Historically, Japan and South Korea were not good stewards of intellectual property, but as both nations started to develop their own technology, they began to respect IP laws. Many feel that increased investment by Chinese firms in research and development will lead to a similar evolution. While China is a resource-hungry and growing country, the real benefit to North American investment is not the energy extracted but rather the techniques and knowledge gleaned from U.S. and Canadian companies, which will allow China’s companies to better extract resources at home.

Carroll-Emory International Law Review-09 (James, 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)

II. Post 9/11 Application of Exon-Florio After 9/11, the CFIUS process shifted to focus more on threats from non-state actors, most noticeably by including the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) among the departments heading the CFIUS board. This shift in focus resulted in the scrutiny of several transactions that did not fit into the traditional military-based interpretation of national security, such as the Chinese purchase of an oil company and the purchase of the operation of ports by an Arab company. The change in the Exon-Florio process culminated in the passage of FINSA, which codified a much broader interpretation of national security that encompassed energy assets and other critical infrastructure. A. A Shift in Foreign Policy Perspective Unsurprisingly, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 dramatically changed the American perspective on national security, including the scrutiny of foreign investment. When Exon-Florio passed, at the end of the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy was still focused on the realist, state-based model of international relations. 86 This realist model largely envisions foreign policy as a competition between states, in which states struggle to find the proper balance between deterrence and reassurance of other governments regarding their good intentions. 87 According to traditional conceptions of realism, non-governmental actors have little or no significant role to play in international relations. 88 The end of the Cold War and the widening web of globalization broadened the spectrum of foreign policy considerations somewhat, but it was not until after 9/11 that the U.S. national security apparatus really shifted to focus more on a range of non-state security threats. 89 The very nature of the 9/11 attacks made it clear that the instruments of globalization could be used to attack the international order itself, and there was a resultant effort on the part of the United States to secure various commercial facilities, such as airports, [\*180] chemical factories, and ports 90 - exemplified in the formation of the DHS to coordinate domestic security measures against terrorism. Consistent with the realist vision of foreign policy, Exon-Florio had focused on state-based acquisitions of defense-related technologies prior to 9/11, with an emphasis on the unique capabilities acquired by foreign governments or "lost" to the United States present in each transaction. 91 As part of the general paradigm change toward considering threats from non-state actors after 9/11, President Bush added the head of the DHS to the CFIUS board in February 2003. 92 Perhaps not coincidentally, "between January 2003 and December 2005, there were six [CFIUS] investigations, and five withdrawals, more than the previous ten years combined." 93 In 2006, the CFIUS conducted seven investigations, the most ever in a single year. 94 B. The Unocal Incident: Protectionism Run Amok The response to the attempt of CNOOC to purchase Unocal, an American oil company, exemplified the tighter CFIUS approach. 95 CNOOC, a Chinese state-owned oil company, regularly purchased foreign oil companies to create joint-ventures between itself and the foreign companies. 96 The Chinese government recognized that there would be a CFIUS review under the Byrd Amendment, since CNOOC was state-owned, but felt that ultimately there was no security risk and that the transaction would pass the CFIUS review. 97 However, on June 24, 2005, 41 members of Congress from both parties wrote to President Bush urging a thorough CFIUS review of the sale. 98 The letter justified the review by raising questions about "whether CNOOC was using Chinese government funds to make the purchase and whether China [\*181] would be acquiring sensitive technology." 99 Congress followed up this letter with the introduction of a resolution in the House on June 29, 2005, that recognized oil and natural gas as strategic national assets and argued that the purchase of Unocal would allow for the oil reserves to be preferentially sent to China - instead of purchasing them on the open market - thus opening up the possibility of China utilizing the "oil weapon" against the United States. 100 China hawks 101 echoed these arguments, claiming that the deal would give China more leverage over the international oil market and that regardless of the facts of the transaction, the symbolic nature of giving into China's resource goals should be prevented at all costs. 102 Unsurprisingly, hawkish arguments toward China played a large role in congressional opposition to the deal. 103 The Bush administration kept relatively quiet during the Unocal controversy, 104 and eventually CNOOC withdrew their bid in the face of the negative publicity. 105 The most remarkable aspect of this episode was the congressional majority's attempt to implicitly redefine national security. The definition of national security was no longer limited to technologies that were at least arguably related to the national defense industrial complex. Congressional opponents of the Unocal sale used public debate surrounding the deal to include energy assets in an expanded interpretation of national security and continued the long-running congressional struggle to use Exon-Florio and the CFIUS review process as a protectionist tool to prevent foreign investment in U.S. industry. 106 Previous CFIUS reviews focused on technological acquisitions that could allow foreign countries unique access to U.S. military capabilities, 107 in contrast to energy companies, which had no [\*182] direct connection to the military. If national security can also mean "important to the United States economy," as energy assets no doubt are, then the definition of national security differs in no meaningful sense from the original "essential commerce" bill that Reagan threatened to veto in order to strip the economic security provisions.

### **\*\*\*Warming Defense**

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### Nuclear winter outweighs and turns warming, faster, no adaptation.

Starr 2008

Steven, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Director of Clinical Laboratory Science Program, University of Missouri-Columbia, Catastrophic Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, Bulletin 28 April 2008, http://www.inesap.org/bulletin-28/catastrophic-climatic-consequences-nuclear-conflict

Climatic changes resulting from nuclear conflict would occur many thousands of times faster – and thus would likely be far more catastrophic – than the climatic changes predicted as a result of global warming.40 The rapidity of the war-induced changes, appearing in a matter of days and weeks, would allow human populations and the whole plant and animal kingdoms no time to adapt. It is worth noting that the same methods and climate models used to predict global warming were used in these studies to predict global cooling resulting from nuclear war. These climate models have proved highly successful in describing the cooling effects of volcanic clouds during extensive U.S. evaluations and in international intercomparisons performed as part of the Fourth Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.41 Predicted drops in average global temperatures caused by small, moderate, and large nuclear conflicts are contrasted with the effects of global warming during the last century in Figure 4 and with average surface air temperatures during the last 1,000 years in Figure 5. There are, of course, other important considerations which must be made when estimating the overall environmental and ecological impacts of nuclear war. These must include the release of enormous amounts of radioactive fallout, pyrotoxins, and toxic industrial chemicals into the ecosystems. A decade after the conflict, when the smoke begins to clear, there will also be massive increases in the amount of deadly ultraviolet light which will reach the surface of the Earth as a result of ozone depletion. All these by-products of nuclear war must be taken into account when comparing the danger of nuclear conflict to other potential dangers now confronting humanity and life on Earth. Conclusions We cannot allow our political and military leaders to continue to ignore the potential cataclysmic climatic and environmental consequences posed by the use of nuclear weapons. Civilization remains at risk from nuclear winter despite a three-fold reduction in global nuclear arsenals during the last 20 years. This is due in part to the fact that nuclear arms control agreements have focused primarily on the dismantlement of delivery systems and have failed to include the verified dismantlement of nuclear warheads. Future negotiations must consider all the potential effects of the total number of nuclear weapons in the nuclear arsenals.44 The U.S. and Russia must recognize the senselessness of continued planning for a nuclear first-strike which, if launched, would make the whole world including their own country uninhabitable. As a first step, they should end their preparations for the pre-emptive use of their nuclear arsenals, stand-down their high-alert strategic nuclear forces, and eliminate the standard operating procedure of launch-on-warning.45 It is essential that all the nuclear weapon states be convinced of the need to honor their commitments under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to “act in good faith” to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. As long as they ignore this commitment and maintain nuclear weaponry as the cornerstone of their military forces, they confer validity to the false idea that nuclear weapons provide security to those who possess them, and thus encourage non-nuclear weapon states to follow in their footsteps. The unalterable conclusion is that a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought. Nuclear weapons must be seen not only as instruments of mass murder, but as instruments of global annihilation which put all humanity and civilization under a common threat of destruction.

