

# The 2008/09

# CORE FILES

**Written by Andrew Brokos, Mike Maffie, and Steve Mancuso**  
**Edited by Andrew Brokos and Les Lynn**

**Resolved: The United States federal government should  
substantially increase alternative energy incentives in the United  
States.**

## 2008-09 Core Files

Renewable Portfolio Standards Affirmative	3
Renewable Portfolio Standards Negative	61
Biofuels Affirmative	94
Biofuels Negative	129
Cap and Trade Affirmative	147
Cap and Trade Negative	181
Nuclear Power Affirmative	214
Nuclear Power Negative	247
Russian Economy Disadvantage Negative	258
Russian Economy Disadvantage Affirmative	280
CO2 Good Disadvantage Negative	292
CO2 Good Disadvantage Affirmative	333
Business Confidence Disadvantage Negative	341
Business Confidence Disadvantage Affirmative	383
Coal Good Disadvantage Negative	388
Coal Good Disadvantage Affirmative	409
States Counterplan Negative	421
States Counterplan Affirmative	453
Carbon Tax Counterplan Negative	464
Carbon Tax Counterplan Affirmative	488
Environmental Justice Critique Negative	495
Environmental Justice Critique Affirmative	519
Social Ecology Critique Negative	523
Social Ecology Critique Affirmative	548
Incentives Topicality Negative	554
Incentives Topicality Affirmative	566
Alternative Energy Topicality Negative	569
Alternative Energy Topicality Affirmative	576
Increase Topicality Negative	579
Increase Topicality Affirmative	587
Extra-Topicality Negative	589
Extra-Topicality Affirmative	601

## RPS Affirmative

1AC	4
Inherency	16
Answers to Dirty Energy	20
Answers to Other Causes	21
Answers to EPA is the Problem	22
Answers to Doesn't Solve Underlying Racism	24
Answers to Right to Pollute	25
Laws Can Empower	27
Answers to EPA Enforcing Now	28
National Solution Necessary	31
No Commitment Now	32
Answers to Income Not Race	33
Answers to Hegemony Low Now	35
Answers to No Soft Balancing	37
Answers to Green Collar Jobs Not Important	40
US Behind	43
US Behind Europe	45
Consistency Needed	47
Federal Signal Necessary	48
Research	50
Soft Power Effective	51
Competitiveness Impact	53
Federal Government Key	54
RPS Possible	55
Empirically Proven	57
Credit Trading	58
Renewable Energy Helps the Economy	59

## 1AC – RPS

Contention one: There is not a national Renewable Portfolio Standard

### **1. On multiple occasions, congress has failed to require electricity companies to generate 20% of their electricity from renewable energy**

Alan Nogee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

In Congress, lawmakers from both chambers and both parties have introduced numerous national RPS proposals since 1997. Championed in large part by Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D.- N.M.), the Senate has passed a national RPS as part of comprehensive energy legislation three times since 2002, most recently in 2005. However, each time it has failed to become law.

### **2. Furthermore, initiatives by the fifty state governments are not enough to drive renewable energy into the mainstream marketplace**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" *Environment*, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

While the participation of 12 states signals a good start, this patchwork of state policies would not be able to drive down the costs of renewable energy technologies and move these technologies fully into the marketplace. Also, state RPS policies have differed substantially from each other thus far. These differences could cause significant market inefficiencies, negating the cost savings that a more comprehensive, streamlined, market-based federal RPS package would provide.

## 1AC – RPS

### Contention Two: Harms

#### **A. Current energy policies promote environmental racism**

**1. Environmental racism occurs when minority neighborhoods burden the cost of energy more than privileged neighborhoods. For example, fossil fuel plants create pollution that harms the surrounding community. This is a reality for hundreds of minority communities across the United States**

Tara Ulezalka, Associate, Law Offices of Michael S. Lamonsoff. J.D., 2005, Brooklyn Law School. "ARTICLE: Race and Waste: The Quest for Environmental Justice" Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, 2007 p.lexis.

Environmental racism is real. It is as real as the racism found in housing, education, employment and the judicial system. Environmental racism results in the nationwide phenomenon in which minority neighborhoods bear a disproportionately large environmental burden as compared to white neighborhoods. n2 It refers to any policy, practice or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages individuals, groups or communities based on race or color. n3 This is the outcome that the landmark "1987 United Church of Christ report on toxic waste and race claimed [\*52] was not the result of mere coincidence." n4 Indeed, evidence suggests that this disproportionate economic impact from environmental mismanagement was already considered a decade earlier, albeit without the suggestion of discriminatory intent. n5 It was not until 1987, however, that the term "environmental racism" was coined. It was described as discrimination in environmental policy-making, enforcement of regulations and laws, and the deliberate targeting of communities of color for toxic waste disposal and the siting of polluting industries. n6 It is racial discrimination in light of the fact that the life-threatening presence of poisons and pollutants occurs mainly in communities of color. This was the reality that the United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice study uncovered and it is the reality of hundreds of minority communities across the United States. n7 The residents of these communities know what environmental injustice is - they live it every day.

1AC – RPS

**2. Requiring electricity companies to use renewable energy helps alleviate the environmental damage imposed on minority communities from burning fossil fuels**

Sacramento Bee, February 19, 2008. "Environmental Justice Groups Declare War on Carbon Trading."

<http://www.sacbee.com/static/weblogs/hothouse/archives/010675.html>

Many environmental groups and economists support a cap-and-trade system to control greenhouse gases, but environmental justice advocates -- which represent low-income communities with large populations of African-American, Latino and Asian people -- fear that cap-and-trade will expose their communities to unfair burdens of pollution. Some oil refineries, they fear, would be allowed to increase or maintain emissions with a cap-and-trade system (by purchasing offsets), whereas a regulatory scheme would force all industries to reduce. "Pollution trading allows us to treat clean air as a private commodity to be traded, speculated against, and profited from. We owe future generations clean air and a healthy environment, making pollution profitable is a prescription for disaster," said Martha Arguello of Physicians for Social Responsibility-Los Angeles in a press release today. The EJ coalition prefers more of a regulatory approach, including mandates for zero-carbon cars and energy efficiency policies, including a tougher Renewable Portfolio Standard bill.

## 1AC – RPS

### **3. Exposing minority communities to the harms is racist**

Maine Law Review, 2005. "Comment: Environmental Injustice and the Problem of the Law" 57 Me. L. Rev. 209

This recognition invites us to conceive of environmental justice as the solution to environmental discrimination, such as in waste facility siting decisions, as well as to broader environmental concerns, such as air or water pollution generally. By linking our concern for environmental injustice more closely with our concern for the earth, we advance both goals, because environmental injustice harms not just the communities that suffer the injustice, but the environment at large as well. To the extent that we fail to consider environmental justice a moral responsibility, and fail to make a conscious effort toward equitable distribution of environmental harms, we perpetuate ineffective pollution control and tolerate ongoing environmental degradation. The fact that environmental injustice is not always visible to the public at large has led to complacency over the level of pollution our laws allow. The toxic exposure that communities like Waterfront South or Chester endure is only "tolerable" because white, wealthier people do not live there. n151 Who can imagine an incinerator being built in the rich Camden or Philadelphia suburbs? The result is that the environment continues to be polluted at a rate that is unsustainable and in many cases irrevocable. By giving a voice to those suffering the worst environmental injustices, and demanding the right to participate in decision making that affects them, the movement furthers social and environmental objectives.

## 1AC – RPS

### **4. Racism is a prima facie issue – we must deal with racism before all other impacts**

Joseph Barndt, Dismantling Racism: The Continuing Challenge to White America, 1991, p. 155-56

To study racism is to study walls. We have looked at barriers and fences and limitations, ghettos and prisons. The prison of racism confines us all, people of color and white people alike. It shackles the victimizer as well as the victim. The walls forcibly keep people of color and white people separate from each other; in our separate prisons we are all prevented from achieving the human potential that God intends for us. The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust; the effects of uncontrolled power, privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison will inevitably destroy us as well. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger of self-destruction seems to be drawing ever more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonization, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction may be reaching the point of no return. A small and predominantly white minority of global population derives its power and privilege from sufferings of the vast majority of peoples of color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.



## 1AC – RPS

### B. US Economic competitiveness

#### **1. The United States' failure to embrace renewable energy is undermining its economic power – or competitiveness – compared to other countries**

Institute for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Energy, "Fats, Choices, and Challenges" 2007  
[http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts\\_security.htm](http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts_security.htm)

Securing our energy supply, and thus our economic competitiveness, is also under pressure from the demands of other nations. Worldwide demand for fuel and power will expand much faster than our own. The Energy Information Administration predicts growth of more than 70% in global energy consumption between 2003 and 2030. Americans will feel the impact of this growing demand in prices, availability, geopolitics, and vulnerability to security threats, especially if we continue to heavily restrict energy development here at home. Burgeoning global energy consumption, most of which will come from fossil fuels, also means that efforts to address environmental and climate change concerns will have little or no effect without worldwide participation. The rapidly expanding economies of China and India are becoming massive consumers of energy and will put serious pressure on global energy supplies, as well as on demand for energy-saving technologies. China and India are powering much of their industrial development with impressive coal reserves. By some estimates, China is building an average of one coal-fired plant every week to power its booming economy. The two countries are each planning to build 20 new nuclear reactors by 2020. Even so, by 2050 both nations could be importing 70% to 80% of their energy needs. By 2020, China will have 140 million private cars, more than the United States has at present. Competitive economies need affordable and reliable energy. Our global competitors are embracing this reality. We can ill afford to ignore it.

## 1AC – RPS

### **2. Without a federal endorsement, businesses will not feel comfortable investigating in renewable energy**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

The push to develop renewable and other clean energy technologies is no longer being driven solely by environmental concerns; these technologies are becoming economically competitive. According to Merrill Lynch's Robin Batchelor, the traditional energy sector has lacked appeal to investors in recent years because of heavy regulation, low growth, and a tendency to be cyclical.<sup>10</sup> The United States' lack of support for innovative new companies sends a signal that U.S. energy markets are biased against new entrants. The clean energy industry could, however, become a world-leading industry akin to that of U.S. semi-conductors and computer systems.

## 1AC – RPS

### **3. Economic competitiveness is necessary to maintain United States' hegemony**

Khalilzad, Rand Corporation, Spring 1995 (Zalmay, The Washington Quarterly, Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War, vol. 18, no. 2, p.84)

The United States is unlikely to preserve its military and technological dominance if the U.S. economy declines seriously. In such an environment, the domestic economic and political base for global leadership would diminish and the United States would probably incrementally withdraw from the world, become inward-looking, and abandon more and more of its external interests. As the United States weakened, others would try to fill the vacuum.

To sustain and improve its economic strength, the United States must maintain its technological lead in the economic realm. Its success will depend on the choices it makes. In the past, developments such as the agricultural and industrial revolutions produced fundamental changes positively affecting the relative position of those who were able to take advantage of them and negatively affecting those who did not. Some argue that the world may be at the beginning of another such transformation, which will shift the sources of wealth and the relative position of classes and nations. If the United States fails to recognize the change and adapt its institutions, its relative position will necessarily worsen.

To remain the preponderant world power, U.S. economic strength must be enhanced by further improvements in productivity, thus increasing real per capita income; by strengthening education and training; and by generating and using superior science and technology. In the long run the economic future of the United States will also be affected by two other factors. One is the imbalance between government revenues and government expenditure. As a society the United States has to decide what part of the GNP it wishes the government to control and adjust expenditures and taxation accordingly. The second, which is even more important to U.S. economic well-being over the long run, may be the overall rate of investment. Although their government cannot endow Americans with a Japanese-style propensity to save, it can use tax policy to raise the savings rate.

## 1AC – RPS

### **4. US hegemony prevents multiple scenarios of global nuclear war**

Khalilzad, Rand Corporation, Spring 1995 (Zalmay, The Washington Quarterly, Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War, vol. 18, no. 2, p.84)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

**Thus we offer the following plan:**

**The United States Federal Government should establish a renewable portfolio standard requiring 20% of energy within the United States come from renewable energy by 2020.**

## 1AC – RPS

### Contention Three: Solvency

#### **1. A federal renewable energy requirement will spur a national market for renewable energy**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

The coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear power industries continue to receive considerable government subsidies, even though they are already well established in the marketplace. Without the RPS or a similar mechanism, many renewables will not be able to survive in an increasingly competitive electricity market focused on producing power at the lowest direct cost. And while the RPS is designed to deliver renewables that are most ready for the market, additional policies will still be needed to support emerging renewable technologies, like photovoltaics, that have enormous potential to become commercially competitive. The RPS is the surest market-based approach for securing the public benefits of renewables while supplying the greatest amount of clean power at the lowest price. It creates an ongoing incentive to drive down costs by providing a dependable and predictable market. An RPS will promote vigorous competition among renewable energy developers and technologies to meet the standard at the lowest cost.

## 1AC – RPS

### **2. Renewable energy is economically feasible. There have been major technological breakthroughs over the past decades – but fossil fuels still dominate the energy market.**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

For many years, renewables were seen as energy options that—while environmentally and socially attractive—occupied niche markets at best, due to barriers of cost and available infrastructure. In the last decade, however, the case for renewable energy has become economically compelling as well. There has been a true revolution in technological innovation, cost improvements, and our understanding and analysis of appropriate applications of renewable energy resources and technologies—notably solar, wind, small-scale hydro, and biomass-based energy, as well as advanced energy conversion devices such as fuel cells.<sup>4</sup> There are now a number of energy sources, conversion technologies, and applications that make renewable energy options either equal or better in price and services provided than the prevailing fossil-fuel technologies. For example, in a growing number of settings in industrialized nations, wind energy is now the least expensive option among all energy technologies—with the added benefit of being modular and quick to install and bring on-line. In fact, some farmers, notably in the U.S. Midwest, have found that they can generate more income per hectare from the electricity generated by a wind turbine than from their crop or ranching proceeds.<sup>5</sup> Also, photovoltaic (solar) panels and solar hot water heaters placed on buildings across America can help reduce energy costs, dramatically shave peak-power demands, produce a healthier living environment, and increase the overall energy supply.

## 1AC – RPS

### **3. A shift to 20% of renewable energy is easily achieved by 2020.**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

The Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) is akin to the efficiency standards for vehicles and appliances that have proven successful in the past. A gradually increasing RPS is designed to integrate renewables into the marketplace in the most cost-effective fashion, and it ensures that a growing proportion of electricity sales is provided by renewable energy. An RPS provides the one true means to use market forces most effectively—the market picks the winning and losing technologies. A number of studies indicate that a national renewable energy component of 2 percent in 2002, growing to 10 percent in 2010 and 20 percent by 2020, that would include wind, biomass, geothermal, solar, and landfill gas, is broadly good for business and can readily be achieved.<sup>34</sup> States that decide to pursue more aggressive goals could be rewarded through an additional federal incentive program. In the past, federal RPS legislation has been introduced in Congress and was proposed by the Clinton administration, but it has yet to be re-introduced by either this Congress or the Bush administration.

## Inherency – Attitude

### **( ) The attitude in Washington is against renewable energy**

Paul Roberts, LA Times, "Power Outage" May 22, 2004.  
<http://www.energybulletin.net/326.html>

Sadly, such a push isn't likely under the current administration. President Bush's national energy strategy has promoted traditional energy production even more aggressively than Reagan's did, and has been even more dismissive of alternatives and conservation. At an international conference on development in 2002, the United States joined with such oil-producing countries as Saudi Arabia to defeat a resolution that would have committed all nations to boost renewable energy's share of the global market to 15% by 2010. U.S. officials insisted, with some justification, that such a goal was unrealistic.

But it's also true that many U.S. energy companies (some happened to be major contributors to the president's election campaign) had no interest in a U.S. policy that supported anything but traditional energy systems.

### **( ) The Administration is opposed to RPS**

Benjamin K. Sovacool, et al. is a former Eugene P. Wigner Fellow at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York. *The Electricity Journal*, "Big Is Beautiful: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard " 2007

While supporting state-based RPS efforts, the Bush Administration has officially opposed a national RPS on the grounds that it would create "winners" and "losers" among regions of the country and increase electricity prices in places where renewable resources are less abundant or harder to cultivate.<sup>2</sup> In the meantime, 21 states (and the District of Columbia) have adopted their own RPS mandates, and eight others – Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia – are considering some form of RPS.



## Inherency – No National RPS

### **( ) The congress has failed to encourage renewable energy**

Sarah A Binder et al., Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institute, "One Year Later: Is Congress Still the Broken Branch?" January 2008.  
[http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2008/01\\_uscongress\\_mann.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2008/01_uscongress_mann.aspx)

With a flurry of legislative activity as the first session wound down, the 110th Congress passed a delayed package of appropriations bills for the fiscal year that began on October 1, a one-year fix in the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) that prevented its impact on millions of middle-class households, and the first increase in automobile fuel efficiency standards in decades. In each case, however, Democrats were unable to advance some of their key priorities, as they faced Senate filibusters and presidential vetoes. The omnibus spending bill contained no restrictions on the war in Iraq and also conformed to the president's domestic spending cap that reduced spending in real terms. The AMT measure was shorn of offsetting tax increases sought by Democrats to comply with their party's commitment to pay-as-you-go budgeting. The energy bill that finally emerged dropped provisions to reallocate tax subsidies from fossil fuel production to renewable energy and failed to require utilities to include a fraction of clean energy sources in their generation of electricity.

### **( ) Action at both the state and federal level is necessary to spur renewable energy market growth**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

Although government R&D and other technology development efforts are important, the history of the United States shows that renewable energy technologies and industries have developed fastest when policies have provided clear, consistent, and strong incentives for commercial market demand to grow. The PURPA era still stands as the most successful period of renewable energy development in the US, due to a confluence of factors and the strong support provided by the feed-in type of policy. In the future, state-level renewables portfolios standards will be the key to large-scale expansion, and some early RPS successes were being achieved. But design pitfalls have plagued some RPS programs and future design and implementation will need to proceed carefully. And even more aggressive policy action will be needed, comparable to aggressive policies in other countries, at both state and federal levels, in order for US markets to follow global trends.

### Inherency – Existing RPS Insufficient

#### **( ) Even with state based RPS renewable energy is only 3% of total energy generation**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

While these projected additions are substantial compared to historic rates of growth, the aggregate amount of renewable generation required under these policies by 2017 equates to just 3% of total 2002 electric sales in the US, and to 7.2% of 2002 load in those states with RPS requirements. In addition, it deserves note that much of the impact to date has been restricted to just a few states, and there are a number of instances in which state RPS policies are not yet having their desired effect. The reasons for the poor performance in a number of US states are detailed below.

#### **( ) Existing state based rps does not mandate a sufficient amount of electricity be generated from renewable energy**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

Selective application of the purchase requirement. Some US states have applied the RPS to only a small segment of the state's electric market, muting the potential impacts of the policy. For example, in both Connecticut and Pennsylvania, initial RPS requirements applied to less than 5% of the total market (in both cases, subsequent revisions to the policies have rectified this problem). Not only does this violate the principle of competitive parity, it also ensures that the RPS will have only a marginal impact.

## Inherency – Insufficient Renewable Energy

### **( ) The US is overly reliant on state-based solutions to generate renewable energy**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

As the PURPA era gave way to stagnation in the early 1990s, electric power restructuring led to a boom in state policy innovations to support renewable energy. Those innovations, including RPS, public-benefit funds, net metering laws, voluntary green power markets, and a variety of financial incentives and regulatory provisions, have been gaining momentum since 1998. They now provide the bulk of encouragement for renewable energy in the United States, in combination with attractive federal tax incentives. Overall, however, the impact of these state-level actions is still modest relative to the potential impact of more aggressive federal policy. If anything, US experience illustrates the risk of relying too heavily on state-level support alone.

### **( ) The US will continue to fall behind because overseas markets are more attractive to investors**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

Second, the wind and solar industries are constrained by the fact that the major renewable energy markets are now overseas, particularly in Europe and Japan. It is more difficult to develop a strong domestic industry without a strong domestic market. The United States missed many opportunities in the 1990s to remain the world leader in the renewable energy industry and now is suffering the consequences. Nevertheless, the domestic solar industry continues to grow, supplying both domestic and international markets. The domestic wind power industry could also continue to grow, but the domestic market is becoming increasingly constrained by regulatory problems with transmission access and continued uncertainty over the future of the federal production tax credit (PTC) beyond its expiration in 2005.

## AT: Dirty Energy

- 1. This is non-unique** – There is an abundance of dirty energy that is used now, the affirmative plan can only be an improvement.
- 2. The plan would still remove coal and oil energy** – these energy sources are the worst types of energy. As long as we decrease our reliance on fossil fuels we solve our advantages

## AT: Other Causes

**1. The plan is still an enormous step forward** – even if we cannot solve for all of racism, our 1AC evidence indicates that thousands of people are exposed to the harms of environmental racism

## **2. Environmental Law is the Most Effective Means of Alleviating Environmental Racism**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Notwithstanding the role of environmental laws in causing environmental injustice, the environmental justice literature does acknowledge that environmental litigation may be an effective tool in challenging an undesirable facility. Since many facilities are undesirable due to their environmental consequences, environmental laws regulating the siting process or facility operations provide a natural basis for challenge. n264 Moreover, environmental laws may be the most promising method for achieving legal redress due to the limited coverage of civil rights laws and the high evidentiary burdens associated with the Equal Protection Clause. n265 The literature refers to the relatively frequent success of environmental lawsuits brought to resolve environmental justice conflicts. n266

## AT: EPA is the Problem

### **1. Current government policy is limited regarding environmental justice**

Tyson R. Smith, Attorney with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: J.D. 2003. Lewis and Clark Law School. Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review 2004/2005 p.1n

First, the Commission reiterated its view that NEPA is the only pertinent statute and stated that environmental justice, as applied at the NRC, "means that the agency will make an effort under NEPA to become aware of the demographic and economic circumstances of local communities where nuclear facilities are to be sited, and take care to mitigate or avoid special impacts attributable to the special character of the community." n22 The Commission also reasoned that "the essence of an environmental justice claim, in NRC practice, is disparate environmental harm." n23 Accordingly, in the Commission's view. NEPA does not "call for an investigation into disparate economic benefits as a matter of environmental justice" because "nothing" in the executive order or NEPA "suggest[s] that a failure to receive an economic benefit should be considered tantamount to a disproportionate impact." n24 As to perceived disparities in the distribution of tax receipts from the project, the Commission noted that "NEPA simply is not the vehicle, and [the] NRC not the forum." for resolving the question of whether a state's tax policies are discriminatory. n25

### **2. Clinton's executive order has been Interpreted in a narrow fashion**

Tyson R. Smith, Attorney with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: J.D. 2003. Lewis and Clark Law School. Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review 2004/2005 p.1n

The Commission agreed that "the executive order asks agencies to consider environmental justice implications only when disparate environmental effects are 'high and adverse.'" n26 After recognizing that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) found the overall environmental impacts on reservation residents as small to moderate, the Commission concluded that there is. therefore, no reason to believe that those who fail to share in the financial benefits of the project are suffering "high and adverse" environmental impacts. n27 "Even though money (or social services) from [a project] might make it easier for some to tolerate noise, cultural insult, and unsightliness near the facility, [such] payments [do not] mitigate environmental harms in the sense of eliminating or minimizing them." n28 Thus, PFS stands for the proposition that NEPA does not call for a detailed examination of the distribution of the financial benefits of a proposed project.

### AT: EPA is the Problem

#### **3. Commissions created by Clinton's executive order have been very hesitant to take action**

Tyson R. Smith, Attorney with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission: J.D. 2003. Lewis and Clark Law School. Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review 2004/2005 p.ln

Taken together, LES and PFS outline the scope of environmental justice at the NRC, Through those adjudicatory decisions, the Commission staked out the limits of what it will consider to be relevant for environmental justice. Instead of taking a pro-active, pro-community role, the Commission declined to even address whether there are discriminatory effects of its decisions. By delineating the outer limits of its understanding of its responsibilities in such a way, the Commission opened the door for a definitive statement regarding its role in addressing environmental justice concerns through its licensing and regulatory functions.

## AT: Doesn't Solve Underlying Racism

### **1. Communities can unmask racist decision makers**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Once a community believes that a decisionmaking process was unjust, the issue becomes the mechanism for challenging the perceived injustice. Communities have two forums in which to respond to political injustice. One forum is legal: an aggrieved community can claim that procedures intended to foster politically just decisions were not followed or that decisionmakers discriminated against them. The other is political: a community can work to unmask the unfairness and hold decisionmakers accountable for their unfair treatment.

### **2. Community efforts can put pressure on decision makers**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

It is in the long-term that a community's efforts to achieve political accountability are most important. While the public exposure of unfair treatment may not be sufficient to generate the reversal of an individual decision, it may, in the long-run, increase the accountability of decisionmakers to groups they had earlier ignored. n157 The more decisionmakers feel themselves accountable to everyone in the community, the more they are likely to treat all with equal concern and respect.



## AT: "Right to Pollute"

**1. The plan is still an improvement over the status quo** – we increase the cost of pollution in minority communities by raising the amount of energy that must be produced by renewable energy

**2. Replacing dirty fuels with renewable energy helps alleviate environmental racism caused by fossil fuels**

Naomi Kim, California Environmental Justice Movement, February 19, 2008.  
[www.environmentalhealth.org/Declaration\\_Against\\_Trading%20FINALrelease.pdf](http://www.environmentalhealth.org/Declaration_Against_Trading%20FINALrelease.pdf)

The coalition called for policies that directly and significantly reduce emissions, and focus on moving the state away from the fossil fuel infrastructure because such fuels are the overwhelming contributor to climate change and have devastating impacts on the poor and communities of color in California and around the world. Dr. Henry Clark of the West County Toxics Coalition explained, "Our people are sick and dying from the refineries. Trading schemes knowingly concentrate pollution exacerbating existing 'hot spots' in our communities of color. You can't buy us off with promises of parks and asthma education programs, and then somehow think we'll be ok with subjecting our children to increased cancer risk."

The EJ Coalition urges others to join their movement in demanding that California reject the fundamentally flawed trading and offsets approach, and instead adopt energy efficiency policies, promote zero-carbon cars, and calls on the Legislature to adopt and the Governor to sign an increased Renewable Portfolio Standard bill. The coalition also supports the use of consistent carbon pricing mechanisms, such as a mitigating effects carbon fee, to achieve actual reductions and a genuine transition to a clean energy economy. "Such a transition could bring about numerous opportunities; economic benefits, green job creation, and healthier communities in the fight against climate change," stated Jose Carmona, a clean energy advocate. Instead, Carolina Simunovic of Fresno Metro Ministries pointed out "we're wasting incredible amounts of time and resources trying to re-design a failed carbon trading system."

## AT: "Right to Pollute"

### **3. RPS helps alleviate environmental injustice**

Peggy Raisch, Environmental Research Associate, Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center, November 10, 2003.

[www.energy.ca.gov/portfolio/documents/2004-02-05\\_hearing/public\\_comments/03-11-10\\_Mount\\_Shasta.doc](http://www.energy.ca.gov/portfolio/documents/2004-02-05_hearing/public_comments/03-11-10_Mount_Shasta.doc)

The Phase II Report outlined certification criteria that did not provide a preference to those renewable projects that would benefit minority populations. The CEC deferred this very important decision. Although the Report deemed it important to include other RPS certification criteria for projects, its avoidance of this issue can be seen as a silent approval to those renewable projects that have documented Environmental Justice impacts. [See Publication 500 03 049 at page 2: "the Committee has deferred consideration of the issue of whether it should provide preference to projects that provide tangible benefits to communities with a plurality of minority or low-income populations."].

We believe that the RPS standards should provide preferential support to projects that have a documented tangible benefits to communities with a plurality of minority or low-income populations, which means that the projects are void of Environmental Justice Impacts. We strongly ask for your support of renewable projects that do not destroy or degrade sacred lands or sacred sites of minority and low income populations; a position which would indicate that those in decision-making positions are not discriminating against this population.

## Harms - Environmental Justice – Laws Can Empower

### **( ) Environmental laws can enhance distribution justice**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Environmental laws play three different roles in the pursuit of environmental justice. The first is instrumental: environmental laws may provide a legal "hook" for suits against a project, even if that "hook" does not explicitly relate to the question of justice. n285 Second, environmental laws could serve, rather than hinder, the pursuit of distributive justice. New requirements that demographic impacts be considered in connection with government decisions affecting the environment provide one mechanism for addressing distributional justice. n286 Passing legislation requiring greater distributional equity would be another. n287 Third, environmental laws may assist in the pursuit of political justice. While the first and second roles have received some attention in the environmental justice literature, n288 the role of environmental laws in the pursuit of political justice has not received sufficient attention. The remainder of this Article addresses this issue.

## AT: EPA Enforcing Now

### **1. Studies indicate environmental justice is a major harm**

Irwin Weintraub, Brooklyn College Library, Electronic Green Journal, June 1994.  
<http://www.mapcruzin.com/EI/ejigc.html>

The report indicated that three out of every five Black and Hispanic Americans lived in communities with one or more toxic waste sites. Over 15 million African-American, over 8 million Hispanics, and about 50 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders and Native Americans are living in communities with one or more abandoned or uncontrolled toxic waste sites.

### **2. There is widespread documentation of environmental racism in the United States**

Irwin Weintraub, Brooklyn College Library, Electronic Green Journal, June 1994.  
<http://www.mapcruzin.com/EI/ejigc.html>

A study by the Environmental Protection Agency concluded that socioeconomic conditions and race are the major factors determining environmental discrimination. Communities inhabited by poor whites are also vulnerable to toxic threats. In its two-volume report, Environmental Equity (1992), the Environmental Protection Agency alluded to the difficulties of assessing the impact of environmental hazards on low income and minority communities. While admitting that those communities suffer a disproportionate share of the burden, there appears to be a general lack of data on the health effects of pollutants in those communities. The report asserts that environmental and health data are not routinely collected and analyzed by categories of income and race. Critics maintain that the information is available but the EPA considers it a public relations issue, not a civil rights issue, and, therefore, does not take the claims seriously enough to gather the necessary data by income and race. (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1992; Satchell 1992; Mohai and Bryant 1992.)

## AT: EPA is Enforcing Now

### **3. Environmental racism is widespread**

Villanova Environmental Law Journal, "Comment: On the Road from Environmental Racism to Environmental Justice". 1994. 5 Vill. Env'tl. L.J. 449 p.lexis

The racial composition of areas surrounding hazardous waste facilities may also impact the degree to which environmental laws and regulations are enforced. n59 By enforcing environmental laws in communities of color significantly less often than in white communities, regulatory agencies tacitly approve the illicit conduct. Accordingly, businesses will flock to communities of color because penalties will be non-existent or low enough to be considered an acceptable cost of conducting business. n60

Due to the lack of commentary on this subject, the National Law Journal ("NLJ") conducted an investigative report in 1992. The NLJ report was a comprehensive survey of "every U.S. environmental lawsuit concluded in the past seven years." n61 The key findings include the following: (1) penalties under hazardous waste laws at sites having the greatest white population were approximately 500% higher than penalties at sites with the greatest minority population; n62 (2) with respect to federal environmental laws governing air, water, and waste pollution, penalties in white areas were forty-six percent higher than in communities of color; n63 (3) under the CERCLA cleanup program, abandoned hazardous waste sites in communities of color take twenty percent longer to be placed on the national priority list than those in white areas; n64 (4) at sites located in communities of color, EPA chooses containment seven percent more often than the cleanup method preferred under the law; n65 and (5) at sites located in white communities, EPA orders permanent treatment twenty-two percent more often than containment. n66 The NLJ found that the racial imbalance evidenced by these findings often occurs regardless of whether the community is wealthy or poor. n67 Although it was only one study, the NLJ investigative report's findings are so striking that they cannot be ignored by policymakers and environmentalists. n68

## AT: EPA is Enforcing Now

### **( ) Minority communities are most likely to bear the costs of pollution**

Irwin Weintraub, Brooklyn College Library, Electronic Green Journal, June 1994.  
<http://www.mapcruzin.com/EI/ejigc.html>

Studies suggest clear relationships between a high concentration of minority populations, or low average incomes, with an unhealthy environment. Poor people do not have the economic means to leave their neighborhoods for resettlement elsewhere. Housing discrimination often makes it difficult to find alternative dwellings at affordable rates. Industries that pollute are attracted to poor neighborhoods because land values, incomes, and other costs of doing business are lower. The industries are drawn to poor neighborhoods where political power and community resources to fight back are weak or lacking. Higher income areas are usually more successful in preventing or controlling the entry of polluting industries to their communities. (Mohai and Bryant 1992.).

### **( ) Minority communities are uniquely vulnerable to environmental racism**

Tara Ulezalka, Associate, Law Offices of Michael S. Lamonsoff. J.D., 2005, Brooklyn Law School. "ARTICLE: Race and Waste: The Quest for Environmental Justice" Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, 2007 p.lexis.

A study commissioned by the United Church of Christ concluded it was "'virtually impossible' that the nation's commercial hazardous waste facilities are distributed disproportionately in minority communities merely by chance; therefore in all likelihood underlying factors related to race play a role in the location of these facilities." n11 These underlying factors include: 1) availability of cheap land; 2) lack of opposition to the siting of the facility due to lack of political resources and clout; 3) inability to "walk with their feet" or lack of mobility resulting from poverty and housing discrimination; and 4) poverty. n12 These characteristics contribute to communities' vulnerability to unfair sitings of waste and polluting industries and, thus, their disproportionate exposure to environmental risk. n13

## Harms - Environmental Justice – National Solution Necessary

### **( ) Environmental racism requires a national solution to widespread discrimination**

Tara Ulezalka, Associate, Law Offices of Michael S. Lamonsoff. J.D., 2005, Brooklyn Law School. "ARTICLE: Race and Waste: The Quest for Environmental Justice" Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law, 2007 p.lexis.

Environmental racism is a nationwide problem. Much is at stake in the quest for justice in environmental law and policy. Environmental racism has given new recognition to the fact that the structural oppression of people of color in this society manifests itself in more ways than traditional civil rights-based paradigms have previously recognized. Formal rights to basic necessities such as employment, [\*73] voting, and other amenities in modern life are now secure. There remains the nagging reality that, despite calls for a race-neutral consciousness, racial differences continue to exist in the distribution of benefits and burdens borne by individuals in this society. In the end, the environmental movement needs to meet the challenge of providing social justice by exploring the limitations of the current decision-making process and achieving a safe environment for us all. It seems as though the residents of Chester have helped put this process into motion. It is now time for a nationwide solution.

## Harms - Environmental Justice – No Commitment Now

### **( ) There is no commitment to fight environmental justice**

Catherine Komp, The New Standard, October 10, 2006.  
<http://newstandardnews.net/content/index.cfm/items/3746>

The federal government prioritized the issue more than a decade ago, when President Bill Clinton issued a 1994 executive order requiring the EPA to convene a working group of 17 federal agencies to review how their programs affect low-income populations and communities of color. But groups and federal auditors have been questioning the working group's progress ever since. According to the EPA's Office of Inspector General, 60 percent of program and regional office directors were not conducting environmental justice reviews at all. The September 18 report also found that 87 percent of offices responding to the EPA's survey said Agency management had not asked them to conduct environmental justice reviews on the Agency's programs, policies and activities.

