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#### Text: The fifty United States and relevant territories should provide substantial financial incentives for wind energy development in Central Appalachia modeled after the Rural Energy for America Program. They should not recruit large corporations but should direct incentives to Appalachia residents and business owners.

**CP solves**

**Goldstein ’11** [Blair S., B.A., Georgetown University, “WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES: CAN STATE-LEVEL POLICIES PROMOTE EFFICIENT DEVELOPMENT OF WIND ENERGY CAPACITY?” April 14, <https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/553738/goldsteinBlair.pdf?sequence=1>]

**In the absence of a strong federal renewable energy policy, states have enacted state-bystate policies to promote renewable energy development. These policies have contributed to a surge in wind energy. U.S. wind capacity has increased from about 2,500 MW in 1999 to about 25,000 MW in 2008**. 4 **Popular state-level renewable energy policies include: mandatory green power options, public benefit funds, loans, tax incentives, and grants. One of the most common state-level policies is the RPS**. **As of 2008, 27 states and the District of Columbia had passed a mandatory RPS**. 5 **Another, five states had passed a voluntary RPS**. 6 There is no standard RPS model. Instead, policies vary substantially. States require differing amounts of renewable energy generation, set different timelines for compliance, and allow different energy sources to contribute toward the renewable goal.

### 2

#### It’ll pass – bipart support – Obama pushing.

Binshteyn 3-5. [Nataliya, lawyer @ Greenberg Traurig LLP, "Immigration compromise makes bipartisan headway as Congress, business and labor converge on solutions" Lexology -- www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3427c20d-1f81-47ae-8e3f-7401e728de06]

The movement to craft a bipartisan plan for comprehensive immigration reform appears to be making genuine headway despite the Capitol’s reputation for gridlock. The tide toward progress has been helped by an unlikely compromise between U.S. business and labor groups, represented by the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, who recently reached a breakthrough agreement to support a series of principles that will make it easier for employers to hire foreign employees when American workers cannot fill needed jobs. The new scheme would include a new worker visa program that may obviate the two camps’ long-standing disagreement about the prospect of a temporary worker program. Moreover, a joint statement released by the groups cites the need for a new federal agency bureau that will inform Congress and the public about labor market needs and worker shortages. ¶ In addition, House Republicans are debating a closed-door proposal that includes eventual citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Under the House version, undocumented immigrants would first be allowed to live and work in the country on a provisional basis and subsequently qualify for “green cards” through employer or family-based sponsorship. For its part, the Senate is also involved in active talks about comprehensive immigration reform and prominent senators from both parties have recently held **high-level meetings** with President Obama about this issue, prompting Senator Lindsey Graham (Republican – South Carolina) to state that it was “one of the best meetings” he had “ever had with the [P]resident.”

#### PC shapes the agenda

Shifter 12/27/12 (Michael, President of the Inter-American Dialogue, “Will Obama Kick the Can Down the Road?”)

Not surprisingly, Obama has been explicit that reforming the US’s shameful and broken immigration system will be a top priority in his second term. There is every indication that he intends to use some of his precious political capital – especially in the first year – to push for serious change. The biggest lesson of the last election was that the “Latino vote” was decisive. No one doubts that it will be even more so in future elections. During the campaign, many Republicans -- inexplicably -- frightened immigrants with offensive rhetoric. But the day after the election, there was talk, in both parties, of comprehensive immigration reform. Despite the sudden optimism about immigration reform, there is, of course, no guarantee that it will happen. It will require a lot of negotiation and deal-making. Obama will have to invest a lot of his time and political capital -- twisting some arms, even in his own party. Resistance will not disappear. There is also a chance that something unexpected could happen that would put off consideration of immigration reform. Following the horrific massacre at a Connecticut elementary school on December 14, for example, public pressure understandably mounted for gun control, at least the ban of assault weapons. But a decision to pursue that measure -- though desperately needed -- would take away energy and time from other priorities like immigration.

#### Wind costs PC with the GOP

Cohen 4/4/11 (Steven, “A Plea for Presidential Leadership on Sustainable Energy”) <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-cohen/a-plea-for-presidential-l_b_844300.html>

The problem is that the Administration assigns a lower priority to energy and environment than to the economy, health care, and our military engagements. While sustainable energy could be a huge boost for the economy, the American political right is unwilling to invest government money in R & D and will not allow tax policies that favor renewable energy. All of that could be overcome with Presidential leadership, but I do not get the sense that the President really cares about these issues. Until he does, I don't think anything will change.

#### Coal industry will backlash

Lipton 12

Eric, NYT, Even in Coal Country, the Fight for an Industry: May 29, 2012

But the coal industry is mustering all the weapons it can: lobbying, legislation, litigation and a multimillion-dollar advertising campaign trumpeting the benefits of “clean coal.” The fight has even become an issue in the presidential campaign, with the industry blaming President Obama and the Environmental Protection Agency for the onslaught, and Mitt Romney, the presumptive Republican nominee, hinting that he would roll back some of the rules. Here in Kentucky, the intervention by Mr. Adkins and other coal industry advocates has saved coal at Big Sandy, at least temporarily. American Electric Power, which is based in Columbus, Ohio, is proposing a $1 billion retrofit to allow the plant to continue burning coal and has asked Kentucky regulators to approve a 30 percent increase in electricity rates to pay for the work. But that request, which will come up for a vote by the state’s utility commission within the next week, has inspired resistance from some residents, large industrial companies that consume much of Kentucky’s electricity and even the state attorney general’s office. Pressured on the domestic front, some giant American coal producers, like Arch Coal and Peabody Energy, are shifting their attention to markets overseas, where coal-fired power plants are being built faster than they are being abandoned in the United States. Even if Big Sandy continues to eat up 90 rail cars of coal a day, the industry’s decline is evident here. Sales to Midwestern power plants have slumped, as has the market price of coal, dropping so suddenly that many local mines are cutting back hours or closing. A warm winter, decreasing demand, only made matters worse. “I call it the imperfect storm,” Mr. Adkins said. “And it is breaking the back of our local economy.” A Coordinated Effort The anger toward Washington is palpable in this impoverished corner of Eastern Kentucky, where miners display bumper stickers or license plates on their pickup trucks with slogans like “Coal Keeps the Lights On” or “If Obama Is the Answer, How Stupid Was the Question?” It is hard to find anyone here who does not feel affected by the fate of Big Sandy. Just as the smokestack at the plant towers over the countryside, Big Sandy dominates much of life here. Danny Sartin, 61, a barrel-chested heavy equipment operator at the plant, said his father, grandfathers and uncles all worked in local mines that feed Big Sandy. “Coal and the coal mining industry, it’s all we have ever known,” Mr. Sartin said. Some of that coal comes from the Licking River mine, about 50 miles south of Big Sandy, where miners rip apart hillsides to reach vast seams just below the surface. Chris Lacy, 41, an executive at Licking River Resources Inc., said layoffs among his 350 miners — in Magoffin County, where unemployment is already 17.5 percent — are inevitable if the coal furnaces at Big Sandy go cold. Even the garden supply company that Mr. Lacy’s father-in-law owns and where his two sons work indirectly relies on Big Sandy, because mines are required to plant grass over the scarred earth they leave behind. “It is the ripple effect that comes right through us,” Mr. Lacy said. Channeling the animosity toward Washington and fears about their livelihoods, coal producers, union leaders, landowners and railroads came together to pressure American Electric Power to back down on its plan to close the coal furnaces at Big Sandy. They have leaned on county judges, state legislators and other politicians to attempt to silence public criticism of the 30 percent electricity rate increase and to pressure the Kentucky Public Service Commission to approve the retrofit project.

#### Immigration reform is key to food security

**ACIR ‘7** (December 4, 2007 THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Dear Member of Congress: The Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform (ACIR) is deeply concerned with pending immigration enforcement legislation known as the ‘Secure America Through Verification and Enforcement Act of 2007' or ‘SAVE Act’ (H.R.4088 and S.2368). While these bills seek to address the worthy goal of stricter immigration law enforcement, they fail to take a comprehensive approach to solving the immigration problem. History shows that a one dimensional approach to the nation’s immigration problem is doomed to fail. Enforcement alone, without providing a viable means to obtain a legal workforce to sustain economic growth is a formula for disaster. Agriculture best illustrates this point. Agricultural industries that need considerable labor in order to function include the fruit and vegetable, dairy and livestock, nursery, greenhouse, and Christmas tree sectors. Localized labor shortages have resulted in actual crop loss in various parts of the country. More broadly, producers are making decisions to scale back production, limit expansion, and leave many critical tasks unfulfilled. Continued labor shortages could force more producers to shift production out of the U.S., thus stressing already taxed food and import safety systems. Farm lenders are becoming increasingly concerned about the stability of affected industries. This problem is aggravated by the nearly universal acknowledgement that the current H-2A agricultural guest worker program does not work. Based on government statistics and other evidence, roughly 80 percent of the farm labor force in the United States is foreign born, and a significant majority of that labor force is believed to be improperly authorized. The bills’ imposition of mandatory electronic employment eligibility verification will screen out the farm labor force without providing access to legal workers. Careful study of farm labor force demographics and trends indicates that there is not a replacement domestic workforce available to fill these jobs. This feature alone will result in chaos unless combined with labor-stabilizing reforms. Continued failure by Congress to act to address this situation in a comprehensive fashion is placing in jeopardy U.S. food security and global competitiveness. Furthermore, congressional inaction threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans whose jobs exist because laborintensive agricultural production is occurring in America. If production is forced to move, most of the upstream and downstream jobs will disappear as well. The Coalition cannot defend of the broken status quo. We support well-managed borders and a rational legal system. We have worked for years to develop popular bipartisan legislation that would stabilize the existing experienced farm workforce and provide an orderly transition to wider reliance on a legal agricultural worker program that provides a fair balance of employer and employee rights and protections. We respectfully urge you to oppose S.2368, H.R.4088, or any other bills that would impose employment-based immigration enforcement in isolation from equally important reforms that would provide for a stable and legal farm labor force.

#### Food insecurity sparks World War 3

**Calvin ’98** (William, Theoretical Neurophysiologist – U Washington, Atlantic Monthly, January, Vol 281, No. 1, p. 47-64)

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

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

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**20**12 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

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

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

Schaffer, Spring **200**2 (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

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

**CIR solves Latin American Relations and stability**

**Coates ’10** (Posted by David Coates at 1:38 pm August 25, 2010 1 COMMENT Immigration and the Problem of the Two-Legged Stool (co-authored with Peter Siavelis) David Coates holds the Worrell Chair in Anglo-American Studies. Born in the United Kingdom and educated at the universities of York and Oxford, he came to Wake Forest University in 1999, having previously held personal chairs at the universities of Leeds (in contemporary political economy) and Manchester (in labor studies). He has written extensively on UK labor politics, contemporary political economy and US public policy.

The diplomatic case for comprehensive immigration reform needs also to be factored in. The lack of comprehensive immigration reform imperils U.S. diplomacy in Latin America, undermining U.S. interests in the region and beyond. The U.S.’s immigration model has historically provided the best and brightest immigrants and students the chance to succeed, reinforcing the notion internationally of the U.S. as the land of opportunity. Workers who stay in the U.S. provide living proof of this reality and international students take back a positive image of the U.S. to their home countries. Tighter immigration has undermined both of these processes, and hurt the reputation of the United States internationally, as visitors become increasingly frustrated with the hostility and suspicion in the visa process. In more concrete terms, the lack of immigration reform has poisoned the well of U.S.-Latin American relations, and particularly U.S.-Mexican relations. Mexico is the U.S.’s second largest trading partner after Canada and an important gateway to markets farther south. The inability to achieve reform interferes with the deepening of mutually beneficial economic relations and complicates joint efforts at progress toward a solution to the scourge of narco-trafficking. The scathing condemnation of Arizona’s immigration law by Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and a group of Cuban parliamentarians provides ample evidence of how the immigration impasse also provides negative diplomatic ammunition to avowed enemies of the U.S.

**Extinction**

**Manwaring ‘5** (Max G., Retired U.S. Army colonel and an Adjunct Professor of International Politics at Dickinson College, venezuela’s hugo chávez, bolivarian socialism, and asymmetric warfare, October 2005, pg. PUB628.pdf)

President Chávez also understands that the process leading to state failure is the most dangerous long-term security challenge facing the global community today. The argument in general is that failing and failed state status is the breeding ground for instability, criminality, insurgency, regional conflict, and terrorism. These conditions breed massive humanitarian disasters and major refugee flows. They can host “evil” networks of all kinds, whether they involve criminal business enterprise, narco-trafficking, or some form of ideological crusade such as *Bolivarianismo.* More specifically, these conditions spawn all kinds of things people in general do not like such as murder, kidnapping, corruption, intimidation, and destruction of infrastructure. These means of coercion and persuasion can spawn further human rights violations, torture, poverty, starvation, disease, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, trafficking in women and body parts, trafficking and proliferation of conventional weapons systems and WMD, genocide, ethnic cleansing, warlordism, and criminal anarchy. At the same time, these actions are usually unconfined and spill over into regional syndromes of poverty, destabilization, and conflict.62 Peru’s *Sendero Luminoso* calls violent and destructive activities that facilitate the processes of state failure “armed propaganda.” Drug cartels operating throughout the Andean Ridge of South America and elsewhere call these activities “business incentives.” Chávez considers these actions to be steps that must be taken to bring about the political conditions necessary to establish Latin American socialism for the 21st century.63 Thus, in addition to helping to provide wider latitude to further their tactical and operational objectives, state and nonstate actors’ strategic efforts are aimed at progressively lessening a targeted regime’s credibility and capability in terms of its ability and willingness to govern and develop its national territory and society. Chávez’s intent is to focus his primary attack politically and psychologically on selected Latin American governments’ ability and right to govern. In that context, he understands that popular perceptions of corruption, disenfranchisement, poverty, and lack of upward mobility limit the right and the ability of a given regime to conduct the business of the state. Until a given populace generally perceives that its government is dealing with these and other basic issues of political, economic, and social injustice fairly and effectively, instability and the threat of subverting or destroying such a government are real.64 But failing and failed states simply do not go away. Virtually anyone can take advantage of such an unstable situation. The tendency is that the best motivated and best armed organization on the scene will control that instability. As a consequence, failing and failed states become dysfunctional states, rogue states, criminal states, narco-states, or new people’s democracies. In connection with the creation of new people’s democracies, one can rest assured that Chávez and his Bolivarian populist allies will be available to provide money, arms, and leadership at any given opportunity. And, of course, the longer dysfunctional, rogue, criminal, and narco-states and people’s democracies persist, the more they and their associated problems endanger global security, peace, and prosperity.65
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#### Saudi would flood the market in response to the plan and crash oil prices

HULBERT ’12 - Lead Analyst at European Energy Review; Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations; Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Security Studies (Hulbert, Matthew. “OPEC's Pending Bloodbath”. June 10, 2012. http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/06/10/opecs-pending-bloodbath/)

That’s unlikely to happen, precisely because Riyadh can bring further pricing pressures to bear **if it wants to get its way** in the cartel. The Kingdom’s policy space has admittedly tightened over the past couple of years, but they remain **the only producer capable of significantly increasing or reducing production at will**. Initial tanker data from Europe suggests Riyadh may have started reigning in production that was running around 6% over OPEC quota. It’s also raised July benchmarks for Arab Light grades in Asia. But Iran, Venezuela, Nigeria, Angola and Algeria will want restraint to come far faster and far deeper to firm prices. The line being spun from the ‘free lunch’ brigade is that storage should easily cover any Iranian spikes when EU sanctions come into full effect 1st July, while OPEC quotas should be pared down to 29.5mb/d (or less). Cheap words from petro-hawks, not least because they’ll all continue to cheat on quotas to squeeze out every last drop they have. Riyadh knows that of course; hawks want a price floor to be set at $100/b to sustain political regimes, but to do so entirely at Saudi expense. Russia is no different outside the cartel: free riding 101. Saudi Arabia (and its GCC partners) might be willing to play ball given ongoing concerns from the Arab Awakening, but with some budgetary tweaks and counter-cyclical cash to burn, they could all easily survive at $85/b making Iran et al sweat. Tehran might decide to rip up formal quotas as it did in June 2011, but that would be a costly mistake. If the Saudis let prices fall, political outages across smaller producer states could help to set a floor for them anyway. Iran would have no say in the matter. Given such ‘pricing perils’, Saudi Arabia holds all the aces to settle institutional issues, not to mention giving the global economy more breathing space (and Washington greater leeway over Iranian sanctions). But the real reason to let prices fall a little further isn’t just to make very clear to OPEC states where the ultimate volume and pricing power rests, but to fight Riyadh’s **bigger battle** over the next decade: **Retaining** 40% of **OPEC market share in the midst of supposedly huge non-OPEC supply growth**. It didn’t go unnoticed that despite Saudi production averaging 31 year highs and prices hitting $128/b in March 2012, the forward curve for 2018 was trading at $30/b discounts relative to spot. You’d think with the cartel maxed out and proximate demand side problems looking bleak, five year curves would be exactly the other way, in sharp contango (i.e. far above prompt prices) once the global economy and demand side fundamentals were fixed. The fact they weren’t is principally because the market thinks vast swathes of unconventional production will come online, not just in North America where production is back above 6mb/d, but in Canada, Brazil and even Arctic extremes. At $100/b that was a fair bet to place, but once benchmark prices drop back to two figures, the 6.4 trillion barrels of unconventional reserves sitting in the Americas look a far less certain prospect. Canadian tar distinctly sticky; Brazilian pre-salt horribly deep; Russian Arctic plays simply impossible. So when OPEC meets in Vienna expect Saudi Arabia to call the shots. The new Secretary General will either be a Saudi national, or a compromise candidate Riyadh can live with. Quotas will stay close to 30mb/d with minor reductions possible. Thinly veiled threats of sustained (or increased) production will be made if Iran doesn’t play ball. Yet the long term price point to watch isn’t just one that keeps OPEC in business and Riyadh in control, but where the al-Saud can maintain secular market share. Letting prices **informally slide** to $85-90/b **might be the** kind of warning shot **Riyadh wants** to send to scrub unconventional plays off global balance sheets. Its OPEC colleagues will see that as sailing far too close to the political wind, but a Saudi bloodbath now, might be just the medicine OPEC requires to sustain its long term health, not unless the cartel is absolutely determined to keep pricing itself out of existence.

They’re afraid of clean energy

William Kole, 9/8/2007. Associated Press Writer. “Despite rising prices, OPEC appears to be in no rush to raise its output targets,” NWI Times, <http://nwitimes.com/articles/2007/09/08/business/business/doc7e79bb33cb7ec6f28625734f00723bfd.txt>.