### **2nc ext---EOR=/=CCS**

Just because c02 eor involves putting c02 into the ground does not mean it is the right kind of carbon sequestration---there are 147 projects now and there has been no increase in our ability to sequestrate carbon---that’s the DOE ev

They have very little to do with eachother technologically, their arguments do not hold their water when put under engineering scrutiny

And, there is not enough supply of co2 to make the plan work

Department of Energy 10 (“CO2-driven Enhanced Oil Recovery as a Stepping Stone to What?” http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\_reports/PNNL-19557.pdf)

This simplified “Economics 101” discussion of supply and demand and resulting prices for CO2-EOR is not merely a macroeconomic phenomenon. There is also reason to question the scale and sustainability of revenues received by individual facilities selling CO2 to individual EOR projects. Here we present preliminary results of work to be formally presented this fall on the role of CO2-EOR when applied to a large CO2 point source such as a power plant (Davidson, Dooley and Dahowski 2010). Previous evaluations of economy-wide CCS deployment have typically applied a simplifying assumption that 100% of the potential storage capacity for a given formation is available on the first day of the analysis, as well as an assumption that the assumed injection rate impacts only the number of wells required to inject a given volume of fluid per year and is thus considered exclusively as a cost driver rather than a technical one. However, as discussed by Dahowski and Bachu (2006), storing CO2 in a field undergoing CO2-EOR is subject to a set of constraints to which storage in DSFs is not, and these constraints – particularly variable demand for CO2 – may strongly influence the ability of an EOR field to serve as a baseload storage formation for commercial scale CCS projects undertaken as a means of addressing climate change mitigation targets. While each EOR field will be unique and will respond to CO2 stimulation in different ways based on reservoir-specific characteristics and project design, Figure 7 illustrates the general pattern of high initial demand for new CO2 coupled with a decrease in demand as recycled CO2 is used for an increasingly larger portion of the total injection volume. This behavior is consistent with most current CO2-EOR practices and is critical to understanding the impact on commercial-scale CO2 storage in EOR fields. Again readers are encouraged to consult Leach et al. (2009) which models the same temporal dynamic; SSEB 2006 and IPCC 2005 also both make explicit reference to the changing demand for “new” CO2 as the CO2 flood matures and more CO2 is recycled. Here we apply the CO2 demand profile shown in Figure 7 to a hypothetical 1000 MW IGCC+CCS which produces 6 MtCO2 per year. We further assume that the IGCC is employing CCS as an alternative to paying an assumed significant disincentive associated with venting CO2 to the atmosphere. In order to avoid penalties associated with emitting CO2 not used by the CO2-EOR project, excess CO2 will need to be stored in a suitable nearby deep saline formation under this scenario.

### **2nc ext---ccs doesn’t solve**

Losses more energy than it saves

Richard 6 (Michael has been with TreeHugger since 2005. He started out as a part-time writer, but after about a year (circa February 2006) he made the transition to full-time editor-in-chief, citing Timothy Flannery, the Chief Commissioner of the Australian [Climate Commission](http://www.climatecommission.gov.au), an independent body providing information on climate change to the Australian public. is currently a professor at [Macquarie University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macquarie_University). He is also the chairman of the [Copenhagen Climate Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Climate_Council), an international climate change awareness group. “Important! Why Carbon Sequestration Won't Save Us” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/important-why-carbon-sequestration-wont-save-us.html)

What's next? Let's assume that some plants are built and the CO2 is captured. For every tonne of anthracite [coal] burned, 3.7 tonnes of CO2 is generated. If this voluminous waste could be pumped back into the ground below the power station it would not matter as much, but the rocks that produce coal are not often useful for storing CO2, which means that the gas much be transported. In the case of Australia's Hunter Valley coal mines, for example, it needs to be conveyed over Australia's Great Dividing Range and hundreds of kilometres to the west. [pipelines cost about $1 million per mile, more when terrain is rough and uneven.] Once the CO2 arrives at its destination it must be compressed into a liquid so it can be injected into the ground--a step that typically consumes 20 per cent of the energy yielded by burning coal in the first place. Then a kilometre-deep hole must be drilled and the CO2 injected. From that day on, the geological formation must be closely monitored; should the gas ever escape, it has the potential to kill. [...] The largest recent disaster caused by CO2 occurred in 1986, in Cameroon, central Africa. A volcanic crater-lake known as Nyos belched bubbles of CO2 into the still night air and the gas settled around the lake's shore, where it killed 1800 people and countless thousands of animals. Okay, so even more energy is lost by compressing the CO2 to liquid form and we must monitor for leaks. What else?

Run out of burying room

Richard 6 (Michael has been with TreeHugger since 2005. He started out as a part-time writer, but after about a year (circa February 2006) he made the transition to full-time editor-in-chief, citing Timothy Flannery, the Chief Commissioner of the Australian [Climate Commission](http://www.climatecommission.gov.au), an independent body providing information on climate change to the Australian public. is currently a professor at [Macquarie University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macquarie_University). He is also the chairman of the [Copenhagen Climate Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Climate_Council), an international climate change awareness group. “Important! Why Carbon Sequestration Won't Save Us” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/important-why-carbon-sequestration-wont-save-us.html)

Earth's crust is not a purpose-built vessel for holding CO2, and the storage must last thousands of years so the risk of leak must be taken seriously. Even the volume of CO2 generated by a sparsely populated country such as Australia beggars belief. Imagine a pile of 200-litre drums, ten kilometres long and five across, stacked ten drums high. [1.3 billion drums] Even when compressed to liquid form, that daily output would take up a cubic kilometre, and Australia accounts for less than 2 per cent of global emissions! Imagine injecting 50 cubic kilometre of liquid CO2 into the Earth's crust every day of the year for the next century or two. If geosequestration were to be practised on the scale needed to offset all the emissions from coal, the world would very quickly run out of A-grade reservoirs near power stations and, especially if the power companies are not liable for damages resulting from leaks, pressure would be on to utilise B, C, D and E grade reservoirs. Okay, so burying it in the ground is not so simple or safe - as the oil industry likes to remind us, drilling is expensive - and it's not a long-term solution since we will run out of convenient places to sequester the liquid CO2. Anything else?

#### Yes there is tons of land but most of it has not been tested and the EPA could have easily missed fault lines, that means the aff risks tons of earthquakes---that’s the 1nc Orcutt evidence

#### Timeframe----this means the plan is a delaying tactic that causes worse warming

Richard 6 (Michael has been with TreeHugger since 2005. He started out as a part-time writer, but after about a year (circa February 2006) he made the transition to full-time editor-in-chief, citing Timothy Flannery, the Chief Commissioner of the Australian [Climate Commission](http://www.climatecommission.gov.au), an independent body providing information on climate change to the Australian public. is currently a professor at [Macquarie University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macquarie_University). He is also the chairman of the [Copenhagen Climate Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Climate_Council), an international climate change awareness group. “Important! Why Carbon Sequestration Won't Save Us” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/important-why-carbon-sequestration-wont-save-us.html)

All of this suggests that the best case scenario for geosequestration is that it will play a small role (at most perhaps 10 per cent by 2050) in the world's energy future. Because action is needed now to combat climate change, both the public and the marketplace need to see proof of geosequestration's potential. Big coal should already be building trial coal gasification plants with geosequestration as a test of the economic and technological viability of their approach. Yet, despite offers of government assistance, very little is happening with geosequestration. [...] Imagine the cost of building the new generation coal gasification power plants, the separation, storage, pipelines, compressors and injection wells. So they're not even rushing to test it and make it happen? Politicians have been seduced by the coal industry's spin. [...] the Australian government set up [behind closed doors] a $500 million research fund for low emission technologies, precisely tailored in its brief to accommodate geosequestration. That's half a billion dollars that will never be fairly shared between all energy options to ensure the best outcome for the nation. [...] What is at stakes is [...] that Australia must increase its power production by more than 50 per cent by 2020 (a slow rate of growth compared with China [the biggest coal user in the world]), and the coal industry would like to secure as large a share of the cake as possible. All this talk of carbon sequestration can basically be seen as a delaying tactic, as a way to get government support and to keep the operation and construction of coal power plants more socially acceptable. It's the equivalent of saying: "Don't bother us, we're working on it!"