### **( ) The EPA has failed to implement the executive order**

Catherine Komp, The New Standard, October 10, 2006.  
<http://newstandardnews.net/content/index.cfm/items/3746>

This is not the first time the inspector general found the EPA was not fulfilling the executive order. In a 75-page report released in March 2004, the inspector general stated that EPA had not fully implemented the 1994 order and had not "consistently integrated environmental justice into its day-to-day operations." "It's about time," Eaves told The NewStandard, in reference to the inspector general's new report. "Many of us have been working on this issue for years and years and years and years, and we knew that EPA was not doing their job."

### **( ) The EPA is failing to meet environmental justice standards**

Catherine Komp, The New Standard, October 10, 2006.  
<http://newstandardnews.net/content/index.cfm/items/3746>

In its response to the inspector general, the EPA admitted that it has not conducted environmental justice reviews. It said it has instead integrated "environmental justice considerations into its strategic plan." But that plan, a draft of which was released in June 2005, was slammed by dozens of groups and lawmakers. It proposed to eliminate references to race and class as an environmental justice consideration



## Harms - Environmental Justice – AT: Income, Not Race

### **1. Studies confirm that race is an important factor in environmental decisions**

Rachel Morello-Frosch, Assistant Professor San Francisco State University, "ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S "RISKScape" The Distribution of Air Toxics Exposures and Health Risks Among Diverse Communities". URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW, Vol. 36, No. 4, March 2001

Past research on "environmental justice" has often failed to systematically link hazard proximity with quantifiable health risks. The authors employ recent advances in air emissions inventories and modeling techniques to consider a broad range of outdoor air toxics in Southern California and to calculate the potential lifetime cancer risks associated with these pollutants. They find that such risks are attributable mostly to transportation and small-area sources and not the usually targeted large-facility pollution emissions. Multivariate regression suggests that race plays an explanatory role in risk distribution even after controlling for other economic, land-use, and population factors. This pattern suggests the need for innovative emissions reduction efforts as well as specific strategies to alter the spatial and racial character of the environmental "riskscape" in urban centers.

### **2. Despite income influences – race still plays an important role in pollution locations**

Rachel Morello-Frosch, Assistant Professor San Francisco State University, "ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S "RISKScape" The Distribution of Air Toxics Exposures and Health Risks Among Diverse Communities". URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW, Vol. 36, No. 4, March 2001

Figure 4 shows how the racial/ethnic disparities in estimated cancer risks persist across household income strata. The y-axis shows a population-weighted individual excess cancer risk estimate for each racial and economic category, and the x-axis displays nine annual household income categories ranging from less than \$5,000 to more than \$100,000. As indicated in the figure legend, each line in the graph represents one of four racial/ethnic groups, which include Anglos, African-Americans, Asians, and Latinos. Asians, African-Americans, and Latinos have the highest population cancer risk indices, with nearly 50% higher risk levels than Anglos. Although risk levels tend to decline for all groups as household income increases, the gap between residents of color and Anglos is fairly consistent across income strata.

## Harms - Environmental Justice – AT: Income, Not Race

### **3. Statistical analysis demonstrates that environmental racism is not from income disparities**

Rachel Morello-Frosch, Assistant Professor San Francisco State University, "ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S "RISKScape" The Distribution of Air Toxics Exposures and Health Risks Among Diverse Communities". URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW, Vol. 36, No. 4, March 2001

Previous environmental research has not effectively addressed the question of what disparate pollution exposures mean for potentially inequitable distributions of health risks among diverse communities. This study has sought to examine this issue by assessing the distributional pattern of lifetime cancer risks associated with air toxics in Southern California. Results indicate that lifetime cancer risk estimates are high for all residents in the region; overall cancer risks from outdoor hazardous air pollution in Southern California exceed the Clean Air Act goal of one in a million by at least one to three orders of magnitude, with these risks attributable mostly to transportation and small-area source emissions. Moreover, race/ethnicity plays a persistent explanatory role in the distribution of these risks, even after controlling for well-known causes of pollution such as population density, income, land use, and a proxy for political power and assets (home ownership).

### **4. Dirty energy is disproportionately placed in minority communities**

Rachel Morello-Frosch, Assistant Professor San Francisco State University, "ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S "RISKScape" The Distribution of Air Toxics Exposures and Health Risks Among Diverse Communities". URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW, Vol. 36, No. 4, March 2001

Finally, although this statistical analysis illustrates how inequities in health risk are spread among Southern California's diverse communities, it sheds little light on their origins or the reasons for their persistence. Some critics, for example, contend that minority residents may congregate in more highly polluted areas, perhaps because of lower housing prices (Oakes, Anderton, and Anderson 1996). However, recent research has suggested that at least for one class of hazards in Southern California, disproportionate siting matters far more than any postsiting minority move-in (Pastor, Sadd, and Hipp forthcoming).

## AT: Hegemony Low Now

**1. All of their evidence is speculative** – The United States may lose its position as the top international player in 10 or 20 years, but there is consensus that the US is still the hegemon.

**2. Their arguments are all brink arguments for the affirmative** – Their arguments indicate the United States is moving dangerously close to losing its international power, but it can still be saved by improving our economy.

### **3. The United States is still dominating international politics**

Forbes, 5/1/2008 [http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx\\_0501oxford.html](http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx_0501oxford.html)

In international politics, hegemony now refers to either the dominance of one power on the global stage or the regional predominance of a single country.

Such "hegemonic dominance" rests on cultural influence, non-military resources and economic power. Russia's influence over its "near abroad" is an obvious example, as is U.S. sway in Canada and Central America; Washington is also sometimes described as the "global hegemon." China might increasingly be seen to exhibit some hegemonic characteristics in Southeast Asia.

### **4. The US maintains its military dominance**

Forbes, 5/1/2008 [http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx\\_0501oxford.html](http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx_0501oxford.html)

-Military might: U.S. defense spending continues massively to overshadow the military outlays of other societies. Substantial elements of the U.S. armed forces are still permanently based in many areas abroad. While this overseas basing is, in part, a residual of the old Cold War security apparatus, many areas of the world welcome these troops as the guarantors of stability and the regional balance of power.

## AT: Hegemony Low Now

### **5. US is a still number one due to its influence in international organizations**

Forbes, 5/1/2008 [http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx\\_0501oxford.html](http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx_0501oxford.html)

--International organizations: Washington dominates key international organizations, notably NATO and the U.N. NATO, which once had a limited collective security role centered around defending Western Europe from a Soviet attack, is slowly moving toward an expanded "out of area" mission under U.S. prodding. Despite President George W. Bush's occasionally confrontational stance toward the U.N., the United States remains highly influential there due to the size of its financial contribution and Security Council veto power.

## AT: No Soft Balancing

**1. There are many examples of Soft Balancing in the past few years** – From the UN veto against an invasion of Iraq to the Russia-China friendship agreement, there are many examples of soft balancing happening.

**2. Hard Balancing can still happen** – The 1ac outlines a scenario for both soft balancing and hard balancing. Countries can still overtake US competitiveness and technological lead and use their militaries to overtake the US.

**3. Nations are beginning to soft balance after the Iraq war**

T.V. Paul is James McGill Professor of International Relations at McGill University, Canada, "Soft Balancing in the age of US Primacy" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005),

Nevertheless, second-tier major powers—barring the United Kingdom—are concerned about the increasing unilateralism of the United States and its post-September 11 tendency to intervene militarily in sovereign states and forcibly change regimes that pursue anti-U.S. policies (such as Iraq). In this new environment, the second-ranking states are taking steps—including bandwagoning, buck-passing, and free-riding—both to constrain U.S. power and to maintain their security and influence. They have also begun to engage in "soft balancing," which involves the formation of limited diplomatic coalitions or ententes, especially at the United Nations, with the implicit threat of upgrading their alliances if the United States goes beyond its stated goals.

## AT: No Soft Balancing

### **4. Soft balancing is the only explanation why nations have not greatly expanded military capabilities after the cold war**

T.V. Paul is James McGill Professor of International Relations at McGill University, Canada, "Soft Balancing in the age of US Primacy" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005),

Balance of power theory, rooted in hard-balancing strategies such as arms buildups and alliance formation, does not seem to explain current great power behavior. In the post-Cold War era, second-tier great power states have been pursuing limited, tacit, or indirect balancing strategies largely through coalition building and diplomatic bargaining within international institutions, short of formal bilateral and multilateral military alliances. These institutional and diplomatic strategies, which are intended to constrain U.S. power, constitute forms of soft balancing. Second-tier states that engage in soft balancing develop diplomatic coalitions or ententes with one another to balance a powerful state or a rising or potentially threatening power.

## AT: No Soft Balancing

### **5. Soft balancing best explains the post cold war international system – such as votes in the UN Security Council**

T.V. Paul is James McGill Professor of International Relations at McGill University, Canada, "Soft Balancing in the age of US Primacy" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005),

In the post–Cold War era, soft balancing has become an attractive strategy through which second-tier major powers are able to challenge the legitimacy of the interventionist policies of the United States and its allies both internationally and in U.S. domestic public opinion. There is an international consensus that foreign intervention, even for humanitarian purposes, needs the “collective legitimation” of the United Nations or a multilateral regional institution. The success of a U.S.-led intervention, especially one for humanitarian purposes, depends on post-intervention peacekeeping and stabilization support offered by the UN and its members. The United States would find it difficult to obtain troops from other countries for postwar reconstruction efforts without the support of the UN Security Council.

### **6. Lack of territorial threat is causing nations to favor “soft balancing”**

T.V. Paul is James McGill Professor of International Relations at McGill University, Canada, "Soft Balancing in the age of US Primacy" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005),

Hard balancing no longer has an appeal for second-tier powers because they do not believe, at least as of now, that the United States is a threat to their sovereign existence. They are, however, worried about the unilateralism and interventionist tendencies in U.S. foreign policy, especially since September 11, 2001, and they have resorted to less threatening soft-balancing means to achieve their objective of constraining the power of the United States without unnecessarily provoking retribution. Thus, if balancing implies restraining the power and threatening behavior of the hegemonic actor, strategies other than military buildups and alliance formation should be included in balance of power theory.

## AT: Green Collar Jobs Not Important

**1. Decreasing the cost of doing business is still important** – The plan reduces the cost of doing business in the United States because companies are not trapped into using fossil fuels.

### **2. Green jobs will help the economy**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.ihb.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

"The development of a green economy creates a broad new set of opportunities," Quam said. "When I first started looking at this area, many people commented on how this will be as big as the Internet. But this is so much bigger than the Internet. The only comparable example we can find is the Industrial Revolution. It will affect every business and every industry."

Jones, the president of Green for All, joined the green economy after graduating from Yale Law School. He became executive director of the Ella Baker Center for Human Rights in Oakland, using that position to start a program that trains low-income workers in how to weatherize homes and install solar panels. Jones calls such jobs green pathways out of poverty. "We need people who are highly educated at the theoretical level," he said, "and we need people who are highly educated at the level of skilled labor."

### **3. Green collar jobs are high quality jobs**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.ihb.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

Pennsylvania's efforts have been helped by the presence of many skilled manufacturing workers in the state and its commitment to having 18.5 percent of its power come from renewable sources by 2020. "We have gone after this sector first and foremost because the green of the sector is important, because it is the green that goes into the pocketbooks and wallets of workers," said Kathleen McGinty, the state environmental secretary. "They are good-paying jobs, jobs that often require advanced skills."



## AT: Green Collar Jobs Not Important

### **4. RPS would cause more job growth**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Renewable energy technologies tend to create more jobs than fossil fuel technologies because they are more labor-intensive. A large share of the expenditures for renewable energy is spent on manufacturing equipment, and installing and maintaining it. With biomass, money is also spent on fuel, but usually from sources that are within 50 miles of a biomass plant, because it is too expensive to transport it for long distances. Therefore, renewable energy facilities avoid the need to export cash to import fuel from other states, regions, or countries— keeping money circulating in the local economy, and creating more local jobs.

### **5. RPS would create jobs across the economy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Using UCS assumptions, we project that by 2020 the 20 percent RPS would generate more than 355,000 jobs in manufacturing, construction, operation, maintenance, and other industries—nearly twice as many as fossil fuels, representing a net increase of 157,480 jobs (Figure 4). Renewable energy would also provide an additional \$8.2 billion in income and \$10.2 billion in gross domestic product in the U.S. economy in 2020.

## AT: Green Collar Jobs Not Important

### **6. RPS would benefit consumers and help the economy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Using UCS assumptions for renewable energy technologies, average consumer natural gas prices would be lower than business as usual in nearly every year of the forecast under the 20 percent RPS, with an average annual reduction of 1.5 percent. In addition, average consumer electricity prices would be lower than business as usual in every year of the forecast, with an average annual reduction of 1.8 percent. As a result, the 20 percent RPS would save consumers \$49.1 billion on their electricity and natural gas bills by 2020 (Figure 1).<sup>19</sup> All sectors of the economy would benefit, with commercial, industrial, and residential customers' total savings reaching \$19.1 billion, \$17.4 billion, and \$12.6 billion, respectively.

## Harms - Competitiveness – US Behind

### **( ) The US is behind in renewable leadership**

Paul Roberts, LA Times, "Power Outage" May 22, 2004.  
<http://www.energybulletin.net/326.html>

Costs for alternatives, such as solar, were still too high to compete with traditional energy sources, such as oil or coal. But the deeper problem was simply that government support had vanished. Even as the Reagan administration moved aggressively to rejuvenate American oil, gas and coal production, providing tax breaks and subsidies worth billions of dollars, the White House was openly hostile to alternative energy. The administration cut R&D funding, and in a grand, symbolic gesture ripped out the solar panels that had been installed on the White House roof by Reagan's Democratic predecessor, Jimmy Carter. Yet even as America rediscovered fossil fuels, quite another strategy was unfolding elsewhere: Both Germany and Japan began aggressively pushing research in solar, wind and other alternatives. Just as important, both countries have moved to build new markets for alternative technologies - for instance, by subsidizing homeowner purchases of solar panels or helping farmers who want to install wind turbines. By creating more demand, these programs have increased the number of solar cells or wind turbines being manufactured, which is driving down the unit costs - ideally, to the point where alternatives can compete directly with conventional energy.

### **( ) New signs the US is falling behind in the energy markets**

Paul Roberts, LA Times, "Power Outage" May 22, 2004.  
<http://www.energybulletin.net/326.html>

When it comes to making gas-electric hybrids that actually sell, Toyota and Honda are the market leaders – meaning Ford will probably have its hybrid on the market much faster than if it developed a complete hybrid system in-house. But that's the rub. By outsourcing some of its technology needs to Toyota, Ford has demonstrated yet again how the United States, ostensibly the most technologically advanced nation in history, is losing a key opportunity not only to shape the next energy economy, but perhaps to effectively compete in that economy as well. And given the troubled state of our oil-based energy system, with its growing political, environmental and supply issues, the failure to be an aggressive player in the new energy economy could pose serious long-term problems - especially for countries as energy-hungry as the United States.

## Harms - Competitiveness – US Behind

### **( ) The US is lagging behind in renewable energy**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

The United States has lagged in its commitment to maintain leadership in key technological and industrial areas, many of which are related to the energy sector.<sup>6</sup> The United States has fallen behind Japan and Germany in the production of photovoltaic systems, behind Denmark in wind and cogeneration system deployment, and behind Japan, Germany, and Canada in the development of fuel-cell systems. Developing these industries within the United States is vital to the country's international competitiveness, commercial strength, and ability to provide for its own energy needs.

### **( ) The United States is falling behind in renewable energy**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

The United States led the world in renewable energy development for many years. In the 1990s, that leadership passed to Europe and to a lesser extent Japan for solar photovoltaics. However, the diversity of policy and market experience, coupled with a policy resurgence at the state level in the late 1990s, continued to make the U.S. experience highly relevant to policy-making in China and other countries. By 2003, the installed renewable electricity capacity of the United States had reached 19 GW, about 13% of worldwide renewable capacity, excluding large hydropower (Table 1).

## Harms - Competitiveness – US Behind – Europe

### **( ) Europe is pushing for new renewable energy standards**

International Herald Tribune, January 28, 2008.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/01/28/business/rtrinside29.php>

With a fervor once reserved for visions of a united Europe, commission officials depict a new age in which office buildings and homes will produce more energy than they consume because of solar panels, wind generators and biomass. The surplus would be sold into the electricity grid. No wonder Big Energy is less than ecstatic at the prospect. "No country that has made big investments in renewables has regretted it," said the commission's energy spokesman, Ferrán Tarradellas. For green campaigners, the boldness of the EU program is deceptive. "A 20 percent emissions reduction for the EU from 1990 levels is already only 10 percent in reality, because we have reduced 10 percent already," said Stefan Singer of the World Wide Fund for Nature.

### **( ) Europe is pushing or new green leadership**

International Herald Tribune, January 28, 2008.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/01/28/business/rtrinside29.php>

Whether you think it's a green revolution, a missed opportunity or a lurch toward economic suicide, the European Union's plan to fight climate change is an ambitious pitch for global leadership. "Energy and environment policy is the New Frontier of European integration," says Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the Green member of the European Parliament from Germany who was a student revolutionary in France the '60s. Leading the world by example in combating global warming could do for Europe what the Coal and Steel Community did in the 1950s and the drive for the euro in the 1990s, he contends. The European Commission's president, José Manuel Barroso, seems to think so, since he has made climate protection his top priority and hence a key credential of his undeclared campaign for reappointment in 2009.

## Harms - Competitiveness – US Behind – Europe

### **( ) Denmark is ahead of the United States in energy technology**

The Winchester Star, April 4, 2008.

[http://www.winchesterstar.com/article\\_details.php?ArticleID=5785](http://www.winchesterstar.com/article_details.php?ArticleID=5785)

Denmark has been a world leader since the 1970s in promoting renewable energy resources such as wind power, geothermal energy, and biomass-derived fuels. Wind power comprises 21 percent of the country's energy resources. Petersen said Denmark is an example to other countries around the world of how to maintain a standard of living while at the same time reducing the impacts on environmental quality. "Energy policy is the solution to climate change," Petersen told the students and faculty, adding that the Bush administration has now realized that climate change is a problem. "Emissions are increasing temperatures."

## Harms - Competitiveness – Consistency Needed

### **( ) Policy inconsistencies are harming us renewable energy competitiveness**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

US renewable energy policy has suffered from inconsistency as incentives have been repeatedly enacted for short periods of time and then suspended. This stop-and-go tendency has seriously hampered the development of markets and industries. As a result, the United States, once the world leader in renewable energy technologies and generation, now lags behind Europe and Japan in many respects. The up-and-down movement of the wind industry during 2001-2004 due to expiration of the production tax credit (PTC) is the best example of how inconsistent policies can affect an industry. The failure of the company LUZ in the late 1980s to continue developing solar thermal power stations is another. As Berger wrote in 1997, "federal aid has vacillated....National energy policy—especially as reflected in the tax code—changes its emphasis too quickly to provide the long-term stable planning horizon that major new renewable energy investments require. Foreign governments, meanwhile, give their renewable energy industries more generous and longer-term support than does the United States, therefore providing a more predictable operating environment, creating stiff competition for American renewable energy companies....For all these reasons, the public's long-term interests in swiftly bringing a renewable energy economy into being are neglected."

## Harms - Competitiveness – Federal Signal Necessary

### **( ) Federal action is necessary to demonstrate effective international leadership regarding renewable energy**

Paul Roberts, LA Times, "Power Outage" May 22, 2004.  
<http://www.energybulletin.net/326.html>

Sadly, such an attitude at the top not only makes it hard to expand America's presence in alternative energy, it actually erodes what small success we've achieved. The American wind industry, for instance, was until recently growing at 30% a year. Helped by a small federal subsidy, U.S. wind farms were nearly cost-competitive with coal-fired power and even cheaper than power plants burning natural gas.

Granted, U.S. wind farms were forced to use turbines imported from Europe, where the wind business is a major source of high-wage jobs that could easily be American. Nonetheless, the fact remained that a form of alternative energy was finally gaining a presence in the U.S. energy market. Unfortunately, Congress last fall failed to renew the small government subsidy for wind power. U.S. lawmakers have promised to push for the subsidy later this year, but without a clear signal from the White House, the fate of the program is not clear.

In the meantime, many planned U.S. wind projects are on hold. Experts expect relatively little development in the U.S. wind market this year – even as European wind farmers and European wind-turbine makers brace for another banner year. When it comes to Americans and alternative energy, success, not failure, seems to be our biggest fear.



## Harms - Competitiveness – Federal Signal Necessary

### **2. Government action communicates the energy problem is real and important**

Mona Hymal, Professor of Law at Cornell, Macquarie Law Journal, 2007. Vol 7. pp 125-153

Requirements for subsidy reform include: diffusion of innovative schemes; better targeting of existing subsidies to improve efficiency and minimise environmental impact; and improved subsidy design for measures targeting alternative energy and energy efficiency. Unlike environmental taxes which generate revenue, subsidies cost money. The level of subsidy needed to encourage the targeted environmental investment can often be substantial initially as new technologies often face significant cost barriers to market entry. As a result, governments may be reluctant to pay large subsidies or they may provide lower subsidies which fail to induce the sought after changes.<sup>185</sup> In addition, designing effective incentives requires information, not only to determine the level of the subsidy, but also about the advantages and disadvantages of different technologies in order to induce individuals and businesses to make the desired choice.<sup>186</sup> On the other hand, individuals often have very little information about environmentally friendly investments, and government incentives can direct consumers towards these new technologies.<sup>187</sup> Furthermore, subsidies have the potential to bring about significant change without initially changing everyone's choices. Individuals lacking information may follow the actions of those they believe have more information. For example, as more people buy hybrid vehicles, others will follow potentially inducing larger scale shifts in behavior.<sup>188</sup> Finally, such government actions send a message to individuals and businesses that environmental problems must be taken seriously.

## Harms - Competitiveness – Research

### **( ) These investments are necessary to long-term research into renewable energy**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.  
<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

Renewable energy technologies have made important and dramatic technical, economic, and operational advances during the past decade. A national energy policy and climate change strategy should be formulated around these advances. Despite dramatic technical and economic advances in clean energy systems, the United States has seen far too little research and development (R&D) and too few incentives and sustained programs to build markets for renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency programs.<sup>2</sup> Not since the late 1970s has there been a more compelling and conducive environment for an integrated, large-scale approach to renewable energy innovation and market expansion.<sup>3</sup> Clean, low-carbon energy choices now make both economic and environmental sense, and they provide the domestic basis for our energy supply that will provide security, not dependence on unpredictable overseas fossil fuels.

## Harms - Competitiveness – Soft Power Effective

### **( ) Soft power is an effective form of international power**

Nathan Gardels, editor of *New Perspectives quarterly*, "The Rise and Fall of America's Soft Power" *New Perspectives quarterly*, vol. 22 no. 1 winter 2005

In this era of free flows, not hard boundaries, the nature of power itself has changed. Military might—the idea that power comes from the barrel of a gun—is associated with territorial defense or conquest. In a world that has moved beyond borders, power is associated with economic prowess and the sway of hearts and minds. The same forces that have eroded the nation state have created a global market and nascent global civil society in their wake. If hegemony is not consensual in this new domain, it won't long last. Without legitimacy conferred by consent, the political objectives for which military might is deployed, and for which a society's wealth must pay, cannot be met. The ability to dominate one's environment— power—is thus frustrated, if not entirely defeated.

### **( ) US dominance during the cold war demonstrates the effectiveness of soft power**

Nathan Gardels, editor of *New Perspectives quarterly*, "The Rise and Fall of America's Soft Power" *New Perspectives quarterly*, vol. 22 no. 1 winter 2005

It is this kind of consensual hegemony on a global scale upon which much of America's influence in the post WWII era rested. America established consensual hegemony through the appeal of its ideas realized in practice—as the land of personal freedom, of equality under the rule of law, of social and economic opportunity. Abroad, these ideas informed the battle against Fascist and Communist totalitarianism and for decolonization and self-determination. Indeed, American freedom and prosperity led Mexico's Nobel laureate Octavio Paz, expressing the view of many, including his migrating compatriots, to declare America "the republic of the future." At least up until the Iraq war, and perhaps during the later stages of Vietnam, this soft power was the legitimating complement to US military might for much of global public opinion, even within the populations of the communist bloc and under US-allied authoritarian rulers.

## Harms - Competitiveness – Soft Power Effective

### **( ) Cultural and economic appeals have been able to shape international politics in the past**

Nathan Gardels, editor of New Perspectives quarterly, "The Rise and Fall of America's Soft Power" *New Perspectives quarterly*, vol. 22 no. 1 winter 2005

Once globalized, this American soft power not only beat out the competition, but helped undermine the hard power of the Soviet empire. Even before the arrival of Gorbachev back in the 1980s, Regis Debray, the French philosopher, champion of guerrilla warfare and pal of Che Guevara had presciently concluded that there was "more power in blue jeans and rock and roll than the entire Red Army." Michael Eisner of Disney was not off base when he said in 1995 that "...the Berlin Wall was destroyed not by force of Western arms, but by force of Western ideas. And what was the delivery system for those ideas? It has to be admitted that to an important degree it was American entertainment. Inherent in the best and worst of our movies and TV shows, books and records is a sense of individual freedom and the kind of life liberty can bring. It's in the movies of Steven Spielberg; it's in the songs of Madonna; it's in the humor of Bill Cosby."

## Harms - Competitiveness - Impact

### **( ) United States hegemony is necessary to prevent multiple scenarios of global nuclear war**

Khalilzad, Rand Corporation, Spring 1995 (Zalmay, The Washington Quarterly, Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War, vol. 18, no. 2, p.84)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

## Solvency – Federal Government Key

### **( ) Federal legislation is necessary to creating a renewable energy market**

Benjamin K. Sovacool, et al. is a former Eugene P. Wigner Fellow at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York. *The Electricity Journal*, "Big Is Beautiful: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard " 2007

State-based renewable portfolio standards (RPS) create regulatory uncertainty for investors and inherent inequities among ratepayers. Ultimately, federal legislation can help create a more just, diverse and predictable national market for renewable resources without significantly increasing aggregate electricity prices.

## Solvency – RPS Possible – Economics

### **( ) The cost of renewable energy has fallen over the past 30 years**

Herzog, Post Doc. Fellow at Berkeley, (Antonia V. "Renewable Energy: A Viable Choice" Environment, Vol 43 No. 10.) December 2001.

<http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

There has been significant progress in cost reductions made by renewable technologies (see Figure 1).<sup>7</sup> In general, renewable energy systems are characterized by low or no fuel costs, although operation and maintenance costs can be considerable. Systems such as photovoltaics contain far fewer mechanically active parts than comparable fossil fuel combustion systems, and are therefore likely to be less costly to maintain in the long term. Costs of solar and wind power systems have dropped substantially in the past 30 years and continue to decline. For decades, the prices of oil and natural gas have been, as one research group noted, "predictably unpredictable"<sup>8</sup>. Recent analyses have shown that generating capacity from wind and solar energy can be added at low incremental costs relative to additions of fossil fuel-based generation. Geothermal and wind can be competitive with modern combined-cycle power plants—and geothermal, wind, and biomass all have lower total costs than advanced coal-fired plants, once approximate environmental costs are included (see Figure 2).<sup>9</sup> Environmental costs are based, conservatively, on the direct damage to the terrestrial and river systems from mining and pollutant emissions, as well as the impacts on crop yields and urban areas. The costs would be considerably higher if the damage caused by global warming were to be estimated and included.

## Solvency – RPS Possible – Economics

### **( ) Renewable have become as cheap as traditional energy**

Dr. Antonia V. Herzon, Berkely Post Doc Fellow. "A National Clean Energy Strategy" February 16, 2001. <http://rael.berkeley.edu/old-site/papers.html>

In the last decade the case for renewable energy has become compelling economically, socially, and environmentally. For many years renewables were seen as environmentally and socially attractive options that at best occupied niche markets due to barriers of cost and available infrastructure. That situation has dramatically changed. Renewable energy resources and technologies – notably solar, wind, small-scale hydro, and biomass based energy, as well as advanced energy conversion devices such as fuel cells – have undergone a revolution in technological innovation, cost improvements, and in our understanding and analysis of appropriate applications. There are now a number of energy sources, conversion technologies, and applications, where renewable energy options are either equal, or better, in price, and equal, or better, in services provided than are the prevailing coal, oil, and gas technologies. For example, in a growing number of settings in industrialized nations, wind energy is now the *least cost* option across *all* energy technologies with the added benefits of being quick to install and bring on-line, and modular. In fact, some farmers in the Midwest can generate more income per hectare from the electricity generated by a wind turbine on their land than from their crop or ranching proceeds. Furthermore, photovoltaic panels and solar hot water heaters placed on buildings and houses across America could help reduce consumers' energy costs, produce a healthier living environment, and increase our energy supply while stabilizing our energy demand.



## Solvency – RPS Empirically Proven Solvency

### **( ) State level success demonstrates how successful a national RPS can be**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

The RPS has emerged as a popular and effective tool used by a growing number of states to reduce market barriers and stimulate new renewable energy development. Driven in part by early successes in the states, and recognition of the many benefits that significantly increasing renewable energy use can provide the entire nation, advocates have been calling for a national RPS for nearly a decade. A national RPS has passed three times in the U.S. Senate from 2002 to 2005, but has failed to become law. Leadership in the 110th Congress has indicated interest in continuing the national RPS debate as part of an effort to increase America's energy independence and reduce global warming emissions. For several years EIA and UCS have been conducting analyses to project the costs and benefits of various RPS proposals. The analyses demonstrate that under a wide range of assumptions, a 20 percent national RPS is achievable, and would save consumers money by reducing natural gas and electricity prices. The analyses also show that a national RPS would diversify the electricity system, promote local economic development, improve the nation's energy security and reliability, and achieve important reductions in global warming emissions. Even under a 10 percent RPS, both UCS and EIA analyses show Americans would see all of these benefits, but at lower levels than what would occur under a 20 percent RPS.

## Solvency – Credit Trading

### **( ) Renewable credit trading is the most efficient way of promoting renewable energy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Finally, a national RPS would establish uniform rules for the most efficient trading of renewable energy credits (RECs). This uniformity could further reduce renewable energy technology costs by creating economies of scale and a national market for the most cost-effective resources; inducing renewable energy development in the regions of the country where they are the most cost-effective; and reducing transaction costs, by enabling suppliers to buy credits and avoid having to negotiate many small contracts with individual renewable energy projects.

## Renewable Energy Helps the Economy

### **( ) High energy prices hurt the US economy**

Institute for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Energy, "Fats, Choices, and Challenges" 2007  
[http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts\\_security.htm](http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts_security.htm)

The impact of energy on jobs, business, and the economy extends far beyond the energy sector itself. Increases in prices mean that consumers have less to spend on other goods and services. Higher energy costs result in lower returns on capital investment, making each worker less productive and adversely affecting wages. Corporate decisions on where to locate, expand, and create jobs depend significantly on the reliability and affordability of fuel and power. Energy imports also substantially expand the U.S. trade deficit. By one estimate, on average, every time oil prices go up 10%, 150,000 Americans lose their jobs. The impact of potential supply disruptions—as the result of terrorism, weather, global competition for resources, or bad policy decisions— would be even more devastating to our economy, mobility, and even our ability to defend the nation.

### **( ) Renewable energy has stronger price stability than traditional energy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Lacking long fuel supply chains, renewable energy facilities are also not vulnerable to supply shortages or disruptions, price spikes, price increases, or price manipulation. And because they do not use volatile fuel or produce dangerous wastes, renewable energy facilities (except large hydropower dams) do not present inviting targets for sabotage or attack.

### **( ) Renewable energy is very stable**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Typically, contracts for natural gas generation are variably priced, which leaves utilities and their customers exposed to periods of price volatility such as that which has plagued the U.S. gas industry since 2000. By contrast, generation from renewable energy systems is normally sold under fixed-price contracts. Increasing the amount of renewable energy included in a utilities' energy portfolio can provide an important hedge against this gas price risk.

## Renewable Energy Helps the Economy

### **( ) RPS would help the US economy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

A national RPS can help improve the U.S. economy in other ways. Renewable energy can greatly benefit struggling rural economies, by providing new income for farmers, ranchers, and landowners from biomass energy production, wind power lease payments, and local ownership. Property tax revenues from renewable energy facilities can also help local communities pay for schools and vital public services. Table 3 compares the economic development benefits of the 20 percent by 2020 and 10 percent by 2020 national RPS scenarios analyzed using UCS assumptions.

## RPS Negative

Environmental Justice Harms 1NC Frontline	62
Dirty Energy	66
Alternate Causality	67
Executive Order	68
Hard to Prove	69
Not Root of Problem	71
Hurts Minorities	72
No Spillover	73
No Resources	74
EPA is the Problem	75
Enforcement	76
Economic Competitiveness Harms 1NC Frontline	77
Hegemony Falling	79
No Soft Balancing	80
Green Collar Overestimated	82
Solvency 1NC Frontline	83
Tax Credits Now	85
Federal Programs	86
Renewables Now	87
States Solving Now	88
Lack of Flexibility	92

## Environmental Justice Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. RPS allows for dirty energy**

Energy Justice Network, 2007, <http://www.energyjustice.net/rps/>.

Unfortunately, many of the RPS laws in other states allow existing and dirty "renewables" to qualify. However, some stronger RPS bills have been put forth. A model RPS bill - the strongest and cleanest in the nation - was introduced in the Pennsylvania Senate in early November 2003.