If you remember what happened in the 1970's (look it up if you don't) you will find the biggest fear OPEC has. It is that oil prices will go up and stay high long enough to fuel investment into conservation and alternative energy sources to the point that a critical mass is reached and the need for their oil is greatly diminished or replaced by other energy sources they don't control. That's exactly what started happening in the 1970's and it took OPEC opening up the tap to make oil cheap again over a decade to reverse the trends. The result was that interest in conservation and alternative energy waned and investments dried up in the face of cheap oil again. We are once again nearing that point and you can expect to see OPEC flood the market again if they see us getting serious with conservation and alternative energy sources that compete with, or worse yet, actually replace demand for their oil. OPEC walks the fine line between price and demand and wants to keep us hooked up to their oil like a bunch of junkies on drugs while making as much money as possible.

#### High oil prices are key to Libyan stability

ACHY ‘12 - a nonresident scholar at the Carnegie Middle East Center in Beirut. He is an economist with expertise in development and institutional economics, as well as trade and labor, with a focus on the Middle East and North Africa (Achy, Lahcen. “Libya’s Economy: On Path to Recovery but Facing Hard Challenges”. May 1, 2012. http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/05/01/libya-s-economy-on-path-to-recovery-but-facing-hard-challenges/apm9)

The Libyan oil minister recently announced that oil production is approaching pre-war levels. The oil sector is the backbone of the Libyan economy, so such a statement is of high importance. **It accounts for 70 percent of GDP,** over **95 percent of exports, and 90 percent of** government **revenue**. With the current level of oil production and high prices on international markets, **the Libyan economy is expected to recover this year**. Yet, to ensure long-term stability, Libya must move away from its dependence on oil toward a diversified economy led by a competitive private sector. The Libyan economy paid a heavy price to topple the regime of Muammar Qaddafi, a toll that far exceeds the losses incurred by both Tunisia and Egypt. Indeed, the year 2011 brought a 60 percent contraction in Libya’s GDP, following months of almost total interruption of oil production and exports. Government revenue fell, while the budget deficit reached a record 40 percent of GDP and a supply shortage led to an inflation rate of nearly 20 percent. The UN Security Council resolution to freeze the Libyan central bank’s assets and the growing amount of bad debt in the country has resulted in a severe lack of liquidity. Libya’s neighborhood has also felt the effects of the armed conflict to overthrow Qaddafi. Many Tunisians and Egyptians that had worked in Libya returned home, thus depriving their families of remittances and swelling the ranks of the unemployed in their home countries. A 70 percent increase in GDP and a current account surplus of 11 percent of GDP are expected in 2012. Prices are projected to go down by 10 percent after the resumption of imports and market supply to normal level. Still, the budget deficit is expected to represent 7 percent of GDP due to a generous increase in civil servants’ wages in March of last year—an attempt by the Qaddafi regime to end popular discontent. The amount budgeted for wages now represents 20 percent of GDP, which is double the level in 2010. Egypt and Tunisia are in need of external funding, which may eventually lead them to accept costly or conditional loans; Libya with foreign reserve assets amounting to $174 billion and almost no foreign debt to repay can set its priorities and design its policies without any external pressure. But Libya’s strengths, along with burgeoning oil revenue, may become weaknesses if the government fails to restore security and stability throughout the country. This is why Libya’s current government must manage the transition to democracy according to a set timetable and build strong, efficient, and yet accountable institutions that will allow Libya to meet the major challenges its economy is facing

#### Libyan war sparks World War III

Lendman, 7-6-11

[Stephen, Libya - Flashpoint for World Conflict, http://www.rense.com/general94/libya.htm]

  On July 3, Peter Dale Scott told Progressive Radio News Hour listeners what he fears most. He repeated it in a July 4 email, citing a Paul Joseph Watson Infowars.com article, accessed through the following link:

http://www.infowars.com/report-ground-invasion-of-libya-within-two-weeks

Using information from DEBKAfile, a Jerusalem-based intelligence site with close Mossad ties (providing commentary and analysis on regional terrorism, intelligence, security, military and political affairs), he discussed a frightening prospect. More on it below. Founded in June 2000, DEBKA calls itself independent, "pioneer(ing) intensive news coverage and analysis of global (Islamic, not Israeli, US, or other Western) terror before it hits" front pages. Calling its reports "not infallible," Scott said its information deserves attention because some past predictions proved true. Specifically, he cited their June 25, 2003 story that "The Americans are secretly building two giant intelligence facilities in Iraq at a cost of some half a billion dollars." Doing so and more makes it "seem that America is now indeed acting as recklessly and idiotically as Britain and France did in the (1956) Suez crisis...." On air and in his email, Scott wondered whether "Washington failed to take into account the reaction of Russia and China (the way Britain in 1956 insanely" didn't bank on America's response at the time). "Or is (America) counting on its (nuclear superiority) to deal with any problems in that area." Disturbingly, top US officials include extremists who think brute force solutions work best, even high risk ones like nuclear war or simultaneously waging too many conventional ones. Scott told Progressive Radio News Hour listeners that he's warned for months about Libya being a flashpoint for escalated general war, similar to how WW I began. Global Research founder/editor Michel Chossudovsky has similar concerns, including in his new E-book titled, "Towards a World War III Scenario," calling today's world "at a critical crossroads." Citing two major incidents, Japan's Fukushima disaster and imperial war on Libya, he called "(t)hese two seemingly unrelated events....of crucial importance in understanding both the nuclear issue as well as the ongoing US-NATO sponsored war." Fukushima's implications and fallout go largely unexplained. In fact, except for occasional misreporting, America's media now entirely ignore them, including warnings from Helen Caldicott and others that every commercial reactor is a ticking time bomb "atomic bomb factory." Moreover, Chossudovsky said "(n)uclear energy is not a civilian economic activity. It is an appendage of the nuclear weapons industry which is controlled by the so-called defense contractors." In fact, secret "atomic-bomb research facilities (are) hidden inside Japan's civilian nuclear power plants," and perhaps also in America's. It may not have been coincidence that Libya's war was launched within days of Fukushima's disaster. It's now dramatically escalated as part of America's broader Middle East/North Africa/Central Asia conflict, **encroaching recklessly close to China and Russia's borders**. Their concerns, in fact, may trigger counter-responses that **could dangerously spin** things out of control. In fact, the war Obama won't call war potentially could trigger a "World War III scenario." It worries Chossudovsky, Scott and others enough to highlight it on air and in print. It's repeated in this article, citing another recent one discussing Barbara Tuchman's 1962 book, "The Guns of August," on how WW I began and its early weeks. Once started, it escalated out of control disastrously, involving dozens of countries directly and indirectly. Moreover, before it ended, over 20 million died, at least that many more were wounded, and a generation of young men were erased before nuclear and today's other mass destruction weapons and technologies existed. Over a half century ago, it worried Einstein enough to say: "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones" if civilizations survive to do it. Given the possibility of Libya triggering escalated general or global war, that scenario today is real, especially in light of a "1996 plan to bomb Libya using tacticalnuclear weapons." It was shelved at that time, but never eliminated as a possibility against any nation. In fact, the Bush administration claimed the preemptive right to use nuclear weapons, including against non-nuclear states, based on alleged national security concerns.Obama recklessly maintains the same policy even though America hasn't had an enemy since Japan surrendered in August 1945. Nonetheless, the prospect of escalating war with nuclear or other mass destruction weapons suggests frightening possibilities, including a potential WW III scenario. It's no less implausible now than WW I seemed in early 1914. Worry most perhaps about what's least expected, especially to refocus angry millions (suffering from global economic crisis misery) on something greater. It's worked many times before, notably post-9/11, escalating one war into multiple ones and counting. Given America's out-of-control belligerence, perhaps ad infinitum wars will proliferate until America destroys planet earth to liberate it in a mushroom-shaped cloud. It's possible given alarming reports like Watson's July 4 Infowars one linked above.

#### Low oil prices will crush Mexico’s economy – causes instability

Morley 08, Robert Morley, economic analyst focusing on US trade relations, “Disorder South of the Border,” July 8th, 2008, from The Trumpet, http://www.thetrumpet.com/?q=5309.3600.0.0&preview

Additionally, since pemex is government-owned, its annual profits are used to cover government spending as opposed to exploration and development. Instead of creating future revenues, current revenues subsidize the living standards of the Mexican populace. The state requires pemex to sell fuel at prices sometimes less than half the market value. This kind of management has virtually bankrupted the company, despite the fact that oil is trading at over $140 per barrel. In 2006, pemex was the most indebted oil company on the planet. If not for record-high oil prices, both pemex and Mexico would have already faced a severe budget crisis. **With 40 percent of** government **revenues at risk**, the whole country could have easily descended into chaos, with resultant devalued currency, rising interest rates and much higher taxes. Record oil prices have temporarily plugged the gap left by plunging production levels. But if high oil prices eventually retreat, Mexico is going to face a huge cash crunch. For now, there are other serious ramifications. Declining Mexican oil production means that either Mexicans or Americans will have to do without. With global oil supplies as tight as they are, either decision will have far-reaching effects. Mexico is left with ugly choices. If it chooses to reduce exports to America, it will lose its largest source of foreign capital. Consequently, the Mexican trade gap will soar, government spending will plummet, and the peso will come under intense pressure—leading to price inflation even more severe than current levels. Yet **if Mexico decides to restrict local supply** in order **to maintain** its foreign **income** streams, it risks choking off local commerce by inducing local price spikes and shortages not only of fuel, but also of essential petrochemical products like lubricants, synthetic fabrics, plastics and fertilizer. A cauldron of social and political upheaval is bubbling. Mexico’s easy oil days are over. Currently, it looks like Mexico has decided to limit exports to America, recently announcing a sizeable reduction of 150,000 barrels per day. So America’s easy oil days are ending too.

#### Instability in Mexico causes nuclear use and retaliation

The Hill 09, “Border lawmakers fear drug-terrorism link,” March 7th, 2009, http://thehill.com/leading-the-news/border-lawmakers-fear-extent-of-drug-cartel-violence-2009-03-07.html)   
Members of Congress are raising the alarm that war-like conditions on the Mexican border could lead to Mexican drug cartels helping terrorists attack the U.S. “When you have…gangs and they **have loose ties with al Qaeda and** then you have **Iran** not too far away from building a nuclear capability, nuclear terrorism may not be far off,” said Rep. Trent Franks (R- Ariz.), a member of the House Armed Services committee. The Mexican drug cartels’ violence accounted for more than 6,000 deaths last year, and in recent months it has begun spilling over into the districts of lawmakers from the southwest region, even as far north as Phoenix, Ariz. -- which has become, Franks noted, the “kidnap capital of the U.S.” Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-Texas), whose district borders Mexico, said that while the situation is bad, it could easily get worse. “The goal of the cartels is to make money,” said Cuellar, who sits on the House Homeland Security committee. “**If they can smuggle in drugs and human cargo,** then certainly they can smuggle other things in, other devices to cause us harm.” “We have not heard of any associations, but is there the possibility? I’ll be the first to say, yeah. They have the routes, they can very easily smuggle in other things. If I was a bad guy in another country, I would go into Central America because the U.S. is not paying the proper attention.”

#### Retaliation leads to nuclear war

Speice ‘6 (Patrick F. Jr., JD Candidate @ College of William and Mary “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” February 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427)

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. 51 This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.

### Solvency

#### Zeller says two NASA scientists we’re working to TRY to make Appalachia the test case. Not that it IS the test case. And he concludes the coal industry takes out solvency – land control

**Zeller 10** [[TOM ZELLER Jr.](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/z/tom_jr_zeller/index.html?inline=nyt-per) “A Battle in Mining Country Pits Coal Against Wind,” New York Times, Published: August 14, 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/8ctubyz

At least one study has shown that a wind project could be a feasible alternative to coal mining here, although the coal industry’s control over the land and the uncertain and often tenuous financial prospects of wind generation appear to make it unlikely to be pursued.

#### Deregulation and natural gas will raise the price cap – causes price spike

Steffy 12 (Loren --- business columnist @ The Chronicle, “Steffy: Electricity prices are going up – just ask Alice” May 21, 2012, FuelFix)

It’s a riddle the Mad Hatter would love: Natural gas prices fall to a decade low. Electricity prices in Texas are pegged to natural gas prices. So what happens to electricity prices? Why, they go up, of course. Next month, the Public Utility Commission is set to vote on a plan to raise the ceiling on wholesale electricity prices by 50 percent as early as August. Lower gas prices were finally supposed to justify the costly fiasco of deregulation. Now, that promise, like so many others related to deregulation, has evaporated. As I wrote earlier, the deregulated market has eroded generating capacity, which left the state vulnerable to rolling blackouts last year. Under the current system, generators can’t justify the cost of building new plants. Last year, the capacity shortage caused prices to soar, and they bumped up against the state’s wholesale price cap of $3,000 a megawatt-hour. So next month, the Public Utility Commission will consider a plan to raise that cap to $4,500. Generators sell the electricity they produce in the wholesale market, where retailers buy it before reselling it to consumers. The higher prices are supposed to ensure greater reliability over time by making it economical for generators to build more plants. In the short term, though, we just get the higher prices, not the additional generation, because new power plants can’t be built between now and August. “There is no chance – none whatsoever – that increasing the cap this summer will lead to new generation construction before 2013,” state Rep. Sylvester Turner, D-Houston, wrote in a recent letter to the PUC. PUC Commissioner Kenneth Anderson echoed those sentiments at a recent commission meeting. “I don’t know what signals it sends this summer, other than panic,” he said. The $4,500 cap is just the beginning. The PUC will consider another measure that would raise the cap even higher next year. Even before the cap is raised, though, traders tell me they’re seeing suspicious activity in the spot markets. Consider what happened on May 9, a mild day when temperatures peaked in the mid-80s. Wholesale prices started the day at $23 a megawatt-hour, and the forecast showed plenty of generating capacity. By late afternoon, that excess capacity dried up and the market appeared headed for a shortage. Prices jumped to $32, according to information compiled for me by a trader using data from the Electric Reliability Council of Texas, the grid operator for the deregulated market. Several electricity traders I spoke with told me they’ve seen similar patterns in recent months, and they worry the volatility will get worse. More volatile markets mean electricity retailers – the companies that sell you your power – must spend more to hedge against price swings. The more they hedge, the more it squeezes their razor-thin profit margins. That could force some companies to break their contracts with customers – and raise prices – or be forced out of business. In 2008, five retailers shut down because of price volatility. It’s not clear what’s causing the latest spikes, but Dan Jones, the state’s independent market monitor, agreed that the spot markets are behaving differently. “We know that this spring the weather was really mild and the load levels are pretty low,” he told me. “Gas prices are totally upside down from where they’ve been. The market dynamics are different.” Jones said he hasn’t ruled out manipulation, but he’s still investigating. Another possibility: With weak gas prices, more generators are running gas plants first and using coal only to meet peak demand. In the past, the opposite was true. Because coal plants take longer to come online, it may be creating capacity gaps, which cause prices to jump. So far, the impact of these daily price swings to consumers has been minimal, but that could change with the higher wholesale price cap and the summer’s increased electricity demands. Prices are going up no matter what. The deregulated market has become a sort of Mad Tea Party, and consumers are Alice. Bombarded by ridiculous riddles, we can only conclude that deregulation has become expensive nonsense.

#### Wind causes price supression – lowers rates

Caperton 12 (Richard W. Caperton is the Director of Clean Energy Investment at the Center for American Progress, “Wind Power Helps to Lower Electricity Prices” October 10, 2012, Energy and Environment)

Studies show that wind energy lowers power prices in wholesale markets, so it’s perfectly rational for Exelon to oppose wind power. But Exelon’s argument about the production tax credit hurting consumers is deeply misleading. Before digging into their argument, however, we need to review how wind power drives down prices. Much of Exelon’s power is sold in competitive wholesale power markets, which allow power generators (like Exelon) to sell power to local distribution utilities, which in turn sell that power to businesses and homeowners. Competitive markets all operate on a “single clearing price” basis, which means that all generators get paid the same amount for their power, no matter how much it costs to produce. This auction method ensures that every generator bids in the lowest price they’re willing to accept for their power. While the details are extremely complicated—the rules for the market that operates in the mid-Atlantic area are more than 2,000 pages long, for example—the basics are fairly straightforward. Every generator in the market tells the market operator how much power they’re willing to provide and at what cost. At the same time, every distribution utility tells the market operator how much power they need to buy. The market operator then stacks up the generators from lowest to highest bid. Then, starting at the lowest bid, the market operator adds up all of the bids until they have enough power to meet the distribution utilities’ demands. The last bid accepted becomes the “clearing price”—the price the distribution utilities pay for all of their power, and the price that every generator receives. To see how wind impacts power markets, consider the hypothetical examples displayed in Figure 1. Say a market has five different generators: a wind farm, a nuclear reactor, a coal-fired power plant, an efficient and modern natural gas power plant, and an older and less efficient natural gas plant. Each of these plants will offer to sell power at the price that covers their operating cost. On the other side of the market, distribution utilities need to buy 3,000 megawatts of power. This means the market operator will then stack up the bids from lowest to highest and then add up the bids until enough power can meet the 3,000 megawatts of demand. In the first example the market will clear at $50 per megawatt-hour of electricity. Now, consider what happens to this market if someone builds a new 500-megawatt wind farm, as shown in the second example. The need for power hasn’t changed at all, so the cheapest 3,000 megawatts will still determine the clearing price. In this case, the market now clears at $30 per megawatt-hour of electricity. This effect of wind power driving down wholesale prices is known as “price suppression” or the “merit order effect,” and its benefits are well known. A recent study of the Midwest Independent System Operator, for example, found that large amounts of wind could save consumers $200 per year. While the benefits for consumers are clear, existing generators lose some profits. In the original scenario, the nuclear reactor—let’s say it’s owned by Exelon—was making $40 per megawatt-hour more than their operating cost. (This isn’t technically “profit,” since some of this $40 goes toward covering fixed costs.) In the latter scenario, the reactor is only making $20 more than their operating costs. Of course, while Exelon makes $20 less, consumers save $20 on their power bill.