#### Backing the wrong horse means extinction--- even a small solvency deficit forces you to vote neg

Richard 6 (Michael has been with TreeHugger since 2005. He started out as a part-time writer, but after about a year (circa February 2006) he made the transition to full-time editor-in-chief, citing Timothy Flannery, the Chief Commissioner of the Australian [Climate Commission](http://www.climatecommission.gov.au), an independent body providing information on climate change to the Australian public. is currently a professor at [Macquarie University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Macquarie_University). He is also the chairman of the [Copenhagen Climate Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Climate_Council), an international climate change awareness group. “Important! Why Carbon Sequestration Won't Save Us” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/important-why-carbon-sequestration-wont-save-us.html)

But even if we suppose that big coal starts to build the expensive gasification plants soon and that they can solve most of the technical problems with geosequestration, they are not saying that they want to replace old, extremely dirty plants with the new ones; they want to build new ones and keep the old ones. They almost certainly won't bear the liability of CO2 leaks from underground storage, so that's an extra cost for taxpayers, not to mention that the electricity coming from coal gasification plants that do carbon sequestration will be more expensive because a lot of energy is lost in the process of running the plants, in the actual sequestration operating, and the huge costs of building the pipelines, the plants, drilling the holes, maintenance & monitoring, etc, will be passed on to the customers (or they'll ask for subsidies - same difference). So it'll take decades which we don't have, be extremely expensive, probably won't work that well, and we'll run out of good burying sites before long. Meanwhile, the clean energy industry (solar, wind, wave, geothermal) will keep growing very fast at exponential rates, their costs will keep going down and the efficiency of their production units (wind turbines, solar panels, hydrokinetic buoys, Gorlov helical turbines, geothermal heat pumps) will keep going up. The fastest and cheapest way to close down coal plants soon is probably investments in efficiency. Remember, it's a lot cheaper to save a watt of electricity than to produce one. As a society civilization species, we must back the right horse and stop being misled by the coal industry's delaying tactics. There's a big opportunity cost in time and resources to going down the wrong path. Each new power plant big coal builds means decades of fat profit for it, but for the rest of us here on Earth, it's just bad, bad news.

## \*\*\*1NR

### \*\*\*Politics

### 1NR Impact Wall

Integration solves conflict escalation   
Griswold, 7 (Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies, 4/20/2007, Trade, Democracy and Peace, HYPERLINK "<http://www.freetrade.org/node/681>" <http://www.freetrade.org/node/681>)  
A little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story a while back reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." In 2006, a survey by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute found that the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century. Since the early 1990s, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 17, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. The Institute's latest report found that 2005 marked the second year in a row that no two nations were at war with one another. What a remarkable and wonderful fact. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the Associated Press report, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Current estimates of people killed by war are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news--the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them--but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author argued in a forgettable book, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war. I would argue that free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, as I argued a moment ago, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies--a record high. Some studies have cast doubt on the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars. While it's true that democracies rarely if ever war with each other, it is not such a rare occurrence for democracies to engage in wars with non-democracies. We can still hope that as more countries turn to democracy, there will be fewer provocations for war by non-democracies. A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by promoting more economic integration. As national economies become more intertwined with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war.

#### That escalation results in extinction

Daguzan 10 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, “Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings” November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threaten the well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France. He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings. Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed. He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges. He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

### 1NR Turns Senaku

#### China won’t be aggressive unless growth falters

Yang, Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Auckland, Associate Editor of The Australasian Journal of Human Security, and Chair of the NZIIA’s Auckland Branch, ’06 (Jian, September 1, “China’s Rise: The Security Implications” New Zealand International Review, Vol 31 No 5, p 12, lexis)

Policy implications It is important for the rest of the world to appreciate Chinas desire for a peaceful international environment. It has profound implications for the making of policy toward China. Chinas desire for peace means incentives for it to integrate with the international society and this provides a solid basis for engaging China. Some argue that China is simply waiting for the time when it is strong enough to challenge other great powers. Indeed, no one can guarantee that China will not follow this path. However, this is by no means inevitable. There is a good chance that China continues to integrate with the international society, keeps learning the rules of the game and eventually graduates as a good international citizen. Masaru Tamamoto has a vision for China, that is vastly different from that ofrealists: It is hard to imagine how an economically successful China so enmeshed in global capitalism will threaten the very system that made it rich and middle class. Bourgeois success tends to diminish military efficacy in international relations. In the long run, the Chinese threat to the United States, Japan and the world comes from an economically faltering China, not a prosperous, self-confident China. (18) Chinas rise often reminds us of the rise of Japan and Germany in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Both resulted in major military clashes. Realists often argue that history repeats itself. This argument neglects the fact that the rise of the United States was peaceful. The United States rose rapidly from 1820 to 1913, which benefitedother great powers. To be more specific, American GDP per capita rose at an average rate of about 1.5 per cent per year, while that of Britain, France, and Germany rose at roughly 1.1-to-1.3 per cent annually. (19) China's rise can be a great opportunity, too. Increasing influenceChina should learn the rules of the game. At the same time, other great powers, especially the United States, should make efforts to accommodate the rise of China. Although China will not be able to substantially challenge the United States strategically in the coming years, its influence is likely to increase. One important reason why the rise of the United States was peaceful was the accommodation of GreatBritain to America's rise. Despite the differences between Anglo-American relations in those years and Sino-American relations today, theUnited States needs to accept China playing a greater role in world affairs and give China due respect.

### 1NR Turns Warming

Elliott 2008

Larry, Economics Editor at the Guardian, Can a dose of recession solve climate change?, http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2008/aug/25/economicgrowth.globalrecession

There are many reasons why it is not quite as simple as that. My rudimentary understanding of the science of climate change is that concentrations of greenhouse gases have been building up over many decades, and you can't simply turn them off like a tap. Even a three- or four-year 1930s-style global slump would have little or no impact, particularly if it was followed by a period of vigorous catch-up growth. On a chart showing growth since the dawn of the industrial age 250 years ago, the Great Depression is a blip. Similarly, Britain's trade deficit always comes down in recessions because imports go down, but then widens again once the economy returns to its trend rate of growth. Politically, recessions are not helpful to the cause of environmentalism. Climate change is replaced by concerns about unemployment and stimulating growth. To be fair, politicians respond to what they hear from voters: Gordon Brown's survival as prime minister depends on how well his package of economic measures is received, not on what he does or doesn't do to limit greenhouse gases. Looking back, it is clear that every advance in the green movement has coincided with period of strong growth - the early 1970s, the late 1980s and the first half of the current decade. It was tough enough to get world leaders to make tackling climate change a priority when the world economy was experiencing its longest period of sustained growth: it will be mightily difficult to persuade them to take measures that might have a dampen growth while the dole queues are lengthening. Those most likely to suffer are workers in the most marginal jobs and pensioners who will have to pay perhaps 20% of their income on energy bills. Hence, recession does not offer even a temporary solution to the problem of climate change and it is a fantasy to imagine that it does. The real issue is whether it is possible to challenge the "growth-at-any-cost model" and come up with an alternative that is environmentally benign, economically robust and politically feasible. Hitting all three buttons is mightily difficult but attempting to do so is a heck of a lot more constructive than waiting for industrial capitalism to collapse under the weight of its own contradictions.

### 1NR A2: No Impact

#### Yes impact – our evidence is more qualified

Royal 2010

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

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of extern conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavious of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations, However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increase incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlated economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### 1NR A2: Cant Solve Economy

#### And growth is slowing now

Papola 1/30/13 (John, Contributer at Forbes, “Think Consumption Is The 'Engine' Of Our Economy? Think Again.” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/beltway/2013/01/30/think-consumption-is-the-engine-of-our-economy-think-again/>)