### **2. Alternative causalities – many non-energy environmental injustices**

Maine Law Review, 2005. "Comment: Environmental Injustice and the Problem of the Law" 57 Me. L. Rev. 209

Documentation of race and income disparities in pollution exposure has been mounting since the release of the influential 1987 study by the United Church of Christ's Commission for Racial Justice, which reported that three out of every five blacks and Latinos, and approximately half of all Asians and American Indians, live in communities with uncontrolled toxic waste sites. n10 A 1994 update to the study found that the concentrations of racial minorities living in close proximity to toxic waste sites had increased. n11 A study of the health effects of pesticides on farm workers by the World Resource Institute found that approximately 313,000 of the two million farm workers in the United States -- ninety percent of whom are people of color -- suffer from pesticide poisoning each year. n12 Of these, between 800 and 1,000 die as a direct result of their pesticide exposure. n13 Studies of blood lead levels in children have shown that "children from poor families are eight times more likely to be poisoned than those from higher income families, and [\*213] African-American children are five times more likely to be poisoned than white children." n14 A recent study of the Southern California Air Basin found that people of color had a consistently higher cancer risk due to air toxics than did whites, with Latinos having the highest risk. n15 These disparities persisted after controlling for income and for other causes of pollution. Similarly, a study of the distribution of toxic chemicals registered and reported in the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) found that "all other things being equal, residential areas with large concentrations of African-Americans and Hispanics are exposed to substantially higher levels of TRI pollutants." n16

## Environmental Justice Harms 1NC Frontline

### **3. Executive order provides government access to communities**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

President Clinton's February 1994 Executive Order 12,898 not only includes mechanisms to improve distributional outcomes; it is also designed to improve the decisionmaking process. The Order is [\*252] intended "to provide minority communities and low-income communities access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment." n141 The Executive Order requires that agencies provide the mechanisms necessary for minority or low-income groups to participate effectively in government decisions. n142 The Council on Environmental Quality's draft guidance on Executive Order 12,898's application to the NEPA process encourages agencies to develop innovative methods for reaching out to community organizations and others who are less likely to keep track of formal notice in government documents. n143 Environmental justice advocates expect that Executive Order 12,898's two-pronged approach - requiring (1)the compilation and consideration of demographic information, and (2)the improvement of public participation mechanisms - will result in fairer decisionmaking. n144

### **4. Environmental justice does not remedy underlying racism**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

While the environmental justice literature generally acknowledges the strategic value of environmental litigation, some of the literature argues that this remedy fails to address the deeper roots of the problem: discrimination. n280 The underlying issue is the political and economic status of the affected community and the extent to which that community is treated fairly. Strategies like bringing an environmental lawsuit or participating in environmental proceedings are unlikely to address these basic concerns. n281

## Environmental Justice Harms 1NC Frontline

### **5. Credits create a "right to pollute" that harm minority communities**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

To the extent that older facilities might find it more economical to purchase the "rights to pollute" than adopt new pollution control techniques, these areas are less likely to benefit from the restrictions imposed by environmental laws and may, in some instances, be harmed by them. As a corollary, those communities with facilities which choose to reduce emissions by more than the amount required by applicable standards and sell the resulting "rights to pollute" will receive disproportionately greater benefits from the trading system. To the extent that the older facilities choosing to buy pollution credits rather than adopt pollution control techniques are disproportionately located in poor or minority areas, these communities will receive less of the benefits and more of the harms of environmental regulations than other communities. n241

### **6. Environmental laws harm minority communities**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

As described in the environmental justice literature, environmental laws may exacerbate unequal environmental conditions because communities with ample resources are able to use environmental and zoning laws in ways that those with fewer resources cannot. As suggested above, when it comes to the siting of undesirable land uses, affluent communities are more likely to have the resources to participate effectively in environmental review and other environmental proceedings than poorer communities. n255 Wealthy communities can afford to hire experts to analyze government documents, appear in public hearings, and bring suit against the decision makers on both procedural and substantive issues.



## Environmental Justice Harms 1NC Frontline

### **7. Environmental justice will not lead to political equality**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Ultimately, when a burdened group's assertions are not believed, their objection to the siting decision may be seen as just another instance of the widespread "Not In My Backyard" phenomenon. n297 NIMBY is seen as a selfish position: don't bother us; bother someone else. NIMBY claims do not, on their own terms, raise questions of political justice. n298 Consequently, the community will inevitably confront the following questions: Is the claim for environmental justice simply a way to mask self-interested NIMBY attitudes in politically-correct clothing? Is a claim in opposition to a facility a claim for justice simply because it is expressed by a minority or low-income community? Without an answer to these questions, a community will not be able to demonstrate political injustice.

### **8. EPA will not enforce environmental justice standards**

Environment News Service, September 20, 2006 <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/sep2006/2006-09-20-09.asp>

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is failing to conduct required reviews to ensure that low-income and minority communities are getting the same environmental protections as other communities, according to a new report by the agency's inspector general. EPA senior management "has not sufficiently directed program and regional offices to conduct environmental justice reviews" in accordance with a 1994 executive order that mandated such reviews, the inspector general said. "Consequently, the majority of respondents reported their programs or offices have not performed environmental justice reviews." The executive order, issued by President Bill Clinton, directs agencies to make environmental justice a part of their mission by reviewing the effects of their programs on minority and low-income populations. The 21-page report was made public Tuesday. It found that some 60 percent of respondents had not conducted the reviews, the report said, and 87 percent of the agency's programs or offices had not even been asked to do them. "Until these program and regional offices perform environmental justice reviews, the agency cannot determine whether its programs cause disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations," the report said.

## Dirty Energy

### **( ) Federal government leads to dirty energy**

Energy Justice Network, 2007, <http://www.energyjustice.net/rps/>.

On the national level, the only RPS being seriously considered is one that almost got included in the much larger energy bill that narrowly avoided passage in November 2007. A majority of U.S. Senators have expressed support for it, but it may be excluded from the bill by Democratic leadership who worry that it'll be too controversial to survive a filibuster or presidential veto. There are two huge problems with supporting a national RPS. First of all, the RPS that would be passed in this Congress would have a dirty definition of renewables -- one that includes burning of toxic landfill gas and poultry waste and which may even be amended to include trash incineration as renewable "biomass" energy. This poses major environmental justice concerns. The other main problem is that if the RPS bill passes as part of the larger energy bill, the promoting the policy could help pass the subsidies for nuclear power, coal and agrofuels which are also likely to be included in the 2007 energy bill.

## Alternate Causality

### **( ) Energy is not the only environmental injustice**

Maine Law Review, 2005. "Comment: Environmental Injustice and the Problem of the Law" 57 Me. L. Rev. 209

These findings represent just a sampling of what is now known about environmental injustice. The methodologies of these studies have also been the subject of debate. n17 Indeed, EPA concluded in 1992, based on its own review of the research, that "racial minority and low income populations experience higher than average exposures to certain air pollutants, hazardous waste facilities (and by implication, hazardous waste), contaminated fish, and agricultural pesticides." n18

### **( ) The root of environmental injustice is the lack of minority participation in environmental movements**

Villanova Environmental Law Journal, "Comment: On the Road from Environmental Racism to Environmental Justice". 1994. 5 Vill. Env'tl. L.J. 449 p.lexis

Responses to the charges that the lack of representation of people of color is a contributing factor to the incidence of environmental racism point to reasons other than race. Proffered explanations include views that: (1) people of color are not concerned about environmental issues; n80 (2) African-Americans still feel unwelcome in the environmental arena from which they have historically been excluded; n81 and (3) people of color lack the resources and confidence necessary to induce political change. n82 Nevertheless, the result of underrepresentation in the political sphere is the neglect of concerns of people of color. n83 This neglect increases the burdens and risks of environmental protection policies shouldered by people of color.

## AT: Environmental Justice – Executive Order

### **( ) It is already federal law to review environmental justice impacts of projects**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

The Order further requires all federal agencies to develop an environmental justice strategy that identifies the distributional implications of existing programs and requires the agencies to propose revisions to improve distributional fairness. n100 It mandates that federal agencies gather information regarding demographic consequences, n101 and requires government agencies to consider the demographic implications of their decisions. n102 By explicitly requiring that demographic information be gathered and incorporated into decisionmaking processes, environmental justice advocates hope that the Executive Order will lead to a fairer distribution of the consequences of federal agency actions. n103

### **( ) All projects must have an environmental impact statement**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

The Executive Order makes clear that existing laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), already require agencies to consider demographic effects. NEPA requires the preparation [\*246] of an environmental impact statement ("EIS") in connection with all major federal actions having a significant environmental impact. n104 The White House memorandum on the Executive Order explicitly states that "[e]ach Federal agency shall analyze the environmental effects, including human health, economic and social effects, of Federal actions, including effects on minority communities and low-income communities, when such analysis is required by [NEPA]." n105 The Council on Environmental Quality, the agency responsible for NEPA regulations, has issued an Interim Final Guidance to explain implementation of the Executive Order in the NEPA context. n106

## AT: Environmental Justice – Hard to Prove

### **( ) Despite impact test prevents intensifying environmental injustice**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Once a siting decision resulting in distributional inequity has occurred, the question becomes the availability of redress. A remedy would be available only where the burdened community could articulate a right to a particular distributional outcome. Where the burdens of undesirable land uses have not been proportionately distributed, authors in the environmental justice movement have suggested legal remedies based on "disparate impacts." In general, they argue that if a minority area is already subject to a heavier burden of undesirable land uses than a white area and the proposed siting would intensify that impact, then the proposal could be said to have a "disparate impact." n116 On its face, the disparate impact test thus for [\*248] goes an inquiry into the decisionmaking process and the attitudes motivating the siting decision. n117 It is designed to prevent a further intensification of disparate burdens.

### **( ) No enforcement for environmental justice – the legal requirements are difficult to prove**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

To date, communities who have challenged local government siting decisions under the Equal Protection Clause have not met with success. n151 To demonstrate a violation of the Equal Protection Clause, [\*254] plaintiffs must prove that the defendants' siting decision intentionally discriminated against them. n152 Although discriminatory intent can be proven through circumstantial evidence if no direct evidence is available, n153 the evidentiary burden is quite high. n154 Because the Equal Protection Clause provides a legal remedy for only the more obvious and persistent instances of discriminatory treatment, it fails to provide a remedy for circumstances in which unfair treatment is more insidious. n155 In many instances, the difficulty of bringing a legal action based on intentional discrimination will mean that the issue of political justice is addressed politically rather than legally. The claim will be that the affected community was not treated with equal concern and respect. The political objective will be to increase the accountability of decisionmakers to all members of the community.

## AT: Environmental Justice – Hard to Prove

### **( ) It is difficult for environmental racism to be proven**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Assuming, then, the importance of pursuing political justice in the political realm, how should such claims be raised? The difficulty of raising such claims should not be underestimated. While unfairness may be obvious to the affected community, it is unlikely to be obvious to the broader body politic. For one, the discrimination is unlikely to be blatant because most decisionmakers would not risk the associated embarrassment. In general, then, one confronts more subtle instances of unfair treatment. Second, as discussed further in Part III, the broader body politic is likely to assume that the affected community is simply asserting a self-interested cry of "Not in My Backyard" under the guise of a claim for fairness. While many communities will indeed be raising a NIMBY claim, demonstrating that their claim is also a claim for fair treatment will require considerable effort. Third, in some instances the claim of discriminatory treatment can be a double-edged sword. As a community raises the charge of racism, the decisionmakers may paint themselves as the victims of the community's unfair accusation. In today's racial politics, many perceive the "victims" as those accused of racism, not the other way around.

### **( ) Unequal treatment in the courts undermines environmental justice**

Maine Law Review, 2005. "Comment: Environmental Injustice and the Problem of the Law" 57 Me. L. Rev. 209

Environmental injustice is a social justice problem, a public health problem, and an environmental problem, and correcting it is a collective responsibility. This Comment has provided an overview of the major civil rights and environmental law theories that have been advanced in environmental justice cases, and why, to date, courts have not been receptive to the claims. We need courts to begin taking the documented inequality and harm seriously -- to engage directly the genuine constitutional issues at stake and to recognize, fundamentally, that our environmental laws operate in an unjust world. This may require a reexamination of the intent requirement in equal protection jurisprudence, heightened scrutiny of economic discrimination claims, reinforcement of the fundamental right to bodily integrity, and recalibration of the concept of risk in light of the unequal distribution of environmental hazards. Even as policymakers strive for environmental justice in the political sphere, it is critical that environmental justice claimants have the day they deserve in our courts.

## AT: Environmental Justice – Not Root of Problem

### **( ) Must address the political systems that make environmentally unjust decisions**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Professor Sheila Foster has noted that focusing solely on distributional outcomes would fail to address political inequalities skewing decisionmaking processes. n137 She therefore advocates activism "geared toward ensuring public participation in compiling, and access to, information critical to environmental decisionmaking processes." n138 This model "equates fair process with justice." n139 Professor Foster notes that environmental laws requiring the consideration of a proposed project's impacts and encouraging public participation in the analysis of those impacts provide an existing model for achieving fair decisionmaking. n140 The expectation is that participation will increase the possibility that decisionmakers will consider all interests equally.

## AT: Environmental Justice – Hurts Minorities

### **( ) Environmental law can alienate minority communities**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Furthermore, the environmental justice literature portrays the technical nature of environmental laws as alienating to the communities enlisting their aid. n282 Because of the complexity of environmental [\*278] laws and the likelihood that community residents will not have the experience or training to use them, the expert lawyer might dictate litigation strategy or engage in the administrative process without the participation of the non-expert community. n283 When the locus of the dispute is moved to the courtroom or an administrative agency, the community group is on unfamiliar turf. Use of environmental laws could thus disengage and disempower the affected community.

### **( ) Environmental law can result in more injustice**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

In many low-income and minority communities, environmental laws are looked on with suspicion. First, environmental laws (and environmental lawyers) often cause or exacerbate environmental injustice. Second, despite the potential for some environmental laws to provide a legal basis for challenging an environmental problem, the use of environmental laws does not address the deeper issues of justice that are at stake. In some cases, using environmental laws might harm rather than help the affected community's quest for justice.



## AT: Environmental Justice – No Spillover

### **( ) Environmental justice is not an efficient mechanism for creating equality**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Identifying the positive contributions of environmental laws to debates about political justice does not erase the concerns about using environmental laws expressed in the environmental justice literature. n367 The literature observes that engaging in environmental proceedings requires considerable expertise - both scientific and legal. n368 One concern is that burdened communities will not have sufficient resources to pay for the scientific expertise necessary to realizing the potential presented by environmental laws. n369 A second concern is [\*297] that communities will not have sufficient legal resources necessary to realizing the potential presented by environmental laws. n370 A third concern is that, even if resources can be obtained, "experts" will take over the process, leaving community residents as disengaged bystanders. n371

### **( ) Need stronger outreach programs to combat environmental racism**

Villanova Environmental Law Journal, "Comment: On the Road from Environmental Racism to Environmental Justice". 1994. 5 Vill. Env'tl. L.J. 449 p.lexis

The EPA Workgroup recommended that "EPA should expand and improve the level and forms with which it communicates with people of color and low-income communities and should increase efforts to involve them in environmental policy making." n181 The Workgroup's suggestions explored ways to help minority and low-income communities involve themselves in local environmental decisionmaking. The suggestions included targeting these communities with outreach and environmental education literature, establishing outreach representatives in regional offices, and translating published materials into languages other than English. n182

## AT: Environmental Justice – No Resources

### **( ) Lack of resources undermines environmental justice**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

The importance of resources is no less relevant when it comes to the enforcement of environmental laws. At a general level, communities with resources find it easier to become involved in and are better equipped to lobby for governmental enforcement of environmental regulations in their communities. n256 More specifically, when the government is unable or unwilling to pursue enforcement actions to a community's satisfaction, a wealthy community has the ability to use its resources to pursue enforcement directly through the "citizen suit" provisions contained in many environmental laws. n257 One of the [\*274] purposes for the citizen suit provisions is to make up for shortfalls in the government's ability or commitment to ensure compliance by all regulated facilities with environmental regulations. n258 These citizen suit provisions permit citizens to pursue enforcement actions against facilities or agencies violating environmental laws. n259

## AT: Environmental Justice – EPA Problem

### **( ) Failing in the EPA is the problem**

Environment News Service, September 20, 2006 <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/sep2006/2006-09-20-09.asp>

The report recommends the EPA require its program and regional offices identify which programs, policies and activities need environmental justice reviews and require these offices to establish a plan to complete the necessary reviews. It calls for the agency to ensure that reviews determine whether EPA's actions may have a disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental impact on minorities and low-income populations. In addition, the report recommends each program and regional office develop specific environmental justice review guidance and urges the EPA to designate a responsible office to oversee implementation of its environmental justice efforts. In response to the findings, the EPA said it has made environmental justice a major part of its work, but agreed that it needs better guidelines and a framework for conducting formal reviews.

### **( ) EPA is effective at combating environmental racism**

Villanova Environmental Law Journal, "Comment: On the Road from Environmental Racism to Environmental Justice". 1994. 5 Vill. Envtl. L.J. 449 p.lexis

EPA has made significant efforts to promote environmental justice. The most pivotal step thus far has been the institution of investigations under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. n170 EPA has also explored its role in achieving environmental justice by forming the Environmental Equity Workgroup ("the Workgroup"). n171 A Workgroup report recommended that EPA raise the priority assigned to [\*476] the environmental justice movement. n172 With respect to the risk assessment process, the report suggested that procedures should be revised to ensure better risk-characterization across populations, communities and geographic areas. n173 The Workgroup also recommended that EPA review permits, grants, monitoring and enforcement procedures to address the high risk concentration in communities of color. n174 Finally, EPA established an Office of Environmental Equity to spearhead the fight for environmental justice. n175

## AT: Environmental Justice - Enforcement

### **( ) Enforcement irregularities contribute to environmental racism**

Alice Kaswan, Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University School of Law, The American Law Review, 1997. 47 Am. U.L. Rev. 221

Bringing a citizen enforcement action, like bringing any litigation, requires significant resources - both to detect and analyze suspected violations and to pursue successful litigation. n260 Wealthy communities are thus more likely to bring private citizen suits than poor neighborhoods. n261 Assuming that government enforcement is evenly distributed, n262 the presence of additional private enforcement efforts in wealthy areas could result in an overall enforcement pattern that varies according to the communities' private resources. n263 Thus, although the citizen suit provisions in environmental laws do provide citizens with recourse if they are concerned about environmental compliance in their neighborhood, the unequal use of these provisions by communities could exacerbate the disparity in environmental conditions among neighborhoods. In this sense, the use of [\*275] environmental laws could constitute one cause of the uneven distribution of environmental problems.

### **( ) Poor enforcement of environmental standards**

Maine Law Review, 2005. "Comment: Environmental Injustice and the Problem of the Law" 57 Me. L. Rev. 209

[\*212] This environmental injustice has been exacerbated by discriminatory enforcement of environmental laws. A National Law Journal study n6 in 1992 found that average penalties under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) were 500% lower for violations in minority communities than in white communities. n7 Less dramatic but still substantial disparities in penalty totals were found under the other major environmental laws. The Clean Water Act was "28% lower, the Clean Air Act, 8% lower, the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), 15% lower, and in multi-media actions involving enforcement of several statutes, 306% lower." n8 The study is significant in part for its finding that, although the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) enforcement and clean-up record showed unequal treatment based on income levels, the disparity was more pronounced still when correlated with race. For example, it took EPA 10% longer to designate toxic sites on the national priority list in low-income areas, compared with 20% longer in minority areas. n9

## Economic Competitiveness Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. US hegemony declining due to international challengers**

The Canberra Times, April 16, 2008

<http://canberra.yourguide.com.au/news/opinion/opinion/us-needs-to-get-smarterstability-in-east-asia-is-more-likely-to-come-from-an-inclusive-approach-that/1224377.html>

One of the key features of this system, though, is US pre-eminence. This will change in the coming decades with the rise of new great powers most obviously China, but also Japan and India and perhaps Indonesia and Russia as well. Yet US strategic policy towards East Asia often seems narrowly focused on the possibility of military conflict with China, and the need to maintain technological superiority.

### **2. US power in the world is falling due to economic woes**

Forbes, 5/1/2008 [http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx\\_0501oxford.html](http://www.forbes.com/home/2008/04/30/hegemony-global-culture-biz-wash-cx_0501oxford.html)

Hegemony' describes the dominance of one social group or class in a society. This control can be exercised subtly rather than forcefully through cultural means and economic power, and can rest on a mixture of consent and coercion. Today, the term is also used to describe the role of the United States in the world, but Washington's privileged position may be in a state of relative decline.

### **3. There is no empirical evidence that soft balancing has constrained United States actions in the past**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

We conclude that although states do periodically undertake actions that end up constraining the United States, the soft-balancing argument does not help to explain this behavior. There is no empirical basis for concluding that U.S. power, and the security threat that potentially inheres in it, has influenced recent constraint actions undertaken by the other major powers. Our examination therefore provides further confirmation of the need for analysts to move beyond the familiar but misleading precepts of balance of power theory. Instead, new theorizing is needed that is more appropriate for understanding security relations in today's unipolar era.

## Economic Competitiveness Harms 1NC Frontline

### **4. Transparency of other powers disproves balancing**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

The key cases of soft balancing are quite recent, so reliable inside information can be scarce. The chief putative soft-balancing powers—France, Russia, and China—are also not known for the transparency of their executive decisionmaking. And public rhetoric presents difficult analytical challenges. A government with a sincere interest in soft balancing may not want to advertise it. At the same time, all four other dynamics may generate balancing rhetoric from policymakers, creating prima facie evidence for a soft-balancing explanation. Leaders motivated chiefly by domestic political considerations are hardly likely to say so; they may detect domestic political advantage in touting the balancing element even if countering the threat from U.S. power is not the real issue.

### **5. Environmental reform will not help competitiveness because green collar jobs overestimated**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.  
<http://www.ihf.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

But some skeptics argue that the phrase "green jobs" is little more than a trendy term for politicians and others to bandy about. Some say they are not sure that these jobs will have the staying power to help solve the problems of the U.S. job market, and others note that green jobs often pay less than the old manufacturing jobs they are replacing. Such is the novelty of the concept that no one is certain how many such green jobs there are, and even advocates do not always agree on what makes a job green.

"A green-collar job is in essence a blue-collar job that has been upgraded to address the environmental challenges of our country," said Lucy Blake, chief executive of the Apollo Alliance, a coalition of environmental groups, labor unions and politicians seeking to transform the economy into one based on renewable energy.

## AT: Competitiveness – Hegemony Falling

### **( ) China is challenging the US for global supremacy**

The Canberra Times, April 16, 2008

<http://canberra.yourguide.com.au/news/opinion/opinion/us-needs-to-get-smarterstability-in-east-asia-is-more-likely-to-come-from-an-inclusive-approach-that/1224377.html>

On one level, this is understandable. China's defence budget is expanding by 12 per cent a year, and it is investing heavily in capabilities like a blue-water navy to blunt the US edge. The US 2006 Quadrennial Defence Review stated that China, among the "major and emerging powers [has] the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States."

### **( ) US soft power is declining due to Chinese influence**

The Canberra Times, April 16, 2008

<http://canberra.yourguide.com.au/news/opinion/opinion/us-needs-to-get-smarterstability-in-east-asia-is-more-likely-to-come-from-an-inclusive-approach-that/1224377.html>

Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane first distinguished between "hard" and "soft" power. Hard power refers to military capabilities, and the ability to use threats or rewards to get others to do what they otherwise would not. Soft power "is the ability to get desired outcomes because others want what you want. It is the ability to achieve goals through attraction rather than coercion."

With the exception of Japan, China has arguably been winning the soft power contest in East Asia in recent years. China has worked to settle many territorial disputes. It has pursued a more substantial role in regional organisations. Its leaders have made many visits throughout the region, typically concluding an economic or financial deal during each visit. China makes the case, too, that it stood by its neighbours during the Asian financial crisis, with the clear implication that the US and the International Monetary Fund did not.

## AT: Competitiveness – No Soft Balancing

### **( ) Soft balancing is just politics as usual**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

How does one identify soft balancing? The answer matters greatly for both policy and theory, yet it remains elusive because soft-balancing proponents have not supplied the conceptual tools to distinguish behavior that is an outgrowth of the systemic balancing imperative from what we might call "unipolar politics as usual." Crucially missing from the literature is sufficient recognition that other explanations besides soft balancing exist for state actions that constrain the United States. As a result, analysts tend to treat nearly any behavior that complicates U.S. foreign policy as soft balancing. We remove this bias by setting out four alternative explanations.

### **( ) Soft balancing does not consider alternative explanations**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

This article shows that the soft-balancing argument has no traction. The only reason some analysts have concluded otherwise is because they have failed to consider alternative explanations. If it were reasonable to equate soft balancing with great power policy bargaining, then balancing would agree as a contributor, but not a driver, in at least the Iraq case. As we have demonstrated, however, there are critical analytical costs to equating these two phenomena. Once the distinction between soft balancing and bargaining is recognized, the strict conclusion is that soft balancing plays no discernable role in any of the four cases we examine.



## AT: Competitiveness – No Soft Balancing

### **( ) Balancing is just political posturing**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

Being seen by Washington as a potential soft-balancer has risks, to be sure, but it also holds out the promise of magnifying one's bargaining influence and the significance of any concessions one might make. Governments that pursue relative economic advantages for themselves or their constituents may find it convenient to cloak the policy in high-minded talk about checking U.S. power. And the United States is so prominent on the global stage that it can potentially serve as a convenient focal point for other states that seek to cooperate on regional security issues. States will likely have strong disagreements on the specifics of how to cooperate at the regional level; a public stance against U.S. policies may be one issue they can agree on. Balancing rhetoric can thus be a useful rallying point for stimulating regional cooperation.

### **( ) No empirical evidence for soft balancing**

Stephen G Brooks, Assistant Professor of Government At Dartmouth and William C Wohlforth, Professor of Government At Dartmouth, "Hard Times for Soft Balancing", *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 1. 2005

In a unipolar world, soft balancing can be seen as the first observable implication that the world works the way balance of power theory expects it to. There is no empirical basis for the soft-balancing argument, and hence any effort to invoke it as a means of buttressing balance of power theory is fruitless.

## AT: Competitiveness – Green Collar Overestimated

### **( ) It is hard to tell number of green collar jobs**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.ihb.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

it is hard to gauge the number of green-collar jobs in the United States. Welders at a wind-turbine factory are viewed as having green jobs, but what about the accountants or janitors?

In the most-often-cited estimate, a report commissioned by the American Solar Energy Society said the United States had 8.5 million jobs in renewable-energy or energy-efficient industries. Jerome Ringo, president of the Apollo Alliance, predicted that the United States could generate three million to five million more green jobs over the next 10 years.

## Solvency 1NC Frontline

### **1. Existing programs will spur renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

But was a mandate necessary to foster the purposes underlying the numerous attempts to enact a RPS, and to spur on the growth of renewable energy markets? When the sum of other federal, state, regional, local, and utility-specific activities in the renewable arena is calculated, the answer is no. Activities on a number of fronts supplant the need for a federal RPS. Moreover, the flexibility inherent in many such programs, as well as in the consideration procedures established under the Electricity Title XII of EAct 2005, n5 mean that these programs and procedures are much more likely to realize the benefits from renewables while providing consumers with reliable, cost-effective energy.

### **2. State RPS is pushing renewable energy into the mainstream marketplace**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

Renewables Portfolio Standards (RPS) have become the most-popular state-level policy to support renewable energy in the United States. Under an RPS, retail electricity suppliers are required to purchase a growing amount or percentage of renewable energy over time. Of all of the state-level policies discussed here, the RPS is also proving to be the most important in stimulating large amounts of renewable energy additions, although design pitfalls have been experienced in numerous states. To date, most capacity installed under RPS laws has been wind, which is the cheapest option.

### Solvency 1NC Frontline

#### **3. Renewable energy is not one-size-fits-all – a federal RPS will not be effective**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

The role of the state, utility, or cooperative is to ensure that a renewable program incorporates all components that are necessary to produce renewable energy that is cost-effective and reliable. The challenge is to find the balance between realizing the promises of renewable energy while protecting consumers and communities from adverse impacts. A renewable program can fall into one of two categories: "elegant, cost effective, flexible policy" or "poorly designed, ineffective, or costly ... ." n135 Regional consortiums, states, local municipalities, and individual utilities are best positioned to evaluate the panoply of renewable data, in conjunction with their policy objectives, to establish programs that work for their citizens and consumers. At the end of the day, the goal of any renewable program should be to provide cleaner, reasonably-priced and reliable electric service. Mandates such as a federal RPS will not achieve these goals.

#### **4. States offer grants and trust funds for renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

States also offer grants and trust funds for research and development of renewable production and technologies. In Delaware, Illinois, and Iowa, research and development grants support the development and marketing of new [\*463] renewable energy technologies, which can significantly support those businesses within the state whose work is related to renewable energy technologies or a depressed area within the state. n80 Finally, California, Minnesota, Nevada, and Washington offer production incentives in the form of RECs that can be traded or sold as well as in the form of supplemental energy payments or tax credits to offset higher production costs. n81

## AT: Solvency – Tax Credits Now

### **1. Massive tax credits driving renewable energy growth**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

To date, electric cooperatives have made application to the United States Treasury Department for almost \$ 500 million in CREBS to finance fifty-eight renewable projects across America. n69 Section 1306 of the Act establishes a production tax credit for new advanced nuclear power facilities with a credit amount of 1.8 cents per KWh for electricity produced over an eight-year term. Section 202 reauthorizes the Renewable Energy Production Incentive until 2026. Section 203 sets goals for federal purchasing of renewable energy up to 7.5% in fiscal year 2013 and each fiscal year thereafter. Sections 124 and 206, respectively, establish rebates for residential consumers who satisfy qualified state energy efficient appliance programs (up to \$ 50 million annually through 2010), and for consumers who install renewable energy systems to homes or small businesses (with an annual cap of \$ 150 million in 2006 and \$ 250 million by 2010). n70 A few other federal bills also provide for funding for renewable energy and ancillary purposes. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Appropriations Act for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) includes \$ 23 million in funding for the USDA's renewable energy loan program and the DOE Appropriations Act for FY 2006 includes \$ 1,185.7 million for DOE's energy efficiency and renewables programs. n71

### **2. Current funding is most efficient way to grow renewable energy sector**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

The federal incentives, particularly the PTC and CREB, provide uniform financial support to the renewable energy industry. They do not create inequities among states, which, according to the opponents of S. Amdt. 791, would have [\*462] occurred under the SREAP. n72 Nor do they impose cost shifts among ratepayers, which occur when utilities are required to purchase renewable energy at a price that exceeds the value of the power. n73 These programs and the state incentives represent the most efficient, cost-effective, and equitable means of supporting the renewable industry. It is imperative that these programs are funded at levels that enable renewables to compete with fossil fuels.

## AT: Solvency – Federal Programs

### **( ) Strong growth in the renewable energy sector**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Financial incentives are in place at the federal, state, and local levels, including tax credits for renewable development and other production incentives, customer rebates, and research, and development grants. The importance of these programs in providing encouragement, inducement, and support for renewable technologies, research and project development cannot be overstated. At the federal level, EPAct 2005 enhances these opportunities by, among other things, amending renewable production incentives that are set forth in the Energy Policy Act of 1992. n64 Under EPAct 2005, the renewable energy production tax credit (PTC) is extended through 2007, and includes incremental and new hydropower and Indian coal as qualifying energy resources. n65 The American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) estimated that up to 2,500 MW of wind energy capacity was scheduled to go on line by 2005, and that the extension of the PTC would continue this strong growth momentum. n66

## AT: Solvency – Renewables Now

### **( ) Renewable are spreading without RPS**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

During the consideration of federal energy legislation, more and more states, electric utilities, and local jurisdictions established RPSs, renewable goals or other programs, n45 many of which include RECs that in some instances can be traded on an interstate basis. Likewise, regional consortiums are supporting renewable efforts and goals. Iowa enacted the first renewable program back in 1983, followed by Minnesota in 1994 and Arizona in 1996. n46 Currently, there are twenty-eight renewable programs in place in the United States: twenty-two states and the District of Columbia have enacted or implemented a RPS or renewable goal program (of these, Minnesota has two: a renewable goal for [\*458] electric utilities other than Xcel Energy, and a wind and biomass mandate for Xcel); Fort Collins, Colorado, Columbia, Missouri, and Austin, Texas have renewable programs; and a utility, Jacksonville Electric Authority in Florida, has a program. n47 Sectors of the industry to which these programs apply range from the RPSs of Delaware and Wisconsin (which apply to all utilities and retail suppliers, including municipals and electric cooperatives), to Nevada's RPS for investor-owned utilities (IOUs). n48 Standards, measured in terms of percentages or megawatts (MWs) of renewable power generated, purchased or acquired via RECs, are all over the map. For example, Maryland requires 7.5% of retail sales by 2019; Iowa requires its utilities annually to contract for a combined 105 MWs of renewable energy; and Connecticut requires 10% retail sales by 2010. n49

### **( ) Regional networks are providing renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Additionally, regional alliances are working to promote renewables. The Western Governors' Association (WGA) n56 agreed upon a resolution that calls for the development of thirty GWs of renewable energy by 2015. n57 In the Northeast, governors in New England and premiers from Canadian provinces set a policy goal of 10% renewable energy by 2020. n58

## AT: Solvency – States Solving Now

### **( ) The states are providing enough renewable energy though RPS**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

By early 2005, 18 states and Washington, D.C. had RPS policies. Renewable energy purchase obligations ranged from just 1% to as high as 30%. (Note, however, that the highest-target states sometimes include hydropower in the electricity share and already have substantially met their targets; Maine's 30% target is already achieved and New York is already at 19% of its 24% target). By 2004, approximately 40% of the U.S. electrical load was covered by state RPS policies. Many of the existing RPS policies have been enacted in states that have restructured their electricity markets. However, a growing number of state RPS policies have been established in traditional monopoly electricity markets. Table 3 shows the states with RPS policies and their renewable energy purchase obligations. The U.S. Congress has considered applying an RPS on the federal level, for the entire United States, but the legislation has not yet succeeded in the legislative process and, as of 2005, all RPS policies were enacted at the state and local levels.

### **( ) State based RPS is effective at creating renewable energy**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

While the number of states that have created RPS policies is large, experience with these policies remained somewhat limited. By 2005, few of the states had more than five years of experience with their RPS programs and some policies were established but not yet implemented. Nonetheless, the impact of these policies was beginning to be felt. According Petersik (2004), state RPS policies helped to motivatedemand for 2,335 MW of new renewable energy capacity through 2003. The vast majority of this capacity, 2,183 MW, was wind power, with the most substantial demand for renewable resources coming from Texas (1,140 MW), Minnesota (476 MW), Iowa (237 MW), and California (175 MW). In fact, of the 4,300 MW of wind power installed in the US from 2001 through 2004, approximately half appeared to have been motivated in part by RPS requirements.



## AT: Solvency – States Solving Now

### **( ) Future state RPS will become more effective**

Eric Martinot, Ryan Wiser, and Jan Hamrin (Center for Resource Solutions, San Francisco, 2005) [www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf](http://www.resource-solutions.org/lib/librarypdfs/IntPolicy-RE.policies.markets.US.pdf)

Despite the mixed experiences, state RPS policies are likely to remain the predominant form of support for renewable energy in the United States, at least in the near term. Existing policies will be re-designed to improve their effectiveness, and new states will be added to the RPS roster. Those policies that are already well-designed will begin to encourage significant – though not massive – growth in renewable energy capacity.