#### Low prices cause reshoring

Davidson 12 (Paul, “U.S. businesses worry they can't compete; They say taxes and regulations put them at a disadvantage globally” November 9, 2012, USA TODAY, MONEY; Pg. 1B)

The Council on Competitiveness, a group of CEOs, university presidents and labor leaders, says many of the issues should draw support from both parties. "We need to make the United States a leader in attracting investment, growing jobs and delivering prosperity," says Deborah Wince-Smith, who heads the competitiveness council. "And we're falling behind in all those things." Despite its slippage, the U.S. is still an economic power and the world's manufacturing leader. In recent years, falling U.S. factory wages and energy prices have narrowed its business-cost gap with other countries. Outsourcing jobs Over the long term, however, its status has declined as manufacturers have outsourced millions of jobs to countries that have lower wages, such as China; capitalism has spread to formerly closed economies, and technology has let companies to do business almost anywhere. The World Economic Forum recently said the USA's global ranking among the most competitive economies fell for the fourth year in a row in 2012, from fifth to seventh. It listed government bureaucracy and high taxes among the biggest deterrents for doing business here. And in a recent Harvard Business School survey of nearly 7,000 alumni, mostly senior business executives, 58% said they expect U.S. competitiveness to deteriorate in the next three years, though that's down from 71% last year. Competitiveness was defined as the ability to compete in the global economy while supporting high living standards for average Americans. There is some good news. The past few years, companies such as General Electric, NCR and Ford have moved at least some production back to the U.S., a trend known as reshoring. There are myriad reasons. Chinese wages have climbed an average 19% annually in recent years, while U.S. wages have risen by less than 4% annually, shrinking China's advantage, according to a study by Boston Consulting Group (BCG). Companies also cite rising overseas shipping costs, the sometimes-poor quality of foreign-made goods and the desire to more closely oversee production. Meanwhile, rising domestic energy production promises to pay huge dividends for the U.S. economy. A natural gas drilling boom has sharply lowered prices of the commodity and prompted companies that use natural gas as an energy source or feedstock to build plants in the U.S. or move production from overseas. Manufacturers such as Toyota, Honda and Siemens are taking advantage of low U.S. costs to begin exporting U.S.-made cars, gas turbines and other products to foreign countries. By the end of the decade, on-shoring and increased exports are expected to add about $125 billion a year to U.S. economic output and create 2.5 million to 5 million jobs, says BCG Senior Vice President Hal Sirkin. Yet while the offshoring calculus has shifted for many companies, it's not enough to reverse the long-term trend, says Harvard business professor Jan Rivkin. Respondents to the Harvard alumni survey were still three times as likely to be considering moving a business out of the U.S. as into the country. "We know the dominant flow remains outbound," he says. "Are we sinking more slowly than in the past? There's no question you hear lots of hopeful stories about reshoring."

#### Kills competitiveness

Hill 12 (Andrew, “Time to get past the stigma of offshoring” July 9, 2012, Financial Times)

But RBS identified the centre of its problem as its Edinburgh facility, underlining a central point. Where such work is done and by whom – let alone what it’s called (be it offshoring, outsourcing, near-shoring or “best-shoring”) – doesn’t matter. What matters is whether the company is managing the collaboration in a way that brings the greatest benefit. The right answer to that question is frequently much too complex for a campaign soundbite. I once visited an Italian nut factory that shipped unopened pistachio nuts to China to be opened by hand – the ultimate in low-cost, low-value work. When I looked again at the same case six years ago, the Chinese had moved up and out of the pistachio supply chain, while the nut-cracking work had transferred to Californian companies using a new automated system. Similarly, in the search for the optimal combination of location, cost and quality, some UK companies have brought call-centres “home”, having recognised that customers respond better to a British accent on the line. Yet some of these centres are operated by Indian providers, while their UK counterparts offer clients a portfolio of locations, including India. In spite of this variety of options, cost efficiency still tops the list of reasons why western companies choose to send work abroad. It is followed, according to a recent survey by the Offshoring Research Network (ORN), by the need for greater organisational flexibility, growth, access to expert personnel and strategic considerations. Arie Lewin of Duke University’s Fuqua School of Business, says managers still have to demonstrate the business case to their superiors in terms of bald efficiency improvements. Providers themselves are also pushing alternatives that are cheaper than traditional locations like India (for IT) or China (for manufacturing). Increasingly, customers are entertaining bids from the Philippines, the Middle East, eastern Europe and Latin America. But more than 20 years since outsourcing and offshoring took off, it is shocking that many companies are still ignoring the value they could add to their business if they took a more disciplined, more collaborative, less cost-centred and more strategic approach to delegating the work. Half of all outsourcing arrangements, measured by performance, are deemed middling or poor by their own clients, according to the London School of Economics. The LSE’s Leslie Willcocks reckons the best outsourcing deals are those where clients and providers collaborate closely, and actively try to innovate and transform their business. In other words, if you aim solely for a low-cost, arm’s length deal, you get what you pay for. Unless you’re a politician, location matters only because it is easier to keep an eye on contractors who are closer to home. The best insurance against unpleasant surprises from partners based far offshore is simple common sense: draw up detailed contracts, communicate often and well, and maintain tight oversight. The benefits of well-managed outsourcing and offshoring might even win over some critics. Prof Lewin points to one pharmaceutical company that brought all business support decisions – including the nature of the work outsourced and where it should be done – under the control of one senior executive. It pours the cumulative savings from this co-ordinated approach back into research and development. That is the kind of competitive advantage US presidential candidates should be campaigning for, not against.

#### Great power war

Khalilzad 11 — Zalmay Khalilzad, Counselor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, served as the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush, served as the director of policy planning at the Defense Department during the Presidency of George H.W. Bush, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, 2011 (“The Economy and National Security,” *National Review*, February 8th, Available Online at http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/259024, Accessed 02-08-2011)

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years. Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression. Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and managing the rise of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today. The policy question is how to enhance economic growth and employment while cutting discretionary spending in the near term and curbing the growth of entitlement spending in the out years. Republican members of Congress have outlined a plan. Several think tanks and commissions, including President Obama’s debt commission, have done so as well. Some consensus exists on measures to pare back the recent increases in domestic spending, restrain future growth in defense spending, and reform the tax code (by reducing tax expenditures while lowering individual and corporate rates). These are promising options. The key remaining question is whether the president and leaders of both parties on Capitol Hill have the will to act and the skill to fashion bipartisan solutions. Whether we take the needed actions is a choice, however difficult it might be. It is clearly within our capacity to put our economy on a better trajectory. In garnering political support for cutbacks, the president and members of Congress should point not only to the domestic consequences of inaction — but also to the geopolitical implications. As the United States gets its economic and fiscal house in order, it should take steps to prevent a flare-up in Asia. The United States can do so by signaling that its domestic challenges will not impede its intentions to check Chinese expansionism. This can be done in cost-efficient ways. While China’s economic rise enables its military modernization and international assertiveness, it also frightens rival powers. The Obama administration has wisely moved to strengthen relations with allies and potential partners in the region but more can be done. Some Chinese policies encourage other parties to join with the United States, and the U.S. should not let these opportunities pass. China’s military assertiveness should enable security cooperation with countries on China’s periphery — particularly Japan, India, and Vietnam — in ways that complicate Beijing’s strategic calculus. China’s mercantilist policies and currency manipulation — which harm developing states both in East Asia and elsewhere — should be used to fashion a coalition in favor of a more balanced trade system. Since Beijing’s over-the-top reaction to the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to a Chinese democracy activist alienated European leaders, highlighting human-rights questions would not only draw supporters from nearby countries but also embolden reformers within China. Since the end of the Cold War, a stable economic and financial condition at home has enabled America to have an expansive role in the world. Today we can no longer take this for granted. Unless we get our economic house in order, there is a risk that domestic stagnation in combination with the rise of rival powers will undermine our ability to deal with growing international problems. Regional hegemons in Asia could seize the moment, leading the world toward a new, dangerous era of multi-polarity.

#### This is Emory’s first solvency card – re-highlighted to illustrate MACED’s mandate of funding - special category alone won’t solve ((read green highlighting -- yellow is emory)

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

Recommendations: Provide grant funding and financing for community-scale renewable energy demonstrations in the areas of wind, solar, low-impact woody biomass and low impact hydro. Community-scale renewable energy production that is locally owned has the potential to maximize the economic benefits of energy production for local communities. In addition, community-scale projects can be high-efficiency, reusing waste heat in the case of biomass projects and minimizing line loss. A program to create local demonstrations across the region, including at public buildings and institutions like hospitals, in small town main street areas, and at a county scale could go a long way in leveraging new beneficial energy activity. A proposal from East Kentucky Biodiesel to create a pilot pyrolysis/gasification facility utilizing biomass grown on former surface mine land, explained on page 19, has the potential to be the first stage of a regional network of community-scale bioenergy production. A wide range of USDA and DOE programs promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency projects could be set aside or repurposed for efforts of this kind. Expand USDA Rural Utility Service (RUS) financing for renewable energy production (and energy efficiency) to utilities located in Central Appalachia. President Obama’s 2011 budget proposes additional funds to USDA “to help transition fossil fuel-dependent utilities to renewable energy.”18 Central Appalachian utilities are among the most fossil fuel dependent in the country, reliant on coal in aging power plants for well over 90 percent of their electricity. A 2009 study by the Ochs Center for Metropolitan Studies showed that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, a major provider of electricity in the Appalachian Kentucky, could create 8,750 jobs and inject $1.7 billion into the regional economy through a program of energy efficiency investments and expanded renewable energy capacity.19 A combination of grants and loans through RUS (and similar USDA programs like REDLG) to Central Appalachian utilities could help them begin to make this transition and create new jobs and economic opportunities in the process. One potential step forward in this direction is the new Rural Energy Savings Program legislation filed by in the House by Rep. James Clyburn and in the Senate by Sen. Jeff Merkley.20 It would create a pool of RUS funds for rural electric coops to create on-bill financing programs. Create a special category and set-aside of USDA Rural Energy for America (REAP) grants and guaranteed loans for renewable energy **and energy efficiency** projects in Central Appalachia. The USDA REAP program provides valuable, much needed funds for small businesses, farmers and others to pursue renewable energy projects and energy efficiency improvements. Even with expanded funding for this program, however, valuable projects including ones MACED has helped support are being denied funding. Those projects that are receiving REAP grants are creating important models in the region. Organizations like MACED and the Natural Capital Investment Fund in West Virginia can also provide financing to small businesses that can be packaged with REAP grants, which will help leverage federal dollars and increase impact. Fund community-based wind monitoring efforts to help communities assess the feasibility of wind power. Wind power along the ridgelines of Central Appalachia is widely recognized as an important regional opportunity. However, there is a lack of site-specific data for communities to understand the actual opportunities for wind development in the region, holding back project development. A program of grants and equipment loans could help communities better assess these opportunities. Support the establishment of renewable energy component manufacturing in the coalfields of Central Appalachia. Manufacturing of component parts for the wind and solar supply chain offer some of the greatest economic opportunities for the nation as a whole. However, the lack of manufacturing infrastructure in the heart of Central Appalachia threatens to leave the region out of these opportunities. An initiative should be developed with the goal of establishing at least one significant supply chain manufacturer in the coalfields of Central Appalachia. This initiative should include research to identify if there are any opportunities with existing manufacturers in the region. If no such opportunities arise, the focus should be on the feasibility of establishing a new facility. New approaches like the Cleveland model of community-based, worker-owned companies in new green industries are promising ways to create jobs that help low-income workers accrue long-term wealth.21 A project to establish a model facility in a coalfield community could go a long way in creating good opportunities and promoting a needed discussion about the region’s energy future. Provide competitive grants for school-based renewable energy projects eligible for schools in Central Appalachia. A number of potential models exist for renewable energy production at the school level, which can save schools money and create important opportunities for student and community learning. The model of Russell High School in Greenup County, Kentucky, is one example of the use of wind and solar demonstrations to save money and provide training for vocational students. Opportunities also exist to fund fuels-for-schools initiatives (like those in the western U. S.) utilizing local, sustainably harvested woody biomass as a building heat source. Support workforce training and enterprise development in the new renewable energy industries. MACED and other entrepreneurial development organizations like the Natural Capital Investment Fund have worked with a number of entrepreneurs in the region interested in starting new companies in wind, biomass, or solar. These folks lack access to training that would deepen their understanding of the technologies, and often lack the business management skills to make their fledgling enterprises survive. In Kentucky, for example, state tax credits were recently enacted for renewable energy installations like solar panels, but included requirements that installers be North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioner (NABCEP) certified. Only a handful of people in tfhe entirestate have that certification. Federal workforce and business services dollars could support targeted scholarship, training, and technical assistance programs that could help more renewable energy businesses get off the ground. As mentioned in the energy efficiency section above, the Department of Labor green jobs training programs such as the Green Capacity Building program, Energy Training Partnerships, and Pathways out of Poverty program could be allocated for such investments. Pg. 8-11

#### Heres the part of the article after Emory’s card ends

#### And concludes we need investment in forestry to solve sustainability

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

Increase sustainable management of forestland and build a sustainable forestry economy Appalachia’s forests are among the most ecologically diverse in the world.22 The Natural Resources Defense Council has named the Cumberland Plateau in Central Appalachia one of thirteen of the world’s Biogems.23 The region’s forests are the origin of water for a large portion of the eastern United States as well as an important source of clean air and the sequestration of carbon. Tremendously beautiful, they are also a source of pride for residents and an attraction for visitors. However, the region’s forests have not been properly managed to maximize their ecological and economic benefits to the residents of the region and beyond. Over 100 years ago, the Appalachian forests were almost completely logged to provide lumber for a growing economy. Now, the region’s forests have grown back but poor management practices threaten their future. The forests suffer from high-grading—the removal of high quality trees to the degradation of forest quality—and the prevalence of predatory or irresponsible logging practices. As climate change increases, the lack of ecological resiliency will make these forests more susceptible to damage from wildfire, pests, ice storms and other weather events.

#### He also says we need stewardship management planning – aff doesn’t do that

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

Provide resources to Central Appalachian states to expand the technical assistance resources available to help landowners with stewardship planning. Developing management plans is the first step towards sustainable forestland management. While states offer free assistance to forestland owners in developing stewardship plans, budget cuts have led to long waiting lists. The federal Forest Stewardship program, which operates through the states, has been inadequately funded 14 | P a g e through the years. Additional resources targeted to the Central Appalachian states could help address the backlog and increase the amount of forestland under a management plan.

#### And right before Emory’s card starts: need poverty-targeting and housing partnerships

**MACED 10** [Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, “Economic Transition in Central Appalachia: Ideas for the Appalachian Regional Development Initiative” April 8, 2010

2. Design ways to ensure that investments reach low-income people and communities. Like many high poverty areas, challenging local politics can sometimes make it difficult for outside investments to be most effective in reaching and impacting low-income people and communities. This is an important lesson of numerous past development efforts in the region. The administration should work to design mechanisms that promote broad community participation in planning and decision-making, and should be creative about targeting resources to a variety of entities including non-profits, community-based organizations, and non-traditional institutions where possible or appropriate. The recent announcement of a USDA partnership with the Federation of Appalachian Housing Enterprises for the administration of $25 million in Section 502 housing funds is an excellent example of this kind of non-traditional funding approach. 3. Promote initiatives that build community, leadership and entrepreneurial capacity. The administration should see itself as a partner with Appalachian communities and people in creating a new and better economy in the region. Using that approach, investments should not simply provide needed services and create jobs, but should be designed in ways that empower local people and organizations to take on new leadership roles and leave lasting business and institutional infrastructure in the region beyond the time in which monies run out. An approach that puts the building of human and social capital at the center will result in better outcomes for the region in the long-term.

#### Government funds go to established companies- causes cronyism- props up inefficiencies- stifles new innovation

DeHaven ’12 (Ted DeHaven, Tad DeHaven is a budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute. Previously he was a deputy director of the Indiana Office of Management and Budget. DeHaven also worked as a budget policy advisor to Senators Jeff Sessions (R-AL) and Tom Coburn (R-OK). In 2010, he was named to Florida Governor Rick Scott's Economic Advisory Council. His articles have been published in the Washington Post, Washington Times, New York Post, Wall Street Journal Online, National Review and Politico.com. He has appeared on the CBS Evening News, CNBC, Fox News Channel, Fox Business Channel, and NPR, “Political Support for Energy’s Loan Guarantees”, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/political-support-energy%E2%80%99s-loan-guarantees>, June 26, 2012)

Several weeks ago, 127 House Republicans joined 155 Democrats to defeat an amendment introduced by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-OH) and Rep. Tom McClintock (R-CA) that would have shut down the Department of Energy’s Title 17 loan guarantee program. That’s the program that gave birth to Solyndra, which has come to symbolize the failure of the Obama administration’s crony capitalist policies. Why would members of Congress, and Republicans in particular, continue to support this federal boondoggle incubator? A new paper from Cato adjunct scholar Veronique de Rugy that looks at the Energy loan guarantees explains: One reason is it serves three powerful constituencies: lawmakers, bankers, and the companies that receive the subsidized loans. Politicians are able to use loan programs to reward interest groups while hiding the costs. Congress can approve billions of dollars in loan guarantees with little or no impact to the appropriations or deficit because they are almost entirely off-budget. Moreover, unlike the Solyndra case, most failures take years to occur, allowing politicians to collect the rewards of granting a loan to a special interest while skirting political blame years later when or if the project defaults. It’s like buying a house on credit without having a trace of the transaction on your credit report. Veronique notes that most of the money for the loan guarantees issued under section 1705 of Title 17 have gone to large and established companies: These include established utility firms, large multinational manufacturers, and a global real estate investment fund. In addition, the data shows that nearly 90 percent of the loans guaranteed by the federal government since 2009 went to subsidize lower-risk power plants, which in many cases were backed by big companies with vast resources. This includes loans such as the $90 million guarantee granted to Cogentrix, a subsidiary of Goldman Sachs. Currently, Goldman Sachs ranks number 80 on the list of America’s Fortune 500 companies. In recent testimony before the House Budget Committee, Chris Edwards and I also discussed the crony nature of the president’s “green” energy subsidies: President Obama’s green energy programs illustrate how corporate welfare creates corrupting relationships between businesses and politicians. The Washington Post found that “$3.9 billion in federal [energy] grants and financing flowed to 21 companies backed by firms with connections to five Obama administration staffers and advisers.” It also noted that the “main players in the Solyndra saga were interconnected in many ways, as investors enjoyed access to the White House and the Energy Department.” According to the New York Times, Solyndra “spent nearly $1.8 million on Washington lobbyists, employing six firms with ties to members of Congress and officials of the Obama White House.” American businesses, of course, have a right to lobby the federal government. But given that reality, Congress throws fuel onto the corruption fire by creating business subsidy programs. When subsidy money flows out the door from Washington to businesses at the same time that money flows back from businesses to Washington for lobbying, it’s no surprise that we get influence-peddling. Corporate welfare undermines honest and transparent governance, and Americans are sick and tired of the inevitable scandals. Unfortunately, most members of Congress apparently aren’t sick and tired of it.

#### Neodymium supplies necessary for wind are limited now but demand is keeping pace – the plan causes massive bottlenecks and price spikes. We are 100% dependent on China.