Have you heard that the economy is like a car? It’s the most popular analogy in financial reporting and political discourse. The American people are repeatedly told by financial pundits and politicians that consumption is an “engine” that “drives” economic growth because it makes up 70% of GDP. One notable Nobel-winning economics pundit with a penchant for bizarre growth theories even recently noted that an economy can be “based on purchases of yachts, luxury cars, and the services of personal trainers and celebrity chefs.” Conversely, other economists including Nobel-winner Joseph Stiglitz claim that our economy is stuck in “first gear” due to inequality: too much income is concentrated among too few rich people who tend to save larger share of their income and thus have a lower “marginal propensity to consume”. The Keynesian message is clear: if you want to put the economic pedal to the metal, get out there and consume! Not so fast, Speed Racer. The systematic failure by Keynesian economists and pundits to distinguish between consuming and producing value is the single most damaging fallacy in popular economic thinking. This past Christmas, we produced a playful video called “Deck the Halls with Macro Follies” exploring the history of this popular myth. If the economy were a car, consumer preferences would surely be the steering wheel, but real savings and investment would be the engine that drives it forward. A History of Macro Follies The historical record on economic growth conflicts with this consumption doctrine. Economic growth (booms) and declines (bust) have always been led by changes in business and durable goods investment, while final consumer goods spending has been relatively stable through the business cycle. Booms and busts in financial markets, heavy industry and housing have always been leading indicators of recession and recovery. The dot-com boom and bust, the Great Depression and our current crisis all exhibit the pattern. For example, during our past two decades of booms and busts, investment collapsed first, bringing employment down with it. Consumption spending actually increased throughout the 2001 recession (financed, in part, by artificially easy credit) even as employment was falling along with investment. During our continuing crisis, consumption spending returned to its all-time high in 2011–yet investment to this day remains at decade lows, producing the worst recovery in growth and employment since the Great Depression. Labor force participation hasn’t been this low since the 1980s. But why? As John Stuart Mill put it two centuries ago, “the demand for commodities is not the demand for labor.” Consumer demand does not necessarily translate into increased employment. That’s because “consumers” don’t employ people. Businesses do. Since new hires are a risky and costly investment with unknown future returns, employers must rely on their expectations about the future and weigh those decision very carefully. As economic historian Robert Higgs’ pioneering work on the Great Depression suggests, increased uncertainty can depress job growth even in the face of booming consumption. As recent years have demonstrated, consumer demand that appears to be driven by temporary or unsustainable policies is unlikely to induce businesses to hire. The past several decades in America have been marked by a collapse of real savings encouraged by artificially easy credit from the Fed, along with explosive growth in government spending. All these combined to bring about a debt-fueled spending binge, with disastrous consequences. Increased investment drives economic growth, while retrenched investment leads to recession and reduced employment–

### 1NR A2: Thumpers

#### **Obama putting immigration first**

CNN 1/30 (“Obama wants immigration reform in first half of the year” http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/01/30/obama-wants-immigration-reform-in-first-half-of-the-year/)

President Barack Obama said Wednesday he wants to get an immigration reform package passed as soon as this summer. "I'm hopeful that this can get done, and I don't think that it should take many, many months," Obama said in an interview with the Spanish-language network Telemundo. "I think this is something we should be able to get done certainly this year, and I'd like to see if we could get it done sooner, in the first half of the year if possible." Obama previously said he wanted to accomplish immigration reform within the first year of his second term, but his latest comments represent a more rushed timeline of his goals. The president said "now's the time" for reform and highlighted his agenda Tuesday in a Las Vegas speech, specifying three pillars: better enforcement of immigration laws, providing a path to citizenship for the more than 11 million undocumented immigrants already in the country, and reforming the legal immigration system.

#### Polls prove---he has the capitalfor it all now, the plan drains it

Business Insider 1/30 “Obama Is More Popular Now Than At Any Point In The Last Three Years” http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-favorability-rating-high-poll-2013-1)

President Barack Obama's favorability rating has reached a three-year high in a new, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll released Wednesday.

The poll found that 60 percent of Americans hold a favorable view of the President, while only 37 percent view him unfavorably. He has an especially strong image among his base of Democrats (92 percent) and among Independents (also 60 percent).

The amount of people who view Obama "strongly" favorably (39 percent) also outpaces the amount that view him "strongly" negatively (28 percent) for the first time in two years.

Overall, it's the best image for Obama since 61 percent of Americans said they viewed him favorably in a Nov. 15, 2009, poll taken a year after the 2008 election. It could continue to give the President advantages on key legislative issues he's trying to push in the first few months of his new term — immigration, gun control, and on key fiscal battles.

Obama's favorability mark is up 6 points from a Washington Post-ABC poll taken right before the election in November. It's also up 12 points from this point one year ago, when it stood at only 48 percent.

### 1NR A2: Winners Win

#### Non-unique, Obama has already won, polls prove but the plan can re-spark battles

The Inquisitr 1/30 (“Obama’s More Popular Than Ever, Even If Everything Else Is Awful [Poll]” http://www.inquisitr.com/502313/obamas-more-popular-than-ever-even-if-everything-else-is-awful-poll/)

President Obama recently enjoyed a surge in popularity that he hasn’t experienced since his first year in office, according to recent polls. The US economy is down, the deficit is high, and the fiscal cliff still looms, but President Obama is completely immune to the dilemmas of our country, reports The Washington Post. A recent WaPo/ABC poll shows that 60 percent of Americans hold a favorable view of the president, up from his mid-to-low 50s during 2012. He also now has more “strongly positive” ratings than “strongly negative,” breaking a two-year stretch of mediocre-to-positive public perception. Obama’s boost primarily comes from his base, with a double-digit increase in popularity among traditionally left-leaning demographics. However, Obama’s popularity has improved some with the majority of Americans (the ever-elusive Independents and Moderates) as well. So, was it the speech that did it? This is where the polls get interesting. Obama’s second inaugural address, which has been criticized by his opponents as being one of the most partisan and radically liberal in history, was a home-run with his base. No surprise there, but what was interesting was that a full quarter of Americans had no opinion whatsoever on the address. Around 50 percent approved of it to various degrees, a quarter hated it, and a quarter just didn’t have an opinion. That’s eight in 10 Democrats in approval and three in 10 Republicans and Independents with zero reaction. Balanced against the popularity poll results, only 3 percent of Americans have no opinion of Obama altogether. Either way, the poll results represent a clear win for President Obama, which he will likely use to push legislative victories in the next year. Still, we face some dense partisanship in upcoming battles, which will make it difficult for him to solidify support among Republicans and conservative Democrats in his second term.

Political capital is key to the agenda and finite for Obama in the second term, he can’t do a replay of his first term

Schultz 1/22/13 (David Schultz is a professor at Hamline University School of Business, where he teaches classes on privatization and public, private and nonprofit partnerships. He is the editor of the Journal of Public Affairs Education (JPAE) “Obama's dwindling prospects in a second term” http://www.minnpost.com/community-voices/2013/01/obamas-dwindling-prospects-second-term)

Presidential power also is a finite and generally decreasing product. The first hundred days in office – so marked forever by FDR’s first 100 in 1933 – are usually a honeymoon period, during which presidents often get what they want. FDR gets the first New Deal, Ronald Reagan gets Kemp-Roth, George Bush in 2001 gets his tax cuts. Presidents lose political capital, support But, over time, presidents lose political capital. Presidents get distracted by world and domestic events, they lose support in Congress or among the American public, or they turn into lame ducks. This is the problem Obama now faces. Obama had a lot of political capital when sworn in as president in 2009. He won a decisive victory for change with strong approval ratings and had majorities in Congress — with eventually a filibuster margin in the Senate, when Al Franken finally took office in July. Obama used his political capital to secure a stimulus bill and then pass the Affordable Care Act. He eventually got rid of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and secured many other victories. But Obama was a lousy salesman, and he lost what little control of Congress that he had in the 2010 elections. Since then, Obama has be stymied in securing his agenda. Moreover, it is really unclear what his agenda for a second term is. Mitt Romney was essentially right on when arguing that Obama had not offered a plan for four more years beyond what we saw in the first term. A replay wouldn't work Whatever successes Obama had in the first term, simply doing a replay in the next four years will not work. First, Obama faces roughly the same hostile Congress going forward that he did for the last two years. Do not expect to see the Republicans making it easy for him. Second, the president’s party generally does badly in the sixth year of his term. This too will be the case in 2014, especially when Democrats have more seats to defend in the Senate than the GOP does. Third, the president faces a crowded and difficult agenda. All the many fiscal cliffs and demands to cut the budget will preoccupy his time and resources, depleting money he would like to spend on new programs. Obama has already signed on to an austerity budget for his next four years – big and bold is not there. Fourth, the Newtown massacre and Obama’s call for gun reform places him in conflict with the NRA. This is a major battle competing with the budget, immigration, Iran and anything else the president will want to do. Finally, the president is already a lame duck and will become more so as his second term progress. Presidential influence is waning One could go on, but the point should be clear: Obama has diminishing time, resources, support and opportunity to accomplish anything. His political capital and presidential influence is waning, challenging him to adopt a minimalist agenda for the future. What should Obama do? Among the weaknesses of his first term were inattention to filling federal judicial vacancies. Judges will survive beyond him and this should be a priority for a second term, as well as preparing for Supreme Court vacancies. He needs also to think about broader structural reform issues that will outlive his presidency, those especially that he can do with an executive order. Overall, Obama has some small opportunities to do things in the next four years – but the window is small and will rapidly close.