### **( ) States are providing renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Furthermore, many states require their state agencies to procure power from renewable sources. Connecticut's Green Power Purchase Plan directs state agencies and universities to purchase renewable power, with a goal of meeting 20% of power needs by 2010 and up to 100% in 2050. n59 Similarly, state agencies in New Jersey are required to purchase an aggregate of 12% of their energy usage from renewable sources, and New York's Renewable Power Procurement Policy committed the state government to purchase 10% of its power from renewables by 2005 and 20% by 2010. n60 Likewise, local governments are establishing their own programs: Montgomery County, Maryland purchases 5% of its power from wind sources; Portland, Oregon has [\*460] met its current goal of 12% renewable purchases, with an eye towards 100%; and Conway, South Carolina's Green Power Purchasing program obligates the city to purchase fifty 200 kilowatt-hour (kWh) blocks of electricity per month that is generated by landfill gas. n61 Several states require utilities to offer their customers green power under specified tariffs: Iowa requires all utilities operating within the state to offer green power options to their customers; and electric utilities in Minnesota must offer green power as well. n62 At the local level, many municipalities and cooperatives have established their own green power purchasing programs. n63

## AT: Solvency – States Solving Now

### **( ) Existing programs provide the stability necessary to grow**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Many of these programs have been in place long enough for the states or other implementing entities to gauge their efficacy, and to refine or even restructure the programs if necessary to take into account evolving state or local factors. This is the flexibility factor that is essential in designing and operating any renewable program, as discussed infra at Part IV.B to Part IV.F. Accordingly, many programs have been amended to require or recommend higher standards than those originally established. California, already considered a sort of juggernaut for renewable issues, appears to be in the final stages of gaining approval for accelerating its RPS from 20% of retail sales by retail sellers by 2010 to 33% by the end of 2020. n50 Likewise, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC), on March 14, 2006, issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to increase the standard for a utility's renewable portfolio from 1.1% in 2007-2012 to 15% by 2025, with 30% of renewables coming from DG resources. n51 Wisconsin recently revisited its 1999 standard when the [\*459] Wisconsin State Legislature enacted SB 459, under which the statewide renewable goal for retail sales increased from 2.2% by 2012 to 10% by the end of 2015. n52 New Jersey is giving California a run for its money for the most aggressive RPS. In April 2006, the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities significantly increased, based on classes or tiers of renewable energy, the standard to 22.5% by 2021. n53 While it is difficult to measure the cumulative renewable energy from all of these programs, one study projected that compliance with RPS and renewable goals would result in an increase from ten gigawatts (GWs) in 2003 to forty GWs in 2015. n54 However, because a growing number of states are increasing the levels of renewable energy required, n55 this cumulative could correspondingly be greater.

## AT: Solvency – States Solving Now

### **( ) States are providing tax credits for renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

State incentives, like their federal counterparts, provide critical benefits for renewable resources that do not distinguish among consumer groups. Many states offer tax credits/rebates to various taxpayer groups. For instance, residential consumers in Idaho, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Utah can receive personal tax credits on equipment and installation costs for renewable heating and/or electric generation. n74 In New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Oklahoma, commercial and industrial consumers can receive corporate tax credits on property using renewable systems. n75 The credits can be focused on those renewable technologies that are available in individual states.

### **( ) Many state programs pushing renewable energy**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Renewable systems in Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, and Tennessee may be eligible for special property assessments to reduce the tax burden on those who make significant capital investments in renewable technologies. n77 Purchasers of renewable equipment and systems in Florida, Idaho, and Nevada can receive rebates on sales taxes, lowering the up-front cost of renewable energy technologies, which is often the greatest barrier to investment. n78 Similarly, in states such as California, Illinois, and Rhode Island, purchasers of renewable equipment and systems can receive state rebates on a percentage of the actual equipment or system costs or on a MWh basis, which also serves to lower the up-front costs of investment in renewable energy technologies. n79

## AT: Solvency – Lack of Flexibility

### **( ) Federal RPS is ineffective due to one-size-fits-all model**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Congressional efforts to impose a mandated RPS contained little opportunity for local variances, or for the flexibility or reconsideration that are essential components in furthering renewable goals while meeting the country's power supply needs in a cost-effective and reliable manner. As discussed supra at Part II, the debates surrounding S. Amdt. 791 highlighted this shortcoming in that RPS proposal. Fortunately, the amendments Congress enacted to Title I of PURPA respecting fuel diversity did not suffer from the same problem. n82

### **( ) Lack of flexibility undermines federal RPS**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Flexibility means that elements of a renewable program can be revised if necessary. Renewable programs should be designed to be flexible in order to balance conservation and environmental benefits against associated costs and reliability concerns. Flexibility is important because programs oftentimes need to be revised to maintain this balance and offer workable solutions for consumers. A RPS or any renewable program should promote energy efficiency and conservation in the context of obtaining affordable and reliable power. Flexibility at the state, local, and utility levels is essential in establishing RPSs or renewable programs that foster these same goals. Those who are implementing the programs must be able to review or reconsider elements as a means of fulfilling the purpose of renewables while safeguarding the need for safe, reliable, and affordable power.

## AT: Solvency – Lack of Flexibility

### **( ) Flexibility is necessary for an effective RPS**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

Renewable advocates have been urging flexibility in designing renewable programs for years. In 2001, the Texas RPS was touted as a success in that it demonstrated that a RPS, if designed properly, can deliver a "low-cost, flexible, and effective support mechanism for renewable energy." n83 Moreover, an analysis of state programs undertaken in 2001 concluded that state experiences showed that "an RPS can be ineffective unless careful attention is given to the [\*464] details of the RPS design." n84 It is essential to design a renewable standard or goal that incorporates many separate elements including structure, size, administration, policy goals, resource eligibility, production targets, and coordination with other policies such as financial incentives, and most importantly, the flexibility to reassess and refine all of the above. n85

### **( ) Flexibility critical to renewable energy success**

Mary Ann Ralls, Member of the Senior Regulatory Counsel at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Energy Law Journal, 2006. 27 Energy L. J. 451

The congressional debate of S. Amdt. 791 focused on whether or not elements of the proposed RPS would prove too intractable concerning factors such as reliability, costs, and eligible renewable sources to ensure its own effectiveness. It is often said "the devil is in the details," which is precisely the reason why renewable programs should be left to those who understand the mechanics of obtaining cleaner power that is also reliable and cost-effective.

## Biofuels Affirmative – Table of Contents

1AC	95
Answers to President’s Biofuels Initiative	106
Answers to No Oil Shortage	107
Answers to Market Solves	108
Answers to Rural Sector Doing Well	110
Answers to No Spillover	111
Answers to Can’t Replace Oil	112
Answers to Food Prices Turn	114
Answers to Dead Zones Turn	117
Answers to Long Timeframe	120
Extensions to Inherency	121
Extensions to Harms – Oil Dependence	122
Extensions to Solvency	123
Extensions to Solvency- Price Floor	124
Extensions to Solvency- Flex Fuel	126
Extensions to Solvency- Rural Economy	127

## Biofuels 1AC

### **Contention One: Inherency**

#### **A. Government Support for Biofuels is Insufficient- More Action is Required to Make Them Competitive with Oil**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

Owing to biofuels' great potential to help America address the steep economic, national security, and environmental costs of its oil dependence, Congress in 2005 created a new Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS). The standard— which currently applies mainly to ethanol—requires the production of 7.5 billion gallons of biofuels by 2012—and President Bush announced plans in his recent State of the Union address to push that target to 35 billion gallons by 2017. (Importantly, though, Bush seeks to add other "alternative" fuels in these totals, including liquids derived from coal, which do not offer the same carbon reduction benefits of biofuels). The RFS will help to further the production of ethanol from corn and sugar in the near-term as a way to help build investor confidence in cellulosic ethanol and other advanced biofuels.

But there is more that government can do. First and foremost, government can create the market conditions necessary for alternative fuels to compete with oil. That requires raising the price of oil to reflect its true cost to society.

As it is, oil prices only reflect the direct costs of finding petroleum, pumping it out of the ground, refining it into usable fuels, and transporting it to consumers. Not included in the market price of oil are its external costs—most notably the environmental cost of burning it and releasing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions into the atmosphere. If those costs were more fully taken into account, biofuels would be much more competitive.

## Biofuels 1AC

### **B. Current Fuel Infrastructure Prevents Adoption of Biofuels**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

Finally, in order for ethanol to be a viable gasoline substitute, it must be as cheap and easy to distribute as gasoline. America's existing system of gas pipelines cannot be used for distributing ethanol, because ethanol can corrode metal and because pipelines are not completely impervious to water. (Unlike gasoline, ethanol can absorb water, and when that happens, it becomes unsuitable as a motor fuel.) Until these problems are resolved, the nation's already-congested rail and barge networks appear to be the most likely distribution method for biofuels. At the retail end of the supply chain, an increasing number of service stations offer biofuels, but the numbers must increase if biofuels are to displace a substantial share of the nation's current gasoline consumption. Government should spur improvements on both fronts.

### **Contention Two: Harms**

#### **Harms Scenario A: US Addiction to Oil Will Result in Terrorism and War**

##### **1. Increasing Dependence on Oil Undermines US National Security**

National Resource Defense Council '05 ["Securing America", February, <http://www.nrdc.org/air/transportation/oilsecurity/plan.pdf>, accessed 4/25/08]

Oil dependence has become the Achilles heel of America's economy—and national security. America consumes more than 20 million barrels of oil every day, oil that powers cars, trucks, factories, and homes. Yet we have less than 3 percent of all known oil reserves and import almost 60 percent of our oil, making us dangerously dependent on a single, precarious energy source to keep our economy moving. Defense and foreign policy experts increasingly point to our oil addiction as an "incipient national security emergency" given the alarming trends in our petroleum demand, the lack of reliable alternatives to Middle East oil, and the vulnerable nature of the oil supply chain. The costs and risks of America's oil dependence will increase as the global oil market tightens and geopolitical tensions threaten to disrupt supply.



## Biofuels 1AC

### **2. Continued Dependence on Oil Makes War and Terrorism Inevitable**

Minsk, energy consultant, '02 [Ronald, "Ending Oil Dependence As We Know It", [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?contentid=250158&knlgAreaID=116&subsecid=155](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?contentid=250158&knlgAreaID=116&subsecid=155), January 30, accessed 4/25/08]

The real issue that we must address is the need to diminish the role of oil -- regardless of its origin -- in our economy. Whether we secure it from any corner of the global market or from every nook and cranny of the United States, oil will continue to be a strategic and economic liability until we reduce our need for it. Instead of trying to address our oil dependence primarily by expanding supply, we must achieve a better balance of increasing the efficiency with which we consume oil while maintaining our supply base.

The following significant and compelling factors should point us to new policies -- and accelerate the implementation of existing policies -- to reduce the nation's overall reliance on oil:

First, our nation's dependence on oil has figured prominently in U.S. policy toward the Middle East in general, and has helped embroil us in conflicts such as the Persian Gulf War. Moreover, oil dependence constrains our foreign policy by diminishing our ability to act freely in our strategic interest and in that of our allies. In today's conflict, the actions of nations that should be strong allies in the war on terrorism -- Saudi Arabia in particular -- appear to be inhibited by domestic concerns about Islamic extremism, straining relations between the world's largest oil consuming nation and its largest producing nation. In addition, many of our allies are more reliant on oil than are we; today's instability in the Persian Gulf could weaken or threaten our allies, particularly in Asia.

## Biofuels 1AC

### **3. Conflict Over Dwindling Oil Resources Results in Human Extinction and the Destruction of the Biosphere**

Heinberg, journalist and lecturer at the New College of California, '05 [Richard, *The Party's Over*, p. 251]

In the past 60 years, the US military and intelligence services have grown to become bureaucracies of unrivaled scope, power, and durability. While the US has not declared war on any nation since 1945, it has nevertheless bombed or invaded a total of 19 countries and stationed troops, or engaged in direct or indirect military action, in dozens of others.

During the Cold War, the US military apparatus grew exponentially, ostensibly in response to the threat posed by an archrival: the Soviet Union. But after the end of the Cold War the American military and intelligence establishments did not shrink in scale to any appreciable degree. Rather, their implicit agenda—the protection of global resource interests—emerged as the semi-explicit justification for their continued existence.

With resource hegemony comes challenges from nations or sub-national groups opposing that hegemony. But the immensity of US military might ensured that such challenges would be overwhelmingly asymmetrical. US strategies labeled such challenges "terrorism"—a term with a definition malleable enough to be applicable to any threat from any potential enemy, foreign or domestic, while never referring to any violent action on the part of the US, its agents, or its allies.

This policy puts the US on a collision course with the rest of the world. If all-out competition is pursued with the available weapons of awesome power, the result could be the destruction not just of industrial civilization, but of humanity and most of the biosphere.

## Biofuels 1AC

### **Harms Scenario B: Biofuels Save the US Agricultural Sector and the World Economy**

#### **1. Despite a Recent Blip in Food Prices, the Long-Term Viability of the US Agricultural Sector is in Danger**

Drabenstott and Henderson, vice president and senior analyst at the Center for the Study of Rural America, '06 [Mark and Jason, "A new rural economy", Winter, [http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/158527069\\_2.html](http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/158527069_2.html), acc 4/25/08]

Recent rural economic gains are certainly welcome, but they can mask persistent long-term economic challenges. Historically, rural America has depended heavily on commodity agriculture, natural resource extraction, and labor-intensive manufacturing. Globalization challenges all three, forcing U.S. producers to slash costs to stay competitive. Thus a pattern of consolidation is the norm throughout the countryside. Farms get bigger and fewer. Coal mines in Wyoming's Powder River Basin produce more coal with bigger shovels and trucks, but fewer workers. Taken together, these shifts mean fewer and fewer rural communities can tie their economic future to the economic engines of the past.

Building new economic engines is not easy, however. A longer term perspective suggests that rural areas are struggling more than metro areas in meeting this challenge. Since 1993, employment gains in rural areas have lagged behind those in metro areas (Map 1). This suggests metro areas have been more successful in shifting to leading edge industries. A look at the leading edge of growth raises even more concerns about rural areas. There are about 3,100 counties in the United States. The top 10 percent of those counties have contributed nearly three-fourths of the nation's new jobs since 1993. And only 8 of those 310 counties are in rural America.

## Biofuels 1AC

### **2. US Agricultural Trade is Key to the Domestic and World Economies**

Edmondson '08 [William, "US Agricultural Trade Boosts US Economy", Fall, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/FAU/2008/04Apr/FAU124/FAU124.pdf>]

As the world becomes more integrated, global trade and the economic links between countries grow ever stronger. U.S. agricultural trade is a significant contributor to the overall U.S. economy and to the rest of the world's economies. The United States continues to be a net exporter of agricultural products, the surplus helping to offset some of the U.S. nonfarm trade deficit. Trade agreements have expanded agricultural trade and, in turn, have opened the U.S. market to exporting opportunities for both developed and developing countries. Such trade benefits developing countries that in the past have had little market access. Agricultural exports by the United States are now enjoying a resurgence due to rising food demand in emerging markets, reduced competition in feed-grain markets, and a weakened dollar. At the same time the value of agricultural imports is rising, averaging 10-percent growth per year since 2001.

The U.S. farm and rural economies have always been affected by international and domestic macroeconomic trade influences. From early colonial days, when tobacco and cotton were the most important export commodities, to today's grain, oilseed, and processed foods, agricultural trade has been an important part of the U.S. economic engine. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and other bilateral and multilateral trade agreements lowered trade barriers and created additional consumer demand for U.S. agricultural commodities in foreign nations. In turn, that demand is satisfied with purchasing power acquired when their products are sold in the United States and elsewhere. The weakening U.S. dollar, which has now fallen to a 30-year low compared with the world's other major currencies, makes the price of U.S. goods increasingly competitive abroad. Canada and Mexico are the leading U.S. trading partners—together, those nations buy over 35 percent of U.S. exports. Meanwhile, U.S. imports of agricultural goods have not slowed despite the weakened buying power of the U.S. dollar. U.S. consumers continue to demand a large variety of imported goods and are willing to pay a premium for them.

Agricultural trade is most importantly a generator of output, employment, and income in the U.S. economy. For every dollar spent on exports in 2006, another \$1.65 was created in the economy to support the exporting activity (see table 1, p. 15). ERS model results show that every \$1 billion of agricultural exports in 2006 requires 11,800 American jobs (see box, "Data Sources," p. 6).

## Biofuels 1AC

### **3. Food Shortages and Economic Collapse Cause Human Extinction**

Bearden, Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army, 2000 [Tom, June 24,  
<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3aaf97f22e23.htm>]

Bluntly, we foresee these factors- and others not covered-converging to a catastrophic collapse of the world economy in about eight years. As the collapse of the Western economies nears, one may expect catastrophic stress on the 160 developing nations as the developed nations are forced to dramatically curtail orders.

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly.

Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible.

As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

**Thus we present the following plan: In order to incentivize biofuels as an alternative to oil, Congress should impose a \$50-per-barrel price floor on oil, allocate \$500 millions for research and development of cellulosic biofuels, require all car manufacturers to offer a flex-fuel option for every model of car, and offer tax credits for the creation of biofuels pumps at filling stations.**

## Biofuels 1AC

### **Contention Three: Solvency**

#### **A. A Comprehensive Incentives Package Will Establish Biofuels as a Viable Alternative to Oil**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

First and foremost, government can create the market conditions necessary for alternative fuels to compete with oil. That requires raising the price of oil to reflect its true cost to society. As it is, oil prices only reflect the direct costs of finding petroleum, pumping it out of the ground, refining it into usable fuels, and transporting it to consumers. Not included in the market price of oil are its external costs -- most notably the environmental cost of burning it and releasing carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. If those costs were more fully taken into account, biofuels would be much more competitive.

Another problem is that oil prices fluctuate wildly on global markets, to such an extent that they can undercut the appeal of alternatives. In the past year, as oil prices have at times soared past the \$70 per barrel mark, biofuels have looked like a sound investment. But historical trends show that sharp price peaks can be followed by deep valleys -- as was the case during most of the 1980s and 1990s, after the oil price shocks of the 1970s. This makes future market trends difficult to predict, and it acts as a deterrent to long-term investment in clean energy, including biofuels.

The federal government should respond to these problems by sending the market better price signals. There are several ways to do that. One approach would be to use a "cap-and-trade" regulatory system to put a tangible price on carbon dioxide emissions. That would effectively raise the cost of burning fossil fuels. Another approach, which many economists believe to be the simplest and most direct, would be to tax carbon consumption. A third approach would be to impose a price floor on oil. Preventing the price of oil from falling below \$50 per barrel would give farmers, fuel producers, and distributors the market certainty they need to increase their investments in the biofuels industry.

## Biofuels 1AC

In addition to using price signals to drive the market toward cleaner sources of energy, government should take proactive steps to spur the nascent biofuels industry. It should start by increasing public investments in research and development projects focusing on cellulosic biofuels. Specifically, Congress should raise the \$200 million in annual funding allowed under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to at least \$500 million. It should work with Bush to raise the Renewable Fuel Standard to his proposed target of 35 billion gallons by 2017 -- with the overwhelming share of that supply to be met with homegrown and sustainable biofuels, or other yet to be developed nonpetroleum, low-carbon fuels. It should also strengthen production incentives for cellulosic biofuels and extend existing ethanol tax credits. And it should require manufacturers to offer a flex-fuel option by 2015 for every model of car and truck sold in America -- a modification that costs as little as \$25 per vehicle.

Finally, in order for biofuels to be viable substitutes for gasoline and petro-diesel, they must be just as cheap and easy to distribute. Unfortunately, America's existing system of gas pipelines cannot be used for distributing ethanol, because ethanol can corrode metal, and because the pipelines are not completely impervious to water. (Unlike gasoline, ethanol can absorb water, which would make it unsuitable as a motor fuel.) Until these problems are resolved, America's congested rail and barge networks appear to be the most likely distribution method for biofuels.

Congress should therefore create a stimulus package to upgrade the country's freight rail system, in recognition of its strategic importance as an energy distribution network. In addition, Congress should press the U.S. Department of Energy and other relevant federal agencies to determine whether it would be technically possible and economically justifiable to build a new, dedicated biofuels pipeline network.

At the retail end of the supply chain, an increasing number of service stations offer biofuel pumps, but the number of pumps must increase dramatically if biofuels are to displace a substantial share of the nation's current gasoline consumption. The best way to pick up the pace would be for Congress to beef up the tax credits offered to stations for installing new clean fuel pumps.

## Biofuels 1AC

### **B. Biofuels Are the Single Best Option for Reducing Oil Dependence**

Progressive Policy Institute '04 ["Powering Oil Independence on Peanuts", 9/9, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=900039&contentID=252872](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=900039&contentID=252872), accessed 6/24/08]

Perhaps more than any other alternative fuel, home-grown biodiesel can lessen our dependence on oil from worrisome overseas sources. DOE-sponsored research shows that for every unit of fossil energy expended to make biodiesel, 3.2 units of energy are gained. No other vehicle fuel has as high a positive "energy balance." In contrast, it actually takes 1.2 units of fossil fuel energy to yield 1 unit of petroleum diesel. And as Diesel himself predicted, studies suggest that biodiesel production can be a boon to farmers. The NBB cites U.S. Department of Agriculture research that concludes that a 100 million gallon a year boost in demand for biodiesel would increase revenue for U.S. soybean farmers by more than \$112 million.



## Biofuels 1AC

### **C. Biofuels Incentives Will Stimulate the US Agricultural Sector and Renew Its Viability in a Globalized Economy**

Detchon '05 [Reid, "Oil Dependence", September/October, <http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/pubs/Ripon-Detchon.pdf>, accessed 6/24/08]

In the United States, a new domestic fuels industry would be a major economic stimulus to the rural economy, creating many thousands of new jobs, increasing farm income by billions of dollars, and reducing the need for government support. It would also make a dent in our enormous trade deficit, one quarter of which is attributable to petroleum. As a country we import oil and export dollars—more than \$450 million every day, a total of \$166 billion last year. That's more than \$500 a year for every man, woman, and child in America. Our traditional strength—agriculture— could be the answer.

In light of the recent WTO rulings against U.S. cotton subsidies and EU sugar subsidies, and the European Union's offer to abandon agricultural export subsidies, the structure of the agricultural support system as it has existed in the West is poised for change. Farmers in the United States and the EU are understandably concerned that their well-being is threatened. While the development of a new market for agricultural resources—for energy—cannot instantly resolve those fears, it does promise an important new source of income that can ease the inevitable transition that lies ahead. The use of agriculture for energy thus promises to become a major element in future farm bills. Indeed, farm leaders allied with the Energy Future Coalition have embraced an ambitious "25 by '25" vision for the future—that agriculture will provide 25 percent of the total energy consumed in the United States by 2025 while continuing to produce abundant, safe and affordable food and fiber.

## Answers to President's Biofuels Initiative

### **1. Biofuels Initiative is Insufficient.**

**Cross-apply our first Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek card from the 1AC Inherency. It says that the current level of government support for biofuels is insufficient to make them competitive with gasoline.**

### **2. Incentives are Needed for Infrastructure.**

**Cross-apply the second Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek Inherency card. The US lacks the infrastructure to make biofuels available as a large-scale alternative to oil. Plan creates incentives for filling stations to offer biofuels, that's the key to getting the industry off the ground and the reason why the status quo does not solve.**

## Answers to No Oil Shortage

**Group the Negative's arguments about how there won't be a shortage of oil.**

### **1. Foreign Oil Dependence is the Problem.**

**All this evidence says is that the Earth itself will not run out of oil. The problem is that most of that oil is not in the United States, compromising foreign policy and making national security vulnerable to nations that control the oil supply. Our NRDC '05 evidence says that foreign countries can undermine the US economy and national security by cutting off the oil supply and causing a shortage.**

### **2. The Risk of Our Impacts Is Linear- Less Reliance on Foreign Oil Means a Less Aggressive Foreign Policy and a Lower Risk of Catastrophic Conflict**

Feldstein, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, '03 [Martin, "Reducing America's Dependence on Foreign Oil Supplies", <http://www.nber.org/feldstein/oildependenceaea2003.pdf>, accessed 4/25/08]

Strong incentives to reduce oil consumption now and to shift over time to a different technology that does not rely on oil would reduce U.S. economic vulnerability to changes in world oil conditions and in the world price of oil. Although we can never expect to achieve full independence from the conditions in global oil markets, any reductions in our use of oil will increase our national security and enhance our freedom of action in military planning and foreign policy.

## Answers to Market Solves

**Group their arguments about how the market will insure a smooth transition from oil.**

### **1. The Market is Too Slow**

**The market needs time to react, but the US' oil supply is vulnerable to sudden disruption from an act of terrorism or an unfriendly foreign government. In the event of a sudden oil shortage, the US would not be able to transition smoothly to fuel conservation or an alternative fuel source.**

### **2. History is on Our Side.**

**So far, the US has not responded to oil scarcity by conserving fuel and developing alternatives. It has responded by threatening other countries, supporting corrupt governments, and even going to war. That's why the US invaded Iraq... twice. Our Heinberg '05 evidence says that this guarantees terrorism, war, and eventually human extinction.**

### **3. Diversification of Oil Supply Does Not Solve the Security Threat Posed By Oil Dependence**

Energy Future Coalition '08 ["National Security",  
<http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/preview.cfm?catID=47>, accessed 4/25/08]

Diversification of U.S. oil supply is not an adequate answer. Oil is like any other commodity - the last unit sold determines its price. The United States could shift all its purchases to relatively safe political sources, such as Canada and Mexico, and it would not be protected. The global price is what matters most. A major disruption of production of oil in Saudi Arabia would cause the price of oil to spike everywhere in the world, dramatically impacting the U.S. economy.

## Answers to Market Solves

### **4. Government Incentives Can Accelerate Market Forces With Tangible Benefits for the Environment, the Economy, and National Security**

Energy Future Coalition '08 ["National Security",  
<http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/preview.cfm?catID=47>, accessed 4/25/08]

Market opportunities alone will eventually lead to widespread use of these bio-products; however, government intervention can greatly accelerate their market penetration and is easily justified by the potential benefits in terms of reduced oil dependence and greenhouse gas emissions. After 100 years of oil dominance, this government support will help overcome the infrastructure advantages that fossil sources now enjoy.

## Answers to Rural Sector Doing Well

### **1. Prefer Our Evidence**

**Our Drabenstott and Henderson '06 card says that despite the short-term benefit provided by high food prices, the US agricultural sector faces structural threats to its continued existence. Corporate farms are consolidating land and replacing jobs with machines. Independent farmers face increasing competition from overseas. Agriculture is the backbone of the rural economy, and in the long term, it needs to adapt or die. Growing crops for fuel would provide a new sense of purpose and create more money and jobs for this vital part of the world economy.**

### **2. Prefer Our Warrants**

**The only warrants in the Negative's Seifried evidence relate to food prices. The evidence says nothing about price volatility, the number of jobs created, or whether the higher profits benefited primarily a few large corporate farming interests. Our evidence is better because it considers more of these factors that contribute to the overall health of rural economies.**

### **3. Incentives for Biofuels Will Revitalize the Agricultural Sector and the Economy as a Whole by Creating New Jobs and Benefiting Small Farmers**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "The Promise of Biofuels", 3/6, accessed 4/23/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116)]

Nearly all of America's farms, rangelands, and forests, moreover, have the potential to grow plants that can be converted into biofuels. This offers the possibility of injecting new life into the U.S. agricultural sector. Even more broadly, producing fuels domestically instead of importing them from abroad will keep the profits at home, spur new investments, and create jobs -- not just in the farm sector but also in processing plants and distribution systems. Industry-led studies estimate that new demand for ethanol helped create 153,725 U.S. jobs last year -- 19,000 of which were in manufacturing. Rural communities would stand to benefit the most from ethanol production because farmers own one-half of all existing ethanol refineries.

## Answers to No Spillover

### **1. Agriculture is Key to the World Economy**

**Cross-apply our Edmondson '08 1AC Solvency evidence. Edmondson gives three reasons: it generates output, employment, and income. Every dollar of agricultural trade generates nearly twice that much economic activity in other sectors.**

### **2. Increased Farm Productivity Lowers Prices and Frees Up Labor and Capital For Other Sectors of the Economy**

Edmondson '08 ["US Agricultural Trade Boosts US Economy", March, acc 4/25/08, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/FAU/2008/04Apr/FAU124/FAU124.pdf>]

Increased farm productivity brings benefits to the economy as a whole. Consumers benefit from high farm productivity, which ensures an abundant supply of food at low prices. Other sectors (and ultimately consumers) benefit from farming's efficient use of resources, which frees up labor and capital for other industries (initially for manufacturing in the 1940's to 1960's and more recently for service industries). Agricultural exports also make a positive contribution to the balance of trade. While agriculture's share of the economy and the number of people that depend on it for income and jobs is shrinking, both nationally and in rural areas, its role in the economy is important.

### **3. Prefer Our Evidence**

**It subsumes theirs. The Negative says the size of the agriculture sector is shrinking, but Edmondson says that agriculture remains important to the economy even though it is shrinking.**

## Answers to Can't Replace Oil

### **1. Biofuels are an Essential Part of the Solution**

**Even if reducing consumption is also important, plan is necessary to solve for oil dependence resulting in terrorism, war, and human extinction.**

### **2. The Negative's Authors Conclude Affirmative**

**Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek believe the government should create more incentives for biofuels. In fact, they are our Solvency advocates.**

### **3. Plan Solves**

**Cross-apply our Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek Solvency evidence. We encourage conservation and fuel-reduction by creating a \$50-a-barrel price floor for oil. This means prices will always be high enough to provide a market incentive for conservation.**



## Answers to Can't Replace Oil

### **4. With the Proper Incentives, Biofuels Can Replace 82% of the Oil Used for On-Road Transportation**

Pew Center on Global Climate Change '06 ["Agriculture's Role in Greenhouse Gas and Mitigation", September, accessed 4/25/08, <http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/Agriculture's%20Role%20in%20GHG%20Mitigation.pdf>]

Bioenergy from agricultural sources offers significant promise as a means of reducing consumption of fossil energy, potentially providing energy equivalent to almost 20 percent of total 2003 U.S. consumption of fossil energy. This amount of bioenergy represents 82 percent of today's U.S. demand for petroleum energy used in on-road transportation. Commensurate with its ability to reduce fossil energy use is bioenergy's ability to dramatically reduce GHG emissions. The order-of-magnitude potential impact of bioenergy on GHGs ranges from 510 to 1,710 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> (140 to 470 MMT carbon-equivalent) annually (9 to 24 percent of 2004 U.S. GHG emissions), depending on which type of fossil fuel is replaced.

However, in order to achieve this potential, significant reductions in the costs of converting biomass to transportation fuels will be required, or significant increases in use of biomass for heat and power, as well as significant increases in per-acre yields of crops grown for energy use. An aggressive research and development effort could eliminate the current price gap between biomass and fossil fuels as sources of energy. In the long run, this means that the GHG savings from bioenergy would come at no additional cost to the nation. To achieve this, the United States would need to invest in biomass research at a scale hitherto unseen. Consistent support of long-term fundamental research for biomass production and conversion is a necessary component of any policy portfolio aimed at making bioenergy a significant part of our energy supply.

## Answers to Food Prices Turn

### **1. Non-Unique**

**The Negative's own evidence says that food prices are increasing in the status quo.**

### **2. No Link. Biofuels Can Offset 25% of US Gasoline Consumption Without Affecting Food Production**

Detchon '05 [Reid, "Oil Dependence", September/October,  
<http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/pubs/Ripon-Detchon.pdf>, accessed 6/24/08]

To put the current market in context, 3.4 billion gallons of ethanol were produced in the United States in 2004, almost entirely from corn. Studies by Battelle Memorial Institute and Oak Ridge National Laboratory have found that 50 billion gallons of cellulosic ethanol could be produced from available land without a significant disturbance to the agricultural economy. Due to the fact that ethanol has less energy content per gallon than gasoline, this is equivalent to about one quarter of current U.S. gasoline consumption of 140 billion gallons a year.

## Answers to Food Prices Turn

### **3. No Link. Larger Economic Trends Overwhelm Biofuels' Influence on Food Prices**

Cohen, foreign editor for the New York Times, '08 [Roger, "Bring on the Right Biofuels", April 24, accessed 4/24/08,  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/24/opinion/24cohen.html?th&emc=th\]](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/24/opinion/24cohen.html?th&emc=th)

Before I get to that, some myths need dispelling. If Asian rice prices are soaring, along with the global prices of wheat and maize, it's not principally because John Doe in Iowa or Jean Dupont in Picardy has decided to turn yummy corn and beet into un-yummy ethanol feedstock.

Much larger trends are at work. They dwarf the still tiny biofuel industry (roughly a \$40 billion annual business, or the equivalent of Exxon Mobil's \$40.6 billion profits in 2007). I refer to the rise of more than one-third of humanity in China and India, the disintegrating dollar and soaring oil prices.

Hundreds of millions of people have moved from poverty into the global economy over the past decade in Asia. They're eating twice a day, instead of once, and propelling rapid urbanization. Their demand for food staples and once unthinkable luxuries like meat is pushing up prices.

At the same time, the rising price of commodities over the past year has largely tracked the declining parity of the beleaguered dollar. Rice prices have shot up in dollar terms, far less against the euro. Countries like China are offloading depreciating dollar reserves to hoard stores of value like commodities.

Food price increases are also tied to oil being nearly \$120 a barrel. Fossil fuels are an important input in everything from fertilizer to diesel for tractors.

## Answers to Food Prices Turn

### **4. Turn. Biofuel Crops Prevent Soil Erosion and Require Fewer Pesticides Than Food Crops, Making Farmland More Long-Term Sustainable For All Purposes**

Center for Strategic and International Studies '02 ["Bioenergy: Background, Potential, and Policy, [http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd et al 2002.pdf](http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd_et_al_2002.pdf), accessed 6/24/08]

There do not appear to be significant land use challenges associated with impacts of energy crop production on soil and water quality when considered on a per hectare basis, and depending on what use is being replaced by energy crops there are opportunities to realize net environmental benefits. Rates of erosion are exceedingly low for perennial grasses, and field data and models indicate that soil organic matter and fertility increase over time under grass cultivation even with regular harvest. Nutrient capture rates are very high due to the extensive root system of perennial grasses, with loss of nutrients to water sources corresponding low. Anticipated rates of pesticide and herbicide application are much lower for energy crops than for row crops. Elements removed from the soil as part of harvesting biomass must be replenished by additives to the soil, but there is long-term potential to recycle such elements from the processing facility back to the field. McLaughlin et al. associate conversion of cropland from row crops to perennial grasses with improved water quality, fertility, and wildlife habitat.

### **5. Case Outweighs**

**Oil dependence makes wars, terrorism, and eventually human extinction inevitable. Even if the Negative wins that plan will cause mass starvation, you would still vote Affirmative because of the magnitude of our impact.**

## Answers to Dead Zones Turn

### **1. Non-Unique**

**The Negative's own evidence says that water pollution occurs as a result of runoffs from status quo agriculture.**

### **2. Non-Unique**

**The Negative's evidence says that destruction of biodiversity could lead to extinction, but there are many other causes of biodiversity loss besides farm waste. Oceans are overfished, rainforests are burned, and endangered species are hunted. These threats will exist with or without the plan.**

### **3. Turn**

**Plan solves for biodiversity by reducing dependence on oil. That means less drilling, fewer oil spills, and reduced tailpipe emissions, all of which are greater threats to biodiversity than farm waste.**

***4. <If you already read this card in answer to the food prices turn, you can just cross-apply it here.>***

**Turn. Biofuel Crops Prevent Soil Erosion and Require Fewer Pesticides Than Food Crops, Reducing Runoff Into the Gulf of Mexico**

Center for Strategic and International Studies '02 ["Bioenergy: Background, Potential, and Policy, [http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd\\_et\\_al\\_2002.pdf](http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd_et_al_2002.pdf), 6/24/08]

There do not appear to be significant land use challenges associated with impacts of energy crop production on soil and water quality when considered on a per hectare basis, and depending on what use is being replaced by energy crops there are opportunities to realize net environmental benefits. Rates of erosion are exceedingly low for perennial grasses, and field data and models indicate that soil organic matter and fertility increase over time under grass cultivation even with regular harvest. Nutrient capture rates are very high due to the extensive root system of perennial grasses, with loss of nutrients to water sources corresponding low. Anticipated rates of pesticide and herbicide application are much lower for energy crops than for row crops. Elements removed from the soil as part of harvesting biomass must be replenished by additives to the soil, but there is long-term potential to recycle such elements from the processing facility back to the field. McLaughlin et al. associate conversion of cropland from row crops to perennial grasses with improved water quality, fertility, and wildlife habitat.