Cho 9-20 (Cho, analyst and reporter for Phys.org "rare earth metals: will we have enough?" September 20, 2012 phys.org/news/2012-09-rare-earth-metals.html

"To provide most of our power through renewables would take hundreds of times the amount of rare earth metals that we are mining today," said Thomas Graedel, Clifton R. Musser Professor of Industrial Ecology and professor of geology and geophysics at the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. There is no firm definition of rare earth metals, but the term generally refers to metals used in small quantities. Rare earth metals include: rare earth elements—17 elements in the periodic table, the 15 lanthanides plus scandium and yttrium; six platinum group elements; and other byproduct metals that occur in copper, gold, uranium, phosphates, iron or zinc ores. While many rare earth metals are actually quite common, they are seldom found in sufficient amounts to be extracted economically. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, world demand for rare earth metals is estimated to be 136,000 tons per year, and projected to rise to at least 185,000 tons annually by 2015. With continued global growth of the middle class, especially in China, India and Africa, demand will continue to grow. High-tech products and renewable energy technology cannot function without rare earth metals. Neodymium, terbium and dysprosium are essential ingredients in the magnets of wind turbines and computer hard drives; a number of rare earth metals are used in nickel-metal-hydride rechargeable batteries that power electric vehicles and many other products; yttrium is necessary for color TVs, fuel cells and fluorescent lamps; europium is a component of compact fluorescent bulbs and TV and iPhone screens; cerium and lanthanum are used in catalytic converters; platinum group metals are needed as catalysts in fuel cell technology; and other rare earth metals are essential for solar cells, cell phones, computer chips, medical imaging, jet engines, defense technology, and much more. Ads by Google Donate Car to Make-A-Wish - Donate Your Car to Help NC Kids Free Towing & Maximum Tax Deduction - WheelsForWishes.org/Make-A-Wish Wind power has grown around 7 percent a year, increasing by a factor of 10 over the last decade, noted Peter Kelemen, Arthur D. Storke Memorial Professor of Geochemistry at the Earth Institute's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. "Every megawatt of electricity needs 200 kilograms of neodymium—or 20 percent of one ton," he said. "So if every big wind turbine produces one megawatt, five turbines will require one ton of neodymium. If wind is going to play a major part in replacing fossil fuels, we will need to increase our supply of neodymium." A recent MIT study projected that neodymium demand could grow by as much as 700 percent over the next 25 years; demand for dysprosium, also needed for wind turbines, could increase by 2,600 percent. China currently supplies 97 percent of global rare earth metal demand, and 100 percent of heavy rare earth metals such as terbium and dysprosium, used in wind turbines. In 2005, it began restricting exports to preserve resources and protect the environment, causing prices to soar. Today, the United States is 100 percent dependent on imports for rare earth metals. From the mid-1960s through the 1980s, however, Molycorp's Mountain Pass mine in California was the world's main source of rare earth metals. As the U.S. share of rare earth metal production declined, China used government support, research and development, training programs, cheap labor and low prices to develop its supply chain, increasing its share of rare earth metal production from 27 percent in 1990 to 97 percent in 2011. In March, the U.S., Japan and the European Union lodged a complaint with the World Trade Organization over China's limits on rare earth exports. In response, China announced that it will export 30,996 more metric tons of rare earth metals in 2012 than it did in 2011.

#### an increase in demand for wind turbines triggers the link – government incentives distort the market

GCC 12 (Green Car Congress, report based on MIT Research "MIT study finds shift to green energy sources could mean crunch in supply of key rare earth elements" 9 March, 2012 www.greencarcongress.com/2012/03/ree-20120309.html)

A large-scale shift from coal-fired electric power plants and gasoline-fueled cars to wind turbines and electric vehicles could increase demand for two already-scarce rare earth elements (REE)—dysprosium and neodymium, available almost exclusively in China—

by 600-2,600 percent over the next 25 years, according to a new study published in the ACS journal Environmental Science & Technology. The study by researchers at MIT also points out that production of the two metals has been increasing by only a few percentage points per year. ...the availability of REEs appears to be at risk based on a number of factors. Of particular significance, one country (China) controls 98% of current supply (production). Historically, much lower levels of market concentration have harmed manufacturing firms. For example, in 1978 Zaire controlled 48% of the cobalt supply and yet political unrest in Zaire resulted in a disruption to global supply that became known as the “Cobalt Crisis”. Another contributor to supply risk for REEs is the fact that they are comined; individual REEs are not mined separately. REEs are found together in geological deposits, rendering mining of individual elements economically inefficient. The supply of any individual REE depends on the geology of the deposits, the costs of the extraction technology employed, and the price of the basket of rare earths (RE). Finally, REEs have come under global scrutiny due to the environmental and social conditions under which they are mined, further increasing their supply risk. —Alonso et al. While the literature contains a number of reports that evaluate different aspects of RE availability, Randolph E. Kirchain, Ph.D., and colleagues evaluated future potential demand scenarios for REEs with a focus on the issue of comining. They analyzed the supply of lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium, neodymium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, terbium, dysprosium and yttrium under various scenarios, and projected the demand for these 10 rare earth elements through 2035. In particular, they estimated resource requirements for electric vehicles and windturbines (revolutionary demand areas for REEs) from performance specifications and vehicle sales or turbine deployment projections. Future demand was estimated for a range of scenarios including one developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA) with adoption of electric vehicles and wind turbines at a rate consistent with stabilization of CO2 in the atmosphere at a level of 450 ppm. In one scenario, demand for dysprosium and neodymium could be higher than 2,600 and 700 percent respectively. To meet that need, production of dysprosium would have to grow each year at nearly twice the historic growth rate for rare earth supplies. The applications that will be most negatively affected by constraints in these REEs (i.e., increased costs) will be those dependent upon high performance magnets. Applications such as petroleum refining, which depend on elements whose supply is projected to exceed demand, may be positively affected if primary producers increase overall production to meet the higher demand for specific elements. If a secondary market emerges to meet the higher demand for specific elements (i.e., recycling of magnets, but not catalysts), then, given that the portfolio of recycled REEs would be significantly different from the portfolio of primary supply, the overall supply portfolio of REEs could change. ...In the end, prices are not the only forces that will influence the REE markets. Government intervention in this market is prevalent. Also, corporate social responsibility policies may influence some firm’s decisions to use REE unless environmental concerns around their mining are addressed. These issues should be considered carefully by interested stakeholders and future research on this topic.

#### A supply bottleneck causes War with China –

Anthony 12/30/12 (Lead editor at Ziff Davis, Inc. Owner at SA Holdings Past Columnist at Tecca Editor at Aol (Weblogs, Inc) Educationm University of Essex, http://www.extremetech.com/extreme/111029-rare-earth-crisis-innovate-or-be-crushed-by-china/2)

The doomsday event that everyone is praying will never come to pass, but which every Western nation is currently planning for, is the eventual cut-off of Chinese rare earth exports. Last year, 97% of the world’s rare earth metals were produced in China — but over the last few years, the Chinese government has been shutting down mines, ostensibly to save what resources it has, and also reducing the amount of rare earth that can be exported. Last year, China produced some 130,000 tons of rare earths, but export restrictions meant that only 35,000 tons were sent to other countries. As a result, demand outside China now outstrips supply by some 40,000 tons per year, and — as expected — many countries are now stockpiling the reserves that they have. Almost every Western country is now digging around in their backyard for rare earth-rich mud and sand, but it’ll probably be too little too late — and anyway, due to geochemistry, there’s no guarantee that explorers and assayers will find what they’re looking for. The price of rare earths are already going up, and so are the non-Chinese-made gadgets and gizmos that use them. Exacerbating the issue yet further, as technology grows more advanced, our reliance on the strange and magical properties of rare earths increases — and China, with the world’s largest workforce and a fire hose of rare earths, is perfectly poised to become the only real producer of solar power photovoltaic cells, computer chips, and more. In short, China has the world by the short hairs, and when combined with a hotting-up cyber front, it’s not hard to see how this situation might devolve into World War III. The alternate, ecological point of view, is that we’re simply living beyond the planet’s means. Either way, strategic and logistic planning to make the most of scarce metals and minerals is now one of the most important tasks that face governments and corporations. Even if large rare earth deposits are found soon, or we start recycling our gadgets in a big way, the only real solution is to somehow lessen our reliance on a finite resource. Just like oil and energy, this will probably require drastic technological leaps. Instead of reducing the amount of tantalum used in capacitors, or indium in LCD displays, we will probably have to discover completely different ways of storing energy or displaying images. My money’s on graphene.

#### Nuclear conflict with China is an EXISTENTIAL risk – causes nuclear winter

Wittner 11 (11/30/11 Dr. Lawrence, Prof of History Emeritus at SUNY Albany, “Is a Nuclear War with China Possible?”)

But what would that "victory" entail? An attack with these Chinese nuclear weapons would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a "nuclear winter" around the globe -- destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction. Moreover, in another decade the extent of this catastrophe would be far worse. The Chinese government is currently expanding its nuclear arsenal, and by the year 2020 it is [expected](http://www.nukestrat.com/china/Book-35-125.pdf) to more than double its number of nuclear weapons that can hit the United States. The U.S. government, in turn, has [plans](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/oct/30/nuclear-powers-weapons-spending-report) to spend hundreds of billions of dollars "modernizing" its nuclear weapons and nuclear production facilities over the next decade.

### Sustainability

#### Legislation to ban mountaintop removal mining must come first to solve

Perks ‘9

Rob, Natural Resources Defense Council, “Time to End Mountaintop Removal Coal Mining”

Nowhere is the debate over how far we are willing to go for inexpensive energy more contentious than in the coalfields of Appalachia. It is there—between the hollows of West Virginia, beyond the bluegrass of Kentucky, bordering the Blue Ridge of Virginia, and above the smoky vistas of Tennessee—where mining companies are blowing up America’s oldest mountains to get the coal beneath the peaks. Without a doubt, mountaintop removal is the world’s worst coal mining. Often referred to as “strip mining on steroids,” it is scarring the landscape and threatening communities throughout Appalachia. Instead of extracting the coal by underground mining, mountaintop removal uses explosive charges and large machinery to remove the mountain and get to the coal. More than 500 mountaintops have already been destroyed and more than one million acres of forest have been clearcut. Well over a thousand miles of valley streams have been buried under tons of rubble, polluting drinking water and threatening the health and safety of all who make their home in the region. Ultimately, mountaintop removal is a symptom of failed federal energy and environmental policy and a conscious effort on the part of the mining industry itself to keep consumers, businesses, financers and state and local government in the dark about the extent of extraction-related harm from coal use. The Natural Resources Defense Council’s (NRDC) position on mountaintop removal is clear: the solution to the ecological, economic, and cultural harm inflicted by this controversial mining practice is not to mend it, but to end it.

#### Their Zeller “test case” evidence indicates the plan would preserve coal in Appalachia – no shift to sustainable development

**Zeller 10** [[TOM ZELLER Jr.](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/z/tom_jr_zeller/index.html?inline=nyt-per) “A Battle in Mining Country Pits Coal Against Wind,” New York Times, Published: August 14, 2010, pg. http://tinyurl.com/8ctubyz

Ms. Scarbro reckons that curbing mountaintop removal, by whatever means, would not only protect some of that diversity — and perhaps help lure more tourists — but would also create more coal jobs, because it would make coal companies go back to more labor-intensive underground mining. That would presumably include an expansion of jobs at Coal River Mountain, which has long been mined from below.

Coal inevitable globally

Morse, ’12 (Richard K. is Director of Research on Coal and Carbon Markets at Stanford University's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “Cleaning Up Coal: From Climate Culprit to Solution”, *Foreign Affairs;* 91. 4, Jul/Aug 2012: 102-112, Proquest, )

Coal Fever

In order to confront the coal problem, it is important to understand how the fuel became so popular in the first place. Although coal is often cast as an environmental villain today, just four decades ago, it seemed the obvious answer to some of the developed world's most pressing political and economic challenges. The oil crises of the 1970s showed industrialized countries that disruptions in the supply of petroleum could send shockwaves not only through their transportation systems but, because much electricity was generated by burning oil products, through their power sectors, too. So they rushed to replace cartel-controlled oil with abundant, cheap coal. Between 1980 and 2000, countries that were members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (oecd) increased the use of coal in electricity generation by 61 percent and reduced the use of oil in that sector by 41 percent. Formerly dispersed in niche regional markets, the international trade in coal grew into a sophisticated global commodities exchange and quadrupled in size. Stable, diversified networks of suppliers oaered coal-importing countries low energy costs and enhanced energy security. No longer were electricity prices vulnerable to instability in the Middle East. Swapping oil for coal paid handsome dividends. By the 1990s, however, natural gas had emerged as a competitive alternative for generating electricity in the developed world, and the coal fever that had been gripping Western capitals started cooling oa. Between 2000 and 2008, the use of coal for power generation in oecd countries grew by only four percent, while the use of natural gas increased by 55 percent. Coal's future in the developed world looks bleaker every year. Today, experts predict that coal demand in the oecd countries will remain flat, and may even shrink, from now until 2035. In the United States, coal is losing market share thanks to newly cheap natural gas (a consequence of the shale gas boom) and tighter federal pollution regulations. In Europe, the main threat to coal comes from environmental policies. The capstone of the eu's climate policy, the eu Emissions Trading System, which was launched in 2005, has caused countries to shiftto cleaner natural gas. Renewable-energy mandates, meanwhile, have also started pushing coal out of the market. The rest of the world is racing in the opposite direction. Whereas industrialized countries once embraced coal to diversify their energy supplies, by the 1990s, the developing world was turning to it to answer a diaerent problem: poverty. Rapidly growing economies needed more and more electricity, and coal was the cheapest and most practical way to get it. It was not the cleanest energy source, to be sure, but developing countries saw pollution as a cost worth incurring in order to obtain the benefits of a modern economy. As the Indian economist Rajendra Pachauri, chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, has asked, "Can you imagine 400 million people who do not have a light bulb in their homes?" He continued, "You cannot, in a democracy, ignore some of these realities. . . . We really don't have any choice but to use coal."

As the developing world keeps growing, coal will remain its fuel of choice. The iea expects coal demand in non-oecd countries to nearly double by 2035 if current policies continue, with Chinese and Indian demand alone accounting for more than 80 percent of that growth. Indonesia, Vietnam, and much of the rest of Asia are also rapidly building new coal plants. The coal markets of Asia are thus at the heart of the global-warming problem. The case of China, the world's biggest carbon emitter, demonstrates just how hard it is to give up the fuel.

#### No environmental crunch – we adapt

Goklany 10, policy analyst for the Department of the Interior – phd from MSU, “Population, Consumption, Carbon Emissions, and Human Well-Being in the Age of Industrialization (Indur, Part IV – There Are No PAT Answers, or Why Neo-Malthusians Get It Wrong”, April 26, http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/population-consumption-carbon-emissions-and-human-well-being-in-the-age-of-industrialization-part-iv-there-are-no-pat-answers-or-why-neo-malthusians-get-it-wrong/)

Moreover, fears that the world’s population would continue to increase exponentially have failed to materialize. The world’s population growth rate peaked in the late 1960s. Population increased by 10.6% from 1965–70, but only 6.0% from 2000–05. Many countries are now concerned that fewer young people means that their social security systems are unsustainable. Projections now suggest that the world’s population may peak at around 9 billion around mid-century (see here). The slowdown in the population growth rate, unanticipated by Neo-Malthusians, can be attributed to the fact that population (P) is dependent on affluence (or the desire for affluence) and technology (A and T in the IPAT equation). Empirical data show that as people get wealthier or desire greater wealth for themselves or their offspring, they tend to have fewer children. Cross-country data shows that the total fertility rate (TFR), which measures the number of children per women of child-bearing age, drops as affluence (measured by GDP per capita) increases (see Figure 1). Moreover, for any given level of affluence, TFR has generally dropped over time because of changes in technology, and societal attitudes shaped by the desire for economic development (see here). Most importantly, it is not, contrary to Neo-Malthusian fears, doomed to rise inexorably, absent coercive policies. Neo-Malthusians also overlook the fact that, in general, affluence, technology and human well-being ***reinforce* each other in a** Cycle of Progress (Goklany 2007a, pp. 79-97). If existing technologies are unable to reduce impacts or otherwise improve the quality of life, wealth and human capital can be harnessed to improve existing technologies or create new ones that will. HIV/AIDS is a case in point. The world was unprepared to deal with HIV/AIDS when it first appeared. For practical purposes, it was a death sentence for anyone who got it. It took the wealth of the most developed countries to harness the human capital to develop an understanding of the disease and devise therapies. From 1995 to 2004, age-adjusted death rates due to HIV declined by over 70 percent in the US (USBC 2008). Rich countries now cope with it, and developing countries are benefiting from the technologies that the former developed through the application of economic and human resources, and institutions at their disposal. Moreover, both technology and affluence are necessary because while technology provides the methods to reduce problems afflicting humanity, including environmental problems, affluence provides the means to research, develop and afford the necessary technologies. Not surprisingly, access to HIV therapies is greater in developed countries than in developing countries. And in many developing countries access would be even lower but for wealthy charities and governments from rich countries (Goklany 2007a, pp. 79–97). Because technology is largely based on accretion of knowledge, it ought to advance with time, independent of affluence — provided society is open to scientific and technological inquiry and does not squelch technological change for whatever reason. Consequently, indicators of human well-being improve not only with affluence but also with time (a surrogate for technology). This is evident in Figure 1, which shows TFR dropping with time for any specific level of GDP per capita. It is also illustrated in Figure 2 for life expectancy, which shows that wealthier societies have higher average life expectancies, and that the entire life expectancy curve has been raised upward with the passage of time, a surrogate for technological change (broadly defined). Other indicators of human well-being — e.g., crop yield, food supplies per capita, access to safe water and sanitation, literacy, mortality — also improve with affluence and, separately, with time/technology (see here and here). This indicates that secular technological change and economic development, rather than making matters worse, have actually enhanced society’s ability to solve its problems and advanced its quality of life. Moreover, population is not just a factor in consumption. It is the basis for “human capital.” No humans, no human capital. Humans are not just mouths, but also hands and brains. As famously noted by Julian Simon, they are the Ultimate Resource. This is something Neo-Malthusians have difficulty in comprehending. Notably, a World Bank study, Where is the Wealth of Nations?, indicated that “human capital and the value of institutions … constitute the largest share of wealth in virtually all countries.” A population that is poor, with low human capital, low affluence, and lacking in technological knowhow is more likely to have higher mortality rates, and lower life expectancy than a population that is well educated, affluent and technologically sophisticated, no matter what its size. These factors — human capital, affluence and technology — acting in concert over the long haul, have enabled technology for the most part to improve matters ***faster* than** any **deterioration** due to population, affluence (GDP per person) or their product (GDP). **This has helped keep environmental damage in check**, (e.g., for cropland, a measure of habitat converted to human uses) **or** even **reverse it** (e.g., for water pollution, and indoor and traditional outdoor air pollution), particularly in the richer countries. Note that since the product of population (P) and affluence (A or GDP per capita) is equivalent to the GDP then according to the IPAT identity, which specifies that I = P x A x T, the technology term (T) is by definition the impact (I) per GDP (see Part II in this series of posts). I’ll call this the impact intensity. If the impact is specified in terms of emissions, then the technology term is equivalent to the emissions intensity, that is, emissions per GDP. Therefore the change in impact intensity (or emissions intensity) over a specified period is a measure of technological change over that period. Since matters improve if impact/emissions intensity drops, a negative sign in front of the change in impact intensity denotes that technological change has reduced the impact. Table 1 shows estimates of the changes in impacts intensity, or technological change, over the long term for a sample of environmental indicators for various time periods and geographical aggregations. Additional results regarding technological change over different time periods and countries are available from the original source (here). These results indicate that in the long run, technological change has, more often than not, reduced impacts. The reduction in many cases is by an order of magnitude or more! Thus, notwithstanding plausible Neo-Malthusian arguments that technological change would eventually increase environmental impacts, historical data suggest that, in fact, technological change ultimately reduces impacts, provided technology is not rejected through an inappropriate exercise of the precautionary principle or compromised via subsidies (which usually flow from the general public to politically favored elements of society). To summarize, although population, affluence and technology can create some problems for humanity and the planet, they are also the agents for solving these very problems. In the IPAT equation, the dependence of the I term on the P, A and T terms is not fixed. It evolves over time. And the Neo-Malthusian mistake has been to assume that the relationship is fixed, or if it is not, then it changes for the worse. A corollary to this is that projections of future impacts spanning a few decades but which do not account for technological change as a function of time and affluence, more likely than not, will **overestimate impacts**, perhaps by orders of magnitude. In fact, this is one reason why many estimates of the future impacts of climate change are suspect, because most do not account for changes in adaptive capacity either due to secular technological change or increases in economic development (see here and here). Famously, Yogi Berra is supposed to have said, “It’s tough to make predictions, especially about the future.” Most analysts recognize this. They know that just because one can explain and hindcast the past, it does not guarantee that one can forecast the future. Neo-Malthusians, by contrast, cannot hindcast the past but are confident they can forecast the future. Finally, had the solutions they espouse been put into effect a couple of centuries ago, most of us alive today would be dead and those who were not would be living poorer, shorter, and unhealthier lives, constantly subject to the vagaries of nature, surviving from harvest to harvest, spending more of our time in darkness because lighting would be a luxury, and our days in the drudgery of menial tasks because under their skewed application of the precautionary principle (see here, here and here) fossil fuel consumption would be severely curtailed, if not banned. Nor would the rest of nature necessarily be better off. First, lower reliance on fossil fuels would mean greater demand for fuelwood, and the forests would be denuded. Second, less fossil fuels also means less fertilizer and pesticides and, therefore, lower agricultural productivity. To compensate for lost productivity,, more habitat would need to be converted to agricultural uses. But habitat conversion (including deforestation) — not climate change — is already the greatest threat to biodiversity!