### 1NR Link Wall

#### Reject their Clauson evidence – it comes from who heads a CO2 EOR company. They have a cognitive bias to say the plan is popular and even Clauson recognizes no one will pass EOR because it says”

Will we see comprehensive legislation on this issue pass the Congress this year? That’s unlikely … but we do think we have a shot at Section 45Q reform this year. Still, the NEORI recommendations have started the conversation and we feel optimistic that we can see progress on this issue in the not-too-distant future no matter who controls the Presidency and the Congress next year.

#### That proves that the plan is realistically too contentious to get support in congress

#### And there is significant opposition to carbon sequestration –

#### A. Spending

Weiss 10 - Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress

Daniel, “Efforts to Save Coal Could End Up Destroying It,” Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/09/coal\_senators.html

Second, without a pollution reduction program to generate revenue to invest in CCS research and development, some of the money for it will have to come from general revenues. The large federal budget deficit, however, has fueled opposition to more government spending. APA and the American Clean Energy and Security Act, H.R. 2454, would have provided billions of dollars for CCS research using revenue raised from selling pollution dumping permits under global warming pollution reduction legislation. It is difficult to imagine Congress appropriating money for CCS when so many existing programs will be facing severe budget cuts.

#### Costs lead to political backlash – no one wants to run the deficit

Parfomak and Folger 08Parfomak: Specialist in Energy and Infrastructure Policy, Folger: Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy (Paul W. Parfomak, Peter Folger, January 17, 2008, “Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Pipelines for Carbon Sequestration: Emerging Policy Issues,” <http://www.marstonlaw.com/index_files/Emerging%20Policy%20issues%20for%20CO2%20pipelines%202008%20CORRECTED%20(2008-01-17%20(No%20RL33971).pdf)>//DR. H

Pipeline Costs

If an extensive network of pipelines is required for CO2 transportation, pipeline costs may be a major consideration in CCS policy. MIT estimated overall annualized pipeline transportation (and storage) costs of approximately $5 per metric ton of CO2.46 If CO2 sequestration rates in the United States were on the order of 1 billion metric tons per year at mid-century, as some analysts propose, annualized pipeline costs would run into the billions of dollars. Furthermore, because most pipeline costs are initial capital costs, up-front capital outlays for a new CO2 pipeline network would be enormous. The 2007 Duke study, for example, estimated it would cost approximately $5 billion to construct a CO2 trunk line along existing pipeline rights of way to transport captured CO2 from North Carolina to potential sequestration sites in the Gulf states and Appalachia.47 Within the context of overall CO2 pipeline costs, several specific cost-related issues may warrant further examination by Congress. Materials Costs. Analysts commonly develop cost estimates for CO2 pipelines based on comparable construction costs for natural gas pipelines, and to a lesser extent, petroleum product pipelines. In most cases, these comparisons appear appropriate since CO2 pipelines are similar in design and operation to other pipelines, especially natural gas pipelines. A University of California (UC) study analyzing the costs of U.S. transmission pipelines constructed between 1991 and 2003 found that, on average, labor accounted for approximately 45% of the total construction costs. Materials, rights of way, and miscellaneous costs accounted for 26%, 22%, and 7% of total costs, respectively.48 Materials cost was most closely dependent upon pipeline size, accounting for an increasing fraction of the total cost with increasing pipeline size, from 15% to 35% of total costs. The MIT study estimated that transportation of captured CO2 from a 1 gigawatt coal-fired power plant would require a pipe diameter of 16 inches.49 According to the UC analysis, total construction costs for such a pipe between 1991 and 2003 averaged around $800,000 per mile (in 2002 dollars), although the study stated that costs for any individual pipeline could vary by a factor of five depending its location.50 [table omitted by Dillon hall] Since pipeline materials make up a significant portion of CO2 pipeline construction costs, analysts have called attention to rising pipeline materials costs, especially steel costs, as a concern for policymakers.51 Following a period of low steel prices and company bankruptcies earlier in the decade, the North American steel industry has returned to profitability and enjoys strong domestic and global demand.52 Now, higher prices resulting from both strong demand and increased production costs for carbon steel plate, used in making large-diameter pipe, may alter the basic economics of CO2 pipeline projects and CCS schemes overall. As Figure 2 shows, **the price of large-diameter pipe was generally around $600** per ton in late 2001 and early 2002. By late 2007, the price of pipe was approaching $1,400 per ton. Analysts forecast carbon steel prices to decline over the next two years, but only gradually, and to a level still more than double the price early in the decade.53

#### B. Environmentalists link – the plan angers them

Hester 09(Tom Hester Sr., October 15, 2009, “New Jersey’s environmentalists form alliance to oppose planned mega coal plant in Linden,” [http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/science-updates/new-jerseys-environmentalists-form-alliance-to-oppose-planned-mega-coal-plant-in-linden)](http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/science-updates/new-jerseys-environmentalists-form-alliance-to-oppose-planned-mega-coal-plant-in-linden)//DR)

A coalition of environmentalists announced Thursday that they have formed the Arthur Kill Watershed Alliance with the goal of fighting a proposed null coal plant in Linden. Members of the new Arthur Kill Watershed Alliance include the Tremley Point Alliance, the New Jersey Sierra Club, the Edison Wetlands Association, the New Jersey Environmental Federation, the New Jersey Environmental Lobby and Environment New Jersey. Linden City Council President Robert Bunk joined alliance leaders at a press conference at City Hall to announce his opposition to the proposal, a 500 megawatt coal plant and carbon capture and sequestration pilot project that environmentalists maintain will threaten the health of the area's residents and pollute the environment. The environmentalists insist the $5 billion pilot project, called PurGen, would "severely degrade'' the local environment and undermine Linden's revitalization effort. They argue that reliance on untested sequestration technology could jeopardize the state's attempts to help mitigate global warming. Carbon capture and sequestration is an unproven and untested technology, according to the environmentalists. PurGen theorizes it can capture and liquefy carbon dioxide and push it 70 miles through an offshore pipeline to be buried under the seabed. The proposed location for plant is the former DuPont site along the Arthur Kill. The pipeline would run under Raritan Bay through the ocean to the shores off Atlantic City, where the carbon dioxide discharge site will be located in ocean rock deposits.

#### Environmentalists are key to the agenda

Williams 08Doctorate and Masters in Economics, Distinguished Professor of Economics, More than 50 of his publications have appeared in scholarly journals, Received the National Fellow at the Hoover Institute of War, Revolution, and Peace; the Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship; the National Service Award from the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies; and the George Washington Medal of Honor from the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation. In 1984-1985, he received the Faculty Member of the Year Award from the George Mason University Alumni. He is also a member of the American Economic Association, the Mont Pelerin Society and is a Distinguished Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, participates in many debates and conferences, is a frequent public speaker and often gives testimony before both houses of Congress (Walter, July 30, 2008, “Environmentalists' Hold on Congress,” [http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2008/07/30/environmentalists\_hold\_on\_congress/page/full/)](http://townhall.com/columnists/walterewilliams/2008/07/30/environmentalists_hold_on_congress/page/full/)//DR)

Let's face it. **The average individual American has little or no clout with Congress** and can be safely ignored. But **it's a different story with groups such as Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club and The Nature Conservancy. When they speak, Congress listens.** Unlike the average American, **they are well organized, loaded with cash and well positioned to be a disobedient congressman's worse nightmare. Their political and economic success has been a near disaster for our nation.**

For several decades, **environmentalists have managed to get Congress to keep most of our oil resources off-limits to exploration and drilling. They've managed to have the Congress enact onerous regulations that have made refinery construction impossible**. Similarly, **they've used the courts and Congress to completely stymie the construction of nuclear power plants.** As a result, energy prices are at historical highs and threaten our economy and national security.

**What's the political response to our energy problems? It's more congressional and White House kowtowing to environmentalists, farmers and multi-billion dollar corporations such as Archer Daniels Midland.** Their "solution," rather than to solve our oil supply problem by permitting drilling for the billions upon billions of barrels of oil beneath the surface of our country, is to enact the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 that mandates that oil companies increase the amount of ethanol mixed with gasoline. Anyone with an ounce of brains would have realized that diverting crops from food to fuel use would raise the prices of corn-fed livestock, such as pork, beef, chicken and dairy products, and products made from corn, such as cereals. Ethanol production has led to increases in other grain prices, such as soybean and wheat. Since the U.S. is the world's largest grain producer and exporter, higher grain prices have had a huge impact on food prices worldwide.