## Answers to Dead Zones Turn

### **5. Cellulosic Biofuels Turn**

#### **a. Plan Paves the Way for the Development of Cellulosic Biofuels**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "The Promise of Biofuels", 3/6, accessed 4/23/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116)]

Cellulosic biofuels are functionally identical from a driver's point of view to the current generation of biofuels made from corn. But they can be produced from the left-over, non-edible parts of food crops, wild grasses, and trees -- which require less fertilizer, water, and energy to grow and harvest than corn. In their current state of development, cellulosic biofuels cost more than twice as much to refine, but technological breakthroughs promise to change the equation. Researchers believe they will soon be able to produce cellulose in greater volumes, with less energy and at lower costs than corn ethanol, yielding greater net benefits in both energy and environmental terms. For now, government should certainly encourage increased production of the current generation of corn-based ethanol. But most experts agree that the real aim of such an increase in production should be to boost the supply and demand for biofuels generally, creating a ready market for cellulosic biofuels when they can be fully commercialized.

## Answers to Dead Zones Turn

### **b. Cellulosic Biofuels Lead to Responsible Water Use**

Center for Strategic and International Studies '02 ["Bioenergy: Background, Potential, and Policy, [http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd\\_et\\_al\\_2002.pdf](http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd_et_al_2002.pdf), accessed 6/24/08]

However, a well planned biofuel development strategy has the potential to diversify agricultural cropping systems with environmentally beneficial crops, such as perennial grasses. According to an assessment of multifunctional agricultural systems (that involves joint production of standard commodities such as food and fiber crops as well as "ecological services" such as protection of biodiversity and water quality), potential socio-economic and environmental benefits increase as cultivation of perennial crops, an excellent source for cellulosic biofuels, increase.

Thus multifunctional agricultural systems promise to address many problems associated with mono-cropped commodity agricultural systems. These problems are environmental (soil erosion, water quality deterioration), ecological (loss of plant and animal life diversity in the agricultural landscapes) and sociological (lack of economic opportunity leading to migration/agribusiness control of farms, decline in rural populations).

## Answers to Long Timeframe

### **1. Short Timeframe for Rural Economy Solvency**

**As soon as the government increases biofuels subsidies, that will be more money in farmers' pockets and the road to recovery for agricultural economies.**

### **2. Oil Dependence is Not All-or-Nothing**

**Complete solvency may take a while, but plan will begin to offset oil dependence immediately. That means fewer wars, less terrorism, and a reduced risk of human extinction.**

### **3. Magnitude Outweighs Timeframe**

**Human extinction is our terminal impact. Ultimately, allowing less bad impacts to occur in the short-term would be justified to prevent eventual human extinction.**



## Extensions to Inherency

### **( ) Despite the Clear and Present Danger Posed by the United States' Oil Addiction, Political Gridlock Prevents the Emergence of Alternative Fuels**

Ballentine and Mazurek, Progressive Policy Institute, '04 [Roger and Jan, "Clean Cars", March, [http://www.ppionline.org/documents/clean\\_cars\\_0304.pdf](http://www.ppionline.org/documents/clean_cars_0304.pdf), accessed 6/24/08]

The costs of America's dangerous addiction to oil are mounting. Auto emissions are deeply implicated in global climate change, even if the Bush administration is still largely in denial about its risks. The wars on terrorism and with Iraq have highlighted the national security risks of our excessive dependence on imported oil.

All of this is fueling a public clamor for a different, less petro-centric energy policy. Yet, the debates in Washington are still mired in political gridlock.

For nearly half a century, transportation has accounted for about one-fourth of total U.S. energy use and two-thirds of total oil consumption. Tailpipe exhaust remains a leading source of air pollution and accounts for roughly one-third of the nation's emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), a key contributor to global warming. Clearly, any serious strategy to promote a cleaner, more secure energy future must be aimed at accelerating the use of newer, cleaner, and more fuel-efficient technologies.

While everyone, including the president, is focusing on the long-range promise of hydrogen as a replacement fuel for oil, that future is still more than a decade away. America cannot afford to waste another decade in which our economic, environmental, and national security is held hostage to our undiminished appetite for imported oil. We need action now.

## Extensions to Harms – Oil Dependence

### **( ) Demand for Transportation Fuel Forces the US to Rely Increasingly on Foreign Oil**

US Department of Energy '06 ["The President's Biofuels Initiative to Reduce Foreign Oil Dependence", accessed 6/24/08, [http://www.brdisolutions.com/Site%20Docs/BiomassInitFactsheet\\_imposed\\_web2.pdf](http://www.brdisolutions.com/Site%20Docs/BiomassInitFactsheet_imposed_web2.pdf)]

The United States has become increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil to meet its rapidly growing energy demand over the past 20 years. Crude oil imports increased 142 percent over the period 1984 to 2004 and the U.S. is now reliant on imports for 60 percent of its oil needs. Among the major factors leading the growth in foreign imports is the increasing demand for fuel in the transportation sector.

## Extensions to Solvency

### **( ) Biofuels Solve for Oil Dependence and Rural Economies**

Pew Center on Global Climate Change '06 ["Agriculture's Role in Greenhouse Gas Mitigation", September, <http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/Agriculture%27s%20Role%20in%20GHG%20Mitigation.pdf>, accessed 6/24/08]

Of equal importance is the role biomass can play in improving the energy security of the nation by dramatically reducing our dependence on petroleum as a source of liquid fuels for transportation and organic chemicals. Fourteen to 20 EJ per year of biomass energy supplies would represent as much as 57 to 82 percent of current U.S. petroleum energy used in on-road light- and heavy-duty vehicles. Finally, rural America has seen both economic and population declines, and the opportunity to turn American farms into a major source of energy and chemicals—in addition to providing food, feed, and fiber—could open new markets for U.S. farmers and revitalize the economy of rural America.

### **( ) Biofuels Boost Rural Economies and Reduce Oil Dependence**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

Moving America off oil by substituting homegrown biofuels for a substantial percentage of current consumption would make the country cleaner, safer, and wealthier. Reducing dependence on oil and growing energy domestically can help rural economies and keep U.S. dollars at home rather than sending them to hostile regimes. Crops grown for fuel also have the potential to mitigate against global warming by keeping greenhouse gases sequestered in plants and soil rather than releasing them to the upper atmosphere where they trap heat. Despite budgetary concerns and the power of entrenched overseas oil interests, the clear and present benefits of using biofuels demand that Congress act now to spur the creation of a robust biofuels industry in America.

## Extensions to Solvency

### **( ) Biofuels Solve for Oil Dependence, Global Warming, and the Agricultural Sector**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

Who can blame him for jumping on the bandwagon? There are in fact myriad reasons to promote biofuels like ethanol, biodiesel, and the coming generation of so-called "cellulosic" variants. For starters, biofuels are practical alternatives to oil. Unlike, say, hydrogen fuel-cell vehicle technologies -- which have only distant potential to be widely commercialized, and which would likely require a whole new service station infrastructure -- expanded use of biofuels will require minimal market adaptation. Corn ethanol already accounts for about 3 percent of the American automotive fuel consumption. Most car engines, without any modification, can run on a blend of 90 percent gasoline and 10 percent ethanol. And carmakers have built 5 million "flex-fuel" vehicles than can run on an increasingly popular blend of just 15 percent gasoline and 85 percent ethanol, known as E85. Meanwhile, most diesel engines manufactured since 1992 -- including the big-rigs, tractors, and other machines that do most of the nation's heavy lifting -- can run on biodiesel brewed from soybeans, peanuts, used cooking fats, animal fats, cottonseed, or canola.

Then, of course, there are the environmental benefits. Unlike gasoline made from oil, which releases carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) into the atmosphere when it is used in internal combustion engines, biofuels are "climate-neutral." Burning them does not add new greenhouse gases to the atmosphere, since the growth and destruction of the crops that biofuels are made from is part of the natural cycle of CO<sub>2</sub> absorption (during growth) and release (during destruction or decomposition).

## Extensions to Solvency – Price Floor

### **( ) Price Floor Incentivizes Biofuels**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

A third option would be to establish a price floor on oil to ensure that the volatility of the global oil market does not prevent the biofuels industry from flowering. Crude oil prices have fallen from a high of \$72 per barrel last summer to less than \$60 per barrel at the time this report went to press. Preventing the price from falling below \$50 per barrel would give farmers, fuel producers, and distributors the market certainty they need to increase their investments in biofuels.

When oil prices dip below \$50 a barrel, virtually no biofuel is economically competitive.

For example, during the summer of 2006, when oil was around \$70 a barrel and corn was selling at \$2.50 a bushel, ethanol makers earned a profit of 86 cents a gallon. By January 2007, oil dropped to nearly \$50 a barrel and corn rose above \$4 because of increasing demand. At these prices, ethanol producers incurred a loss of 21 cents for every gallon they produced. A \$50 price floor on oil, coupled with a policy agenda that spurs the development of cellulosic biofuels from biomass sources that are cheaper to grow than corn, would create the conditions for a viable market for alternative biofuels.

## Extensions to Solvency – FlexFuel

### **( ) FlexFuel Requirements Will Spur a Market for Biofuels**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 [David, Robert, and Jan, "Harvesting Fuel", April 23, accessed 4/25/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=153&contentID=254273)]

Require manufacturers to produce more vehicles that run on biofuels. About five million U.S. vehicles are already capable of running on high ethanol blends, such as E85, though the owners often are not aware of that feature. Progressives should spur further growth of the market for biofuels by requiring vehicle manufacturers to alert owners of existing "flex-fuel" vehicles. And Congress should require that manufacturers offer a flex-fuel option for every model of car and truck sold in America by 2015—a modification that costs as little as \$25 per vehicle.

## Extensions to Solvency – Rural Economy

### **( ) Biofuels Stimulate Rural Economic Development**

Energy Future Coalition '03 ["Challenge and Opportunity: Charting a New Energy Future", [http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/pubs/app\\_bioenergy.pdf](http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org/pubs/app_bioenergy.pdf), acc 6/24/08]

Accelerated development of industries that convert biomass to liquid fuels, polymers, and chemicals will provide new markets for farmers and stimulate rural economic development in the U.S. and throughout the world. In essence, the ability to convert cellulosic biomass to other products will allow farmers to harvest an additional cash crop from every field they plant. Wheat farmers, for example, could sell their straw along with their wheat. Rice straw, now a waste disposal problem, could become a source of revenue.

### **( ) FlexFuel Vehicles Reduce Motor Vehicle Oil Consumption by 60 Percent**

Feldstein, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, '03 [Martin, "Reducing America's Dependence on Foreign Oil Supplies", <http://www.nber.org/feldstein/oildependenceaea2003.pdf>, accessed 4/25/08]

Natural gas is not the only non-petroleum carbon fuel. All three major US car manufacturers also make full size cars and/or SUVs powered by engines that use a combination of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline. Shifting the stock of US cars to such an ethanol-gasoline mixed fuel would eliminate about 60 percent of the current use of oil for motor vehicle fuel. The overall net reduction in oil use would, however, depend on the extent to which oil was used as fuel for the fermentation and distillation of alcohol from corn or agricultural waste. The net reduction in oil use would be much greater if the ethanol is produced from agricultural waste, a feasible process but one that is not yet fully developed as a commercial technology.

## Extensions to Solvency – Rural Economy

### **( ) Transitioning to Biofuels Solves for Democracy, Terrorism, and War**

Center for Strategic and International Studies '02 ["Bioenergy: Background, Potential, and Policy, [http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd\\_et\\_al\\_2002.pdf](http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd_et_al_2002.pdf), accessed 6/24/08]

Among energy sources, by far the largest security issues are associated with oil supply, and "energy security" is essentially synonymous with "oil security" for most countries. Paraphrasing Senator Richard Lugar and former Director of Central Intelligence R. James Woolsey from their "The New Petroleum" article (Lugar and Woolsey, 2000):

Well over two-thirds of the world's remaining oil reserves lie in the Middle East (including the Caspian Sea). This unwelcome dependence keeps U.S. military forces tied to the Persian Gulf, forces foreign policy compromises, and sinks many developing nations into staggering debt as they struggle to pay for expensive dollar-dominated oil with lower-priced commodities and agricultural products. Dependence on the Middle East entails the risk of a repeat of the international crises of 1973, 1979, and 1990 – or worse. This growing reliance on Middle Eastern Oil not only adds to that region's disproportionate leverage but provides the resources with which rogue nations support international terrorism and develop weapons of mass destruction and the ballistic missiles to carry them.

If a transition from fossil fuels to biofuels becomes affordable, the world's security picture could be different in many ways. It would be impossible to form a cartel that would control production, manufacturing, and marketing. U.S. diplomacy and policies in the Middle East could be guided more by respect for democracy than by a need to protect oil supplies and accommodate oil-producing regimes. Our intrusive military presence in the region could be reduced, both ameliorating anti-American tensions and making U.S. involvement in a Middle Eastern war less likely. Other states would also reap benefits. Ukraine, rich in fertile land, would be less likely to be dominated over time by oil-rich Russia. China would feel less pressure to befriend Iran and Iraq or build a big navy to secure the oil of the South China Sea. The ability of oil-exporting countries to shape events would be increasingly limited. A transition to biofuels would democratize the world's energy markets.



## Biofuels Negative – Table of Contents

Oil Dependency Harms 1NC Frontline	130
Rural Economy Harms 1NC Frontline	134
Solvency 1NC Frontline	136
Oil Will Not Run Out	141
New Technology/Unconventional Oil	143
Biofuels Destroy Biodiversity	145

## Oil Dependence Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. The President's Biofuels Initiative is Already Increasing Energy Security**

US Department of Energy '06 ["The President's Biofuels Initiative to reduce foreign oil dependence", accessed 4/23/08, [http://www.brdisolutions.com/Site%20Docs/BiomassInitFactsheet\\_imposed\\_web2.pdf](http://www.brdisolutions.com/Site%20Docs/BiomassInitFactsheet_imposed_web2.pdf)]

The President's Biofuels Initiative responds directly to the clear need to improve the security of U.S. energy supply. It will support the aggressive EPA Act requirement of producing 7.5 billion gallons of biofuels for transportation market by 2012. Further, it will result in 60 billion gallons per year of additional domestic production capacity for biobased liquid transportation fuels by 2030, significantly reducing dependence on foreign oil. Biofuels have the added energy security benefit in that resources are widespread and production can be distributed across the U.S., eliminating risks associated with regional weather or natural disasters. For example, a natural disaster like Hurricane Katrina may have had less of an impact on our nation's energy had we relied more heavily on a resource dispersed about the country rather than centrally in the Gulf region.

### **2. Oil Supply Will Continue to Grow and Relieve Current Supply Pressures**

Yergin, chairman of Cambridge Energy Research Associates, '05 [Daniel, "It's Not the End of the Oil Age", July 31, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/07/29/AR2005072901672.html>, accessed 6/24/08]

Yet this fear is not borne out by the fundamentals of supply. Our new, field-by-field analysis of production capacity, led by my colleagues Peter Jackson and Robert Esser, is quite at odds with the current view and leads to a strikingly different conclusion: There will be a large, unprecedented buildup of oil supply in the next few years. Between 2004 and 2010, capacity to produce oil (not actual production) could grow by 16 million barrels a day -- from 85 million barrels per day to 101 million barrels a day -- a 20 percent increase. Such growth over the next few years would relieve the current pressure on supply and demand.

## Oil Dependence Harms 1NC Frontline

Where will this growth come from? It is pretty evenly divided between non-OPEC and OPEC. The largest non-OPEC growth is projected for Canada, Kazakhstan, Brazil, Azerbaijan, Angola and Russia. In the OPEC countries, significant growth is expected to occur in Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, Algeria and Libya, among others. Our estimate for growth in Iraq is quite modest -- only 1 million barrels a day -- reflecting the high degree of uncertainty there. In the forecast, the United States remains almost level, with development in the deep-water areas of the Gulf of Mexico compensating for declines elsewhere.

While questions can be raised about specific countries, this forecast is not speculative. It is based on what is already unfolding. The oil industry is governed by a "law of long lead times." Much of the new capacity that will become available between now and 2010 is under development. Many of the projects that embody this new capacity were approved in the 2001-03 period, based on price expectations much lower than current prices.

### **3. New Technology and Unconventional Sources Will Increase Oil Production**

Yergin, chairman of Cambridge Energy Research Associates, '05 [Daniel, "It's Not the End of the Oil Age", July 31, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/07/29/AR2005072901672.html>, accessed 6/24/08]

But this time, it is said, is "different." A common pattern in the shortage periods is to underestimate the impact of technology. And, once again, technology is key. "Proven reserves" are not necessarily a good guide to the future. The current Securities and Exchange Commission disclosure rules, which define "reserves" for investors, are based on 30-year-old technology and offer an incomplete picture of future potential. As skills improve, output from many producing regions will be much greater than anticipated. The share of "unconventional oil" -- Canadian oil sands, ultra-deep-water developments, "natural gas liquids" -- will rise from 10 percent of total capacity in 1990 to 30 percent by 2010. The "unconventional" will cease being frontier and will instead become "conventional." Over the next few years, new facilities will be transforming what are inaccessible natural gas reserves in different parts of the world into a quality, diesel-like fuel.

## Oil Dependence Harms 1NC Frontline

### **4. The Market is Self-Correcting- If Oil Grows Scarce, People Will Use Less**

Richman, senior fellow at The Future of Freedom Foundation, '01 [Sheldon, "Beware the Conservationists", <http://www.fff.org/comment/ed0301d.asp>, March, acc 4/24/08]

But let's be clear: There is no need for government conservation measures. They are premised on two fallacies: first, that a free society is wasteful and, second, that energy shortages are the long-term condition of humanity. Nonsense.

As everyone knows, when a resource becomes more scarce, its price goes up. And when its price goes up, people economize, use less — conserve. Thus the free market contains its own conservation principle. People may not consciously intend to conserve on the resource, but since they will be trying to control their household budgets, they will do so anyway. It's what Adam Smith had in mind when he coined the term "invisible hand." As long as energy is scarce — which means as long as there is a price to pay for it — people will be careful in their use. The surest way to create wasteful use is to keep the retail price artificially low. Exactly what California did!

While energy will always be scarce (though less and less so), there need not be shortages in which it cannot be found at all. In a free market, while consumers have an incentive to conserve, producers have an incentive to find new supplies and to develop alternatives. That incentive is the profit motive. Thus the key to abundant energy is to keep power away from those who despise profits.

## Oil Dependence Harms 1NC Frontline

### **5. If Necessary, the US Can Transition Smoothly Away From Oil**

Bailey, science correspondent for Reason magazine, '04 ["Are We Out of Gas Yet?", February 18, <http://www.reason.com/news/show/34766.html>, accessed 4/24/08]

Someday, of course, oil production really will peak, either for geologic or economic reasons, or most likely a combination of both. Instead of a catastrophe, Lynch expects a relatively smooth transition to new energy sources. And history bears out his optimism. Oil crisis mongers make the mistake of thinking that "markets are so myopic that they cannot foresee future supply trends; that markets won't realize when a resource is running out."

If demand for oil begins to outstrip the supply, prices will rise, signaling companies and consumers to use less, develop new technologies, switch to other fuels, increase their insulation, and so forth. "Demand for energy is going to move away from heavy hydrocarbons," Lynch predicts. "Coal is first, oil is next." He expects that our old hydrocarbon friends will be replaced in our affection by natural gas, nuclear, and other forms of energy as those technologies improve. "It will be much like the transition in the 20th century from coal to oil in the residential heating and transportation sectors or like the transition from horses to cars," he says. The Oil Age will end, not with a horrific screech leading to a destructive crash, but with a barely perceptible, well-lubricated, smoothly braked halt, one that is merely a prelude to moving smoothly and rapidly forward again.

## Rural Economy Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. Rural Sector Doing Well**

Seifried '08 [Dr. Edmund, "Wall Street's Bad News Overshadows Healthy Farm Sector", <http://www.mraeresources.com/focus/articles/?aid=134>, February, accessed 4/23/08]

Farm communities across the nation are enjoying a healthy resurgence. Net farm income will reach a record high of \$87.5 billion in 2007, according to the USDA's most recent forecast. That \$87.5 billion harvest represents a huge \$28.5 billion increase from the 2006 level and is more than \$30 billion above the 10-year average of \$57.4 billion. The previous record was \$85.9 billion earned in 2004.

The record income was even more remarkable given that farmers received lower government payments in 2007 and had to contend with record high farm production expenses. Those factors were more than offset by the escalation in commodity prices.

Prices for a number of major commodities have been higher throughout the year, and unexpectedly high for wheat, soybeans, and milk, among others. The higher prices available to U.S. farmers are principally resulting from strong demand from the domestic biofuels industry and from foreign buyers. As a result, farmers have lots of production to sell at high prices.

Moreover, despite higher costs, the values of both crop and livestock production – at \$148.5 billion and \$140 billion, respectively – are estimated to hit record levels in 2007.

## Rural Economy Harms 1NC Frontline

### **2. Agricultural Problems Will Not Spillover Into the Larger Economy**

Economic Research Service '08 ["Farming's Role in the Rural Economy", June, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/agoutlook/jun2000/ao272h.pdf>, acc 4/23/08]

The U.S. rural economy remains strong, despite low commodity prices that have besieged the farm sector in recent years. In most rural communities, problems in the farm sector have not spilled over to cause a general rural downturn. In fact, the unemployment rate in nonmetropolitan counties decreased as crop prices were falling, dropping to 4.25 percent in 1999. In general, the strength of the overall economy has sustained the rural economy.

While many view "rural" and "agriculture" as virtually synonymous, the ability of the rural economy to shake off severe problems in the agricultural sector is a reminder that agriculture is no longer the primary economic engine of rural America. Growth in other rural industries combined with structural changes in the farm sector have reduced farming's relative importance and altered traditional perceptions of farms.

This article, based on a forthcoming Economic Research Service (ERS) report, examines the changing role of agriculture in the rural economy and highlights two changes. First, the nonagricultural economy in rural America has grown steadily, outpacing growth in agriculture, so that agriculture's relative importance as a source of jobs and income has declined.

Second, the growing service orientation of the U.S. economy suggests that the key to survival and growth for rural communities is to develop and attract service-sector businesses.

## Solvency 1NC Frontline

### **1. Not Even Advanced Biofuels Can Solve for Oil Dependence**

Hayes, Ballentine, and Mazurek, senior fellows at the Progressive Policy Institute, '07 ["The Promise of Biofuels", March 6, accessed 4/23/08, [http://www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?contentid=254211&subsecid=149&knlgAreaID=116)]

Second, even when the next generation of cellulosics have arrived -- which will take a number of years under any circumstance -- biofuels will still not constitute a silver bullet solution to America's oil addiction. Lawmakers must also aggressively spur the development and commercialization of other fuel-saving transportation technologies that are currently available or close at hand, such as hybrid-electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid-electric vehicles, a topic explored in a companion report to this one. Plug-in hybrids with flex-fuel capabilities will be able to travel up to 500 miles on a gallon of gasoline blended with 5 gallons of ethanol. Widespread use of such vehicles would indeed amount to a radical break from the country's current oil dependency.



## Solvency 1NC Frontline

### **2. Turn: Biofuel Production Increases Domestic Use of Corn, Driving Up Food Prices Around the Globe, Starving Billions, and Collapsing the World Economy**

Brown, president of the Earth Policy Institute, '06 [Lester, "Exploding U.S. Grain Demand for Automotive Fuel Threatens World Food Security and Political Stability", September 6, <http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/2006/Update60.htm>, accessed 4/23/08]

Corn importers like Japan, Egypt, and Mexico are also worried that the likely reduction in U.S. corn exports, which are 70 percent of the world total, will disrupt their livestock and poultry industries. In some importing countries in sub-Saharan Africa and in Mexico, corn is the staple food. In the United States corn supplies sweetener for soft drinks and is used in breakfast cereals, but most corn is consumed indirectly. The milk, eggs, cheese, chicken, ham, ground beef, ice cream, and yogurt in the typical refrigerator are all produced with corn. In effect, the refrigerator is filled with corn. And the price of every item in the refrigerator is affected by the price of corn.

Wheat and corn prices have climbed by a third or more over the past several months. Corn and wheat futures are both trading at 10-year highs. With corn stocks at the lowest level on record and demand soaring, corn prices appear headed for historic highs. Wheat and rice prices will likely follow corn prices upward. By the end of 2007, the emerging competition between the 800 million automobile owners who want to maintain their mobility and the world's 2 billion poorest people who want simply to survive will be on center stage. If grain prices do climb to all-time highs, food riots and political instability in lower-income countries that import grain, such as Indonesia, Nigeria, Mexico, and scores of other countries, could disrupt global economic progress.

This clash between motorists and people over the food supply is occurring when 854 million of the world's people are chronically hungry and malnourished and some 24,000 of them, mostly children, die each day. The U.N. Millennium Development Goal of reducing by half the proportion of people suffering from hunger by 2015 is now failing as the number who are hungry edges upward, and it could collapse completely in the face of the food-for-cars onslaught.

## Solvency 1NC Frontline

### **3. "Dead Zones" Turn**

#### **a. Biofuel Production Leaks Nitrates Into Ground Water, Causing Oxygen Depleted "Dead Zones" in the Gulf of Mexico**

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy '07 ["Biofuels and Global Water Challenges", October, accessed 4/23/08,  
<http://www.iatp.org/iatp/publications.cfm?accountID=451&refID=100547>]

Depending on practices associated with growing corn, and the regulations regarding plant effluents, biofuel production can have varying impacts on water quality as well. For example, since corn is the most nitrogen intensive of major field crops, excess nitrates move down through the soil and leach into ground water, contaminating both soil and water sources. Nutrient leaching from farm land around the Mississippi River and its tributaries have contributed to high rates of algae growth in the Gulf of Mexico. This in turn has caused hypoxia (oxygen depletion) in the Gulf. Pesticide contamination and sediment erosion also impact the quality of water.

In October 2007, the National Academies of Sciences in the United States issued a report looking into the water implications of biofuel production in the United States. The report warns that "if projected increases in the use of corn for ethanol production occur, the harm to water quality could be considerable, and water supply problems at the regional and local levels could also arise." It calls for policy interventions that will move away from current ethanol production practices that use corn as a feedstock, and suggests policy options to ensure that biofuels development in the U.S. adopts sustainable production strategies.

## Solvency 1NC Frontline

### **b. These Dead Zones Threaten Human Survival**

Environmental News Service '99 ["Human Impact Triggers Massive Extinctions", August, <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/aug1999/1999-08-02-06.asp>, accessed 4/23/08]

Humanity's impact on the earth has increased extinction rates to levels rivaling the five mass extinctions of past geologic history, transformed nearly half of Earth's land and created 50 dead zones in the world's oceans, according to research being presented this week at the 16th International Botanical Congress.

Delegates at the world's largest gathering of plant scientists, which opened Friday, heard a seven point plan to slow the extinction rates of plants around the world. The Congress has brought together some 5,000 scientists from more than 100 countries to discuss the importance of plants for human survival and improved quality of life, and to announce breakthrough research in the field of plant science.

Two studies being discussed find that humans have gravely altered the chemistry, biology and physical structure of the Earth's land and water. What scientists are calling the "human footprint on Earth" is increasingly impairing the planet's ability to maintain the quality of human life, and may lead to the loss of up to two-thirds of all plant and animal species during the second half of the 21st century.

#### Earth's Water Resources in Trouble

"We're degrading the water, changing our coastlines, filling in our estuaries, and changing our rivers," says Dr. Jane Lubchenco of Oregon State University, author of "Environmental Science and Engineering for the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the National Science Foundation." Lubchenko specializes in marine biology and zoology and their relation to climate change.

Dr. Lubchenco, past president of both the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Ecological Society of America, warns, "We're witnessing many signals of the problems that will result from these changes, including toxic algal blooms, coral bleaching and sudden disappearance of fish from key fisheries."

## Solvency 1NC Frontline

Lubchenko and coauthors Harold Mooney and Peter Vitousek of Stanford University found that close to 50 percent of the land surface of the planet has been transformed by humans through actions such as filling in wetlands, converting tall grass prairies into cornfields, or converting forests into urban areas. Humans have also more than doubled the amount of available nitrogen in the environment because of excess fertilizer use and burning of fossil fuel.

Lubchenko points out that while human domination of land masses is clear, the new data also indicates a dramatic alteration of Earth's oceans. There are now some 50 "dead zones" in the world's coastal areas, she says. The largest in the Western Hemisphere is in the Gulf of Mexico, caused by excess nitrogen and phosphorus flowing down the Mississippi River.

"We've long thought of oceans as having an infinite ability to provide food and other goods and services to humans. But the massive human-wrought changes in our oceans are impairing their ability to function as we assume they will," says Lubchenko.

Lubchenko lists problems facing the world's waterways, including loss of mangrove forests and invasive marine species carried in ships' ballast waters. About 3,000 species of marine life are in transit in ballast water of ships around the world, Lubchenko says.

The changes humans have set in motion on a global scale will impair the Earth's ability to provide a wide range of services to human life. "In addition to the direct services of food, fiber, shelter, and medicines, many other inter-dependent services are being disrupted," Lubchenko says.

### **4. It Will Take Decades to Make Biofuels Available on a Large Scale**

Center for Strategic and International Studies '02 ["Bioenergy: Background, Potential, and Policy, [http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd\\_et\\_al\\_2002.pdf](http://i-farmtools.org/ref/Lynd_et_al_2002.pdf), 6/24/08]

The matter of the potential sufficiency and limits of biomass resources for fuel production is most important to consider in a timeframe for which such limits could conceivably be met or exceeded. Even given an aggressive effort, several decades would likely be required in most countries to develop the infrastructure needed to produce biomass derived fuels on a scale large enough to make resource availability an issue.

## Oil Will Not Run Out

### **( ) Oil Resources Will Never Be Scarce Enough to Trigger War**

Rist '99 [Curtis, "Why We'll Never Run Out of Oil," October 1,  
<http://discovermagazine.com/1999/jun/featoil>, accessed 4/24/08]

This year, wells around the world—from the sands of Saudi Arabia to the deep continental trench off the coast of Brazil—will pump some 75 million barrels of oil each day to satisfy demand. That's about 25 billion barrels a year, and the number is climbing at a rate between 2 and 3 percent a year. Barring a worldwide recession, the U.S. Energy Information Administration believes the world will be consuming around 110 million barrels a day by the year 2020. And it looks as though we won't be running short by then either. "It's hard for people who remember the seventies to accept this, but I believe we'll never 'run out' of oil the way the pessimists used to think," says Michael Lynch, a political scientist at MIT.

"People think of the Earth as having a certain amount of oil the way you might have a certain amount of money in your bank account," adds Daniel Yergin, chairman of Cambridge Energy Research Associates, who wrote *The Prize*, a history of oil, and *The Commanding Heights*, a study of market forces and the energy industry. "But in reality, the ultimate amount available to us is determined both by economics and technology." So even though the United States has already spent more than half its domestic oil reserves on its energy-hungry economy, the gloom-and-doom predictions of the seventies were averted because of advances in oil technology and colossal new oil finds in West Africa, Colombia, and Russia. And Roger Anderson, director of the energy research center at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, expects the future will hold more of the same. "If you pay smart people enough money," he says, "they'll figure out all sorts of ways to get the oil you need."

## Oil Will Not Run Out

### **( ) Oil Output Will Continue to Rise**

Mortished, World Business Editor, '08 [Carl, "World Not Running Out of Oil, Say Experts", January 18,  
[http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry\\_sectors/natural\\_resources/article3207311.ece](http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/natural_resources/article3207311.ece)]

Doom-laden forecasts that world oil supplies are poised to fall off the edge of a cliff are wide of the mark, according to leading oil industry experts who gave warning that human factors, not geology, will drive the oil market.

A landmark study of more than 800 oilfields by Cambridge Energy Research Associates (Cera) has concluded that rates of decline are only 4.5 per cent a year, almost half the rate previously believed, leading the consultancy to conclude that oil output will continue to rise over the next decade.

Peter Jackson, the report's author, said: "We will be able to grow supply to well over 100million barrels per day by 2017." Current world oil output is in the region of 85million barrels a day.

## New Technology/Unconventional Oil Extensions

### **( ) New Technology Will Continue to Increase Oil Output**

Mortished, World Business Editor, '08 [Carl, "World Not Running Out of Oil, Say Experts", January 18,  
[http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry\\_sectors/natural\\_resources/article3207311.ece](http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/natural_resources/article3207311.ece)]

Cera reckons that oil output, including unconventional oil, such as tar sands, could allow oil to peak at much higher levels of as much as 112 million barrels per day, with average rates of more than 100million bpd.

The Cera analysis targeted oilfields producing more than 10,000 barrels a day of conventional oil and concluded that overall output was declining at a rate of 4.5 per cent a year and that field decline rates were not increasing.

This is much lower than the 7 to 8percent average rate that is generally assumed in the industry. Typically, Peak Oil theorists believe that the output of oil reserves can be plotted on a graph as a bell curve, rising to a peak and then falling rapidly.

It was proposed in 1950 by M King Hubbert, a US geologist, who successfully predicted the peak of onshore oil production in the United States.

His analysis is disputed by many geologists today, who argue that technology has changed the equation, allowing oil companies to produce more oil from reservoirs than was previously possible.

Meanwhile, increases in the price of oil has made the extraction of difficult reserves economically viable.

## New Technology/Unconventional Oil Extensions

### **( ) Technological Advances Will Make New Supplies of Oil Accessible**

Deming, National Center for Policy Analysis, '03 [David, "Are We Running Out of Oil?", January 29, <http://www.ncpa.org/pub/bg/bg159/>, accessed 6/24/08]

With every passing year it becomes possible to exploit oil resources that could not have been recovered with old technologies. The first American oil well drilled in 1859 by Colonel Edwin Drake in Titusville, Pa. — which was actually drilled by a local blacksmith known as Uncle Billy Smith — reached a total depth of 69 feet.

- Today's drilling technology allows the completion of wells up to 30,000 feet (9,144 meters) deep.
- The vast petroleum resources of the world's submerged continental margins are accessible from offshore platforms that allow drilling in water depths to 9,000 feet (2,743 meters).
- The amount of oil recoverable from a single well has greatly increased because new technologies allow the boring of multiple horizontal shafts from a single vertical shaft.
- Four-dimensional seismic imaging enables engineers and geologists to see a subsurface petroleum reservoir drain over months to years, allowing them to increase the efficiency of its recovery.

New techniques and new technology have increased the efficiency of oil exploration. The success rate for exploratory petroleum wells has increased 50 percent over the past decade, according to energy economist Michael C. Lynch.