### Tea Party

#### The Tea Party is over

Friedman 1-22

Brad, 'Tea Party' Brand Now a Liability to 'Tea Party' ... and Republicans

American blogger, journalist, actor, radio broadcaster, director and software programmer, most known for his criticism of election integrity issues in the USA, http://www.bradblog.com/?p=9827#more-9827

But it's little wonder these folks are running from the name. Their popularity, and their name brand, is now plummeting along with the fortunes of the Congressional Republican Party. As Bennet notes, even Rightwing pollsters like Rasmussen are finding that support for the "Tea Party" movement is absolutely cratering... Rasmussen, a favorite polling firm of conservatives, found in a survey this month that only 8 percent of voters identify themselves as tea party members, down from a high of 24 percent shortly after passage of the federal health care law in 2010. The Rasmussen poll found 30 percent of voters had a favorable view of the tea party and 49 percent had a negative view. ... An October Rasmussen poll found 44 percent of voters considered “tea party” a negative label, eclipsing “liberal” as the most potent negative adjective. And, again, he's the Republican pollster. NBC News/Wall Street Journal finds, according to Benen, that attitudes about the "Tea Party" are "abysmal". "Just 9% have a 'very positive' impression of the so-called movement --- an all-time low," he writes, "while 32% have a 'very negative' impression --- an all-time high. All told, the Tea Party's favorability rating is down to just 23%, which is even lower than the GOP's support and that of the NRA." "If the 'movement' still exists," Benen argues, "it's gasping for air --- and relevance." But the problems for the Republican Party itself are much deeper than simply their association with the tainted "Tea Party". Benen explains, for example, that "After discovering that there aren't any Republicans left in the center," the Republican Main Street Partnership, a D.C. outfit promoting moderate GOP lawmakers and policies, "dropped the 'R' word and became simply the Main Street Partnership."

#### Iran’s military was destroyed 20 years ago

**Gerhsman 5**. [John, Middle East editor for the Foreign Policy in Focus Project, 7/26/2005, “The U.S. and Iran: Democracy, Terrorism, and Nuclear Weapons”, Foreign Policy in Focus, http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/173]

One litmus test of a country’s aggressive designs on its neighbors is military procurement. As a country amasses arms, bolsters troops, and acquires training, the chance that it may initiate war escalates, because the probability of success rises. On this front, Iran also seems less of a threat. Iran’s military procurement relative to the Gulf States is far less than it was during the 1970s under the shah, when the United States was actually promoting arms sales to Iran. In addition, much of Iran’s naval capability was destroyed by the United States in the 1987-88 tanker war, and Iran lost much of its ground weaponry during Iraq’s 1988 offensive. As much as half of Iran’s inventory of major land-force weapons were destroyed in the course of the war with Iraq.9 Although Iran’s defensive capabilities have improved somewhat, there is little to suggest that Teheran poses any kind of realistic offensive threat to the region. Indeed, Iranian tanks and planes actually number less than in 1980.10

#### Trade wars don’t escalate

**Ikenson, 12** [March 5th, Daniel, [Daniel Ikenson](http://www.cato.org/people/daniel-ikenson) is director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute,

<http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war>]

. Nature of the U.S.-China Trade War It should not be surprising that the increasing number of commercial exchanges between entities in the world's largest and second largest economies produce frictions on occasion. But the U.S.-China economic relationship **has not descended into an existential call to arms.** Rather, both governments have taken protectionist actions that are **legally defensible** or plausibly justifiable within the rules of global trade. That is not to say that those measures have been advisable or that they would withstand closer legal scrutiny, but to make the distinction that, unlike the free-for-all that erupted in the 1930s, these trade "skirmishes" have been prosecuted in a manner that **speaks to a** mutual **recognition of the** primacy of — if not respect for — the **rules-based system** of trade. And that suggests that the **kerfuffle is containable and the recent trend reversible.1**

#### Status quo solves multilateralism—Obama’s engaging the international system and other countries are following

WO ‘12, postgraduate student in international affairs at King’s College [“How valuable is multilateral diplomacy in a post-9/11 world?,” <http://worldoutline.wordpress.com/2012/01/24/how-valuable-is-multilateral-diplomacy-in-a-post-911-world/>]

At the turn of the last century, 189 world leaders convened at the Millennium Summit and approved the Millennium Declaration which outlined eight specific goals that the United Nations was to achieve by 2015.[4] Yet, just a year later the 9/11 terrorist attacks tilted the world upon its head. The Security Council was rallied into action after the attacks and unanimously backed the United States against the threat which had caused so much devastation.[5] However, a wounded United States became increasingly relentless and unilateral in their ‘War on Terror’; when the Security Council refused to authorise a US attack upon an allegedly nuclear-armed Iraq, the United States, led by George. W. Bush, launched the assault anyway without UN approval.[6] This has been referred to as the ‘crisis of multilateralism’, as the United States undermined the very institution of which it is the biggest financial contributor and the most influential player.[7] If the founding member of the UN was refusing to follow the guidelines of the institution then why should other states follow the rules? This act set a worrying precedent for the rest of the world and, as Kofi Annan asserted, ‘undermined confidence in the possibility of collective responses to our common problems’.[8] Other instances of American unilateralism are Bush’s abstention from the Human Rights Council, his refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol and the US departure from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The United States was losing sight of the benefits that multilateral diplomacy has to offer. However, the arrival of Barack Obama at the Oval Office has **revived multilateral values** within US foreign policy. The Obama administration has realised that it must now engage with the UN and this has marked a ‘*transitional* moment **in** the **history** of multilateralism’.[9] In his 2010 National Security Strategy, Obama acknowledged the fact that the US had been successful after the Second World War by pursuing their interests within multilateral forums such as the United Nations and not outside of them.[10] The global financial crisis of 2008 and the European Union’s sovereign debt crisis have demonstrated just how interdependent the economies of the western world are and these crises have created an age of austerity in which multilateralism is needed more than ever before.[11] The US has overstretched its resources and is now currently winding down two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; they have realised that they simply do not have the means to conduct their foreign affairs exclusively anymore. Clear indications **of** Washington’simproved **multilateral engagement with the UN** since Obama’s inauguration, and the changing attitude in US foreign policy, are the economic sanctions negotiated over Iran, Obama’s decision for the US to join the Human Rights Council and, more specifically, its participation in the recent Libya mission. In Libya, the US provided support for the mission, yet played a subdued role in the campaign, allowing its European counterparts to take the lead. In contrast to his predecessor, **Obama is displaying pragmatism** rather than sentimentalism in his search for partners, making alliances in order to adapt to the emerging multipolar world; this is typified by Obama’s recent visit to the Asia-Pacific and his tour of South America (Brazil, Chile and El Salvador) in 2010. For the time being, US unipolarity looks to be a thing of the past; its **foreign policy is *changing* from** Bush’s **unilateralism** at the start of the century **to a** more **multilateral** **approach** at the beginning of a new decade under Obama.[12] This is the **correct precedent** that the most powerful nation in the world should be setting for other states to follow. The fact that the US is now engaging with the UN to counter global problems has restored the credibility that the UN had lost after the Iraq debacle and, by setting this example, **other nations will follow suit** and the international community as a whole can only benefit. From this change in US foreign policy, it is clear that multilateral diplomacy is of more value today than it was a decade ago.

#### No terror threat

Stephen M. **Walt 12**, Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University, "'America the brittle?'" September 10, Foreign Policy, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/09/inflating\_the\_terrorist\_threat\_again

According to yesterday's New York Times, assorted "senior American officials" are upset that adversaries like al Qaeda, the Taliban, or the Somali pirates are not simply rolling over and dying. Instead, these foes are proving to be "resilient," "adaptable," and "flexible." These same U.S. officials are also worried that the United States isn't demonstrating the same grit, as supposedly revealed by high military suicide rates, increased reports of PTSD, etc. According to Times reporters Thom Shanker and Eric Schmitt, these developments¶ "raise concerns that the United States is losing ground in the New Darwinism of security threats, in which an agile enemy evolves in new ways to blunt America's vast technological prowess with clever homemade bombs and anti-American propaganda that helps supply a steady stream of fighters."¶ Or as Shanker and Schmitt put it (cue the scary music): "Have we become America the brittle?"¶ This sort of pop sociology is not very illuminating, especially when there's no evidence presented to support the various officials' gloomy pronouncements. In fact, the glass looks more than half-full. Let's start by remembering that the Somali pirates and al Qaeda have been doing pretty badly of late. Piracy in the Gulf of Aden is down sharply, Osama bin Laden is dead, and his movement's popularity is lower than ever. Whatever silly dreams he might have had about restoring the caliphate have proven to be just hollow fantasies. And as John Mueller and Mark Stewart showed in an article I linked to a few weeks ago, the actual record of post-9/11 plots against the United States suggests that these supposedly "agile" and "resilient" conspirators are mostly bumbling incompetents. In fact, Lehman Bros. might be the only major world organization that had a worse decade than al Qaeda did.

#### No risk of nuclear terror—means and motive

**Chapman 12** [Stephen, columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune “The Implausibility of Nuclear Terrorism” May 17 http://reason.com/archives/2012/05/17/the-implausibility-of-nuclear-terrorism]

Given their inability to do something simple — say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb — it’s reasonable to ask whether they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a presentation at the University of Chicago, “the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb **seems to be vanishingly small**.” The events required to make that happen comprise a **multitude of Herculean tasks**. First, a terrorist group has to get a bomb or fissile material, perhaps from Russia’s inventory of decommissioned warheads. If that were easy, **one would have already gone missing**. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not maintained quickly become what one expert calls “**radioactive scrap metal**.” If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and other safeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally — for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. Then comes the task of building a bomb. It’s not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment — plus people with specialized skills, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time — but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible **exposure or extortion**. This, like every other step in the entire process, means expanding the circle of people who know what’s going on, **multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up**. That has heartening implications. If al-Qaida embarks on the project, **it has only a minuscule chance** of seeing it bear fruit. **Given the** formidable **odds, it** probably **won’t bother.**

# 2nc

## sCP

#### States cp = predictable – empirics.

Learner 8. [Howard, President and Executive Director, Environmental Law and Policy Center; Adjunct Professor, Northwestern University School of Law, “Symposium: Ordering State-Federal Relations Through Federal Preemption Doctrine: Restraining Federal Preemption When There Is An "Emerging Consensus" Of State Environmental Laws And Policies” Northwestern Law Review -- lexis]

[\*657] States do have a longstanding history to draw upon in regulating many environmental concerns related to public health, safety, and land use. 34 The Supreme Court has often recognized strong state interests in preserving and protecting natural resources. 35 Indeed, in its recent landmark decision in Massachusetts v. EPA on the federal government's responsibility to regulate carbon dioxide as an air pollutant covered by the federal Clean Air Act, the Court reaffirmed the sovereignty of a state over its own land and resources. 36 The Court found "considerable relevance" in the fact that the party seeking review was a sovereign state. Under the Court's analysis, Massachusetts had standing to sue on an environmental issue because of its interest in "all the earth and the air within its domain." 37

#### It’s real world – NCCUSL Proves.

Pryor 1 (C. Scott, Associate Prof – Regent U. School of Law, American Bankruptcy Institute Law Review, Spring)

NCCUSL is a national organization of practicing lawyers, judges, law professors, and others appointed by the governors of each of the states. NCCUSL drafts uniform laws in various fields and then proposes them to the various state legislatures for adoption. See Edward J. Janger, Predicting When the Uniform Law Process Will Fail: Article 9, Capture, and the Race to the Bottom, [83 IOWA L. REV. 569, 586 (1998)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=ac2dac45d495ec7cbf7fbf59a67dee2c&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b9%20Am.%20Bankr.%20Inst.%20L.%20Rev.%20229%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=347&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b83%20Iowa%20L.%20Rev.%20569%2cat%20586%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=33&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=ffae86c2bab38023e1ae756e5f1f7188) (describing problem of "capture" in drafting process); Alan Schwartz & Robert E. Scott, The Political Economy of Private Legislatures, [143 U. PA. L. REV. 595, 651 (1995)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=ac2dac45d495ec7cbf7fbf59a67dee2c&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b9%20Am.%20Bankr.%20Inst.%20L.%20Rev.%20229%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=348&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b143%20U.%20Pa.%20L.%20Rev.%20595%2cat%20651%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=33&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=5c9e91cdef8e27e492ff10431016c269) (stating that problems stemming from reliance on "ill-informed generalists" and influence of interest groups may be unavoidable for any official organization whose goal is to foster uniformity of state laws).

### AT: Fed Key

#### Federal control over wind fails.

Salkin 9. [Patricia, Raymond and Ella Smith Distinguished Professor of Law, Associate Dean, Director, Govt Law Center @ Albany Law, “Cooperative Federalism and Wind: A New Framework for Achieving Sustainability” Legal Studies Research Paper Series -- Hofstra Law Review -- Volume 37]

In addition, local tailoring is particularly relevant for wind siting. Although wind energy is available throughout the United States, characteristics of wind rich areas vary greatly. Wind energy is available on-shore and off-shore, in both rural and urban areas.216 Given this diversity, best practices for facilities siting vary greatly with regard to many of the most commonly contested issues, including noise abatement, setback requirements, environmental impacts, shadow flicker, aesthetics, and safety regulation. As a result, uniform substantive¶ federal siting guidelines are unlikely to account for variations in local geography and culture.¶ Moreover, because the technology is relatively new, unitary federal guidelines might lock in sub-optimal regulatory choices. As William Buzbee explains, ―challenges like climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, or diverse risks of chemical facilities, seem poorly suited to federal assertion of a preemptive unitary federal choice that acts as a ceiling, prohibiting more protective state law or incentives and reexamination promoted by potential common law liability.‖217

#### State action spurs federal modeling on energy policy.

Goulder and Stavins 11. [Lawrence, Shuzo Nishihara Professor of Environmental and Resource Economics, Stanford University, Robert, Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government, Director of Graduate Studies for the Doctoral Programs in Public Policy and in Political Economy and Government, Cochair of the MPP/MBA and MPA/ID/MBA Joint Degree Programs, and Director of the Harvard Environmental Economics Program, “Critical Issues in National Climate Policy Design: Challenges from State-Federal Interactions in US Climate Change Policy” American Economic Review, 101:3, 253-257 -- http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rstavins/Papers/Goulder&StavinsAERPapers&Proceedings.pdf]

State and federal policies can interact along other dimensions, which may lead to positive outcomes. First, strategic interactions can arise between states and the federal government. In particular, state efforts can create pressure for more stringent federal policy. There is, in fact, a considerable history of California air standards having precisely this effect on federal policy developments, because industry is reluctant to face different standards in different parts of the country. For example, the California-led state-level tightening of greenhouse-gas-per mile standards helped bring about the subsequent tightening of federal CAFE standards. 5 Of course, such triggering of stronger federal policy is desirable only if the previous federal policy was insufficiently stringent. Second, states can serve as laboratories for experimenting with innovative policy approaches. Approaches that prove successful on cost effectiveness or other dimensions could later be adopted at the federal level. The interaction here is one of information transfer. The case for state-level experimentation needs to be considered carefully: why the laboratories should be at the state, rather than national, level is not clear, and—in any event—there is some question regarding whether state authorities will allow their “laboratory” to be closed after the experiment has been completed and the information delivered.