**Congress and the environmentalists aren't through with us.** If you're bothered by skyrocketing food and energy prices, **wait until Congress re-introduces its environmentalist-inspired Climate Security Act, so-called "Cap and Trade**." Cap and Trade is deceptively peddled as a free-market solution to the yet-to-be-settled issue of manmade climate change. Under its provisions, companies would be able to emit greenhouse gases only if they had a government allowance. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a 15 percent cut in emissions would raise the annual average household's energy costs by $1,300. Since energy is an input to everything we use, we can expect everything to become more costly, resulting in a reduction in economic growth.

There's a hateful side to Cap and Trade that's revealed by asking the question: How will it be decided who received how much allowance to emit greenhouse gases? **Congress could sell the allowances and/or give them away to favorite constituents. You can bet the rent money that a new army of lobbyists, with special pleadings, will descend on Washington to lobby Congress. And you can be sure that campaign contributions and favoritism will play an important role in the decision of who received what amount of allowances.**

Much worse than that is the massive control government would have over our economy and our lives. Congress might decide that since tobacco use is unhealthy, it might not issue allowances to tobacco companies. While many Americans might applaud that, how many would like Congress to refuse to issue allowances to companies that produce foods that some people deem unhealthy such as French fries, sodas, canned soups and potato chips. Congress might deny, or threaten to deny, allowances to companies that in their opinion didn't hire enough women and minorities. The possibilities for control over our lives would be endless and could include nuisance-type edicts such a requiring us to buy a permit to barbeque in our backyard.

**The thirst to wield massive control over our economy helps explain the near religious belief in manmade global warming and the attacks on scientists and others who offer contradictory evidence.**

#### C. Public link – the public hates the plan in their backyard

Stephenson 8 - Director, Natural Resources and Environment @ GAO

“Federal Actions Will Greatly Affect the Viability of Carbon Capture and Storage As a Key Mitigation Option,” GAO, http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081080.pdf

Thus far at least, there has been little public opposition to the CO2 injections that have taken place in states such as Texas to enhance oil recovery. However, several notable studies explain that this lack of publicly-expressed concern may reflect more a lack of knowledge about CCS rather than confidence that the process is safe. 56 This is suggested in the IPCC’s 2005 report on CCS which stated, for example, that there is insufficient public knowledge of climate change issues and of the various mitigation options and their potential impact. In another 2005 study, researchers surveyed 1,200 people, representing a general population sample of the United States, and found that that less than 4 percent of the respondents were familiar with the terms carbon dioxide capture and storage or carbon storage. Some of the stakeholders we interviewed explained that public opposition could indeed grow when CCS extends beyond the relatively small projects used to enhance oil and gas recovery, to include much larger CO2 sequestration projects located in more populated areas. One noted, in particular, that a lack of education about CCS’s safety could potentially create confusion and fear when commercial-scale CCS is implemented.

#### The public is critical to the agenda

Sam Youngman, The Hill, 07/27/09, Analysis: July has been disaster for Obama, Hill Dems, http://thehill.com/leading-the-news/analysis-july-has-been-disaster-for-obama-hill-dems-2009-07-27.html

Paul Light, an expert on the presidency and a professor at New York University, said the president's problems with Capitol Hill reflect "a miscalculation by the Obama administration on how political capital gets spent in Washington." Light said that capital, even for a president who enjoys immense personal popular support like Obama, is spent a bit at a time on each initiative or piece of legislation. "I think the Obama administration has been spending political capital at roughly the same rate the federal government spends money," Light said. "Eventually, it runs out." Light quoted President Lyndon Johnson, who said that "if you don't get it done in six months, you're not going to get it done." One of the reasons Obama has spent so much capital, aside from his ambitious agenda, has been his willingness to cede so much control to Congress, Light said. While lawmakers like Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) are allies of the president, his political capital is not necessarily a priority of theirs. To that end, Light says, Obama has made a mistake in making Pelosi his "broker," spending his political capital but not always to his benefit. The other misstep that has bogged down the administration on healthcare specifically is Obama's inability to communicate effectively to the American people, Light said. While it is shocking to consider that Obama is anything less than one of the best communicators in modern political history, when it comes to healthcare, he simply has not been able to make the sell to people who do have health insurance. And Wednesday night's primetime press conference was a "disaster," Light said. Light said that for the president to regain political momentum, he needs to reclaim his agenda from Congress and start connecting with the public. "He needs to take this over and own it," Light said.

#### Link turns case – public backlash prevents CCS success

Stephenson 8 - Director, Natural Resources and Environment @ GAO

“Federal Actions Will Greatly Affect the Viability of Carbon Capture and Storage As a Key Mitigation Option,” GAO, http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081080.pdf

Citing such concerns, a recent report by the National Academy of Sciences underscored the importance of public outreach, noting that while the success of DOE’s carbon capture program depends heavily on its ability to reduce the cost of the technology, “the storage program cannot be successful if a significant fraction of the public views it as dangerous or unacceptable. Thus, the technologies must not only be safe and effective, they must be explainable to the public and the regulatory community in such a way as to instill confidence that they are in fact safe and effective.” 57 The report went on to caution that “the federal government in general and the DOE in particular have not had a good track record in accomplishing this task in other programs.” For its part, EPA received similar advice from its Clean Air Act Advisory Committee’s Advanced Coal Technology Work Group. The Work Group’s January 2008 report recommended that the agency immediately develop, in consultation with other agencies, a public outreach effort to explain carbon capture and sequestration. 58 A diverse group of panel members at EPA’s 2007 UIC workshop made similar recommendations for public outreach and participation.

### 1NR A2: UQ

CIR will pass---there is bipartisan support for a bill now, but historically controversy that divides the white house and congress can collapse a deal, that’s CNBC, the Gang of eight will propose an comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship, but thorny issues still exist

ABC 1/30 (“Obama Confident Immigration Reform Passes This Year” http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/Politics/president-obama-confident-immigration-reform-passes-year/story?id=18358660&page=2)

President Barack Obama expressed confidence on Wednesday that he would sign comprehensive immigration reform into law by the end of this year. In an interview with Univision's Maria Elena Salinas, Obama explained that significant details of a bill still must be worked out by lawmakers, including the structure of a pathway to citizenship for many of the 11 million undocumented immigrants. But Obama said that the progress made by a bipartisan group of lawmakers in the Senate has given him hope that a deal can get done. When asked by Salinas if we will have immigration reform by the end of the year, Obama said, "I believe so." "You can tell our audience, 'Sí, se puede?'" Salinas asked. "Sí, se puede," Obama responded. Later in the interview, Obama said that he hopes a bill could be passed as early as this summer. But cognizant of deep divisions a topic like immigration has sewn in the past, Obama said that's contingent on bipartisan negotiations continuing to proceed well. "The only way this is going to get done is if the Republicans continue to work with Democrats in Congress, in both chambers, to get a bill to my desk," he said. "And I'm going to keep on pushing as hard as I can. I believe that the mood is right." Although the president threatened to introduce his own bill if negotiations in Congress stall during his speech in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Tuesday, he said he is content to let lawmakers hash out the details among themselves for the time being. "If they are on a path as they have already said, where they want to get a bill done by March, then I think that's a reasonable timeline and I think we can get that done. I'm not going to lay down a particular date because I want to give them a little room to debate," he said. "If it slips a week, that's one thing. If it starts slipping three months, that's a problem." The president's principles and the Senate's principles on immigration broadly align with one another, but there are still thorny issues that could spark a division between Obama and Republicans, such as the pathway to citizenship. The Senate's path to citizenship would allow many undocumented immigrants to obtain legal status immediately upon passage of the law. But their ability to then seek legal permanent residency would be contingent upon the U.S.-Mexico border being deemed secure. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" on immigration, has been particularly vocal in stating that border security is a precondition for gaining legal permanent residence, and then citizenship. While the White House has said that it is withholding judgment on that plan until actual legislative language is drafted, Obama said that he wants a bill that makes it clear from the outset that undocumented immigrants eligible to earn their way to citizenship can eventually obtain it. "What we don't want to do is create some kind of vague prospect in the future that somehow comprehensive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship will happen, you know, mañana," Obama said. "We want to make sure we are very clear this legislation provides a real pathway." The president said that enhancing border security measures and workplace enforcement provisions are a part of his plan, as well as the Senate's, and cited his administration's efforts to bulk up border security during the past four years, saying that illegal crossings have dropped 80 percent since 2000. "We have done almost everything that Republicans asked to be done several years ago as a condition to move ahead with comprehensive immigration reform," he said. "It's not as if we haven't been attentive to border security and we will continue to be attentive to border security." Obama also reiterated that his path to citizenship would be earned, meaning that undocumented immigrants would have to pass a background check, pay fines and back taxes, learn English and go to the back of the line. "That pathway will take some time. Even under our proposal, this is not a situation where overnight people are suddenly going to find themselves a citizen," he said. Obama also suggested that he wouldn't accede to a demand from immigrant-rights groups that a moratorium be placed on deportations of undocumented immigrants who otherwise do not have criminal records, saying it would amount to executive overreach. "I'm not a king," he said. But he said that passing comprehensive reform would allow him to address the record levels of deportations, which have been a grave concern to many in the Latino community.