### **( ) Unconventional Oil Will Offset Shortages**

Rist '99 [Curtis, "Why We'll Never Run Out of Oil," October 1, <http://discovermagazine.com/1999/jun/featoil>, accessed 4/24/08]

When and if supplies of natural gas begin to run out, the oil companies will focus on squeezing usable fuels out of even more difficult prospects. Already, the Canadians are starting to mine the tar sands of Alberta, where an estimated 300 billion barrels of oil are trapped. And Venezuelans are beginning to excavate the solid tarry deposits of the Orinoco sludge belt, which contains as much as 1 trillion barrels of oil. If those supplies run out, there's always coal—the most abundant and environmentally damaging of all fuels. Ninety percent of the world's fossil fuels are contained in these remnants of swamps. Tapping it and converting it to liquid fuels (a process nobody has fully mastered yet) could yield a supply lasting a millennium.



## Biofuels Destroy Biodiversity

### **( ) Biofuels Lead to Deforestation and Ecosystem Destruction**

Barry, political ecologist and conservation biologist, '07 [Clean Coal, Forest Biofuel, and Other Fairy Tales, <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2007/01/clean-coal-forest-biofuel-and-other.html>, January 21, accessed 6/23/08]

The world's forests have been hammered for millennia; and are barely able to continue providing ecosystem services of cycling of nutrients, energy and water while providing for traditional wood products. Removal of forest biomass and agricultural residues from natural ecosystems and human agro-ecosystems at the industrial scale envisioned will be yet one more massive drain upon the Earth's net primary productivity. The woody forest "waste" materials to be used; including forest slash, thinning, bark and sawdust are the nutrient materials that new forests depend upon.

Surely woody biomass requirements will be met by vast plantations of genetically modified fiber bearing plants and/or by encroaching into regenerating forests and land used to grow food. A large biofuel industry based upon ethanol from cellulose will lead to greater deforestation, forest diminishment and degradation of agricultural lands. Ancient forests will be replaced to grow genetically modified crops in plantations, regenerating secondary forests will be logged into further decline, and land use will shift from food to fiber even as soils become more degraded. One must only look at oil palm in Asia, sugar cane and soya in Brazil and corn in the U.S. to see this is true. To presume that the massive energy needs of the world can be met by already overworked and still diminishing forest and agricultural ecosystems is true folly.

### **( ) Biofuels Industry Only Worsens Ecological Sustainability**

Barry, political ecologist and conservation biologist, '07 [Glen, "Bursting Biofuels' Bubble", April 25, <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2006/04/bursting-biofuels-bubble.html>, accessed 6/25/08]

Interest is rising regarding climate change and energy security, but the true extent and nature of the Earth's environmental problems are not being recognized. Proposed solutions are often inadequate, such as the idea that hybrid cars can appreciably make the world's car culture sustainable. In the case of recently much hyped biofuels, the impacts upon the environment caused by further industrial resource intensive agriculture makes the solution equally bad if not worse than the problem. A large scale embrace of industrial biofuel will further harm prospects for global ecological sustainability.

## Biofuels Destroy Biodiversity

### **( ) Biofuels Destroy the Environment and Biodiversity in Multiple Ways**

Barry, political ecologist and conservation biologist, '07 ["Bursting Biofuels' Bubble"  
<http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2006/04/bursting-biofuels-bubble.html>]

In the race to embrace biofuels I have seen little discussion of the apocalyptic harm agriculture has caused to the environment historically, nor the significant pressures modern agriculture continues to place upon natural life-giving ecosystems. Most terrestrial ecosystem destruction throughout history has resulted from agricultural conversion for farmland. Industrial agriculture causes water scarcity due to excessive irrigation, a toxic cocktail of agricultural chemicals which pervades food chains, and widespread soil erosion, infertility and even desertification.

To feed the human enterprise we are already using some 40% of the sun's energy captured by plants and over 40% of the Earth's surface is already comprised of agricultural lands. Around the world the last life giving large natural ecosystems are being razed - in such places as the Amazon and Asian rainforests - to feed an exponentially growing population of six billion (which was one billion 150 years ago and is expected to reach at least nine billion mid-century). Greater agricultural efficiency has always led to more people and less nature.

Even supposing biofuels yield an appreciable surplus of energy after subtracting the energy necessary for their production (which is far from certain), there is no way enough biomass could ever be grown to meet a significant portion of current, much less anticipated, world energy needs without causing great environmental harm.

Resource intensive agricultural biofuel monocrops will unalterably and perhaps fatally continue the undermining of the biological foundation of life, intensifying existing loss of biodiversity and ecosystems. The Earth's remaining natural and ancient forests will become further endangered as pressures increase to expand agricultural lands and provide more forest biomass - the last thing the world's dwindling forests need.

Locally produced biofuels that are certified to have minimized ecological impacts may be an important part a comprehensive program to move local economies towards relocalized sustainability. But on the international agro-industrial scale which they are being proposed they are certain to further greatly degrade land and water ecosystems while prolonging the era of binge like non-sustainable energy consumption and population growth.

## Cap and Trade Affirmative – Table of Contents

1AC	148
Answers to Regions/States Solving	160
Answers to No Warming Now	161
Answers to IPCC Wrong	163
Answers to Sun Causes Warming	164
Answers to Species Adapt/Resilient	165
Answers to No Sea Level Rise	166
Answers to Hurts Economy	168
Answers to Soft Power Dead	169
Answers to Iraq Kills Soft Power	170
Answers to Soft Power Not Important	171
Answers to European Examples	173
Answers to Only Easy Solutions	175
Answers to Hurts the Poor	176
Answers to Solvency- Alternative Energy	177

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **Contention One: Inherency. American Policy Fails to Promote Alternative Energy.**

#### **A. Special interests have paralyzed America's government, entrenching fossil fuel energy paths. The result is an inadequate global commitment to a transition to alternative energy.**

Ross Gelbspan, 30-year veteran journalist, The American Prospect June 18, 2007  
<http://www.heatisonline.org/contentserver/objecthandlers/index.cfm?id=6487&method=full>

The United States, as the world's most disproportionate energy consumer, is in a position either to lead an energy transition, or to thwart it. A pro-active U.S. role has been blocked by both the Bush administration and big oil and coal. Beginning in the early 1990s, the coal industry mounted an extensive campaign of deception and disinformation, covertly paying a tiny handful of "greenhouse skeptics" several million dollars and buying them a great deal of air time to persuade the public and policy-makers that climate change was either nonexistent, negligible, or due to natural causes. As recently as October 2006, President Bush tapped Lee Raymond, the recently retired chief executive of ExxonMobil, to help chart America's energy future. Despite Bush's belated admission in his 2007 State of the Union address that climate change is real, Bush's policies are essentially unchanged and the White House has become the East Coast branch office of ExxonMobil and Peabody coal. The Democrats are only marginally better. Climate change has become the preeminent case study of the contamination of our political system by money.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **B. The Congress has rejected numerous pieces of energy legislation.**

Solar Nation, The Politics of Climate Change, March 24, 2008  
<http://www.solar-nation.org/2008/03/24/the-politics-of-climate-change/>

Since this Congress has so far been unable to pass meaningful legislation to promote clean energy (see above), attention must inevitably soon turn to another, longer-term energy cauldron that's been bubbling in the back room for many a month. The U.S. Senate has seen the birth of at least nine bills in the last year intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but most have been stillborn, lacking the nourishment of either Congressional or activist support. The currently surviving bill, "America's Climate Security Act", co-sponsored by senators John Warner (R-VA) and Joe Lieberman (I-CT), is showing more signs of life than its moribund siblings, having recently passed out of committee stage with a detectable pulse. It may yet be torn limb from limb, however, with fossil fuel-friendly senators pulling one way and environmental groups the other, since in its present form it makes the mistake of trying to be centrist enough to please everybody. Congress has yet to internalize the lesson that some bills are critical enough to our future that they should be passed even if some parochial interests are offended.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **C. The Warner-Lieberman legislation is fatally flawed.**

Solar Nation, The Politics of Climate Change, March 24, 2008  
<http://www.solar-nation.org/2008/03/24/the-politics-of-climate-change/>

The single biggest shortcoming of S2191 is that the long-term (2050) emissions reduction target, the sine qua non of any bill claiming to address climate change, is only 55-65 percent below 2005 levels, a figure that most climatologists agree will not stabilize global temperatures to avoid the most dangerous impacts of climate change. The target, it is felt, needs to be increased to 80 percent to be effective. Further:

\* The bill covers most facilities in industry, electric utilities, refineries, and natural gas commercial and residential heating, which make up about 80 percent of the economy. If it is to be effective, the bill should cover the entire economy.

\* The bill initially gives away 72.5% of emission allowances, and continues to do so until 2030, when it still gives away 29.5% and auctions the rest. As European experience has shown, such giveaways produce windfall profits for polluters and do very little for pollution reduction. All allowances should be auctioned, to create incentives for pollution control activities and to generate revenue for clean energy programs.

\* The bill allows polluters to offset so much of their pollution with sponsorship of carbon-reducing projects elsewhere that they can achieve all the reductions required between now and 2020 without cleaning up their own operation at all. The offset figure should be kept low enough to force polluters to remove the beam from their own eye instead of tinkering with the speck in someone else's; otherwise, we will reach 2020 without having made the technological advances needed to achieve the much steeper cuts in emissions that will then be needed.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **Contention Two. Harms.**

#### **Harm Scenario A: Runaway Global Warming**

##### **1. An overwhelming number of scientific observations confirm that the accelerated burning of fossil fuels, not natural causes, is causing global warming.**

Joseph Romm, senior fellow, Center for American Progress, February 27, 2008  
[www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/02/27/global\\_warming\\_deniers/index.html](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/02/27/global_warming_deniers/index.html)

Over and over again, scientists have demonstrated that observed changes in the climate in recent decades can only be explained by taking into account the observed combination of human and natural forcings. Natural forcings alone just don't explain what is happening to this planet. For instance, in April 2005, one of the nation's top climate scientists, NASA's James Hansen, led a team of scientists that made "precise measurements of increasing ocean heat content over the past 10 years," which revealed that the Earth is absorbing far more heat than it is emitting to space, confirming what earlier computer models had shown about warming. Hansen called this energy imbalance the "smoking gun" of climate change, and said, "There can no longer be genuine doubt that human-made gases are the dominant cause of observed warming." Another 2005 study, led by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, compared actual ocean temperature data from the surface down to hundreds of meters (in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans) with climate models and concluded: A warming signal has penetrated into the world's oceans over the past 40 years. The signal is complex, with a vertical structure that varies widely by ocean; it cannot be explained by natural internal climate variability or solar and volcanic forcing, but is well simulated by two anthropogenically [human-caused] forced climate models. We conclude that it is of human origin, a conclusion robust to observational sampling and model differences. Such studies are also done for many other observations: land-based temperature rise, atmospheric temperature rise, sea level rise, arctic ice melt, inland glacier melt, Greenland and Antarctic ice sheet melt, expansion of the tropics (desertification) and changes in precipitation. Studies compare every testable prediction from climate change theory and models (and suggested by paleo-climate research) to actual observations. How many studies? Well, the IPCC's definitive treatment of the subject, "Understanding and Attributing Climate Change," has 11 full pages of references, some 500 peer-reviewed studies. This is not a consensus of opinion. It is what scientific research and actual observations reveal.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **2. Climate change threatens the lives of billions of people through droughts, flooding, and infectious diseases.**

Carlos Pascual, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, THE GEOPOLITICS OF ENERGY: FROM SECURITY TO SURVIVAL, January 2008 p. 1

These traditional geopolitical considerations have become even more complex with global climate change. The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has irrefutably documented that the use of fossil fuels is the principal cause of greenhouse gases that are driving up the temperature of the planet. Climate change will create severe flooding and droughts, which will devastate many countries' food production, lead to the spread of various illnesses, and cause hundreds of thousands of deaths per year, particularly for those living in the developing world. Nearly two billion people were affected by climate related disasters in the 1990s and that rate may double in the next decade.

### **3. The very survival of the planet is at stake.**

Carlos Pascual, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, THE GEOPOLITICS OF ENERGY: FROM SECURITY TO SURVIVAL, January 2008 p. 9-10

Avoiding the destruction of the planet through the emission of greenhouse gases is one of the most complex challenges that we, as the collective human race, have ever created for ourselves. Our very survival is at stake. The difficulties lie in the intersection of earth sciences, technology, economics and politics. The emission of greenhouse gases will have the same impact regardless of the source – whether Beijing, Detroit or Newcastle. Hence it is impossible to solve the global problem without involving all states. The problem of climate change, due to the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent), was created by the industrialized world, so emerging market economies resent that they must share the cost in addressing the problem.



## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **Harm Scenario B: American Leadership**

#### **1. America's ability to address numerous international problems that threaten our security is undermined by our declining reputation in the world.**

John J. Hamre, President and CEO, CSIS COMMISSION ON SMART POWER, 2007 p.3  
[http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\\_csis\\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/](http://www.csis.org/component/option,com_csis_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/)

We have all seen the poll numbers and know that much of the world today is not happy with American leadership. Even traditional allies have questioned American values and interests, wondering whether they are compatible with their own. We do not have to be loved, but we will never be able to accomplish our goals and keep Americans safe without mutual respect. There is a moment of opportunity today for our political leaders to strike off on a big idea that balances a wiser internationalism with the desire for protection at home. Washington may be increasingly divided, but Americans are unified in wanting to improve their country's image in the world and their own potential for good. We see the same hunger in other countries for a more balanced American approach and revitalized American interest in a broader range of issues than just terrorism. And we hear everywhere that any serious problem in the world demands U.S. involvement. Of course, we all know the challenges before us. The center of gravity in world affairs is shifting to Asia. The threat America faces from nuclear proliferation, terrorist organizations with global reach, and weak and reckless states cannot be easily contained and is unlikely to diminish in our lifetime. As the only global superpower, we must manage multiple crises simultaneously while regional competitors can focus their attention and efforts. A globalized world means that vectors of prosperity can quickly become vectors of insecurity. These challenges put a premium on strengthening capable states, alliances, partnerships, and institutions. In this complex and dynamic world of changing demands, we greatly benefit from having help in managing problems.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **2. American leadership, including effective use of our military strength, will increasingly depend on "soft power" mechanisms.**

Joseph Nye, Professor of International Relations, Harvard, Belfer Center, South China Morning Post, March 18, 2008  
[http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18173/america\\_must\\_learn\\_the\\_hard\\_facts\\_of\\_soft\\_power.html](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18173/america_must_learn_the_hard_facts_of_soft_power.html)

The American presidential race commands attention around the world. The fact that the final three contenders include a woman, an African American, and an older man who often challenged his own party suggests that the United States, after a decline in popularity during the Bush years, retains a capacity to reinvent itself. But the next president must recognise that the nature of leadership is also changing. The information revolution is transforming politics and organisations. People today have become less deferential to authority in organisations and in politics. Soft power — the ability to get what you want by attraction rather than coercion or payment — is becoming more important. Even the military faces these changes. The Pentagon reports that American army drillmasters do "less shouting at everyone", because today's generation responds better to instructors who play "a more counseling-type role". Of course, the hard power of command remains important. Hard and soft power are related, because they are both approaches to achieving one's objectives by affecting the behavior of others. Hard and soft power can reinforce or undermine each other. In response to al-Qaeda's terrorist attacks on the US, Vice-President Dick Cheney argued that strong military action would deter further attacks. But the indiscriminate use of hard power — illustrated by the invasion of Iraq, the Abu Ghraib prison photos, and detentions without trial — served to increase the number of terrorist recruits. The absence of an effective soft power component undercut the strategic response to terrorism.

**Thus we offer the following plan: The United States should implement a cap-and-trade policy with a goal of reducing its global warming pollution emissions at least 20 percent below 2000 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 2000 levels by 2050. The cap should cover all major sources of emissions and all major heat-trapping gas emissions. A substantial majority of allowances should be auctioned, using auction revenues to invest in alternative energy.**

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **Contention Three: Solvency**

#### **A. A cap-and-trade system would create strong *incentives* for moving away from fossil fuel use and toward development of alternative energy.**

Union of Concerned Scientists, "Global Warming Solutions" 2007  
[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/solutions/cap-and-trade.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/cap-and-trade.html)

Under a cap-and-trade program, the federal government would establish an economy-wide cap on emissions, measured in metric tons of CO2 equivalent, and tighten that cap over time. It then would issue "emissions allowances" that correspond to a specific number of metric tons of carbon. The total number of allowances would match the cap. The program would require electric utilities, refineries, and other sources of global warming pollution to have an allowance for each ton of their emissions. Polluters would acquire allowances during the initial distribution or by trading for them in an "allowance market." This market would enable polluters that are able to reduce their emissions relatively cheaply to sell allowances to those that are unable to do so, thereby establishing a market price for carbon. The program would create an **incentive** for polluting facilities to implement the most cost-effective emissions reduction options and, by putting a price on global warming pollution, encourage investments in new low-carbon technologies.

#### **B. An "80 percent" target is an essential element.**

Union of Concerned Scientists, "Global Warming Solutions" 2007  
[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/solutions/cap-and-trade.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/cap-and-trade.html)

According to a Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) analysis, even with aggressive action by industrialized and developing countries, the United States would have to cut its emissions by at least 80 percent from 2000 levels by 2050. This daunting task will require countries to quickly deploy clean energy technologies and develop new low-carbon technologies, using a combination of policies to help spur these activities. Foremost among them is a well-designed cap-and-trade program, which would put a price on carbon emissions that reflects the costs of global warming. This must be coupled with strengthened efficiency standards, incentives, and public investment in clean technologies and infrastructure. A carbon tax—which has attracted some attention recently on Capitol Hill—also could be part of the solution, but it would not guarantee necessary emissions reductions without an emissions cap in place.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **C. America is the key nation for creating sufficient global will, including in China and India, to address the problem of climate change.**

Carlos Pascual, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, THE GEOPOLITICS OF ENERGY: FROM SECURITY TO SURVIVAL, January 2008 p. 12

Among these groups, the United States has the capacity to be a pivotal figure. China and India will not move toward more responsible international policies if the United States does not set the example. Along with Europe and Japan, the United States has the capacity to demonstrate that green technology and conservation can be compatible with growth and a foreign policy that is more independent of energy suppliers. The United States also stands to benefit from accelerated commercialization of green technologies and the development of global markets in energy efficient and clean energy technologies. But the ability of the United States to lead will fundamentally depend on domestic action: whether it will undertake on a national basis a systematic strategy to price carbon and curb emissions. If it does, the scale and importance of the American market can be a driver for global change. If not, then the United States will find that over time the opportunity for leadership to curb climate change will be replaced by crisis management as localized wars, migration, poverty and humanitarian catastrophes increasingly absorb our international attention and resources, eventually coming back to our own borders in a way that will make the Katrina disaster seem relatively small.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **D. An American cap-and-trade policy would create an incentive for alternatives and is essential for U.S. global leadership.**

Elliot Diringer, Pew Center on Global Climate Change, Testimony for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 24, 2008  
<http://www.pewclimate.org/testimony/diringer/01.24.08>

The success of the Bali Roadmap depends ultimately on the willingness of each of the world's major economies to assume and fulfill a binding commitment commensurate with its responsibilities and its capabilities. The willingness of other countries to assume such commitments will depend in large measure on the willingness of the United States. As the world's largest economy and largest historic emitter, the United States has a singular responsibility not only to reduce its own emissions but also to lead the international community in forging an effective global response. To date, the United States has failed to deliver on either score. In our view, the United States must do three things to reverse this record and set the stage for a post-2012 agreement. First, Congress and the President must move as quickly as possible to enact mandatory domestic legislation to limit and reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. As a founding member of the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, or USCAP, the Pew Center strongly supports the establishment of a cap-and-trade system as the centerpiece of a mandatory federal program with the goal of reducing U.S. emissions 60 to 80 percent by 2050. We are very encouraged by the progress achieved in the Senate toward enactment of such a program, and are fully committed to working with you and your colleagues towards that end. Domestically, a mandatory market-based program will stimulate technology development and deployment and give U.S. businesses the certainty and incentives they need to reduce emissions as cost-effectively as possible. Internationally, a mandatory domestic target will enable the United States to negotiate with greater confidence and credibility. Having resolved what it is prepared to do at home, the United States will know far better what it is prepared to deliver abroad. And, having taken concrete action to meet its responsibilities, it can more credibly call on other countries to fulfill theirs.

## Cap and Trade 1AC

### **E. American action on greenhouse gas limitations would provide a broader platform for American leadership through “smart power”.**

Center for Security and International Studies, COMMISSION ON SMART POWER, 2007 p.58

[http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\\_csis\\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/](http://www.csis.org/component/option,com_csis_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/)

A world, however, that establishes a global consensus on the cost of carbon could breathe life into new and emerging sectors of the economy, provide new avenues for U.S. economic growth, and provide a platform for U.S. global leadership on a major issue of concern to the global economy. U.S. leadership to shape a new energy framework in a carbon-constrained world offers a unique opportunity to alter the geopolitics of energy, improve energy security, reinvigorate the spirit of innovation and entrepreneurialism, and engage disenfranchised portions of the developing world. A smart power approach to energy security and climate should focus on what Americans have long done best—innovating.

### **F. Smart power will help us work with our allies to address global problems.**

Center for Security and International Studies, COMMISSION ON SMART POWER, 2007 p.58

[http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\\_csis\\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/](http://www.csis.org/component/option,com_csis_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/)

Investing in the global good is not charity. It is smart foreign policy. America’s allies and friends look to it for ideas and solutions, not lectures. The goal of U.S. foreign policy should be to prolong and preserve American preeminence as an agent for good. Achieving this goal is impossible without strong and willing allies and partners who can help the United States to determine and act on priorities. America should have higher ambitions than being popular, but foreign opinion matters to U.S. decision-making. A good reputation fosters goodwill and brings acceptance for unpopular ventures. Helping other nations and individuals achieve their aspirations is the best way to strengthen America’s reputation abroad.

## Answer to: U.S. Already Leading Now

- 1. Extend the Gelbspan 1AC evidence – the Bush administration has blocked a proactive U.S. role in international energy leadership – even the new Warner-Lieberman legislation is inadequate.**
- 2. The 2007 Energy Bill Lacked Meaningful Support For Alternative Energy Production.**

Daniel J. Weiss, Center For American Progress, February 25, 2008  
[http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/02/investments\\_energy.html](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/02/investments_energy.html)

Renewable energy and energy efficiency are key elements in our transformation from a high carbon, oil dependent economy to a sustainable low carbon economy. The Energy Independence and Security Act, P.L. 110-140, enacted late in 2007, includes many important renewable and efficiency measures, including better motor vehicle fuel economy standards and a sustainable biofuels mandate. Yet at the 11th hour, President Bush and Senate conservatives removed a package of additional economic incentives that included extensions of tax credits for wind and solar energy, and for biofuels.

- 3. President Bush Isn't Serious About Global Warming**

Center for American Progress April 17, 2008  
[http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/04/environment\\_timeline.html](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/04/environment_timeline.html)

President Bush's Rose Garden speech on global warming yesterday lacked any real commitment to reducing greenhouse gas pollution and proved again that he will continue to oppose global warming solutions. Instead, the president described a long term goal devoid of specific commitments to binding emissions reductions. In addition, he publicly opposed the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act that would tackle global warming. But this stubbornness is nothing new. As the timeline below shows, the Bush administration has spent the past seven years obstructing progress toward creating a low-carbon economy that will help to decrease emissions, which slow global warming and stimulate growth in the renewable energy industry.

## Answer to: Regions and States Solving

- 1. The Federal Government would Solve Better Through Larger Markets. The 1AC Gelbspan evidence says the U.S. is abdicating leadership through inaction by the Federal Government.**
- 2. In The Absence Of Federal Support, State And Local Actions Are Insufficient To Establish A Sizable And Reliable Market For Alternative Energies.**

CSIS COMMISSION ON SMART POWER, 2007 p.58

[http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\\_csis\\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/typ,1/](http://www.csis.org/component/option,com_csis_pubs/task,view/id,4156/typ,1/)

Many companies are delaying investment in a variety of energy infrastructure projects, however, particularly in the power generation sector. This is because of uncertainty over the sustained traction of climate policies emerging at the state and local level and questions of whether and how soon affordable technology for providing low-carbon alternatives will come online. Companies also are uncertain over the cost and regulatory approach associated with implementing carbon constraints, as well as the risk of the emergence of future constraints. This delay in investment in infrastructure undermines the reliability of our current energy supply. A world operating on differing sets of rules or costs associated with carbon dioxide emissions could have disruptive implications for trade, energy security, competitiveness, and economic growth.

- 3. State and Regional Efforts Have No Relationship With Foreign Governments.**



## Answer to: No Warming Now

**1. Extend The 2008 Romm Evidence From The 1AC. Scientists Have Demonstrated Many Times That Warming Can Only Be Explained By Human Actions. This Is Supported By Measurements In Oceans, Atmospheres, Of Inland And Arctic Ice Melting, Of Expansion Of Tropical Areas. The International Consensus Is Expressed By Thousands Of Scientists In The IPCC Report.**

**2. Current Warming Ranges Are Not Within Normal Cycles**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

Though natural amounts of CO2 have varied from 180 to 300 parts per million (ppm), today's CO2 levels are around 380 ppm. That's 25% more than the highest natural levels over the past 650,000 years. Increased CO2 levels have contributed to periods of higher average temperatures throughout that long record. (Boden, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center). As for previous Arctic warming, it is true that there were stretches of warm periods over the Arctic earlier in the 20th century. The limited records available for that time period indicate that the warmth did not affect as many areas or persist from year to year as much as the current warmth. But that episode, however warm it was, is not relevant to the issue at hand. Why? For one, a brief regional trend does not discount a longer global phenomenon. We know that the planet has been warming over the past several decades and Arctic ice has been melting persistently. And unlike the earlier periods of Arctic warmth, there is no expectation that the current upward trend in Arctic temperatures will reverse; the rising concentrations of greenhouse gases will prevent that from happening.

## Answer to: No Warming Now

### **3. A Scientific Consensus Exists About Climate Change – National Academy Of Science Study**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

The most respected scientific bodies have stated unequivocally that global warming is occurring, and people are causing it by burning fossil fuels (like coal, oil and natural gas) and cutting down forests. The U.S. National Academy of Sciences, which in 2005 the White House called "the gold standard of objective scientific assessment," issued a joint statement with 10 other National Academies of Science saying "the scientific understanding of climate change is now sufficiently clear to justify nations taking prompt action. It is vital that all nations identify cost-effective steps that they can take now, to contribute to substantial and long-term reduction in net global greenhouse gas emissions." (Joint Statement of Science Academies: Global Response to Climate Change [PDF], 2005) The only debate in the science community about global warming is about how much and how fast warming will continue as a result of heat-trapping emissions. Scientists have given a clear warning about global warming, and we have more than enough facts — about causes and fixes — to implement solutions right now.

## Answer to: The IPCC is Wrong

### **1. The Report Represents a Scientific Consensus**

Union of Concerned Scientists, June 19, 2008

[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/science/consensus-in-the-ipcc-what-does-it-mean.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science/consensus-in-the-ipcc-what-does-it-mean.html)

The first type of consensus is sought among the scientists writing the report. In this case, consensus does not mean that everyone agrees with every single aspect of the report - a clearly unrealistic aim. It is well understood that science is not something to be decided by voting, but by logical reasoning. The core, then, of scientific consensus among IPCC scientists is that they agree that the report is of the highest scientific integrity and reflects the state of knowledge fairly and adequately. Points of dispute in the science of climate change are usually resolved either by developing appropriate intervals of uncertainty around certain projections or by crafting language that reflects the different viewpoints of experts within the scientific community and the reasons that the differences exist.

### **2. Dissent is Tolerated – Everyone Signs off on the IPCC Conclusions**

Union of Concerned Scientists, June 19, 2008

[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/science/consensus-in-the-ipcc-what-does-it-mean.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science/consensus-in-the-ipcc-what-does-it-mean.html)

The second type of consensus is sought among the governmental representatives who need to sign off on the report's Summaries for Policymakers (SPM). In the final stages of preparing the assessment report, these governmental representatives meet in plenary and seek unanimity on the exact wording of the SPM. The scientific experts serving as lead authors of the underlying technical report are at hand to ensure scientific integrity and to resolve questions. It is particularly impressive that full consensus has been achieved in the final "sign-off" of all IPCC documents. Such consensus is not required -- countries are allowed to formally register their dissents; in all cases to date, however, unanimous agreement has been reached.

## Answer to: The Sun is Causing Global Warming

- 1. Extend our Consensus Evidence from the 1AC, Global Warming is Caused by Humans, not Nature**
- 2. No Link Found Between Sun and Global Warming**

Ian O'Neill, PhD, Solar Physics, Universe Today, February 21, 2008

<http://www.universetoday.com/2008/02/21/solar-variability-most-likely-not-the-cause-of-global-warming/>

However, results from this analysis appear inconclusive and no strong link can be found in favour of increased solar activity during periods of atmospheric heating. Linking any atmospheric phenomenon with solar variability is a difficult task. Attempts to connect monsoons with the 11-year solar cycle for instance have failed in 150 years of trying. It would seem that, for now at least, any connection between increased solar energy output and global warming is tenuous at best. Casper M. Ammann, climate modeler at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, points out that global temperatures are rising at a historic rate, and there remains no link between solar variability and global warming. He states that global warming has "nothing to do with changes in solar activity. It's greenhouse gases. It's not the sun that is causing this [climate] trend."

- 3. New Study Proves The Sun Hasn't Increased Over Past 20 Years**

Agence France Presse July 17, 2007

<http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/news/1451/sun-clear-over-global-warming>

A solar radiation study is evidence that global warming over the past two decades cannot be blamed on the Sun, a theory espoused by climate-change sceptics. British and Swiss researchers looked at data for radiation from the Sun, levels of which can cool or warm our planet's atmosphere. They factored in a cycle of solar radiation, which goes through peaks and troughs of activity over a period of about 11 years. Writing in the British journal, the Proceedings of the Royal Society A, the team said that the Sun had been less active since 1985, even though global temperatures have continued to rise. The study also puts to bed an idea that a decrease in the activity of the Sun's magnetic field – affecting the amount of galactic cosmic rays that reach Earth – could have recently altered weather patterns, causing warming.

## Answer to: Species Adapt/Resilient

**1. The Effects of Climate Change would be Too Severe and Sudden to Adapt. Extend the Pascual 1AC Evidence on Severe and Devastating Droughts and Flooding. Two Billion People Would Be Harmed. We don't Claim Species Loss in our 1AC.**

**2. Past Examples Of Humans Adapting To Climate Change Don't Apply** Now

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008 <http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

Although humans as a whole have survived the vagaries of drought, stretches of warmth and cold and more, entire societies have collapsed from dramatic climatic shifts. The current warming of our climate will bring major hardships and economic dislocations — untold human suffering, especially for our children and grandchildren. We are already seeing significant costs from today's global warming which is caused by greenhouse gas pollution. Climate has changed in the past and human societies have survived, but today six billion people depend on interconnected ecosystems and complex technological infrastructure. What's more, unless we limit the amount of heat-trapping gases we are putting into the atmosphere, we will face a warming trend unseen since human civilization began 10,000 years ago. (IPCC 2001)

**3. Even If Humans Can Adapt, Ecosystems Can't**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008 <http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

Scarcity of water and food could lead to major conflicts with broad ripple effects throughout the globe. Even if people find a way to adapt, the wildlife and plants on which we depend may be unable to adapt to rapid climate change. While the world itself will not end, the world as we know it may disappear.

## Answer to: No Sea Level Rise

### **1. Glaciers And Ice Sheets Are Not Growing – On Balance They Are Shrinking**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008 <http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

In most parts of the world, the retreat of glaciers has been dramatic. The best available scientific data indicate that Greenland's massive ice sheet is shrinking. Between 1961 and 1997, the world's glaciers lost 890 cubic miles of ice. The consensus among scientists is that rising air temperatures are the most important factor behind the retreat of glaciers on a global scale over long time periods. Some glaciers in western Norway, Iceland and New Zealand have been expanding during the past few decades. That expansion is a result of regional increases in storm frequency and snowfall rather than colder temperatures — not at all incompatible with a global warming trend.

### **2. Studies Of Greenland Prove The Ice Is Shrinking**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008 <http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

In Greenland, a NASA satellite that can measure the ice mass over the whole continent has found that although there is variation from month to month, over the longer term, the ice is disappearing. In fact, there are worrisome signs that melting is accelerating: glaciers are moving into the ocean twice as fast as a decade ago, and, over time, more and more glaciers have started to accelerate. What is most alarming is the prediction, based on model calculations and historical evidence, that an approximately 5.4 degree Fahrenheit increase in local Greenland temperatures will lead to irreversible meltdown and a sea-level rise of over 20 feet. Since the Arctic is warming 2-3 times faster than the global average, this tipping point is not far away.

### Answer to: No Sea Level Rise

#### **3. Increases In The Ice Are In The Interior, Not The Edges Which Is What Matters**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008 <http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

The only study that has shown increasing ice mass in Greenland only looked at the interior of the ice sheet, not at the edges where melting occurs. This is actually in line with climate model predictions that global warming would lead to a short-term accumulation of ice in the cold interior due to heavier snowfall. (Similarly, scientists have predicted that Antarctica overall will gain ice in the near future due to heavier snowfall.) The scientists who published the study were careful to point out that their results should not be used to conclude that Greenland's ice mass as a whole is growing. In addition, their data suggested that the accumulation of snow in the middle of the continent is likely to decrease over time as global warming continues.

## Answer to Hurts The Economy

- 1. Their Evidence is Not Talking about Our Plan Specifically.**
- 2. Cap And Trade Will Stimulate The Economy**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

A well designed trading program will harness American ingenuity to decrease heat-trapping pollution cost-effectively, jumpstarting a new carbon economy. Claims that fighting global warming will cripple the economy and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs are unfounded. In fact, companies that are already reducing their heat-trapping emissions have discovered that cutting pollution can save money. The cost of a comprehensive national greenhouse gas reduction program will depend on the precise emissions targets, the timing for the reductions and the means of implementation. An independent MIT study found that a modest cap-and-trade system would cost less than \$20 per household annually and have no negative impact on employment.

- 3. Experience Shows Compliance Costs Will Fall**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

Experience has shown that properly designed emissions trading programs can reduce compliance costs significantly compared with other regulatory approaches. For example, the U.S. acid rain program reduced sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 30 percent from 1990 levels and cost industry a fraction of what the government originally estimated, according to EPA. Furthermore, a mandatory cap on emissions could spur technological innovation that could create jobs and wealth. Letting global warming continue until we are forced to address it on an emergency basis could disrupt and severely damage our economy. It is far wiser and more cost-effective to act now.