### AT: No Funding

#### State investment in wind power is high now -

National Renewable Energy Laboratory 3 (July 2003, “Policies and Market Factors Driving Wind Power development in the United States”)

In the United States, there has been substantial recent growth in wind energy generating capacity, with growth averaging 24% annually during the past five years. With this growth, an increasing number of states are experiencing investment in wind energy. Wind installations currently exist in about half of all U.S. states. This paper explores the policies and market factors that have been driving utility-scale wind energy development in the United States, particularly in the states that have achieved a substantial amount of wind energy investment in recent years. Although there are federal policies and overarching market issues that are encouraging investment nationally, much of the recent activity has resulted from state-level policies or localized market drivers. In this paper, we identify the key policies, incentives, regulations, and markets affecting development, and draw lessons from the experience of leading states that may be transferable to other states or regions. We provide detailed discussions of the drivers for wind development in a dozen leading states—California, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

## Prices

#### Thesis to the impact is military capabilities --- we need to beat every other state

Adam Segal, Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Practical Engagement: Drawing a Fine Line for U.S.-China Trade,” The Washington Quarterly 2004 Summer

The brevity of the list of technologies the United States should try and control is the product of two processes that have occurred over the last 10 years: the increasing importance of commercial producers in R&D and the globalization of technological innovation. Unlike during the Cold War, government spending and procurement no longer play a dominant role in commercial R&D, especially in IT sectors. In the 1970s, the major semiconductor manufacturers were essentially government defense contractors; the Pentagon was the source of almost 50 percent of the funding for semiconductor R&D from the 1950s to the 1970s. n29 In 2002, according to David Rose, director of export, import, and information security affairs at Intel Corporation, all government procurement (including Defense Department contracts) accounted for less than 1 percent of U.S. semiconductor sales, and that number is declining. n30 With the diminishing importance of government funding, private firms play a greater role in maintaining the United States' national security. Military capabilities are closely tied to the innovative capabilities of commercial producers. According to a 1999 Defense Science Board Task Force on Globalization and Security, the Defense Department relies "increasingly on the U.S. commercial advanced technology sector to push the technological envelope and enable the [department] to 'run faster' than its competitors." n31

#### That independently solves their impact

Robert L. Pfaltzgraff Jr., president of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, January 2001, World & I, Vol. 16, No. 1

As the world's only superpower with interests that span the globe, **the** **U**nited **S**tates **is a provider of hegemonic stability** in many parts of the world, capable of intervening, as in Operation Desert Storm or Operation Allied Force, against an aggressor or regional destabilizer. As a result, the United States is the nation most able to help shape the global security setting in ways that support its vital interests, including the extension of democratization and market economies. Without U.S. leadership and presence, the **conflicts of Europe, the** **Mid**dle **East, and** East **Asia** of the early twenty-first century will be more explosive and therefore more threatening both within and beyond their respective regional settings. Yet this extended security role carries with it numerous risks in the form of asymmetrical warfare designed to attack U.S. vulnerabilities, as in the embassy bombings and other terrorist incidents. As we think about U.S. leadership, it is appropriate to suggest that there is a point of intersection between national interests and American values. By shaping a world in which U.S. interests are protected, the values that underlie America as a society--individual liberty and democratization--are also strengthened. Although promoting these values is to its advantage, the United States, even as a superpower and global leader, cannot be all things to all people. Because resources are finite, priorities based on interest must be established. This is more easily said than done. For example, the vital national interest in the Balkans is not self-evident. Yet U.S. actions that have the effect of weakening NATO have important implications for a vital national interest, which is the preservation of a transatlantic relationship, just as the United States has a vital interest in maintaining its security relationships in other regions of importance, especially the Middle East and Pacific Rim. Such relationships form an essential part of a national security strategy designed to deter or dissuade enemies from actions against U.S. interests and values. There are several obvious priorities for protecting national interests. Decisions leading to a national missile defense that protects the United States and its allies must be made as a matter of urgent priority in the new administration. Because the ABM Treaty was designed to prevent an effective missile defense, its continuation is incompatible with a national missile defense for the United States. U.S. military power will need to be strengthened both in the areas of readiness and the development of next-generation technologies. This will require a defense budget at a 3--4 percent GDP level sustained at least over the next decade. Alliance relations, from Europe to the Pacific Rim as well as forward-deployed forces, must be updated.

#### Capability outweighs

Feldstein 07 - Professor of Economics @ Harvard University

[Martin Feldstein (President and CEO of the National Bureau of Economic Research.), "The Underfunded Pentagon," Foreign Affairs, March /April 2007, Volume 86 • Number 2]

Deterring other great powers, such as Russia and China, will require Washington to maintain its dominance in conventional warfare and therefore at least to maintain its current level of military spending. But in addition, the United States now faces three new types of threats for which its existing military capacity is either ill suited or insufficient. First, there are relatively small regional powers, such as North Korea, Iran, and Pakistan, that can or will soon be able to strike the United States and its allies with weapons of mass destruction (WMD).Second, there are global nonstate terrorist networks, such as al Qaeda, with visions of re-creating the world order. And third, there are independent terrorists and groups motivated less by a long-term vision of global conquest than by hatred, anti-Americanism, and opposition to their own governments. Each of these threats is exacerbated by the relative ease with which crude wmds can be developed due to the diffusion of modern technology and the potential emergence of a black market in fissile material. Furthermore, there seems to be general agreement that the United States has committed so much of its war-fighting capacity to Iraq and Afghanistan that it could not fight in Iran or North Korea or elsewhere if that were deemed necessary. That limit on capacity encourages U.S. adversaries to behave in ways that are contrary to U.S. interests. **Those** **adversaries would be less likely to do so if Washington had the extra manpower and equipment** that were once assumed to be the goal— and perhaps the reality—of the U.S. military structure.

#### Offshoring key to chinese econ

El-Shenawi 11 (Eman, “India and China are reaping the financial benefits produced by wealthy remitters” October 30, 2011, AlArabiya.net)

China, a holder of the world's largest foreign exchange reserves, at $3.2 trillion, has recently become a major player in the European debt crisis talks; the region's European Financial Stability Facility bailout fund has been trying to win help from Beijing. This is because China's GDP is set to grow to almost 9 percent in 2011. Compare that with the United States and the eurozone (growth forecasted at a joint 1.6 percent), and China's economic charm is clear. Indeed, the main reasons behind Chinese and Indian economic growth remain: their relatively cheap labor force and a thriving domestic market that has fed well into the global manufacturing supply chain. But their wealthy on- and offshore communities have cranked up their economic caliber and their global appeal for investors. India appears in the top five countries where the offshore affluent now have more than $1 million investable assets on average, according to the Global Affluent Investor study conducted by research company TNS. "India and China have already surpassed major European markets like Germany and France. It's interesting to see that the entrepreneurial spirit of people in these markets is already paying off in terms of personal wealth," Reg van Steen, director of business and finance, TNS, said, according to Reuters. Such emerging markets paint a cheery picture of wealth and how it can leverage economies in the wake of the 2008 global recession and amid the continuing fiscal crises.

#### CPP decline bypasses their defense – the economy is key

Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs – Princeton, Asia Expert – CFR, ‘10

(Aaron, “Implications of the Financial Crisis for the US-China Rivalry,” *Survival*, Volume 52, Issue 4, August, p. 31 – 54)

Despite its magnitude, Beijing's stimulus programme was insufficient to forestall a sizeable spike in unemployment. The regime acknowledges that upwards of 20 million migrant workers lost their jobs in the first year of the crisis, with many returning to their villages, and 7m recent college graduates are reportedly on the streets in search of work.9 Not surprisingly, tough times have been accompanied by increased social turmoil. Even before the crisis hit, the number of so-called 'mass incidents' (such as riots or strikes) reported each year in China had been rising. Perhaps because it feared that the steep upward trend might be unnerving to foreign investors, Beijing stopped publishing aggregate, national statistics in 2005.10 Nevertheless, there is ample, if fragmentary, evidence that things got worse as the economy slowed. In Beijing, for example, salary cuts, layoffs, factory closures and the failure of business owners to pay back wages resulted in an almost 100% increase in the number of labour disputes brought before the courts.11 Since the early days of the current crisis, the regime has clearly been bracing itself for trouble. Thus, at the start of 2009, an official news-agency story candidly warned Chinese readers that the country was, 'without a doubt … entering a peak period of mass incidents'.12 In anticipation of an expected increase in unrest, the regime for the first time summoned all 3,080 county-level police chiefs to the capital to learn the latest riot-control tactics, and over 200 intermediate and lower-level judges were also called in for special training.13 Beijing's stimulus was insufficient At least for the moment, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) appears to be weathering the storm. But if in the next several years the economy slumps again or simply fails to return to its previous pace, Beijing's troubles will mount. The regime probably has enough repressive capacity to cope with a good deal more turbulence than it has thus far encountered, but a protracted crisis could eventually pose a challenge to the solidarity of the party's leadership and thus to its continued grip on political power. Sinologist Minxin Pei points out that the greatest danger to CCP rule comes not from below but from above. Rising societal discontent 'might be sufficient to tempt some members of the elite to exploit the situation to their own political advantage' using 'populist appeals to weaken their rivals and, in the process, open[ing] up divisions within the party's seemingly unified upper ranks'.14 If this happens, all bets will be off and a very wide range of outcomes, from a democratic transition to a bloody civil war, will suddenly become plausible. Precisely because it is aware of this danger, the regime has been very careful to keep whatever differences exist over how to deal with the current crisis within bounds and out of view. If there are significant rifts they could become apparent in the run-up to the pending change in leadership scheduled for 2012. Short of causing the regime to unravel, a sustained economic crisis could induce it to abandon its current, cautious policy of avoiding conflict with other countries while patiently accumulating all the elements of 'comprehensive national power'. If they believe that their backs are to the wall, China's leaders might even be tempted to lash out, perhaps provoking a confrontation with a foreign power in the hopes of rallying domestic support and deflecting public attention from their day-to-day troubles. Beijing might also choose to implement a policy of 'military Keynesianism', further accelerating its already ambitious plans for military construction in the hopes of pumping up aggregate demand and resuscitating a sagging domestic economy.15 In sum, despite its impressive initial performance, Beijing is by no means on solid ground. The reverberations from the 2008-09 financial crisis may yet shake the regime to its foundations, and could induce it to behave in unexpected, and perhaps unexpectedly aggressive, ways.

## Tea Party

#### Polarization inevitable – 6 reasons the aff can’t solve

Strauss ‘12

Steven, Advanced Leadership Fellow, Harvard University, “Six Reasons American Political Polarization Will Only Get Worse” 10/14/2012

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-strauss/megatrend-six-reasons-ame_b_1965182.html>

Welcome to the world of dysfunctional Belief Communities. "Americans ... values and basic beliefs are more polarized along partisan lines than at any point in the past 25 years." (Pew Research) Pundits bemoan this polarization, and await a leader who'll cut the Gordian knot of gridlock politics to deliver us to a bi-partisan nirvana. The pundits will have a long wait. America's current hyper-partisanship stems from a perfect storm of factors (described below). And it's created Belief Communities -- where people who want to believe patently untrue things (e.g., that President Obama was born in Kenya) are never challenged in their beliefs, and may even be encouraged in their fantasies. Let's examine the causes of American political polarization. 1. Confirmation Bias and Weak Feedback Loops: "When Democrats and Republicans see the same presidential debate on television, both sets of viewers claim that the facts clearly show that their candidate was the winner." (Daniel Gilbert) We believe what we want to believe, and we selectively filter out information contradicting our preferences (this is called Confirmation Bias). Convincing us of something we don't want to believe requires: (i) repeated challenge and reinforcement with contradictory information, or (ii) strong immediate feedback loops (e.g., 99.99% of Americans believe a green light means 'go' and a red light means 'stop' because acting contrary to that belief causes car crashes). Unfortunately, many issues about which citizens are most detached from reality have weak feedback loops.

2. Changing Economics of the Media Industry: Confirmation Bias was less of an issue in the 1960s, when Americans got their news from one of three TV networks, and local newspapers were often a monopoly. National TV was regulated and subject to licensing, and networks could lose their licenses for biased or inaccurate reporting. Under these conditions, news wasn't targeted to distinct Belief Communities. Instead, news providers tried to create a common narrative on current events. With the arrival of cable and the web, news media became more like the cereal business -- with different brands targeted at different segments. Through targeting and segmenting, people are told what they want to hear, about topics with non-immediate feedback loops (e.g., basic science and public policy). Fox News is the network of choice for the Right, and many smaller channels/websites are even more micro-targeted, all of which exacerbates the Confirmation Bias problem. 3. Filter Bubbles: Google/Facebook know whether you're a liberal, conservative, birther, believer in ghosts or whatever -- and your information is tailored to reinforce what you already believe. 4. Ideologically Safe Congressional Seats: About 80% of all Congressional Districts are solidly Democratic or Republican. We have bipartisan agreement on one issue -- politicians prefer safe Congressional seats, which sometimes happens naturally, but also because politicians use redistricting to create them. Instead of engaging with challengers from the other party, most members of Congress now engage only with challengers within their own party -- Democrats with their Left, and Republicans with their Right. Bipartisan compromise becomes a dirty word, as a consequence. 5. Advocacy Industry Expansion: Over the past generation, we've seen the rise of special interest groups, often narrowly focused on a single issue. The National Rifle Association, for example, spends $250 million/year fighting gun control. These advocacy groups employ a small army of people at high wages (the head of the NRA is paid $1 million/year). Institutionally, the NRA has every incentive to find new battlegrounds to justify its existence. Replicate this incentivized self-interest for all sorts of narrow issues, mix in even greater ability to raise funds due to Citizen's United -- and you have a formula for polarization. 6. Lack of a Shared Context: The post-WW II era of bi-partisanship (from the 1940s-1970s) was characterized by a shared context. Americans experienced some combination of: WW I, the Great Depression (25% unemployment rate), and WW II (requiring every healthy draft-age male to serve, with no college deferments). After WW II, Americans all faced the shared challenge of the Cold War. Today, despite a U.S. at war for the past 10 years, fewer than 1% of Americans have served in Afghanistan or Iraq. Neither Romney nor Obama has done military service, and few of their relatives and friends have either. (Note: President Clinton, President Bush, and Governor Romney all had children of appropriate age for military service, but none of them has served.) We can begin to break the polarization cycle with: (i) Stronger public finance for political campaigns to reduce the power of special interest groups; (ii) Discouraging ideologically pure Congressional districts thereby forcing Congressmen to appeal to moderates; (iii) Setting limitations on algorithmic filtering of news; and (iv) Engaging Americans in a shared narrative/experience (e.g., requiring mandatory community service for all high school graduates). Otherwise, welcome to the new normal. And without serious reform, things will only get worse.

### Strikes

**Russia and China would support the U.S.**

**Herman**, **2007** (Arthur, professor of History at Georgetown. “How to Fight Iran.” New York Post. January 26. http://www.worldaffairsboard.com/iranian-question/36216-how-fight-iran.html)

The conventional wisdom is that there are "no good options" in dealing with Iran. Most commentators see one of two scenarios, both nightmares: a large, bloody and expensive ground invasion and occupation that would cause oil to spike through the roof or a monthslong aerial bombardment of Iran's estimated 1,500 nuclear-related targets that would trigger a worldwide terrorist backlash. (Alternately, the Israelis could do it for us and set the Middle East ablaze.) Yet there is a third option, of which our show of force with two carrier groups could be the opening move: a naval and air campaign to topple the ayatollahs without a single U.S. soldier's setting foot on Iranian soil. This is not unprecedented. Although the public never noticed, the U.S. Navy accomplished much the same thing during the Iran-Iraq war, when Iran tried to fire on oil tankers in the Persian Gulf in 1987-8. The Navy managed both to destroy the Iranian navy and to protect shipping in the Gulf to keep the world economy stable. This time, we can finish the job we started during the so-called Tanker War. The first step would be a U.S. naval blockade of the Straits of Hormuz backed by anti-missile Aegis class destroyers, together with a guarantee of free passage for all non-Iranian oil shipping. This would reassure the world that energy supplies would continue to flow. At the same time, airstrikes would take out Iran's air defense and anti-ship missile sites scattered around the Gulf. The second step would be what military analysts call an "Effects-Based Operation," as Air Force and Navy planes target Iran's extremely vulnerable military and economic infrastructure, including electrical grid, transportation links, gasoline refineries, port facilities and suspected nuclear sites. Next would come Special Ops and airborne attacks to seize Iran's main oil-pumping station at Kargh Island and capture or neutralize its offshore oil facilities. This would be an enhanced version of what Navy Seal teams pulled off in the 1988 Tanker War with no more than an airborne and a Marine brigade - fewer troops than in the surge planned for Iraq. In a matter of days or weeks, the key components of the Iranian oil industry could be in American hands as Iran ground to a halt. This would not only keep Iranian crude oil flowing to the world's economy. It would also safeguard Russia's and China's investments in Iran's energy industry, which would help line them up in our corner.

# 1NR

### Overview

#### Probability- History proves food shortages are the most likely cause of extinction

**Brown ’11** (from World on the Edge: How to Prevent Environmental and Economic Collapse, by Lester R. Brown © 2011 Earth Policy Institute

For the Mayans, it was deforestation and soil erosion. As more and more land was cleared for farming to support the expanding empire, soil erosion undermined the productivity of their tropical soils. A team of scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has noted that the extensive land clearing by the Mayans likely also altered the regional climate, reducing rainfall. In effect, the scientists suggest, it was the convergence of several environmental trends, some reinforcing others, that led to the food shortages that brought down the Mayan civilization. 26 Although we live in a highly urbanized, technologically advanced society, we are as dependent on the earth’s natural support systems as the Sumerians and Mayans were. If we continue with business as usual, civilizational collapse is no longer a matter of whether but when. We now have an economy that is destroying its natural support systems, one that has put us on a decline and collapse path. We are dangerously close to the edge. Peter Goldmark, former Rockefeller Foundation president, puts it well: “**The death of our civilization is no longer a theory** or an academic possibility; it is the road we’re on.” 2 **Judging by the archeological records of earlier civilizations, more often than not food shortages appear to have precipitated their decline and collapse**. Given the advances of modern agriculture, I had long rejected the idea that food could be the weak link in our twenty-first century civilization. **Today I think not only that it could be the weak link but that it is the weak link.**

**Magnitude- food shortages mean extinction**

**Takacs ‘96** (David, The Idea Of Diversity: Philosophies Of Paradise, 1996, p. 200-1.)

So biodiversity keeps the world running. It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs’ rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: “It is likely that destruction of the rich complex of species in the Amazon basin could trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the famines could lead to a thermonuclear war, which could extinguish civilization.” Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion , loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well­stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where can­cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter. Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civilization will disappear some time before the end of the next century - not with a bang but a whimper.

#### Escalation is highly probable

Geller 5 (Daniel S. – Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Wayne State University, The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry, Ed. T. V. Paul, p. 99)

In fact, both the May-July 1999 military engagement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and the crisis of December 2001-June 2002 after the terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament mirrored the conflict escalation pattern for nuclear-armed states. Each side initiated troop mobilization and general military alerts, coupled with the evacuation of civilians from border-area villages. However, the outcome of the future confrontations for India and Pakistan may not adhere to the pattern established by other nuclear dyads. Elements are present in this dyad that were largely absent between other nuclear-armed antagonists and that make the escalation of war more probable. Among those factors are the presence of a contiguous border between India and Pakistan, a history of multiple wars, and an ongoing territorial dispute. These factors, among others,79 increase the likelihood that an Indo-Pakistani dispute will turn violent and that the violence will escalate to war irrespective of the presence of nuclear weapons.