#### ---Obama is using his political capital from the reelection to shift the political consensus

Washington Post 1/29 (“Obama makes his immigration push” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-unveils-his-own-proposal-for-immigration-reform/2013/01/29/b27dcb78-6a47-11e2-95b3-272d604a10a3\_story\_1.html)

President Obama on Tuesday put the weight of his administration behind efforts to pass legislation allowing many of the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants to earn citizenship, seeking to build on a rapidly shifting political consensus around the issue. Obama dedicated the first trip of his second term to calling for an overhaul of immigration laws, making clear that it is one of his top domestic priorities. The president — who has said that not passing an overhaul in his first term was his biggest failure — also suggested he has little patience for Congress and would demand that lawmakers vote on his more permissive plan if they do not swiftly pass their own. “Now is the time,” Obama said, eliciting chants of “Si, se puede” — roughly translated as “Yes, it’s possible” — from the crowd at a majority Hispanic high school here. “We can’t allow immigration reform to get bogged down in an endless debate.” Fresh off a decisive reelection, Obama is seizing this moment as one in which both sides could come together to address widespread anxieties within rising demographic groups, particularly Hispanics and Asian Americans. But obstacles still loomed large Tuesday on Capitol Hill, fueled by continued unease among conservative Republicans over going too far to loosen immigration restrictions. One of the biggest disputes centers on whether illegal immigrants would have to wait to seek a green card — the first step to full citizenship — until the U.S. border with Mexico is secure and other enforcement measures are in place. A bipartisan Senate plan released Monday would tie the possibility of citizenship to several such enforcement measures, including a system to verify the immigration status of employees. The president did not comment explicitly on that proposal in his speech, but the administration suggested in its own guidelines released Tuesday that it does not want to link the citizenship process to other goals. “It must be clear from the outset that there is a pathway to citizenship,” Obama said, adding that the administration has made great strides in an effort to toughen enforcement. Some key Republicans expressed concern with any approach that does not link border security with the proposal to offer illegal immigrants a way to become citizens.

#### Obama holds all of the cards---assures passage

Weigant 1/23 (Chris WeigantPolitical writer and blogger at ChrisWeigant.com “Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda”

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term\_b\_2537802.html

The second big agenda item is immigration reform. President Obama holds virtually all the cards, politically, on this one. All Republicans who can read either demographics or polling numbers know full well that this may be their party's last chance not to go the way of the Whigs. Their support among Latinos is dismal, and even that's putting it politely. Some Republicans think they have come up with a perfect solution on how to defuse the issue, but they are going to be proven sadly mistaken in the end, I believe. The Republican plan will be announced by Senator Marco Rubio at some point, and it will seem to mirror the Democratic plan -- with one key difference. Republicans -- even the ones who know their party has to do something on the immigration problem -- are balking at including a "path to citizenship" for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in America. The Republicans are trying to have their cake and eat it too -- and it's not going to work. "Sure," they say, "we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." This just isn't going to be good enough, though. There are essentially two things citizens can do which green card holders cannot: serve on juries, and vote. The Republicans are not worried about tainted juries, in case that's not clear enough. Republicans will bend over backwards in an effort to convince Latinos that their proposal will work out just fine for everyone. Latinos, however, aren't stupid. They know that being denied any path to citizenship equals an effort to minimize their voice on the national political stage. Which is why, as I said, Obama holds all the cards in this fight. Because this is the one issue in his agenda which Republicans also have a big vested interest in making happen. Obama and the Democrats will, I believe, hold firm on their insistence on a path to citizenship, and I think a comprehensive immigration bill will likely pass some time this year, perhaps before the summer congressional break. The path to citizenship it includes will be long, expensive and difficult (Republicans will insist on at least that), but it will be there. On gun control, I think Obama will win a partial victory. On immigration, I think he will win an almost-total victory. On global warming, however, he's going to be disappointed. In fact, I doubt -- no matter how much "bully pulpiting" Obama does -- that any bill will even appear out of a committee in either house of Congress. This will be seen as Obama's "overreach" -- a bridge too far for the current political climate. Anyone expecting big legislative action on global warming is very likely going to be massively disappointed, to put it quite bluntly. In fact, Obama will signal this in the next few months, as he approves the Keystone XL pipeline -- much to the dismay of a lot of his supporters. Of course, I could be wrong about any or all of these predictions. I have no special knowledge of how things will work out in Congress in the immediate future. I'm merely making educated guesses about what Obama will be able to achieve in at least the first few years of his second term. Obama has a lot of political capital right now, but that could easily change soon. The House Republicans seem almost demoralized right now, and Obama has successfully splintered them and called their bluff on two big issues already -- but they could regroup and decide to block everything the White House wants, and damn the political consequences. Unseen issues will pop up both on the domestic and foreign policy stages, as they always do. But, for now, this is my take on how the next few years are going to play out in Washington. Time will tell whether I've been too optimistic or too pessimistic on any or all of Obama's main agenda items. We'll just have to wait and see.

#### Bipartisan compromise and Boehner magic

Johnson 1/28 (Fawn Johnson is a correspondent for National Journal, “The 3 Big Hurdles Obama Has to Clear to Pass Immigration Reform” http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/the-3-big-hurdles-obama-has-to-clear-to-pass-immigration-reform/272584/)

House Republicans. No one expects "regular order" in the House on immigration. Any broad bill that comes to the floor under normal proceedings would certainly be doomed. The House has killed Senate immigration legislation before (in 2006), and forces are gathering to do so again. The Judiciary Committee counts several bomb throwers as members; Rep. Steve King, R-Iowa, is the most well known in immigration circles. The committee also includes ruby-red conservatives like Rep. Jim Jordan, R-Ohio, whose actions are closely scrutinized by other Republicans. Its former chairman, Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas, is feverishly opposed to increasing immigration, particularly for low-skilled workers. But that doesn't mean an immigration bill can't get through. A bipartisan group of House lawmakers has been quietly working on an immigration bill that would satisfy conservatives and liberals. The Republican participants are a closely-held secret, but whisperers say they include serious conservatives like Paul Ryan of Wisconsin, Ted Poe of Texas, and Raul Labrador of Idaho. House Speaker John Boehner is among the Republicans who desperately want the GOP's hand-wringing on immigration to end. He has already demonstrated that he is willing to flout party rabble-rousers with the House's recent votes on fiscal cliff taxes and Hurricane Sandy, which passed with more Democrats than Republicans. Boehner has to be careful. He only has so many chances to put incendiary legislation on the floor before his caucus stages an all-out revolt. To appease them, he will probably offer one or two high-profile House votes, where Democrats will protest like crazy, on enforcement-only immigration legislation. That gets the dealmakers to the next step, a conference committee where anything can happen. As Kennedy was fond of saying, "We'll fix it in conference." If Boehner wants the issue to go away, he might be willing to put a conference report up for a vote despite a raucous caucus. It's possible that enough Republicans could join with Democrats to support it.