## Answer to Soft Power is Dead

- 1. Extend the Hamre and Nye evidence from the 1AC. The U.S. has a unique moment of opportunity with the next President to reverse our image and re-establish our soft power.**
- 2. Climate Change is the right issue. The CSIS evidence from the 1AC says our allies and friends look to the U.S. for ideas and solutions. Cap and trade domestic legislation is one of those areas. The Diringer evidence says this will create more confidence and credibility in U.S. diplomacy.**
- 3. The U.S. still has Plenty of Soft Power Potential.**

Michael Fullilove, visiting fellow, Brookings Institution, International Herald Tribune, June 17, 2008  
<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/06/17/opinion/edfullilove.php>

In terms of soft power, too - the ability to get others to want what you want - the case for America's decline is easily overstated. America retains its hold on the world's imagination. For most non-Americans around the world, America's politics are, at some level, our politics as well. Why is the world so interested? America's bulk is only part of the answer. Ultimately, it is not really the size of the U.S. economy that draws our attention. It is not even America's blue-water navy or its new bunker-busting munitions. Rather, it is the idea of America which continues to fascinate: a superpower that is open, democratic, meritocratic and optimistic; a country that is the cockpit of global culture; a polity in which all candidates for public office, whether or not they are a Clinton, seem to come from a place called Hope.

## **4. When President Bush leaves office it will Revive U.S. Soft Power Potential**

Michael Fullilove, visiting fellow, Brookings Institution, International Herald Tribune, June 17, 2008  
<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/06/17/opinion/edfullilove.php>

It's worth noting that the declinist canon has emerged at the nadir of the Bush years; America's soft power account will look much healthier the instant the next president is inaugurated.

## Answer to Iraq Kills Soft Power

**1. Our 1AC evidence takes Iraq into account. The Nye evidence explicitly says the next President can overcome Iraq. The Hamre evidence says that a "big idea" can re-create U.S. leadership with mutual respect.**

**2. The next President will have a clean slate.**

Michael Fullilove, visiting fellow, Brookings Institution, International Herald Tribune, June 17, 2008  
<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/06/17/opinion/edfullilove.php>

It's worth noting that the declinist canon has emerged at the nadir of the Bush years; America's soft power account will look much healthier the instant the next president is inaugurated.

**3. The lesson of the Iraq War is how important Soft Power is to the U.S.**

Stephen Coulthart, Whitehead School of Diplomacy, Seton Hall, Daily News (Egypt) June 26, 2008  
<http://dailystaregypt.com/article.aspx?ArticleID=14663>

Five years ago in May, President Bush, standing on the deck of an aircraft carrier, proudly declared "mission accomplished" in Iraq and stated that major combat operations were over. The event comes as a reminder of the limits of American military might, or "hard power". Indeed, the US easily toppled the Iraqi regime in days but it failed to win the peace after the conventional conflict ended. As a result, it is clear that the US must place greater emphasis on soft power than ever before.

## Answer to Soft Power Unimportant

### **1. Even the Military Supports Soft Power now.**

Stephen Coulthart, Whitehead School of Diplomacy, Seton Hall, Daily News (Egypt) June 26, 2008 <http://dailystaregypt.com/article.aspx?ArticleID=14663>

The US needs to look outside of the "military might" box when it comes to foreign engagement. Warfare is no longer the straightforward task of prior ages but a delicate affair that should only be used in the direst circumstances. Interestingly, some of the backers of this idea are coming from the most unlikely of places: the military. Former NATO general Rupert Smith has stated the war has moved from the battlefields to amongst the people. Indeed civilians now suffer more than ever before in war: in World War I approximately 10% of all deaths were civilian while in modern conflicts, such as in Iraq, civilian casualties account for 90% of all fatalities. Now that the battle is moving amongst the people, the US government must take an active lead in developing soft power approaches to mitigate conflict.

### **2. Soft Power is Becoming Increasingly Important.**

Joseph Nye, Prof. International Relations, Belfer Center, Harvard, March 18, 2008 [http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18173/america\\_must\\_learn\\_the\\_hard\\_facts\\_of\\_soft\\_power.html?breadcrumb=%2Fregion%2F121%2Famericas%3Fpage%3D4](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18173/america_must_learn_the_hard_facts_of_soft_power.html?breadcrumb=%2Fregion%2F121%2Famericas%3Fpage%3D4)

But the next president must recognise that the nature of leadership is also changing. The information revolution is transforming politics and organisations. People today have become less deferential to authority in organisations and in politics. Soft power — the ability to get what you want by attraction rather than coercion or payment — is becoming more important. Even the military faces these changes. The Pentagon reports that American army drillmasters do "less shouting at everyone", because today's generation responds better to instructors who play "a more counselling-type role".

### Answer to Soft Power Unimportant

#### **3. Hard Power Depends on Soft Power – Iraq Proves It.**

Stephen Coulthart, Whitehead School of Diplomacy, Seton Hall, Daily News (Egypt) June 26, 2008 <http://dailystaregypt.com/article.aspx?ArticleID=14663>

Five years ago in May, President Bush, standing on the deck of an aircraft carrier, proudly declared "mission accomplished" in Iraq and stated that major combat operations were over. The event comes as a reminder of the limits of American military might, or "hard power". Indeed, the US easily toppled the Iraqi regime in days but it failed to win the peace after the conventional conflict ended. As a result, it is clear that the US must place greater emphasis on soft power than ever before.

## Answer to: No Solvency – European Examples

- 1. Extend the 1AC Union of Concerned Scientists Evidence. Cap and Trade would create a strong incentive for encouraging investments in alternative energies. The 80% target is stronger than the Europe target.**
- 2. Cap And Trade Has Worked In The United States**

Environmental Defense Fund September 17, 2007  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1085>

"Cap and trade" harnesses the forces of markets to achieve cost-effective environmental protection. Markets can achieve superior environmental protection by giving businesses both flexibility and a direct financial incentive to find faster, cheaper and more innovative ways to reduce pollution. Cap and trade was designed, tested and proven here in the United States, as a program within the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. The success of this program led The Economist magazine to crown it "probably the greatest green success story of the past decade." (July 6, 2002).

### **3. Cap And Trade Has A Strong Record In Europe**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008  
[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

While many people still oppose emissions trading over concerns that it would allow companies to keep polluting, most environmentalists and European governments now view the practice as the easiest and most comprehensive way to regulate industrial emissions. "You are using profit motive to achieve a public good, and this is just brilliant," Derwent, now head of the International Emissions Trading Association, said on the sidelines of this week's UN climate change conference in Thailand.

## Answer to: No Solvency – European Examples

### **4. Carbon Markets Have Achieved Real Solvency In Europe**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008

[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

While supporters agree that carbon markets alone cannot reduce emissions, they insist they can change behaviour. They noted that the European system has resulted in a number of coal plants being mothballed and they predict they will spur investment in expensive but clean technologies like solar energy and carbon sequestration and storage in which carbon dioxide is stored underground.

## Answer to: No Solvency – Only Easy Solutions

### **1. Their Evidence isn't Specifically About our Plan, which is Not Just Easy Solutions. It Requires Substantial Auctioning and All Major Sources Be Covered.**

### **2. Ineffective Carbon Markets Can Be Tightened**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008  
[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

"The point of the market is to find the most efficient way to reduce emissions," said Greenpeace's Bill Hare, who supports the market but admits he has concerns about the lack of regulations. "The tighter the cap, the higher you will see carbon prices and the more incentive to switch to investments to lower emitting technology and practices," he said.

### **3. 80% Target Would Halt And Reverse The Co2 Threat**

Francis Moore, Earth Policy Institute, April 9, 2008  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Indicators/CO2/2008.htm>

The IPCC projects that without policy measures to address global warming, carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning could more than double between 2000 and 2030, a trajectory that would make it almost impossible to avoid a temperature increase of 3 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial temperatures. Increasing evidence suggests that even a warming of less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial temperatures would constitute "dangerous" climate change, something nations have already committed to avoid under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. It is clear that to prevent the most serious and irreversible effects of climate change, the world must act swiftly to substantially cut emissions. Energy efficiency measures and existing technologies such as wind power and plug-in hybrid electric cars, combined with programs to protect and restore the world's forests could cut net global carbon dioxide emissions 80 percent by 2020, a goal outlined in Plan B 3.0: Mobilizing to Save Civilization by Lester R. Brown. Putting this plan into action would halt and reverse the longstanding trend of growing carbon dioxide emissions.

## Answer To: Cap and Trade Hurts the Poor

**1. This Evidence is Not Talking About Our Plan.** Auctioning Requires that the Well-Off Will Pay Their Share. Global Warming Hits the Poor the Most. (See Answers to Environmental Justice Critique)

## **2. Cap And Trade Policies Can Be Designed To Be Progressive**

Alan Durning, former researcher Worldwatch Institute, GRIST:  
Environmental News and Commentary, January 31, 2008  
<http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2008/1/30/17554/0835>

It doesn't have to be this way, as Boyce and Riddle demonstrate. If we auction rather than give away permits to emit greenhouse gases, the public will claim for the common good the proceeds of higher energy prices. And the public can then return much of the resulting revenue to families, on an equal per person basis. Boyce and Riddle call this "cap-and-dividend"; others call it the Sky Trust. Everyone pays more for their energy; everyone gets a dividend check from the new Climate Trust Fund. A \$55/ton carbon dioxide charge would yield almost \$700 a year per person. It'd be like the Alaska Permanent Fund, which pays out an annual share of oil earnings to each resident of the state. The net effect of cap-and-dividend, shown in this chart, is to take the sting out of climate pricing for low- and middle-income families. They pay more for energy, but their climate dividend covers the expense. That's not going to end poverty or reverse the widening income gaps that plague our continent. But it's a step toward climate fairness; it's enough to offset some of the unfairness of climate change itself. And it's proof that how we set climate policy matters as much as that we set climate policy.



## Alternative Energy Solvency Extensions

### **( ) Solar Thermal Energy Can Solve Global Warming**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

Certainly we will need many different technologies to stop global warming. They include electric cars and plug-in hybrids, wind turbines and solar photovoltaics, which use sunlight to make electricity from solid-state materials like silicon semiconductors. Yet after speaking with energy experts and seeing countless presentations on all forms of clean power, I believe the one technology closest to being a silver bullet for global warming is the other solar power: solar thermal electric, which concentrates the sun's rays to heat a fluid that drives an electric generator. It is the best source of clean energy to replace coal and sustain economic development. I bet that it will deliver more power every year this century than coal with carbon capture and storage -- for much less money and with far less environmental damage.

### **( ) Technology For Solar Thermal Is Easy, And Could Be Built Rapidly**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

The technology has no obvious bottlenecks and uses mostly commodity materials - steel, concrete and glass. The central component, a standard power system routinely used by the natural gas industry today, would create steam to turn a standard electric generator. Plants can be built rapidly -- in two to three years -- much faster than nuclear plants. It would be straightforward to build CSP systems at whatever rate industry and governments needed, ultimately 50 to 100 gigawatts a year growth or more.

## Alternative Energy Solvency Extensions

### **( ) Solar Thermal Is Cheap, Accessible, Workable And Matches Expected Demands**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

Clearly, the world needs a massive amount of carbon-free electricity by 2050 to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions. The industrialized countries need to cut their carbon dioxide emissions from electricity generation by more than 80 percent in four decades. Developing countries need to find a way to raise living standards without increasing electricity emissions in the short term, and then reduce those emissions sharply. And, over the next few decades, the world needs to switch to a ground transportation system whose primary fuel is clean electricity. This electricity must meet a number of important criteria. It must be affordable: New electricity generation should cost at most about 10 cents per kilowatt hour, a price that would probably beat nuclear power and would certainly beat coal with carbon capture and storage, if the latter even proves practical on a large scale. The electricity cannot be intermittent and hard to store, as is energy from wind power and solar photovoltaics. We need power that either stays constant day and night or, even better, matches electricity demand, which typically rises in the morning, peaks in the late afternoon, and lasts late into the evening. This carbon-free electricity must provide thousands of gigawatts of power and make use of a low-cost fuel that has huge reserves accessible to both industrialized and developing countries. It should not make use of much freshwater or arable land, which are likely to be scarce in a climate-changed world with 3 billion more people. Solar electric thermal, also known as concentrated solar power (CSP), meets all these criteria. A technology that has the beauty of simplicity, it has proved effective for generations.

## Alternative Energy Solvency Extensions

### **( ) Many Countries Have Space For Solar Thermal Plants**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

CSP makes use of the most abundant and free fuel there is, sunlight, and key countries have a vast resource. Solar thermal plants covering the equivalent of a 92-by-92-mile square grid in the Southwest could generate electricity for the entire United States. Mexico has an equally enormous solar resource. China, India, southern Europe, North Africa, the Middle East and Australia also have huge resources.

### **( ) Solar Thermal Technology Would Help Boost Global Water Supplies**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

CSP plants can also operate with a very small annual water requirement because they can be air-cooled. And CSP has some unique climate-friendly features. It can be used effectively for desalinating brackish water or seawater. That is useful for many developing countries today, and it's a must-have for tens if not hundreds of millions of people if we don't act in time to stop global warming and dry out much of the planet. Such desertification would, ironically, mean even more land ideal for CSP.

## Alternative Energy Solvency Extensions

### **( ) Loan Guarantees Solve Solar Thermal**

Joseph Romm, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, Salon Magazine, April 14, 2008 [http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar\\_electric\\_thermal/](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2008/04/14/solar_electric_thermal/)

Another useful incentive would be loan guarantees, a program that could be retired once we have a price for carbon dioxide. CSP has no fuel cost, and low operations and maintenance costs, but it has high upfront capital costs. Loan guarantees can reduce the risks of the first big plants at little or no cost to the taxpayer. The United States should also insist that CSP be a high priority for development projects by the Global Environmental Facility and the World Bank.

## Cap and Trade Negative – Table of Contents

Inherency – US Leading on Renewables Now 1NC Frontline	182
Extensions to US Leading on Renewables Now	184
Inherency – US Regional Cap and Trade Policies 1NC Frontline	186
Harms – Global Warming Frontline	187
Extensions to No Consensus on Warming	193
Extensions to Sun Causes Warming	196
Extensions to Ocean Acidity/Coral Reefs	197
Extensions to Hurricanes/Storms	198
Extensions to Health	299
Extensions to Economic Impacts	200
Extensions to Biodiversity Impacts	201
Extensions to Sea Level	203
Harms – Soft Power 1NC Frontline	204
Extensions to Hard Power Key	207
Extensions to Soft Power Fails	209
Extensions to Counterproductive	211
Solvency 1NC Frontline	212
Hurts the Poor	213

## US Leading on Renewables Now 1NC Frontline

### **1. U.S. Leading World In New Wind Energy Investment**

Jonathan Dorn, Earth Policy Institute, March 4, 2008  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Indicators/Wind/2008.htm>

For the third consecutive year, the United States led the world in new installations, with its 5,240 megawatts accounting for one-quarter of global installations in 2007. Installations in the fourth quarter of 2007 alone exceeded the figure for all of 2006, and the United States is on track to overtake Germany as the leader in installed wind power by the end of 2009. Wind farms are now found in 34 states and total 16,800 megawatts. The electrical output from these farms is equivalent to that from 16 coal-fired power plants and is enough to power 4.5 million U.S. homes. The recent exceptional growth in the United States is largely due to an extension of the wind production tax credit under the 2005 Energy Policy Act.

### **2. State Policies Are Driving Increases In Renewables**

Janet Swain, senior researcher and director, Energy and Climate Change Program, Worldwatch Institute, March 13, 2008 <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5648>

The states have really been the biggest drivers of renewables, with many now competing to be the new hubs for clean energy industries and green jobs. Twenty-five states plus Washington, D.C., now have Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS)—or mandated targets—for electricity generation; an additional four have voluntary policy goals. During the past two years, five states added RPS laws, and at least nine states strengthened existing targets. Several states have adopted other policies to support renewables as well, with some now considering feed-in laws. Feed-in laws guarantee renewable energy generators—whether farmers who install wind turbines, homeowners who put photovoltaics (PV) on their rooftops, or large utilities that develop large-scale renewable energy projects—a guaranteed market with priority access to the electric grid and long-term fixed payments. They have been extremely successful in Germany and elsewhere, and are now used in nearly 40 countries around the world, including 18 EU countries. Over just the past six months, feed-laws have been introduced into the legislatures in several U.S. states, beginning with Michigan last September. In addition, many states are now part of regional carbon cap and trade programs that could also lead to significant increases in renewable energy use.

## U.S. Already Leads on Renewable Energy Frontline

### **3. Private Investment In Renewable Energy Is Exploding**

Janet Swain, senior researcher and director, Energy and Climate Change Program,  
Worldwatch Institute, March 13, 2008  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5648>

There was also a huge surge in U.S. venture capital investment in renewables in 2007, greatly due to increased investment in solar energy. Other major recipients of venture capital money were wind power and biofuels—particularly work on next generation fuels, which are expected to be more sustainable than the current food-based biofuels. The United States ranks first in venture capital investment in renewables, accounting for more than 60 percent of the global total in 2006. And U.S. levels will only rise in coming years with new efforts like Google’s program to make renewables cheaper than coal.

### **4. Regional Cap And Trade Policies Being Implemented**

Ned Raynolds, Northeast Climate Policy Coordinator, UCS Report, 11/9, 2007  
[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/solutions/regional\\_cap-and-trade\\_programs.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/regional_cap-and-trade_programs.html)

The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) is a market-based cap-and-trade program to reduce carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from power plants in 10 Northeast states. Participants include the six New England states (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island), New York, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. RGGI will be the first mandatory cap-and-trade program in the United States to reduce global warming emissions.

## U.S. Already Leads on Renewable Energy Extensions

### **( ) States Are Creating Huge Amounts Of Wind Energy**

Jonathan Dorn, Earth Policy Institute, March 4, 2008  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Indicators/Wind/2008.htm>

After passing California to become the leader in installed U.S. wind power capacity in 2006, Texas maintained its lead in 2007 by expanding its total capacity to 4,360 megawatts. Minnesota, Iowa, and Washington round out the top five leading states. Texas is now planning the development of 23,000 megawatts of wind power capacity, enough to satisfy over half the residential electricity demand in the state. Southern California Edison is planning a 4,500-megawatt wind project, and a task force established by Maine's governor, John Baldacci, is recommending the development of 3,000 megawatts. At the national level, wind farm proposals exceed an astounding 100,000 megawatts, roughly six times the current installed capacity.

### **( ) California Alone Is Competing With Germany For Renewable Energy Leadership**

Janet Swain, senior researcher and director, Energy and Climate Change Program, Worldwatch Institute, March 13, 2008  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5648>

California, one of the top states for renewable electric capacity, captured 70 percent of the nation's PV market in 2006. Thanks to a new Solar Initiative, the state is set to rival Germany, the world leader, in solar PV over the next several years. California aims to install 3,000 MW of new solar electric capacity by 2017, with a state budget of \$3.3 billion.



## U.S. Already Leads on Renewable Energy Extensions

### **( ) Major American Cities Are Increasing Renewable Energy**

Janet Swain, senior researcher and director, Energy and Climate Change Program,  
Worldwatch Institute, March 13, 2008  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5648>

And cities are getting in on the act as well. From San Francisco and Portland in the West Coast to New York City on the East Coast, and from Chicago in the North to Austin in the South, U.S. cities are competing to be green, adopting renewable energy targets and incentives. They are doing so because of a growing recognition that renewables can help them to meet a number of goals: new jobs, carbon emissions reductions, a more secure and stable energy supply, a cleaner environment, and better health for their citizens.

## Regional Cap and Trade Policies Extensions

### **( ) The Rggi Will Reduce Emissions Considerably**

Ned Raynolds, Northeast Climate Policy Coordinator, UCS Report, 11/9, 2007  
[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/solutions/regional\\_cap-and-trade\\_programs.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/regional_cap-and-trade_programs.html)

RGGI will go into effect January 1, 2009, capping emissions from all power plants in the 10 states. The annual regional cap is 188 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. This was the projected level of emissions from those plants in 2009, based on data available when the states set the cap in 2005. Emissions will be capped at that level through 2015, and reduced by 2.5 percent annually over the next four years, to achieve a 10 percent reduction in emissions by 2019. This emission level was projected to be 37 percent below a "business as usual" scenario. Each state receives a fraction of the cap (an "emissions budget") roughly corresponding to the historical emissions from power plants located in that state.

### **( ) Rggi Will Auction Nearly 100% Of The Permits**

Ned Raynolds, Northeast Climate Policy Coordinator, UCS Report, 11/9, 2007  
[http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/solutions/regional\\_cap-and-trade\\_programs.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/regional_cap-and-trade_programs.html)

RGGI has established an important policy precedent. Every state that has formally issued a proposed regulation or enacted legislation (Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Vermont and Connecticut) has decided to auction nearly 100 percent of the emissions allowances created by the program. They realized that fundamental economics dictates that once a cap is implemented, an emissions allowance is an economic asset. Giving away allowances to electricity generators would amount to granting them a windfall profit.

## Global Warming Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. Hundreds Of Scientists Dispute Global Warming Consensus**

Center for Global Food Issues, Hudson Institute, September 12, 2007 9-07 Avery  
Global Warming.pdf

A new analysis of peer-reviewed literature reveals that more than 500 scientists have published evidence refuting at least one element of current man-made global warming scares. More than 300 of the scientists found evidence that 1) a natural moderate 1,500-year climate cycle has produced more than a dozen global warmings similar to ours since the last Ice Age and/or that 2) our Modern Warming is linked strongly to variations in the sun's irradiance. "This data and the list of scientists make a mockery of recent claims that a scientific consensus blames humans as the primary cause of global temperature increases since 1850," said Hudson Institute Senior Fellow Dennis Avery. Other researchers found evidence that 3) sea levels are failing to rise importantly; 4) that our storms and droughts are becoming fewer and milder with this warming as they did during previous global warmings; 5) that human deaths will be reduced with warming because cold kills twice as many people as heat; and 6) that corals, trees, birds, mammals, and butterflies are adapting well to the routine reality of changing climate.

### **2. New Study Shows No Warming For At Least 20 Years**

Daily Tech May 2, 2008

[www.dailytech.com/Researchers+Global+Warming+Halts+Until+2020/article11672.htm](http://www.dailytech.com/Researchers+Global+Warming+Halts+Until+2020/article11672.htm)

Now, a team of researchers has predicted that global warming will halt for at least 15 years, as oscillating ocean currents cause the planet to cool slightly. In a paper appearing the journal Nature, the scientists study changes in SST (sea surface temperatures) caused by the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation and the Meridional Overturning Oscillation. A larger, slower-acting version of the better-known El Nino/La Nina oscillation, the MOC is expected to weaken over the next 15-20 years, causing cooling throughout Europe and North America. Pacific temperatures are expected to remain flat.

## Global Warming Scenario - Frontline

### **3. IPCC Reports Have A History Of Inaccuracy**

Frederick **Seitz, Past President, National Academy of Sciences**, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p.iii

The IPCC is pre-programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty. The 1990 IPCC Summary completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text *after* it was approved by the scientists – in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed 'unusual warming' based on the now-discredited hockey-stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devaluates the climate contributions from changes in solar activity, which are likely to dominate any human influence.

### **4. The Sun, And Solar Variations, Are Responsible For Global Warming And Cooling**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 26

If current warming is not due to increasing greenhouse gases, what are the natural causes that might be responsible for both warming and cooling episodes – as so amply demonstrated in the historic, pre-industrial climate record? Empirical evidence suggests very strongly that the main cause of warming and cooling on a decadal scale derives from solar activity via its modulation of cosmic rays that in turn affect atmospheric cloudiness. According to published research, cosmic-ray variations are also responsible for major climate changes observed in the paleo-record going back 500 million years.

## Global Warming – Impact Answers - Frontline

### **5. Species Can Adapt To Temperature Changes**

Dennis **Avery, Hudson Institute**, Testimony before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, September 26, **2007** The Impact of Global#187E81.pdf

Thirdly, Dr. Thomas himself has documented wild species' adaptations to the warming. He has reported on butterflies colonizing "new types of habitat" during the warming, and bush crickets producing more offspring with longer wings, the better to reach new territories.<sup>7</sup> We have already seen dramatic evolutions of wild species, including tolerance for massive quantities of cadmium by mudworms in the Hudson River near a battery factory, and insects quickly developing tolerance for synthetic pesticides. Have the species adapted before? They must have. Does the polar bear have adaptation strategies too? That also seems certain. Even though the polar bear is a relatively recent offshoot of the grizzly bear, it goes back some 200,000 years.

### **6. Ocean Acidity Impacts Are Exaggerated**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 19

Measurements of increased ocean acidity give us little additional information about the sources of CO<sub>2</sub> increases. Although higher concentrations of carbon dioxide reduce the pH of the ocean to some degree, it still remains slightly alkaline; pH values range from 8.2 (in the Norwegian Sea of the North Atlantic) to 7.9 (in the Eastern Pacific and Arabian Sea) [Doney 2006]. There seems no imminent danger of impact on shell formation by marine creatures. The much-feared effects on coral growth are not supported by actual data. [Lough & Brnes 1997; Fine & Tchernov 2007]

## Global Warming – Impact Answers - Frontline

### **7. Warming Won't Cause More Extreme Weather Or Storms**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p.24

There has been an intense debate also whether a warmer climate will lead to more severe storms and to more frequent and/or more intense tropical cyclones. Regarding storms, claims that heavy precipitation events in the U.S. increased between 1900 and 1990 [Karl and Knight 1998] fails to provide evidence that the increase has anything to do with greenhouse gases or temperature, particularly since there was a slight decline in temperatures during that period. Increases in maximum annual 24-hour precipitation amounts have not been observed in Germany in the past 50 years [DWD, German National Weather Service], the Iberian Peninsula [Gallego et al. 2006] or in parts of China [Wu et al. 2007].

### **8. Warming Reduces Deaths Caused By Weather**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 25

In temperate regions, human mortality and morbidity tend to show clear maxima in the winter and secondary maxima in the summer. While the secondary maxima are more pronounced in regions with warmer summer climates, as in the southern U.S. and southern Europe, even in those regions the secondary maxima are smaller than the winter maxima. A warming of even 3°C in the next 100 years would, on balance, be beneficial to humans because the reduction of wintertime mortality/morbidity would be several times larger than the increase in summertime heat stress-related mortality/morbidity [Laaidi et al. 2006, Keatinge et al. 2000].

## Global Warming – Impact Answers - Frontline

### **9. Earth's Current Diversity Proves That It Is Resilient To Global Change**

Sherwood **Idso, Center the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change**, 6/6  
**2007**

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansen critique.jsp>

Hansen says "earth's history shows that climate is remarkably sensitive to global forcings" and that "positive feedbacks predominate," causing "the entire planet to be whipsawed between climatic states." Exercising but a modicum of thought, however, it is readily realized that the three parts of this unqualified contention are not universally-accepted facts, as Hansen makes them out to be, but merely opinions, and arguable ones at that. Just as easily, for example, one could say that earth's climate is not strongly influenced by global forcings and that negative feedbacks predominate, allowing the bulk of the planet to never stray too far from a climatic state conducive to the continued existence of life. And as compelling evidence for the veracity of this latter view, one need only observe the mind-boggling diversity and total number of plant and animal species that currently inhabit the planet, plus the fact that they have all been around for a very long time. How could this vast assemblage of life possibly exist today, if earth's climate was truly "remarkably sensitive to global forcings," and if "positive feedbacks predominate[d]," causing "the entire planet to be whipsawed between climatic states," as Hansen claims, especially in light of the tremendous ease with which he envisions hoards of earth's existing plant and animal species being driven to extinction by just a tad more warming than what the earth has already experienced?

## Global Warming – Impact Answers - Frontline

### **10. Sea Level Impacts Are Exaggerated**

Sherwood **Idso, Center the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change**, 6/6  
**2007**

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansen critique.jsp>

Although Hansen speaks of a sea level rise this century measured in meters, due to "the likely demise of the West Antarctic ice sheet," the most recent and comprehensive review of potential sea level rise due to contributions arising from the wastage of both the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets suggests a century-long rise of only 35 millimeters, based on the results of 14 satellite-derived estimates of imbalances of the polar ice sheets that have been obtained since 1998. In addition, whereas Hansen claims that the rate of sea level rise is accelerating, century-scale data sets indicate that the mean rate-of-rise of the global ocean has either not accelerated at all over the latter part of the 20th century or has actually slowed.



## Global Warming Scenario - No Warming Consensus Extensions

### **( ) Peer-Reviewed Anti-Warming Literature Ignored By The Media**

**Center for Global Food Issues**, Hudson Institute, September 12, **2007** 9-07  
Avery Global Warming.pdf

Despite being published in such journals such as *Science*, *Nature* and *Geophysical Review Letters*, these scientists have gotten little media attention. "Not all of these researchers would describe themselves as global warming skeptics," said Avery, "but the evidence in their studies is there for all to see." The names were compiled by Avery and climate physicist S. Fred Singer, the co-authors of the new book *Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years*, mainly from the peer-reviewed studies cited in their book. The researchers' specialties include tree rings, sea levels, stalagmites, lichens, pollen, plankton, insects, public health, Chinese history and astrophysics. "We've had a Greenhouse Theory with no evidence to support it-except a moderate warming turned into a scare by computer models whose results have never been verified with real-world events," said coauthor Singer. "On the other hand, we have compelling evidence of a real-world climate cycle averaging 1470 years (plus or minus 500) running through the last million years of history. The climate cycle has above all been moderate, and the trees, bears, birds, and humans have quietly adapted."

## Global Warming – The Earth is not Warming Extensions

### **2. New Peer Reviewed Studies Shows Minimal Temperature Increase**

**World Net Daily**, August 20, **2007**

**[http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=57253](http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=57253)**

A major new scientific study concludes the impact of carbon dioxide emissions on worldwide temperatures is largely irrelevant, prompting one veteran meteorologist to quip, "You can go outside and spit and have the same effect as doubling carbon dioxide." That comment comes from Reid Bryson, founding chairman of the Department of Meteorology at the University of Wisconsin, who said the temperature of the earth is increasing, but that it's got nothing to do with what man is doing. "Of course it's going up. It has gone up since the early 1800s, before the Industrial Revolution, because we're coming out of the Little Ice Age, not because we're putting more carbon dioxide into the air." "Anthropogenic (man-made) global warming bites the dust," declared astronomer Ian Wilson after reviewing the newest study, now accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed Journal of Geophysical Research. The project, called "Heat Capacity, Time Constant, and Sensitivity of Earth's Climate System," was authored by Brookhaven National lab scientist Stephen Schwartz. "Effectively, this (new study) means that the global economy will spend trillions of dollars trying to avoid a warming of (about) 1.0 K by 2100 A.D.," Wilson wrote in a note to the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works Sunday.

### **3. The Best Data, From Satellites, Fail To Find Warming Trend**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 26

In this NIPCC report we have presented evidence that helps provide answers to all three questions. The extent of the modern warming – the subject of the first question – appears to be less than is claimed by the IPCC and in the popular media. We have documented shortcomings of surface data, affected by urban heat islands and by the poor distribution of land-based observing stations. Data from oceans, covering 70 percent of the globe, are also subject to uncertainties. The only truly global observations come from weather satellites, and these have not shown any warming trend since 1998, for the past 10 years.

## Global Warming – IPCC Study Indictments Extensions

### **( ) IPCC Exaggerates The Future Co2 In The Atmosphere**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 22

The IPCC grossly exaggerates the long-term (though not the short-term) increase in emissions from poor countries. It does so by converting Gross Domestic Product estimates for wealthy and poor countries into a common currency (U.S. dollars) using market exchange rates instead of purchasing power parity. This method overstates the baseline income disparity. Because the IPCC projects that poor nations will catch up to or even surpass wealthy nations in per-capita income by the end of the century, the inflated disparity in starting positions means much greater economic activity must take place, and more greenhouse gas emissions would be released into the atmosphere.

### **( ) Models Ignore Negative Feedback Effects - Water Vapor**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p.26

If the human contribution to global warming due to increased levels of greenhouse gases is insignificant, why do greenhouse gas models calculate large temperature increases, i.e., show high values of 'climate sensitivity'? The most likely explanation is that models ignore the negative feedbacks that occur in the real atmosphere. New observations reported from satellites suggest it is the distribution of water vapor that could produce such strong negative feedbacks.

## Global Warming – The Sun is the Cause Extensions

### **( ) The IPCC Report Under-Estimates The Role Of The Sun**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 10

The IPCC has been disingenuous about solar influences on the climate. Their first report completely ignored solar variability. The IPCC began to take notice only after the pioneering work of Baliunas and Jastrow [1990] and the startling correlation between twentieth-century temperature and solar-cycle length, published by Friis-Christensen and Lassen [1991]. Even then, IPCC reports have persisted up until now in concentrating on solar-cycle changes in total solar irradiance (TSI), which are quite small, of the order of 0.1 percent [Lean 1995; Willson and Mordvinov 2003]. By disregarding or ignoring the very much larger changes of solar ultraviolet [Haigh 1996, 2003] or of the solar wind and its magnetic-field effect on cosmic rays and thus on cloud coverage [Svensmark 2007a], the IPCC has managed to trivialize the climate effects of solar variability.

### **( ) Thousands Of Years Of Data Confirm The Connection Between The Sun And Global Temperatures**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 10-11

However, this neglect may no longer be acceptable. The demonstration of solar influence on climate is now overwhelming. One of the prize exhibits is seen in Figure 14 [Neff 2001], which summarizes data obtained from a stalagmite from a cave in Oman. The carbon-14 variations are a clear indication of corresponding changes in galactic cosmic rays (GCR), which are modulated by variations in solar activity. The oxygen-18 values are proxies for a climate parameter, like temperature or precipitation, from a shift in the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ). The correlation extends well over 3,000 years, with amazingly detailed correspondence. The bottom graph shows the central 400 years expanded and is accurate on almost a yearly basis, making a cause-effect relationship very likely.

## Global Warming – Ocean Acidity/Coral Reefs Extensions

### **( ) Impact Of Acidity Of The Ocean Is Slight**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p.23

Concerns have been raised that coral reefs could be harmed by rising CO<sub>2</sub> emissions through a CO<sub>2</sub>-induced acidification of the world's oceans. But a study of calcification rates of Porites coral colonies on Australia's Great Barrier Reef (GBR) found "the 20th century has witnessed the second highest period of above-average calcification in the past 237 years" [Lough and Barnes 1997]. Research by the same authors has found GBR calcification rates were linearly related to average annual sea surface temperature, such that "a 1°C rise in average annual SST increased average annual calcification by 0.39 g cm<sup>-2</sup>year<sup>-1</sup>."

### **( ) Real World Data Show Coral Reefs Not Hurt By Sea Level Warming**

Sherwood **Idso, Center the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change**, 6/6 **2007**

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansen critique.jsp>

Noting that their results "allow assessment of possible impacts of global climate change on coral reef ecosystems," Lough and Barnes determined that between the two 50-year periods 1780-1829 and 1930-1979, there was a mean calcification increase of 0.06 g cm<sup>-2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>; and they note that "this increase [our italics] of ~4% in calcification rate conflicts with the estimated decrease [our italics] in coral calcification rate of 6-14% over the same time period suggested by Kleypas et al. (1999) as a response to changes in ocean chemistry." Even more stunning was their observation that between the two 20-year periods 1903-1922 and 1979-1998, the warming-induced increase in calcification was about 12% in the central GBR, about 20% in the southern GBR and as much as 50% to the south of the GBR. In light of these real-world observations, therefore, and in stark contrast to the predictions of Kleypas et al. (1999), Orr et al. (2005) and the testimony of Hansen, the two researchers concluded that coral calcification rates "may have already significantly increased [our italics] along the GBR in response to global climate change."