#### That escalation has a high probability of being nuclear

Raghavan, Fall-Winter **200**1 (Lieutenant General V. R. – former Director General of Military Operations for India, Limited War and Nuclear Escalation in South Asia, The Nonproliferation Review, p. 1)

The status of India and Pakistan as declared nuclear powers with growing nuclear arsenals has raised the risks of a nuclear exchange between them, if the two countries engage in a large military conflict. The political leadership in both countries does not seem to have fully grasped the implications of nuclear weapons in relation to the ongoing conflict in Jammu and Kashmir. This conflict could lead to a limited war, as it has triggered three wars in the past. The risks involved in fighting a limited war over the Kashmir issue and the potential for such a war to escalate into a nuclear exchange are at best inadequately understood, and at worst brushed aside as an unlikely possibility. Despite this official stance, however, a close examination of Indian and Pakistani military and nuclear doctrine reveals elements that could contribute to the rapid escalation of a limited war to include nuclear weapons. Strikingly, India and Pakistan have not revealed warfighting doctrines for the post-1998 condition of nuclear weapons readiness. It is not clear, for example, what threats to its security would compel India to declare a state of war with Pakistan. There is also no indication of the circumstances that would induce Pakistan to seek a larger war with India. The political objectives that a limited war might seek to achieve have also not been articulated in official and public discourse in the two countries. This article examines the possibility of limited war between India and Pakistan, and the potential of such a conflict triggering a nuclear war. It examines the considerations that could push each of the two countries to fight a limited war. It discusses how such a war might be waged and the circumstances that would likely precipitate an escalation to a nuclear exchange. The doctrinal beliefs and decisionmaking processes of the two countries are examined to trace the likely escalatory spiral towards a nuclear war. The article concludes that the probability of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan is high in the event the two countries engage in a direct military conflict.

**Indo-Pak war is the most probable scenario for extinction**

Fai 1

(Ghulam Nabi, Kashmiri American Council; July 8, Washington Times)

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. The Director of Central Intelligence, the Department of Defense, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries. Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

### Impact Turns Case

#### DA turns sustainability

**Zedillo et al ‘8** (Rethinking U.S.–Latin American Relations A Hemispheric Partnership for a Turbulent World Report of the Partnership for the Americas Commission The Brookings Institution November 2008 Ernesto Zedillo Commission co-chair; Former President of Mexico Thomas R. Pickering Commission co-chair; Former U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Memb e r s o f the Par t n e r s h i p for t h e Ame r i cas Commi ssi o n Mauricio Cárdenas Director of the Commission; Senior Fellow and Director, Latin America Initiative, Brookings Leonardo Martinez-Diaz Deputy Director of the Commission; Political Economy Fellow, Global Economy and Development, Brookings

The link between carbon-intensive activities and changes in the world’s climate is now well established, and the consequences will be felt across the hemisphere. According to figure 2, if current human activity remains unchanged, the hemisphere will likely suffer from a variety of ecological shocks, including declines in agricultural yields, water shortages, the loss of animal and plant species, and more frequent and destructive storms in the Caribbean Basin. These extreme weather events could bring devastation to Central America, the Caribbean, and the southeastern United States, imposing a heavy human and material toll. As we know from recent storms, the costs of replacing homes, businesses, and infrastructure—along with the higher costs of energy if refineries and offshore rigs are damaged—will be vast. Hemispheric Solutions Addressing the challenge of energy security will require making energy consumption more efficient and developing new energy sources, whereas addressing the challenge of climate change will require finding ways to control carbon emissions, helping the world shift away from carbon-intensive energy generation, and adapting to some aspects of changing ecosystems. Potential solutions to these problems exist in the Americas, but mobilizing them will require a sustained hemispheric partnership. Latin America has enormous potential to help meet the world’s growing thirst for energy, both in terms of hydrocarbons and alternative fuels. Latin America has about 10 percent of the world’s proven oil reserves. Venezuela accounts for most of these, though Brazil’s oil reserves could increase from 12 to 70 billon barrels if recent discoveries can be developed. Bolivia is an important producer of natural gas, Mexico has great potential in solar energy generation, and several countries in the region could potentially produce much more hydroelectric power. Brazil is a world leader in sugarcane-based ethanol production, and the United States is a leader in corn-based ethanol (figure 3). Solar and wind power, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean, remain underdeveloped. To expand the hemisphere’s energy capacity, massive infrastructure investments will be required. Major investments in oil production 13 (especially deep offshore), refining, and distribution will be needed to achieve the region’s potential. Developing the Tupi project in Brazil alone will cost $70–240 billion. Liquefied natural gas will become an important source of energy, but not before major investments are made in infrastructure to support liquefaction, regasification, transport, and security. U.S. and Canadian electricity networks, which are already highly integrated, can be further integrated with Mexico’s. Mexico also plans to connect its grid to those of Guatemala and Belize, eventually creating an integrated power market in Central America. Power integration in South America will demand even larger investments in generation, transmission, and distribution. Finally, reliance on nuclear power may grow because it is carbon free and does not require fossil fuel imports. However, efforts to expand energy capacity and integrate hemispheric energy markets face a variety of obstacles. Energy nationalism has led to disruptive disputes over pricing and ownership. Tensions and mistrust in South America have hindered regional cooperation and investment, particularly on natural gas. The security of the energy infrastructure, especially pipelines, remains a concern in Mexico and parts of South America. Gas, oil, and electricity subsidies distort patterns of production and consumption, and they are triggering protectionist behavior elsewhere. Technology on renewables remains underdeveloped, and research in this area can be better centralized and disseminated. Overcoming these obstacles will require high levels of cooperation among hemispheric partners. In addition to developing carbon-neutral sources of energy, the Western Hemisphere has other roles to play in combating climate change. The LAC region currently accounts for about 5 percent of annual global carbon emissions, and emissions per capita are still relatively low compared with other regions. However, minimizing the LAC region’s future carbon footprint will require new policies. Also, deforestation globally accounts for 20 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. The Amazon River Basin contains one of the world’s three most important rainforests, whose protection can therefore very significantly contribute to combating climate change. Brazil is pioneering the use of information technology to lessen deforestation in the Amazon.

#### DA turns protectionism

**Pollan ‘8** (BOOKS ARTICLESAPPEARANCESMEDIA PRESS KITNEWSRESOURCES TODAY’S LINK Farmer in Chief By Michael Pollan The New York Times Magazine, October 12, 2008

The impact of the American food system on the rest of the world will have implications for your foreign and trade policies as well. In the past several months more than 30 nations have experienced food riots, and so far one government has fallen. Should high grain prices persist and shortages develop, you can expect to see the pendulum shift decisively away from free trade, at least in food. Nations that opened their markets to the global flood of cheap grain (under pressure from previous administrations as well as the World Bank and the I.M.F.) lost so many farmers that they now find their ability to feed their own populations hinges on decisions made in Washington (like your predecessor’s precipitous embrace of biofuels) and on Wall Street. They will now rush to rebuild their own agricultural sectors and then seek to protect them by erecting trade barriers. Expect to hear the phrases “food sovereignty” and “food security” on the lips of every foreign leader you meet. Not only the Doha round, but the whole cause of free trade in agriculture is probably dead, the casualty of a cheap food policy that a scant two years ago seemed like a boon for everyone. It is one of the larger paradoxes of our time that the very same food policies that have contributed to overnutrition in the first world are now contributing to undernutrition in the third. But it turns out that too much food can be nearly as big a problem as too little — a lesson we should keep in mind as we set about designing a new approach to food policy.

#### DA turns liberal internationalism – also de-escalates the terminal impact to the tea party adv

Shifter 12. [Michael, President of the Sol M. Linowitz Forum Intern-American Dialogue, "Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America" Inter-American Dialogue Policy Report -- April -- www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf]

Relations between the United States and Latin America are at a curious¶ juncture . In the past decade, most Latin American countries have made ¶ enormous progress in managing their economies and reducing inequality ¶ and, especially, poverty, within a democratic framework . These critical ¶ changes have brought greater autonomy, expanded global links, and growing self-confidence . It is now the United States that is in a sour mood, ¶ struggling with a still weak economic recovery, diminished international ¶ stature and influence, and fractured politics at home .¶ These recent changes have profoundly affected Inter-American relations .¶ While relations are today cordial and largely free of the antagonisms of the ¶ past, they also seem without vigor and purpose . Effective cooperation in ¶ the Americas, whether to deal with urgent problems or to take advantage ¶ of new opportunities, has been disappointing .¶ The Inter-American Dialogue’s report is a call to all nations of the hemisphere to take stock, to rebuild cooperation, and to reshape relations in a ¶ new direction . All governments in the hemisphere should be more attentive ¶ to emerging opportunities for fruitful collaboration on global and regional ¶ issues ranging across economic integration, energy security, protection of ¶ democracy, and climate change . The United States **must regain its credibility** in the region by dealing seriously with an unfinished agenda of ¶ problems—including immigration, drugs, and Cuba—that stands in the ¶ way of a real partnership . To do so, **it needs the help of Latin America** and ¶ the Caribbean

#### DA turns Iran strikes

The China-Iran relationship poses a significant challenge to international efforts to isolate Iran and pressure its leaders to abandon their nuclear program. China has continued to develop tighter ties with the Islamic Republic even as Iranian weapons and facilitators kill Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan, the terrorist activities of Tehran-backed Hamas and Hezbollah threaten Israel, and Iranian centrifuges continue to enrich uranium. China continues to provide weapons to Iran, maintains extensive economic relations with it, and protects the Iranian regime at the United Nations Security Council. All of these activities have contributed to the ineffectiveness of Washington’s policies toward Iran. Although Chinese support for the Iranian regime has certainly frustrated American leaders, it has not harmed U.S.-China relations. China has offered Iran as much support as it can get away with without bringing reprisals upon itself.¶ China appears to see Iran as “a useful hedge against a hostile United States.”[1] The relationship is mutually beneficial. Iran’s economy is well served, as are its political and strategic objectives in the region. Meanwhile, Beijing can use Tehran to keep the United States bogged down in the region, and to demonstrate its ability to frustrate U.S. policy outside of the Asia-Pacific. China is not eager to go toe-to-toe with the United States; using Iran, Beijing can assert its leadership and demonstrate that its power rivals that of the U.S. without directly challenging American leadership in the Asia-Pacific.¶ The China-Iran relationship is problematic for the United States not only because it frustrates Washington’s Iran policy, but also because the ultimate outcome of the Iran challenge has wider consequences for U.S. global leadership and credibility.

### AT: Thumpers

#### Immigration reform on top of agenda – will pass – no thumpers.

Berger 3-4. [Judson, journalist, "Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities" Fox News -- www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/]

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., a vocal advocate for immigration reform, voiced confidence Monday that the administration and Congress could handle the busy agenda. ¶ "The spirit of bipartisan cooperation that is keeping the immigration issue moving forward has not been poisoned by the sequester and budget stalemate, so far," he said in a statement. "The two sets of issues seem to exist in parallel universes where I can disagree with my Republican colleagues strenuously on budget matters, but still work with them effectively to eventually reach an immigration compromise. ... I remain extremely optimistic that immigration reform is going to happen this year." ¶ Immigration reform efforts are still marching along despite the budget drama. Obama met last week on the issue with Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who both are part of a bipartisan group crafting legislation. ¶ However, work on gun control before the Senate Judiciary Committee last week was postponed.

#### Obama is backing down on sequester – not spending pc.

Berger 3-4. [Judson, journalist, "Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities" Fox News -- www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/]

But in terms of time management, Ullyot said Obama may soon realize that pursuing a "balanced" package of tax revenues and spending cuts to replace the $85 billion in sequester cuts may not be worth his time. ¶ "In the end, the president may back off on spending a lot of time on replacing the sequester" so he can press the other issues, he said.

Sequester won’t affect Obama’s agenda

US News 3-5-12 (“Obama Sticking With Broad Agenda,” Lexis)

President Obama insists that he isn't giving up on his other objectives even though reducing the deficit currently dominates his attention. Obama tells members of his cabinet that the ongoing fiscal drama of spending cuts, known as sequestration, "doesn't reduce our commitment to things like education and basic research that will help us grow over the long term." He also tells aides that he wants to move ahead aggressively on immigration reform, gun control, and other issues.

Cabinet meetings prove

AFP 3-4-12 (“Despite budget cloud, Obama kick starts second term agenda,” Lexis)

US President Barack Obama sought Monday to shield his ambitious second-term agenda from the poisoned political aftermath of a budget fight with Republicans that triggered an $85 billion austerity hit. Obama gathered his cabinet for their first meeting since his second inauguration and vowed to press ahead with action on nurturing economic growth, curbing gun violence and working towards comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Obama staying out of gun control.

Associated Press 3-9-13. da: 3-10-13 -- www.newsday.com/news/nation/obama-staying-out-of-negotiations-on-gun-bills-1.4783266

With gun legislation taking shape on Capitol Hill, President Barack Obama has kept a low profile on an issue he has made a critical part of his second-term agenda.¶

#### Obama is not investing capital in climate change

Pace 1/24/13 (Julie, AP White House Correspondent, “Obama’s Lofty Inaugural Ideals Run into Reality”) http://www.redding.com/news/2013/jan/24/obamas-lofty-inaugural-ideals-run-reality/

President Barack Obama's lofty ideals from his inaugural address ran smack into reality Tuesday on the first working day of his second term. Twenty-four hours after Obama pledged to tackle climate change and called for gays and lesbians to be treated equally under the law, the White House struggled to back up his sweeping rhetoric with specifics, raising questions about how much political muscle he'll put behind both issues. Republicans were already signaling their unhappiness with Obama's agenda. "The era of liberalism is back," said Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell. "If the president pursues that kind of agenda, obviously it's not designed to bring us together." Obama, standing before hundreds of thousands of people on the National Mall, had vowed to "respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations." But in the White House briefing room a day later, Obama spokesman Jay Carney said he couldn't speculate about future actions. He said that while climate change was a priority for the president, "it is not a singular priority."

#### In case they cross apply the PTC thumper – it doesn’t thump politics, its temporary, plan isn’t

Juliano 12/22 (Wind tax credit debate simmers amid ongoing ‘fiscal cliff’ talks, MIDWEST ENERGY NEWS, http://www.midwestenergynews.com/2012/12/20/wind-tax-credit-debate-simmers-amid-ongoing-fiscal-cliff-talks/)

The ongoing war of words over the “fiscal cliff” that intensified this week left unanswered one of the most important questions for energy watchers: What will happen to a suite of expired or expiring tax credits? The debate over those incentives, including the wind production tax credit and subsidies to promote energy efficiency and alternative fuels, has largely simmered on the back burner amid the broader debate over across-the-board tax hikes and spending cuts scheduled to take effect in January. That is still the case, although observers continue to believe they have a good chance of being included in a year-end cliff package, if there is one. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) on Tuesday unveiled a “Plan B” approach to avoid most of the looming tax hikes, but it did not address the PTC or other so-called tax extenders. President Obama and Senate Democrats were quick to dismiss the offer. Rep. Pat Tiberi (R-Ohio), who has been a leading negotiator over the fate of the PTC, acknowledged that it and other temporary tax provisions “take a back seat” to the broader debate over the cliff and that it would take “a deal on everything else” to see movement on extending the temporary credits. Boehner’s proposal was seen as largely a messaging exercise, with the extenders still expected to be along for the ride if Congress and the White House can reach a broader deal on taxes and spending, lawmakers and lobbyists said. “I suspect this is all for show,” one wind lobbyist said of Boehner’s proposal. ‘A lot of quiet conversations’ Sen. Mark Udall (D-Colo.), who has been leading a public push for a PTC extension with near-daily floor speeches, said yesterday that there have been “a lot of quiet conversations” among senators over how to insert the credit into a broader fiscal cliff deal but that he was not at liberty to say more. Udall participated Wednesday in an online discussion with Energy Secretary Steven Chu over the future of the wind industry and the importance of policies such as the PTC. The House is expected to vote soon on the Boehner Plan B proposal. It would continue George W. Bush-era tax cuts for people earning less than $1 million per year but not address temporary tax breaks like the PTC or across-the-board spending cuts known as the sequester. Rep. Kristi Noem (R-S.D.), a leading PTC advocate, said Tuesday morning that the fate of the wind credit had not yet been discussed with the full House Republican conference but that she remained optimistic it could win an extension as part of a larger fiscal cliff deal ([Greenwire](http://www.eenews.net/Greenwire/2012/12/18/archive/2), Dec. 18). The PTC and other energy incentives are included in a broader mix of tax provisions known as “extenders” because they are temporary and often have to be renewed. The Senate Finance Committee this summer voted to extend and modify the PTC as part of a larger package to extend dozens of temporary tax breaks, including big-ticket items such as relief from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) and the popular research and development credit. That bill never came to the floor, but lawmakers remain optimistic it will see action before the end of the year as part of a larger package. “I expect that when it comes to extenders if we have a fiscal cliff bill that all of the extenders will be in there, probably driven by AMT or research and development,” Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), a leading PTC champion, told reporters Tuesday. Boehner’s Plan B, which is not expected to pass the Senate, did include a permanent AMT fix, although other extenders were not included. Tiberi predicted Congress would eventually address the so-called tax extenders, and he suggested that separating the AMT fix would not affect the chances for other extenders to be renewed. “I think there’s a lot of members who are supportive of a lot of the different extenders,” Tiberi told reporters last night. “So whether it’s done next week if there’s a deal or next month if there’s a deal, I still think in the interim — before comprehensive tax reform, which is a goal for a lot of us — that you have that debate still.” Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), the ranking member on Finance, said, “You can’t help but have those [as] part of a final debate” over the fiscal cliff.

### AT: VAWA

#### No ev that Obama is involved and it’s non controversial.

St Louis Post Dispatch 2-5-13. www.stltoday.com/news/national/govt-and-politcs/senate-tries-again-to-move-anti-violence-bill/article\_a284a7d3-1472-53ee-83d3-17da9c798103.html

The Senate bill, while making minor concessions to meet GOP concerns, is essentially the same as the measure that passed that chamber last April on a 68-31 vote. It focuses on ensuring that college students, immigrants, Native Americans and gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender people have access to anti-abuse programs. In contrast to the House version of the update of the legislation, the Senate bill has bipartisan backing and is expected to have little difficulty in garnering the necessary 60 votes to be moved to the floor. A final vote could come by the end of the week.

### AT: Won’t Pass

#### Obama PC locking down key GOP senators

CNN Wire 3-2-13 (“5 things: What's next for Washington?,” Lexis)

Of all the issues Congress could tackle, immigration is seen as one of the most likely areas for progress. Both sides see a potential political benefit in hammering out a deal, and both sides are voluntarily at the negotiating table trying to work one out. "Send me a comprehensive immigration reform bill in the next few months and I will sign it right away," Obama said in his State of the Union address just over a month ago. The Republican response to his speech was delivered that night by Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, one member of the bi-partisan Gang of Eight working behind the scenes to craft legislation. Rubio said immigration reform would be good for the economy. "We need a responsible, permanent solution to the problem of those who are here illegally," he said. "But first, we must follow through on the broken promises of the past to secure our borders and enforce our laws." The bipartisan effort nearly hit a snag when details of an Obama administration draft immigration proposal was published, but Obama phoned lawmakers and met with two Republicans in that Gang of Eight -- Sens. John McCain and Lindsey Graham -- at the White House in mid-February.