Reform won’t be easy---but first steps are bipartisan

New America 2/1 (Media Al Día, Editorial, Staff,“Immigration Reform: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back” http://newamericamedia.org/2013/02/immigration-reform-two-steps-forward-one-step-back.php)

For those who were waiting for news on the comprehensive immigration reform front, Monday’s proposal by the Senate’s so-called ‘Gang of 8’ (which includes both Republican Marco Rubio and Democrat Robert Menendez) seemed a bipartisan first step. Tuesday’s proposal by President Obama shored up that first step without adding much more to it. It is a measure of how disastrous the discourse on immigration reform has become since the days of the Ted Kennedy-John McCain immigration reform bill of 2005 that both of the proposals seem such a step forward to so many of us. Both proposals have their problematic aspects. Obama extolled his deportation rate without so much as acknowledging that the astromical number includes nearly as many ordinary heads of household as criminals. The senators proposed that a path to citizenship cannot be enacted until the border is deemed secure by an advisory committee comprised of selected governors, legislators, etc. Depending on who is selected (Arizona Governor Jan Brewer? House Immigration subcommittee members Lamar Smith and Steven King?) this advisory committee might block the institution of a path to citizenship for years. But the proposals we heard are canny politicking. On the president’s part, he has now seemingly made good on his promise to Latinos to put immigration reform on the table. For the Republicans of the “Gang of 8,” the move is to reclaim Latino voters, who abandoned the party in droves during the past election, largely because of the toxic Republican-led discourse on immigration. But the proposals are not universally acclaimed, and it remains to be seen how much political capital it earns either party. It has been characterized by immigration activists as an enforcement-heavy further militarization of the border. And though advocates have applauded the expedited citizenship path that would be accorded to DREAM-Act eligible students, agricultural workers and graduates of STEM programs, there are fears that it further codifies and criminalizes undocumented immigrants that don’t fall into those categories PA Rep. Lou Barletta told the Allentown Morning Call that, “Anyone who believes that they’re going to win over the Latino vote is grossly mistaken. The majority that are here illegally are low-skilled or may not even have a high school diploma. The Republican Party is not going to compete over who can give more social programs out. They will become Democrats because of the social programs they’ll depend on.” Seemingly, reform will not be accomplished easily, no matter how cautious the steps.

#### Spending his PC on it now

TMP 1/3 (“Report: Obama To Make Push For Immigration Reform This Month” http://livewire.talkingpointsmemo.com/entry/report-obama-to-make-push-for-immigration-reform)

President Barack Obama is prepared to use his political capital to pursue immigration reform this month, according to a report published Wednesday in the Huffington Post.

The report cited an anonymous official in the Obama administration, who suggested that the president is unlikely to be deterred by the protracted fiscal cliff debate that will be revisited in the coming months. As such, the administration will reportedly move quickly on both immigration reform and gun control.

The report also quoted an unnamed Senate Democratic aide, who gauged the likelihood of immigration reform to pass Congress. Citing the fiscal cliff deal that passed the House of Represenatives this week with a combination of Republican and Democratic votes, the aide expressed confidence that House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) will be able to overcome expected opposition from the conservative wing of his caucus.

"He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide said.

### 1NR A2: No Internal Link

#### And studies prove the theory of political capital

Eshbaugh-Soha, M. (2008). Policy Priorities and Presidential Success in Congress. Conference Papers -- American Political Science Association, 1-26. Retrieved from Political Science Complete database.

Presidential-congressional relations are a central topic in the scientific study of politics. The literature is clear that a handful of variables strongly influence the likelihood of presidential success on legislation. Of these variables, party control of Congress is most important (Bond and Fleisher 1990), in that conditions of unified government increase, while conditions of divided government decrease presidential success, all else equal. The president’s approval ratings (Edwards 1989) and a favorable honeymoon (Dominguez 2005) period may also increase presidential success on legislation. In addition, presidential speeches that reference policies or roll-call votes tend to increase the president’s legislative success rate (Barrett 2004; Canes-Wrone 2001; Eshbaugh-Soha 2006). In their landmark examination of presidential success in Congress, Bond and Fleisher (1990, 230) identify yet another condition that may facilitate presidential success on legislation when they write that “the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged.” Moreover, the policies that the president prioritizes have “a major impact on the president’s relationship with Congress.” Taken together, these assertions strongly suggest that the policy content of the president’s legislative agenda—what policies the president prioritizes before Congress—should be a primary determinant of presidential success in Congress.

#### And reject Dicksonson, he is speaking about supreme court political capital and he concludes neg

Dickinson, yes the same damn one, 2009 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212). To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power. Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.).

#### Bargaining chips are limited – plan directly trades off

Bernstein, 8/20/11

Jonathan Bernstein is a political scientist who writes about American politics, especially the presidency, Congress, parties and elections, http://www.salon.com/news/politics/war\_room/2011/08/20/bernstein\_presidential\_power/index.html

Moreover, the positions of the president and most everyone else are, to look at it one way, sort of opposites. The president has potential influence over an astonishing number of things -- not only every single policy of the U.S. government, but policy by state and local governments, foreign governments, and actions of private citizens and groups. Most other political actors have influence over a very narrow range of stuff. What that means is that while the president's overall influence is certainly far greater than that of a House subcommittee chair or a midlevel civil servant in some agency, his influence over any specific policy may well not be greater than that of such a no-name nobody. A lot of good presidential skills have to do with figuring out how to leverage that overall influence into victories in specific battles, and if we look at presidential history, there are lots of records of successes and failures. In other words, it's hard. It involves difficult choices -- not (primarily) policy choices, but choices in which policies to fight for and which not to, and when and where and how to use the various bargaining chips that are available.

#### And- controversy aversion link—

#### Empirics prove – it’s not just question of capital - forcing votes on highly a controversial item means they won't be willing to on others - accesses structural factors and anticipated voter reaction warrants

Katherine Ling and Katie Howell, E&E reporters, 11-2-2010 Katherine Ling and Katie Howell, E&E reporters

After Obama was inaugurated as president in 2009, House Democrats unleashed a formidable agenda consisting of a two-month blitz to pass a $787 billion stimulus bill, which passed in February 2009; four months of pushing the cap-and-trade climate bill, which passed in June 2009; and, finally, an eight-month slog to pass a financial regulation reform bill in December 2009 and a health care reform bill in February 2010. But only the stimulus, health care reform and financial regulation bills made it through the "wet cement" that is the Senate, as Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) has described it. After months of talks, Senate negotiations on climate came to a standstill this summer as partisan bickering kept the upper chamber from passing even the smallest of energy bills. Many lawmakers have criticized House leadership for forcing them to take a hard vote on a cap-and-trade bill without knowing whether Senate Democrats would also be able to take up and pass the bill. "I frankly don't think the House gave it that much thought. I think they acted on what they thought was an important initiative at a time when the perception was that the new president and the Democrats in Congress had a lot of momentum," said Leon Billings, a retired lobbyist and former Democratic Senate staffer who helped write the Clean Air Act in 1970. "It was only later that the leadership in the House began to realize ... that the Senate was going to become a cemetery rather than a maternity ward," Billings added. "It took awhile, way too long, for the Democrats in the House, Senate and White House to realize the magnitude of the assault that was going to be launched by the radical right and even longer to realize that it was going to take a real toll on the country." Frost also blasted Democrats' costly political oversight, saying the cap-and-trade vote was "much harder" than health care.

#### This ev is on the context of a supreme court nomination—those are always ideologically based because supreme court nominations are life-long the likely hood of people being on the fence and changing their mind on <insert da> are larger because its legislation based and our issue specific evidence outweighs because on the issue of <da> it <warrant>

**Empirical studies and expert consensus proves political capital is key to the agenda**

**Wang 10**( Yuhua Wang Department of Political Science University of Michigan, he is also a member of the Wo Wang Clan, a group of poli sci profs who are also ill rappers. “Congressional Weakness, Political Capital, and the Politics of Presidential Agency Design” <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/wangyh/files/presidential_agency_design_yuhua_wang.pdf>)

Presidents’ popularity with the public is a resource that may influence members of Congress (Neustadt 1960). Some **recent studies have noticed the “political capital”** the president possesses (Light 1999; Johnson and Roberts 2005). Several scholars demonstrate that popular presidents are able to win more often in Congress (Brace and Hinckley 1992; Edwards and Wood 1999;Ostrom and Simon 1985; Rivers and Rose 1985). Krutz, Fleisher, and Bond (1998) argue that, “Washingtonians widely accept the view that Congress is more inclined to give presidents what they want when public support is high rather than low” (873). For Light, presidents’ strength includes their public approval ratings and their margin of victory in the most recent election (Light 1999: 32). When these factors increase, presidents gain political capital and are therefore more likely to garner Congressional support for their domestic agenda in Congress. Although some studies identify methodological and theoretical reasons to question the importance of presidential capital (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Collier and Sullivan 1995), it is worthwhile to test this in models of agency design. This paper predicts that when Congress is strong and united, “weak” presidents enjoy less discretion creating agencies by executive orders; in contrast, popular presidents are not constrained by Congress in agency design1.