#### Momentum.

Korn 3-4. [Jennifer, Executive Director of the Hispanic Leadership Network. Previously, she served in President George W. Bush’s White House as Director of Hispanic Affairs, "New Momentum for immigration reform with conservatives leading the way" Fox News Latino -- latino.foxnews.com/latino/opinion/2013/03/04/new-momentum-for-immigration-reform-with-conservatives-leading-way/]

There is reason to be cautiously optimistic about the road that lies ahead toward immigration reform. After four years of inaction, the president is now focused on repairing his legacy with the Hispanic community. On the other hand, after the lessons learned from the 2012 presidential elections, a broad group of conservatives have embraced the concept of a long-lasting fix to our broken immigration system.¶ There is new momentum for immigration reform and conservatives are leading the way. This week, the Hispanic Leadership Network (HLN), a national organization that strives to engage Hispanics on center-right issues, launched an advocacy campaign in support of fixing our broken and antiquated immigration system. The campaign includes a six-figure ad buy on ABC, FOX, and Univision.¶ The ad, entitled “Be Part of the Solution,” features former Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez calling on Washington to pass immigration reform “that grows the economy and respects the rule of law.” Last month, Secretary Gutierrez resigned his senior position at Citigroup Inc. to become chairman of a pro-immigration reform super PAC. He will not only be an invaluable ally in HLN’s advocacy campaign, but a powerful force in his own right as the legislative process moves forward. ¶ HLN’s paid media campaign is only one of a series of initiatives aimed at growing our members across the nation and activating them to play a key role in the grassroots movement behind a bipartisan deal to fix our broken immigration system once and for all. HLN’s members support the work of the Senate, led by Senator Marco Rubio, to achieve a reform that addresses the main problems of our broken system — strengthening our southern border, overhauling our legal visa system, implementing a viable temporary worker program, and creating a fair but tough plan for earned legal status.¶ Also this week, HLN Co-Chair Jeb Bush will jump-start the public debate beyond the halls of Congress with the official launch of “Immigration Wars.” In the book, Governor Bush and constitutional lawyer Clint Bolick lay out a strategy to do away with all that is wrong with our current system and have a fresh, new start. “Immigration Wars” offers sensible advice to all conservatives. ¶ In the last few weeks, we have also been encouraged by the news of other conservative governors who have added their voices to the chorus advocating for immigration reform. Those include Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin and Governor Bill Haslam of Tennessee. In calling for reform, it became evident that these leaders understand that immigration reform is needed to further our economic development.¶ In Washington, the push to overhaul our immigration system has now been embraced by the top brass of conservative congressional leaders, from Speaker John Boehner to former vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan. Across the nation, conservative governors are not only paying attention, but coming out in full force for reform. Even in the media, conservative commentators like Sean Hannity have jumped in the reform bandwagon. Lastly, and more importantly, poll after poll shows that there is an increasing appetite among conservative voters to see this issue resolved. ¶ This momentum and new appreciation for the changing face of our electorate should give conservatives in Congress the impetus to do what is morally right, economically wise, and politically prudent.

### AT: Winners Win

#### Doesn’t say PC irrelevant just says it’s complex-evaluate our specific arguments

**Hirsch, 2-7-13**

(Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, DOA: 2-9-13)

The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term**.** Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is**, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”** The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.

#### Depends on picking the right issues --- links prove the plan is wrong

**Hirsch 13**

(Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, DOA: 2-9-13)

And then **there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong**. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either. At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country. Bush failed utterly, of course. But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital. Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. **The problem was** that **whatever credibility** or stature Bush thought **he had earned** as a newly reelected president **did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes**. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it. The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But **there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform**. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… **Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill**. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls.

#### Doesn’t win on energy

Eisler ‘12

(Matthew, “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above”, Science Progress <http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/>)

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital **from his energy policy from either the left or the right** by the end of his first term. **The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy,** but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, **Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term**, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

### AT: Bipartisan

#### Conceded the coal lobby link – coal lobby will overwhelm the plan and convert any supports into silence or opposition – that’s the 1NC – no new 1AR responses to this link, skews block strategy

#### Congress actually cut energy funding for REAP

Jessen 1-2

Holly, Biomass Magazine, Farm bill contains no mandatory funding for energy title programs, http://www.biomassmagazine.com/articles/8467/farm-bill-contains-no-mandatory-funding-for-energy-title-programs

The good news is that legislators came through at the 11th hour and passed the “fiscal cliff bill,” which extended the farm bill through Sept. 30 and several biofuel-related tax incentives through 2013.The bad news is, all mandatory funding for energy title programs were stripped from the farm bill at the last moment. “The programs have lived, but they don’t have money,” said Lloyd Ritter, co-director of the Agriculture Energy Coalition. “Unless the appropriators decide to fund them and that’s a tough battle given the appropriations situation.” Growth Energy released a statement that commended members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives for passing the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. Still, CEO Tom Buis said that, while the biofuel tax extensions were needed, longer-term solutions were imperative. He also said that removing mandatory funding for energy programs effectively killed funding to ethanol infrastructure development through Rural Energy for America Program and second-generation feedstock development through Biomass Crop Assistance Program and the Biorefinery Assistance Program. “As the 113th Congress convenes this Thursday, I urge them to revisit these provisions and act to provide the stability and funding necessary to ensure robust growth and continued success for the renewable fuels industry moving forward,” he said in a prepared statement. Other biofuel and biomass related energy programs include the Biomass Research and Development program, the Rural Energy Self-Sufficiency Initiative, the Feedstock Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers and the Forest Biomass for Energy and Community Wood Energy Program. Ritter called it highly unfortunate that mandatory funding for energy title programs was removed from the bill. The changes happened at the last minute, and it differed from the agreement that had been hammered out by the ag committees in the House and Senate. “The ag committees had a bipartisan, bicameral approach that we thought was a pretty good solution,” he said. “It had a reasonable amount of mandatory funding for core energy title programs.” The changes were negotiated by minority leader Sen. Mitch McConnell, R-Ky. “We really had a good package together for agriculture and ag energy and we lost the energy piece and some other pieces,” Ritter said. “Funding was stripped from a variety of different sections, not just energy, and there were quite a few changes in the overall bill.”

#### Sequencing link – CIR needs to happen first – plan pushes it off the docket

Times Leader 1-24-13. tories/ALTHOUGH-President-Obama-promises-to-make-immigration-reform-a-priority-in-his-second-term-other-issues-are-taking-center-stage-

ALTHOUGH President Obama promises to make immigration reform a priority in his second term, other issues are taking center stage in Washington.¶ The legislative calendar is already crowded. Unless reform advocates are prepared to insist that an overhaul of immigration must be at the top of the agenda, fixing the system may be sidetracked again by diehard opponents and the need to deal with other issues.¶ Fortunately, advocates have received new in the form of a new report by the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute.¶ The report says the government spent $18 billion on immigration enforcement in 2011 — more than all other federal law enforcement agencies combined — resulting in record levels of detentions and deportations. Customs and border enforcement, the report found, refer more cases for federal prosecution than all the Justice Department agencies combined.¶ At the same time, apprehensions along the border have fallen to a 40-year low — roughly 340,000, down from roughly 1.6 million in 2000, reflecting a decrease in illegal entries. Indeed, beginning in 2007 with the onset of the recession, immigration has turned into a negative flow.¶ All of this should set the stage for a new approach to the immigration debate.¶ The new debate should go beyond enforcement and the laudable but piecemeal attempts by Mr. Obama to tinker with the system..¶ The president must lead by becoming more involved in the immigration issue, and proponents must keep up the pressure for change. There won’t be a “next time” or another second term. Customarily, presidents lose much of their political clout in the later years of a second term — there’s no point in waiting until manana.

#### Renewables energy transition requires presidential leadership

Mengel 10 (Jimmy, Green Chip Stocks, “America Falls from Top Spot in Energy Rankings”) <http://www.greenchipstocks.com/articles/china-overtakes-us-for-renewable-investing/1097>

Thanks in no small part to our inability to pass comprehensive energy legislation, China has pulled ahead of the United States in the race to become the most attractive country for renewable energy investment. In a list released by accounting firm Ernst and Young, China ranked first out of 27 countries, with the United States dropping to number two. Rounding out the top ten were Germany, India, Italy, the UK, France, Spain, Canada, and Portugal. The index provides scores for each country on renewable energy markets and infrastructures and the nations' suitability for individual technologies. Regulations, available land, planning barriers subsidies, access to the power grid, and access to capital all factor into the final scoring. According to the report, China outspent the United States almost two to one in clean energy projects. The communist nation has also emerged as the world leader in installed wind power capacity, while the U.S. has languished — falling to its lowest installed capacity since 2007. China also improved her position with plans to standardize grid connection procedures for wind projects. “China has all the benefits of capital, government will, and it’s a massive market,” Ben Warren, Ernst & Young’s environment and energy infrastructure advisory leader, [told Bloomberg](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-09-07/china-supplants-u-s-at-top-of-ernst-young-ranking-for-renewable-energy.html). “We would expect to see China retaining a dominant position.” While China's prospects are still on the rise, the United States has been treading water, at best. With Congress mired in paralyzing partisan bickering, and President Obama quickly running out of political capital, energy legislation has slipped through the cracks yet again. “What we’re seeing in the U.S. is a continued resistance to committing to long-term visible and transparent support for the sector,” Warren added. That resistance is catching up to us... And it will only widen the gap between China and the United States. We'll continue to cede investment dollars and green jobs to the Chinese until we wake up and get serious about renewable energy legislation.

### AT: Agencies Don’t Link

#### Obama will get blamed for agency action.

Wallison 3. [Peter, resident fellow at AEI, “A Power Shift No One Noticed” American Enterprise Institute -- January 1 -- http://www.aei.org/issue/economics/financial-services/a-power-shift-no-one-noticed-issue/]

Control over independent regulatory agencies has traditionally resided with Congress, which created all of them. The recent controversy over the Securities and Exchange Commission suggests, however, that now Congress, the White House, and the public all take for granted that the independent agencies are the president's responsibility. The political frenzy surrounding Enron's collapse and other corporate scandals may have produced--or at least exposed--a significant shift in the relationship between Congress and the White House. The efforts of congressional Democrats to pin some of the blame for the scandals on the president and the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission--and President Bush's willingness to act as though the SEC is his responsibility--may signal the end of more than a century of experimentation with independent regulatory agencies as a so-called "fourth branch" of government. History of Independent Agencies Independent agencies such as the SEC have always been regarded as "arms of Congress," outside the control of the executive branch. The president appointed the members and the chairman, but the terms for these officials overlapped presidential administrations, allowing--and encouraging--them to act without policy direction from the White House. The political fallout from the recent scandals has turned all this on its head. These independent agencies are creatures of Congress, not the Constitution. The first, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), was established in 1887 to control the powerful railroad industry. Later, especially during the Progressive and New Deal eras, a number of other agencies were created, several of which still exist--including the SEC, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. Several others, such as the Federal Power Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, went out of business a quarter-century ago. The ICC closed its doors in 1995. There was no clear reason, or constitutional rationale, why the duties of these bodies could not have been performed by regular executive branch departments. Presidents have expressed their unhappiness with this diminution of their authority, and some have tried to influence agency policies through the appointments process, but they have not confronted Congress on the issue. And Congress--always jealous of its prerogatives in the face of the executive branch's growing power--has never conceded that the independent regulatory agencies could take policy direction from the president. Then, in 1971, the status quo was called into question. The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization--known as the Ash Council after its chairman, Roy L. Ash of Litton Industries--recommended that almost all of the functions of these bodies be transferred to single administrators, appointed by the president and accountable to him. The Ash Council's rationale for this reform was simple: If the president's policy control did not extend to these independent agencies, then his responsibility for them could not be clearly fixed and voters could not hold him accountable. Moreover, the president's policies, even if adopted by Congress, could be frustrated through contrary actions by the independent agencies. The Ash Council's proposal, like many reform ideas, went nowhere. There was no support in Congress for enhancing the president's power, and the Nixon administration--beset first by economic problems and then by the Watergate scandal--had no stomach for challenging Congress. (The Ash Council's report did lead, however, to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, headed by an administrator who answers to the president.) During the Reagan administration, however, the executive branch became more assertive. The Justice Department took the Constitution's separation of powers seriously, which by implication challenged the very legitimacy of the independent regulatory agencies. Nevertheless, because of congressional sensitivities and the continuing sense that these bodies were quasi-judicial in nature, White House officials were warned that all contacts with the independent regulatory agencies had to be approved in advance--or actually carried out--by the White House counsel's office. The Reagan administration never seriously considered taking on Congress through a legislative proposal that would bring these independent agencies within the constitutionally established structure. The Presidential Role All this history appears to have been forgotten in the politics of 2002. The Democrats, hoping to make an election issue out of the SEC's "failure" to stop "corporate corruption," proceeded to blame a Republican president for events that were solely within the authority of the SEC. There was no indication that departments or agencies unquestionably controlled by the president had any role for policing either the securities industry or the companies under scrutiny. So if President Bush was somehow responsible for what happened at Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, and the rest, it had to be as a consequence of some presidential authority over the SEC. To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of all parties--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was fully accountable for an agency that has always been viewed as independent. The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can hardly be overstated. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become electorally responsible for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the die is now cast. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the attitude of Congress. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be difficult to convince them otherwise. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."

#### Congress still weighs in on every agency action

Lovell 00. [George, Assistant Professor of Government, College of William and Mary, “THAT SICK CHICKEN WON'T HUNT: THE LIMITS OF A JUDICIALLY ENFORCED NON-DELEGATION DOCTRINE”, Constitutional Commentary -- Spring -- lexis]

An initial problem with this complaint is that it is not entirely accurate. Even in a world with delegation, voters can usually trace regulatory decisions to "yes" or "no" votes cast by their representatives in Congress. It is true that members of Congress do not cast "yes" or "no" votes on particular rules created by agencies, but they do quite often need to go on record with "yes" or "no" votes that make agency activities possible. Legislators must cast votes to establish executive branch agencies and to give those agencies the authority to make regulatory decisions. The democratic controls created by such votes weaken over time. (Most of the voters who voted for the legislators who passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act are now dead). But members of Congress need to take at least one vote per year (on the relevant appropriations bill) in order for any regulatory program to continue, and circumstances sometimes force members to cast additional votes on particular programs. Since no regulatory program can operate without being created and continually authorized by Congress, there is nothing about delegation that prevents an unhappy electorate from holding members of Congress accountable for regulatory power exercised by the agencies. Opponents of incumbents are certainly free to make such votes an issue in the next campaign, and they sometimes do. Representative George Nethercutt (R-Washington) recently found this out the hard way from an ad sponsored by some of his political opponents. Nethercutt probably did not know that he had voted for the Endangered [\*91] Species Act twelve times until he saw an ad that recounted his votes on various appropriations and authorizations items. 21

### AT: Executive Action Links

#### Obama won’t do major immigration changes through XOs

Krikorian 12. [Mark, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, "The president's unconstitutional DREAM amnesty gets rolling" Center for Immigration Studies -- cis.org/OpedsandArticles/DREAM-Amnesty-Begins-Krikorian-National-Review]

The president knows what he’s doing is unconstitutional. We don’t have to read his mind to know this — he’s said it repeatedly. In July of last year, he told the National Council of La Raza, “The idea of doing things on my own is very tempting, I promise you, not just on immigration reform. But that’s not how our system works. That’s not how our democracy functions.” In September he told some journalists: I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there’s been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It’s just not true.

### AT: India Resiliency

#### U.S.-India relations are high but not resilient

Tellis 12 – Senior Associate, South Asia Program (Ashley J., 11/29, “A New Friendship: U.S.-India Relations,” http://carnegieendowment.org/globalten/?fa=50147)

Building on this evolution in American policy toward India since Bill Clinton, President Barack Obama has already underscored India’s strategic and economic significance for the United States. Future policies should build on Obama’s vision but even more importantly translate it into an “all of government” effort that deepens the partnership on multiple dimensions. This goal, however, could prove challenging and will require strong resolve. The second Obama term will likely confront a series of potentially serious dangers relating to Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Syria, and possibly China—in addition to all the domestic challenges of accelerating a slow economic recovery. Given these realities, it is possible that the task of exploiting breakthroughs will be shortchanged amid the struggle to overcome calamities. In Washington, as in many other capitals, addressing the urgent invariably dominates engaging the important. Strong U.S.-India relations will continue to be important for American interests in the years ahead. But continuing the renovation of U.S.-India ties represents an opportunity to be realized rather than a crisis to be overcome. The difference between a distracted and a concerted effort to sustain a favorable Asian geopolitical equilibrium could set the course for the relationship. The evolving U.S.-India strategic partnership could simply languish as yet another historical curiosity embodying some vague potential or it could actually advance important common interests.

### AT: Water

#### This turn is incoherent – the 2AC Sovacool card says water shortages are occurring in the Great Plains and other agricultural areas – the plan clearly only gives wind incentives for Central Appalachia, no significant agricultural occurs there

#### Other energy issues overwhelm the link

Colman ’12

(Zack, “Report: Energy production threatens to strain nation’s water supply”, The Hill, 10-26-2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/262559-report-oversight-needed-for-energy-production-impact-on-water-supply)

Higher energy consumption in general has required using more water for cooling power plants. A significant amount of the growth in water consumption also has come from the emergence of new energy production methods. For example, hydraulic fracturing used to tap hard-to-reach oil-and-gas deposits revolutionized the natural-gas drilling industry. Known as fracking, that process injects a high-pressure mixture of water, chemicals and sand into tight rock formations to unlock fossil fuel reserves. Biofuels production also has siphoned considerable amounts of local water for growing feedstocks, the report noted. A federal rule requires refiners to nearly triple current production levels by blending 36 billion gallons of biofuel into traditional transportation fuel by 2022. Those developments — and, in particular, the fracking boom — combined with the past summer’s drought have led to water shortages across the country. That forced water auction prices higher, with energy companies outbidding farmers who traditionally had little problem securing water through that avenue. On the other hand, many energy firms could not find enough water to continue fracking.

#### Water recycling solves the impact

Percival ’10

(Pamela, “More drilling means more water: New facilities, new technologies help oil and gas companies to better manage wastewater”,

While disposal wells have been the tried and true method for many years for handling such waste products as produced water, exploration and production companies continue to look for innovations in this area. For example, recycling technology continues to evolve that allows companies to clean up produced water and reuse it for fracing, or even to put it back into the watershed. Some obstacles to widespread use of recycling in the industry include cost effectiveness, portability, and the ability to recycle large enough quantities of water. However, increasing governmental regulations and citizens’ concerns in some areas are making recycling a more attractive option. For example, in the Marcellus Shale Play in Pennsylvania, the industry currently treats or recycles all of its flowback water, according to the Marcellus Shale Coalition (www.pamarcellus.com). Recycling accounts for approximately 60 percent of the water used to complete Marcellus Shale wells, with greater percentages predicted for the future. More than a dozen approved water treatment facilities are available to treat flowback water, with plans for additional capacity in the future. “Companies are working with international water quality experts and are funding research and development projects to develop mobile and permanent treatment technologies such as evaporation and crystallization,” a coalition news release stated in February.