## Global Warming – Hurricanes/Storms Extensions

### **( ) New Study Proves No Net Effect Of Warming On Storms**

Daily Tech April 13, 2008

<http://www.dailytech.com/Global+Warming+Researchers+Reverse+Stance+on+Storm+Intensity/article11471.htm>

(Kerry) Emanuel, professor of Atmospheric Science at MIT, is the author of numerous books and research papers on climate change. For over twenty years, he has argued that global warming breeds more frequent and stronger storms. In fact, his 1987 paper is often cited as the first appearance of the theory itself. His 2005 research -- published just one month before Hurricane Katrina struck -- made world headlines, and was heralded as the "final proof" that Global Warming was already having severe impacts on daily lives. Overnight, Emanuel became a media darling. The following year, Time Magazine named him to their "100 People Who Shape Our World" list. In 2006, Al Gore used an image of a smokestack spawning a hurricane to promote his movie, An Inconvenient Truth. Emanuel's newest work, co-authored with two other researchers, simulates hurricane conditions nearly 200 years in the future. The research -- the first to mesh global climate models with small-scale high-resolution simulations of individual storms -- found that while storm strength rises slightly in some areas, it falls in others -- and the total number of worldwide storms actually declines slightly.

## Global Warming – Health and Infectious Diseases Extensions

### **( ) Infectious Disease Spread Not Increased By Warming**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p.25

The claim that malaria would spread under a warmer climate has been severely critiqued by Paul Reiter, professor, Institute Pasteur, Unit of Insects and Infectious Diseases, Paris, France, who points out that the incidence of malaria depends on a number of factors, few of them related to climate or temperature. Historically, malaria was widespread throughout many areas in the temperate or even colder regions of the mid-latitudes [Reiter 2005].

## Global Warming – Economic Impacts Answers Extensions

### **( ) There Are Economic Benefits To Warming**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 25

Beneficial economic effects of warmer temperatures include longer growing seasons in temperate climates, benefiting agriculture and forestry industries, lower heating bills, and lower construction costs. Robert Mendelsohn and James E. Neumann [1999] presented a synthesis of previous studies on the costs and benefits of global warming, which is summarized in Figure 26.

### **( ) Warming Will Have Positive Economic Effects**

S. Fred **Singer, research professor, George Mason University**, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February **2008** p. 25-6

Mendelsohn and Neumann assumed an increase in temperature of 2.5°C, a 7 percent increase in precipitation, and an increase to 530 ppm atmospheric carbon dioxide by 2060, which they admit “may be somewhat more severe than the most recent scientific assessment in IPCC (1996a).” They found the net impact of global warming on the U.S. economy in the year 2060, if no action were taken to slow or stop emissions, would be *positive*, to the tune of \$36.9 billion, or about 0.2 percent of projected GDP. In 2001 dollars this would be about \$11.5 billion. The benefits of global warming to the agricultural and timber industries more than outweigh losses to the energy industry or damage to coastal structures.



## Global Warming – Species/Biodiversity Impacts Extensions

### **( ) Species Loss Impacts To Warming Are Empirically False**

Dennis **Avery, Hudson Institute**, Testimony before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, September 26, **2007** The Impact of Global#187E81.pdf

It is important to note that no wild species extinction has yet been tied to the rise in earth temperatures since 1850. A claim was made that the Golden Toad, which lived in a Costa Rican cloud forest, went extinct due to higher sea surface temperatures. However, the loss of the Golden Toad has now been blamed on the clearing of the once-forested mountainsides below its cloud forest home, which altered the cloud-forest moisture conditions. Biologist Chris Thomas of Great Britain has claimed that the world would lose more than a million wild species due to the projected speed and scope of modern global warming, but this claim is literally incredible.

### **( ) Species Have Lived For Millions Of Years Despite Rapid Climate Changes – And Warming Increases Biodiversity**

Dennis **Avery, Hudson Institute**, Testimony before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, September 26, **2007** The Impact of Global#187E81.pdf

In the first place, the record of past Dansgaard-Oeschger cycles indicates that they are typically abrupt. Yet most of our wild species "body types" date back about 600 million years and are still going strong. In the second place, the shifts in ecosystems are not likely to be abrupt. Most trees and plants are cold-limited but they are not heat-limited. Stand replacement of trees must await fires or disease outbreaks to clear a path for the invading species to take over. Thus, the current warming is encouraging the vegetation to gradually expand ranges, and the associated fauna have the same opportunity. Study after study, around the world, shows more biodiversity in our forests and wild meadows today than have resided in them for centuries.

## Global Warming – Species/Biodiversity Impacts Extensions

### **( ) Warmer World Offers More Opportunity For Species, Not Less**

Sherwood **Idso**, **Center the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change**, 6/6  
**2007**

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansencritique.jsp>

These observations, which are similar to what has been observed in many other plants, suggest that when the atmosphere's temperature and CO2 concentration rise together (Cowling, 1999), the vast majority of earth's plants would likely not feel a need (or only very little need) to migrate towards cooler regions of the globe. Any warming would obviously provide them an opportunity to move into places that were previously too cold for them, but it would not force them to move, even at the hottest extremes of their ranges; for as the planet warmed, the rising atmospheric CO2 concentration would work its biological wonders, significantly increasing the temperatures at which most of earth's C3 plants - which comprise about 95% of the planet's vegetation - function best, creating a situation where earth's plant life would actually "prefer" warmer conditions.

## Global Warming – Sea Level Impacts Extensions

### **( ) No Threat To Antarctic Ice Sheet**

Dennis **Avery, Hudson Institute**, Testimony before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, September 26, **2007** The Impact of Global#187E81.pdf

Warmer temperatures melt more glacier ice, but they also evaporate more water from the oceans, much of which falls again as snow on the ice caps. More snow becomes more ice, and the Antarctic is currently adding billions of tons of ice per year, mostly on the ultracold East Antarctic Ice Sheet. This ice is too cold to melt. It flows downhill virtually in solid blocks, based on the slope of the underlying mountains. It has been flowing at about the same rate for 10,000 years, and that rate has not accelerated during our warming. It would take another 7000 years to get rid of that ice at current rates, according to John Stone of the University of Washington.<sup>8</sup>

### **( ) Projections Of Harm To Greenland Ice Are Exaggerated**

Patrick Michaels, senior fellow environmental studies, CATO Institute, September 27, 2007 [http://cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=8725](http://cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8725)

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which bills itself as the consensus of scientists (for whatever that is worth) recently published a computer model for Greenland. It loses half of its ice in approximately 900 years. But the model assumes that the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere — the major human contributor to warming — is three times higher than it is today and stays there forever. That's abject nonsense, too. First, it's going to be very difficult to ever burn enough fuel to get the concentration that high, and second, it is very bizarre indeed to project that society will be powered by fossil fuels in, say, 2600 A.D.

## Soft Power Harms 1NC Frontline

### **1. U.S. Already Leading In Renewable Energy Development**

Janet Swain, senior researcher and director, Energy and Climate Change Program,  
Worldwatch Institute, March 13, 2008  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5648>

Last year was a banner year for renewable energy in the United States, especially for the wind industry. As the recent REN21 Renewables 2007 Global Status Report highlights, the industry broke all past global records, installing 5,244 megawatts (MW) of new wind energy capacity in 2007, or 30 percent of all new U.S. capacity added. This brings the cumulative national total close to 17,000 MW—enough to power more than 4.5 million U.S. homes. The United States continues to lead the world in production and use of ethanol as well, with most of this coming from corn. The industry had about 6.9 billion gallons (more than 26 billion liters) of annual production capacity in 2007—a 60 percent increase over 2005—and most gasoline in the United States is now blended with ethanol. In addition, the nation is helping to lead a resurgence of concentrating solar power, with two new parabolic trough plants completed during the past two years, for a total of 65 MW of new capacity. And more than 2,000 MW of additional capacity are now planned or under construction.

### **2. Hard Power Key To Soft Power**

James Traub, NYT Syndicated Columnist, NYT MAGAZINE January 30, 2005 p.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/01/30/magazine>

The problem with the hard-soft dichotomy itself is that it fails to take account of the soft-power potential of military helicopters and aircraft carriers. We live in an era not only of globalized information but also of the nearly \$450 billion defense budget. The United States military is now an instrument of absolutely everything - - warfare, diplomacy, social policy, humanitarianism. It just depends how we deploy it. The critical attributes that make the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln an instrument of persuasion rather than of coercion are, first, that it is being put to nonlethal use and, second and no less important, that it is advancing humanitarian ends -- that it is not directly serving American self-interest. "This was an act of God," the Jakarta Post reporter quotes an American serviceman. "We are here and happy to help."

## Soft Power Harms 1NC Frontline

### **3. The Iraq War Calls All U.S. Soft Power Into Question**

Joshua **Kurlantzick**, visiting sch., **Carnegie Endowment**, Current History, December **2005** p. 421

The past four years have transformed this resentment into outright anger. The Iraq War in particular has sharply reduced global acceptance of the legitimacy of America's role in the world—and a number of US actions have aggravated this decline. For example, poorly conceived security measures launched in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks have made it much harder for many foreigners to obtain American student, work, and tourist visas, or to apply for political asylum in the United States. These changes have prompted questions about the idea of America as a land of opportunity and refuge. The number of foreign visa applications to the United States, mostly for scholars, that were sent for extensive security review grew twenty-fold between 2000 and 2003, even though the resources to conduct these reviews were not yet in place. Despite these problems, the Republican leadership of Congress and the White House have been unable to agree on a comprehensive strategy to manage immigration and balance visa policies with homeland security.

### **4. No Link Between Spread Of "Soft Power" And Influence**

Joseph Joffe, publisher-editor, Die Zeit (German) New York Times 5/14, 2006  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/14/magazine/14wwln\\_lede.html?\\_r=1&n=Top/News/Science/Topics/Sociology&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/14/magazine/14wwln_lede.html?_r=1&n=Top/News/Science/Topics/Sociology&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin)

Between Vietnam and Iraq, America's cultural presence has expanded into ubiquity, and so has the resentment of America's soft power. In some cases, like the French one, these feelings harden into governmental policy. And so the French have passed the Toubon law, which prohibits on pain of penalty the use of English words — make that D.J. into a disque-tourneur. In 1993, the French coaxed the European Union into adding a "cultural exception" clause to its commercial treaties exempting cultural products, high or low, from normal free-trade rules. Other European nations impose informal quotas on American TV fare.

## Soft Power Harms 1NC Frontline

### **5. American Soft Power Strength Is Counterproductive – It Breeds Resentment**

Joseph Joffe, publisher-editor, *Die Zeit* (German) New York Times 5/14, 2006  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/14/magazine/14wwln\\_lede.html?\\_r=1&n=Top/News/Science/Topics/Sociology&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/14/magazine/14wwln_lede.html?_r=1&n=Top/News/Science/Topics/Sociology&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin)

There is a moral in this tale of two critics: the curse of soft power. In the affairs of nations, too much hard power ends up breeding not submission but resistance. Likewise, great soft power does not bend hearts; it twists minds in resentment and rage. And the target of Europe's cultural guardians is not just America, the Great Seductress. It is also all those "little people," a million in all, many of whom showed up in the wee hours to snag an admissions ticket to MoMA's Berlin exhibit. By yielding to America-the-beguiling, they committed cultural treason — and worse: they ignored the stern verdict of their own priesthood. So America's soft power is not only seductive but also subversive.

## Soft Power – Hard Power is Key Extensions

### **( ) Hard Power Mistakes Overwhelm Soft Power**

Walter **LaFeber, Professor, History of Foreign Relations, Cornell** University,  
Diplomatic History June **2007** volume 31, number 3 p.424

A major problem with transnational history or, as many job descriptions now call a variation, international history, is that, in the effort to be inclusive, the realities of power are too often avoided. Those realities are sometimes sacrificed to the illusion of perspective. A (perhaps the) central characteristic of the world arena is the extent of U.S. military and economic power and, of course, how Washington officials use or attempt to use it. Cultural, so-called soft, power is often fascinating to read about but, as Karen Hughes, on behalf of President George W. Bush, discovered on her trip to the Middle East which aimed to understand and prepare the ground for an American cultural offensive, soft power stood little chance given the way U.S. hard power had been deployed. Many of Washington's foreign-policy tragedies of the past 60, if not 110, years can be analyzed from this perspective of why Hughes failed—of why Americans overvalue the supposed virtue of their soft power and overestimate the utility of their hard power. The critical scholars of the 1950s, including Mills and William Appleman Williams, better understood these relationships, and their work was therefore useful in the 1960s when American military power and an imperial, or as the Bush administration prefers, a unitary, presidency swept Americans into Southeast Asia and then, a generation later, into Central America.

## Soft Power – Hard Power is Key Extensions

### **( ) Soft Power Is Not Really Separable From Hard Power**

Kazuo Ogoura, President, Japan Foundation, Center for Global Partnership,  
October 2006

<http://www.cgp.org/index.php?option=article&task=default&articleid=341>

If all of the above points are considered together, it is clear that soft power as an actual political theory is loaded with ideology and riddled with contradictions and hypocrisy. Religion and ideology, for example, are seen by some as potent examples of soft power. Looking back through history, however, one cannot fail to notice that whenever religion and ideology have spread around the world, they have invariably been accompanied by military might. History teaches us that soft power needs to be backed by hard power, and this is something that many soft power theorists are now recognizing. It is possible, therefore, to see soft power as no more than a means of rationalizing the exercise of hard power. Describing the use of military force as a "war on terror" is a deft use of soft power. Labeling the use of force with the ideology of a righteous struggle against terrorism is a means of legitimizing military action undertaken without the consent of the international community. To put it another way, we need to be aware that soft power can be a subtle way of rationalizing military action that lacks international legitimacy by bringing into play the concept of good and evil. In this light, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the concept of soft power is a kind of hypocrisy.



## Soft Power – Hard Power is Key Extensions

### **( ) The U.S. Is Too Powerful To Have Effective Soft Power**

Jeffrey Fields, The False Promise of American Soft Power, Abstract, ISA Annual Convention Paper, Bridging Multiple Divides, March 26, 2008  
[http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p\\_mla\\_apa\\_research\\_citation/2/5/1/2/9/p251298\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/5/1/2/9/p251298_index.html)

Many analysts and observers fear that the United States is eroding its “soft power” by pursuing unpopular, unilateral foreign policies. This paper critically examines the issue of soft power and U.S. foreign policy. Joseph Nye has famously written that “soft power is the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments.” Nye, the progenitor of the concept, asserts that with the war in Iraq and the larger “war on terrorism,” the United States is eroding its soft power. This paper contends, however, that while the concept of soft power has merit, it does less so with regards to the United States. The United States is a “hyperpower.” Thus, it is more difficult to disaggregate its “soft power” from its hard power. That is, the United States is so powerful that other states’ deference to, or preference for its foreign policies cannot easily be seen as co-optation. Rather, American preeminence forces other states to be ever cognizant of their relationship and criticism of the United States. I argue that in essence Nye has it backwards. Rather than erode soft power by its unilateral war in Iraq, the reluctance of U.S. allies to join America in its war to oust Saddam Hussein demonstrates the limits of American soft power. If states only support an ally’s foreign policies when they are convenient or popular domestically, then the effect of soft power it seems is limited.

## Soft Power – Hard Power is Key Extensions

### **( ) Soft Power Theories Ignore Sources Of Motivation Of Other Nations**

Kazuo Ogoura, President, Japan Foundation, Center for Global Partnership,  
October 2006

<http://www.cgp.org/index.php?option=article&task=default&articleid=341>

One blind spot in the soft power concept is the confusion over the source of this power. For Nye and many others, the power of soft power lies in "attraction." The problem with this idea, however, is that it views things from the perspective of the party exercising power. Seen from the viewpoint of the party being influenced by the power, the question of whether accepting the power accords with this party's own interests is likely to be a far more important consideration than the attraction of the power. Here we must keep in mind that sovereign nations in the international community act not on the basis of likes and dislikes but in accordance with their own interests. No matter how attractive a given country may be, other countries will not accept its attractive power if it obstructs their freedom of action or adversely affects their economic interests. Hollywood movies, for instance, are often cited as a source of American soft power, but in France they have been subject to partial restriction precisely because of their attractiveness.

## Soft Power – Turn: Soft Power Counterproductive - Extension

### **1. Soft Power Hasn't Worked With Our Enemies**

Steven Martinovich, book review, Enter Stage Right, March 27, 2006  
<http://www.enterstageright.com/archive/articles/0306/0306americacrossroads.htm>

Fukuyama also believes that the United States mustn't simply assume the world will accept that American power when used is being employed for moral purposes; it must convince them before that power is unleashed. The solution to that is the employment of "soft power" -- as practiced by Europe and Canada -- and the recognition that other nations can offer their own brand of expertise. Given the competing interests of the players involved in the run-up to the Iraq war, Fukuyama's faith in international diplomacy might be somewhat optimistic. Soft power is an admirable principle in theory but it has shown little sign of affecting any real change with rogue nations like North Korea and Iran.

## Cap and Trade Solvency Frontline

### **1. Cap And Trade Has Been Ineffective In Europe**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008  
[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

But carbon trading has plenty of critics, many of whom argue that it does little or nothing to actually cut greenhouse gases. The EU system, for example, has had a minimal impact on emissions in its first two years. The system has also been criticised for leaving out sectors like transport and focusing on less profitable companies like cement or chemical producers that must cut output or make major investments to reduce emissions.

### **2. Cap And Trade Allows Easy Solutions That Aren't Effective**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008  
[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

Other critics, like research fellows Benjamin Sovacool and Toby Carroll at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore, say market solutions increase poor nations' dependence on the industrialised world for such things as clean technology, allow industries to keep polluting, and fail to change consumer consumption patterns. "Until people consciously realise the situation that the world is in and change their own patterns of behaviour, you can't change anything," Carroll said. "One of the reason carbon trading is so acceptable to the powers-that-be is that it doesn't substantially impact on existing operations." Carroll and others argue that a more effective way to cut emissions would be a pollution tax.

## Cap and Trade Solvency Frontline

### **3. Cap And Trade Policies Are Regressive – They Hurt The Poor More Than The Rich**

Alan Durning, former researcher Worldwatch Institute, GRIST: Environmental News and Commentary, January 31, 2008  
<http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2008/1/30/17554/0835>

Truthful pricing of carbon emissions, of course, means higher prices for fossil fuels. Higher fuel prices are regressive. They hit working families the hardest. By a lot. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office's rigorous analysis of the different approaches to climate pricing estimates that a carbon charge steep enough to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions by 15 percent would take about 3.3 percent of low-income families' after-tax money. James Boyce and Matthew Riddle of the University of Massachusetts peg the cost to working families (PDF) even higher. "Grandfathering" carbon-emissions permits -- giving them away to historic polluters, as many energy interests propose to do -- would write this redistribution of wealth into law. Under this version of cap-and-trade (Boyce and Riddle call it "cap-and-giveaway"), fossil fuel prices would rise. (They will rise under any firm cap; in fact, they're likely to rise even without a cap, as they have done in recent years.) Families would pay more for their energy -- and their food and other energy-intensive consumer goods. Energy companies, flush from high prices, would reap huge windfall profits. These windfalls would ultimately accrue to the shareholders of energy companies, who are mostly rich families. (This scenario already played out in Europe.) Under cap-and-giveaway, the richest fifth of families would pay more for their energy, just like everyone else. But their stock portfolios would get so much fatter that the net effect would be an additional \$1,200 a year per person, according to Boyce and Riddle. Yep, under cap-and-giveaway, the rich get richer, and the poor get poorer.

## Nuclear Power Affirmative – Table of Contents

1AC	215
+ 213	
Answers to Waste Not a Barrier	225
Answers to Clean Coal	226
Extensions to Clean Coal Bad	227
Answers to No Terrorism Risk	229
Answers to Terrorist Attack Won't Cause Leak	232
Answers to Local Politics Blocks	233
Answers to Uranium Shortage	234
Answers to Transportation Turn	236
Answers to Terrorism Turn	238
Extensions to Inherency	239
Extensions to Harms – Terrorism	242
Extensions to Solvency – New Construction	243
Extensions to Solvency – Pollution	244
Extensions to Solvency – US Key	245
Extensions to Solvency – Terrorism	246

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **Contention One: Inherency**

#### **A. Status Quo Policies Will Lead to the Decline and Eventual Disappearance of Nuclear Energy in the United States**

MIT Nuclear Energy Study '03 ["The Future of Nuclear Power",  
<http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-full.pdf>, accessed 6/23/08]

In 2000 nuclear power produced about 17% of the world's electricity from 442 commercial reactors in 31 countries. The United States has the largest deployment, with 104 operating reactors producing 20% of the country's electricity, followed by France, Japan, Germany, Russia, and South Korea. The reliability of these plants has improved considerably in recent years (for example, capacity factors of U.S. nuclear reactors have achieved 90%), and many will have their originally expected operating lives extended significantly. Nuclear power is clearly an important source of electricity in the United States and the world.

If current policies continue, however, nuclear power is likely to decline gradually and conceivably disappear in this century from the world's electricity supply portfolio. We believe removing nuclear power as a supply option would be a mistake at this time. The primary reason is that nuclear power is an important source of electricity that does not rely on fossil fuel and hence does not produce greenhouse gas emissions.

#### **B. Specifically, the Federal Government's Failure to Take Responsibility for Waste Disposal Discourages Construction of New Nuclear Power Plants**

MIT Nuclear Energy Study '03 ["The Future of Nuclear Power",  
<http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-full.pdf>, accessed 6/23/08]

The management and disposal of radioactive waste from the nuclear fuel cycle is one of the most difficult problems currently facing the nuclear power industry. Today, more than forty years after the first commercial nuclear power plant entered service, no country has yet succeeded in disposing of high-level nuclear waste – the longest-lived, most highly radioactive, and most technologically challenging of the waste streams generated by the nuclear industry.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

In most countries, the preferred technological approach is to dispose of the waste in repositories constructed in rock formations hundreds of meters below the earth's surface. Although several experimental and pilot facilities have been built, there are no operating high-level waste repositories, and all countries have encountered difficulties with their programs.

The perceived lack of progress towards successful waste disposal clearly stands as one of the primary obstacles to the expansion of nuclear power around the world.

### **Contention Two: Harms**

#### **Harms Scenario A: Continued Reliance on Fossil Fuels For Electricity Generation Destroys Biodiversity and Guarantees Human Extinction**

##### **1. In the Absence of New Nuclear Plants, the US Will Burn More Fossil Fuels to Produce Electricity, Causing Massive Air Pollution, Smog, Acid Rain, and Respiratory Illness**

Moore, co-founder of Greenpeace, '05 [Patrick, "An Environmentalist Revisits Nuclear Energy", [http://greenspiritstrategies.blogspot.com/2005/10/environmentalist-revisits-nuclear\\_17.html](http://greenspiritstrategies.blogspot.com/2005/10/environmentalist-revisits-nuclear_17.html), October 17, accessed 5/2/08]

Today nuclear energy supplies 20 percent of U.S. electrical energy. The demand for electricity continues to rise and, in the coming decades, may increase by 50 percent over current levels. If nothing is done to revitalize the U.S. nuclear industry, the industry's contribution to meeting U.S. energy demands could drop from 20 percent to 9 percent.

What sources of energy would make up the difference? It is virtually certain that the only technically feasible path is an even greater reliance on fossil fuels. According to the Clean Air Council, annual power plant emissions are responsible for 36 percent of carbon dioxide, 64 percent of sulfur dioxide, 26 percent of nitrogen oxides and 33 percent of mercury emissions

These four pollutants cause significant environmental impact, including acid rain, smog, respiratory illness, mercury contamination, and are the major contributors to greenhouse gas emissions.



## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **2. This Pollution Kills Tens of Thousands Every Year**

Third World Network '00 ["Thousands Die Annually From Power-Plant Pollution", October 17, <http://www.twinside.org.sg/title/plant.htm>, accessed 6/23/08]

Pollution from electric power plants in the United States shortens the lives of more than 30,000 people every year, according to a new report released here by environmental and health researchers. The study concludes that soot, or fine particle air pollution, from the nation's ageing coal-fired power plants is causing tens of thousands of asthma attacks, cardiac problems and upper and lower respiratory problems each year.

While many have studied air pollution's impact on human health, this is the first attempt to examine the direct health impact of these facilities, according to health experts.

"More people die as a result of the pollution from these plants every year than from drunk driving or homicides, societal woes that everyone agrees are top priorities," says Conrad Schneider, advocacy director of the Boston-based Clean Air Task Force, one of the groups that released the report, "Death, Disease and Dirty Power".

The 25-page report is based on research conducted by Abt Associates, a consulting firm regularly employed by the US Environmental Protection Agency to assess the health benefits of the agency's programs. The firm developed a model using health studies which link changes in soot concentrations in the environment to changes in risks of death and illness. Using pollution information made publicly available by the power plants themselves - as required by law - Abt Associates then employed this model to estimate the number of probable deaths from exposure to fine particles emitted from power plants. Besides 30,000 annual deaths, fine particle soot from power plants also causes an estimated 603,000 asthma attacks nationwide, according to the study.

"We can only hope the information provided through this study will help crystallize the policy debate leading to dramatic reductions in pollution from dirty power plants," says John Spengler, a professor at the Harvard School of Public Health, who wrote the foreword to the study.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

Fine particles are a mixture of a variety of different compounds and pollutants that originate from power plants, diesel trucks, buses and cars. Among particles, fine particles, or particulates, are of the gravest concern, according to researchers, because they can be inhaled deeply, thus evading the human lungs' natural defenses.

While acknowledging that vehicle exhaust also causes particulate pollution, the study says that power plants outstrip all other polluters as the largest source of sulphates - the major component of fine particle pollution - in the United States.

### **3. Pollution From Burning Fossil Fuels Leads to the Extinction of Plants That Are Key to Biodiversity and to the Oxygen That Humans Need to Live**

Council for Scientific and Industrial Research '07 ["Biodiversity", March 28, <http://bcb705.blogspot.com/2007/03/air-pollution-lethal-injection.html>]

From the above information it is obvious to see that air pollution has severe adverse effects on the ultra structure and biological processes of plants. As plants form the bases of all food chains and also supplies us with oxygen, we should value and treasure them. Many of our forest ecosystems will be destroyed or at least be disturbed, resulting in considerable changes in plant communities and losses of plant resources and ecosystems. We should therefore increase our awareness of pollution in general and see what we are able to do to decrease pollution levels.

Air pollution also changes the distribution of many plants species and plant communities. It reduces biodiversity and does not respect boundaries set by conservation areas and nature reserves. Air pollution therefore contributes to the decline of biodiversity on a global scale. This global impact is also evident with climatic changes i.e. increase in temperature caused by gases polluting the atmosphere.

Something needs to be done to reduce pollution at the source. This can be done by reducing energy demands, conserving energy, switching of fuel and having technical pollution controls. The sixth major extinction is being triggered by humans' inconsideration for our planet. Deforestation and fossil-fuel combustion have caused an increase in carbon dioxide by 30% in the past three centuries. We have already caused the extinction of 5-20% of the species in many groups of organisms. How much more disaster are we going to cause and what will it take to bring about a reformation? Air pollution is only one factor that influences biodiversity but controlling it can make the world of difference.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **4. Biodiversity is the Single Most Important Impact in the Debate— Without It, Extinction is Inevitable and Nothing Else Matters**

Bartlett, professor emeritus at UC-Berkeley, '04 ["Preserving Biodiversity", May 20, <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/Miscellany2.htm>, accessed 6/23/08]

It is a shocking commentary on the human species – supposedly intelligent – that it is in the process of destroying the very biosphere on which is it totally dependent for its existence. Fermenting yeast in a vat of beer do a similar thing – reproduce to the limit, until they suffocate in their own waste. Humankind is in the midst of the planet's sixth mass species extinction. Large human numbers and industrial activity are the direct cause of the extinction of 30,000 – 150,000 species every year, out of the total of just a few million on the planet. The normal rate of extinction, prior to the modern era, was a few species per century.

Incredibly, not a single world leader is calling for a reduction in industrial activity. All national leaders and world organizations, such as the World Bank and the United Nations, are calling for even more industrial activity. The US was willing to go to war in Iraq over oil, which will all be gone (planet-wide) by 2050, but it did not even consider going to war against Brazil, which causes the destruction of about 10,000 square miles of Amazon rain forest, and the extinction of thousands of species, every year.

It is amazing to listen to the candidates in the US presidential race, and to hear what they are discussing, while the biosphere dies. None of the issues that they are discussing will matter a whit if the biosphere is destroyed, or if the human species becomes extinct. After each statement that a candidate makes, ask yourself, "Yes, but how does that affect the species extinction?" Or, "Yes, but how does that affect global warming." Or, "Yes, but will this matter after six billion people die when global oil reserves exhaust?" You will soon find out that what they are discussing is, in the face of our imminent demise, totally irrelevant.

Saving the planet is the only thing that matters. If the biosphere is destroyed, all of the issues about unemployment, poverty, race or sex discrimination, abortion and terrorism will be irrelevant. Preserving biodiversity is the only game in town.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **Harms Scenario B: Nuclear Terrorism**

#### **1. On-Site Storage of Nuclear Waste Dramatically Increases the Risk of Nuclear Terrorism**

Schultz, Princeton University, '03 [Steven, "High Density Storage of Nuclear Waste Heightens Terrorism Risks", February 13, accessed 5/1/08, [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-02/pu-hso021303.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-02/pu-hso021303.php)]

A space-saving method for storing spent nuclear fuel has dramatically heightened the risk of a catastrophic radiation release in the event of a terrorist attack, according to a study initiated at Princeton.

Terrorists targeting the high-density storage systems used at nuclear power plants throughout the nation could cause contamination problems "significantly worse than those from Chernobyl," the study found.

The study authors, a multi-institutional team of researchers led by Frank von Hippel of Princeton, called on the U.S. Congress to mandate the construction of new facilities to house spent fuel in less risky configurations and estimated a cost of \$3.5 billion to \$7 billion for the project.

The paper is scheduled to be published in the spring in the journal Science and Global Security.

Strapped for long-term storage options, the nation's 103 nuclear power plants routinely pack four to five times the number of spent fuel rods into water-cooled tanks than the tanks were designed to hold, the authors reported. This high-density configuration is safe when cooled by water, but would likely cause a fire -- with catastrophic results -- if the cooling water leaked. The tanks could be ruptured by a hijacked jet or sabotage, the study contends.

The consequences of such a fire would be the release of a radiation plume that would contaminate eight to 70 times more land than the area affected by the 1986 accident in Chernobyl. The cost of such a disaster would run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, the researchers reported.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **2. An Act of Nuclear Terrorism Against the US Homeland Would Spark Massive Retaliation, Killing Hundreds of Millions**

Easterbrook '01 [Gregg, CNN.com, November 2, 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0111/01/gal.00.html>]

Well, what held through the Cold War, when the United States and Russia had thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other, what held each side back was the fact that fundamentally they were rational. They knew that if they struck, they would be struck in turn.

Terrorists may not be held by this, especially suicidal terrorists, of the kind that al Qaeda is attempting to cultivate. But I think, if I could leave you with one message, it would be this: that the search for terrorist atomic weapons would be of great benefit to the Muslim peoples of the world in addition to members, to people of the United States and Western Europe, because if an atomic warhead goes off in Washington, say, in the current environment or anything like it, in the 24 hours that followed, a hundred million Muslims would die as U.S. nuclear bombs rained down on every conceivable military target in a dozen Muslim countries.

**Thus we propose the following plan: The United States federal government should construct a network of safeguarded, centralized interim storage facilities capable of housing spent fuel for at least 100 years. As soon as possible, it should transport all nuclear waste currently stored on site and commit to transporting and storing all waste produced in the future at these facilities until a long-term option is available.**

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **Contention Three: Solvency**

#### **A. Interim Waste Storage Facilities Will Pave the Way for the Construction of New Nuclear Power Plants and Decrease Proliferation Risks**

MIT Nuclear Energy Study '03 ["The Future of Nuclear Power",  
<http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-full.pdf>, accessed 6/23/08]

The management and disposal of high-level radioactive waste continues to be one of the primary obstacles to the development of the nuclear power industry around the world. We concur with the many independent expert reviews that have concluded that the geologic disposal approach is capable of safely isolating the waste from the biosphere for as long as it poses significant risks. Successful implementation of this approach has yet to be demonstrated, however. Within the next 10-20 years, it is likely that one or two full-scale high-level waste repositories will be commissioned in the United States and elsewhere. Public opposition will continue to be a major obstacle to repository siting in many countries, however, and progress towards establishing operating repositories will be slow.

For fifteen years, the scientific and technical focus of the U.S. high-level waste management program has been directed almost exclusively on the investigation and development of the Yucca Mountain site. The focus on Yucca Mountain will continue as design and licensing activities gain momentum over the next few years. The successful commissioning and operation of Yucca Mountain would be a significant step towards the secure disposal of nuclear waste. However, a broader focus for the U.S. nuclear waste program is needed to provide a foundation for a possible expansion of the nuclear power industry in the U.S. and overseas.

Our assessment of advanced technical strategies for waste management and disposal in Chapter 7 led to the following key conclusions:

Replacing the current ad hoc approach to spent fuel storage with an explicit strategy to store spent fuel for a period of several decades, prior to reprocessing and/or geologic disposal, will create additional flexibility and robustness in the waste management system and, if organized internationally, can also provide significant non-proliferation benefits.

## Nuclear Power 1AC

### **B. Expanded Nuclear Power Capacity Drastically Reduces Air Pollution**

Nuclear Energy Institute '07 ["Nuclear Industry Leaders Identify Challenges on Road to US Nuclear Energy Renaissance", May 24, accessed 6/18/08, <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2004/energysubcmtefepteextended>]

The value of the emissions avoided by U.S. nuclear power plants is essential in meeting clean air regulations. In 2002, U.S. nuclear power plants avoided the emission of about 3.4 million tons of sodium dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and about 1.4 million tons of nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>). To put these numbers in perspective, the requirements imposed by the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments reduced SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the electric power sector between 1990 and 2002 by 5.5 million tons per year and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 2.3 million tons year. Thus, in a single year, nuclear power plants avoid nearly as much in emissions as was achieved over a 12-year period by other sources.

The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions avoided by U.S. nuclear power plants are equivalent to eliminating NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from six out of 10 passenger cars in the United States. The carbon emissions avoided by U.S. nuclear power plants are equivalent to eliminating the carbon emissions from nine out of 10 passenger cars in the United States.

Nuclear energy helped reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in northeastern and mid Atlantic states, according to a report last year by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Ozone Transport Commission (OTC). The 2003 EPA assessment found that energy companies have been shifting electricity production from fossil-fueled power plants to emission-free nuclear power plants to help comply with federal air pollution laws.

In Tennessee, for example, three nuclear reactors avoid the emission of approximately 170,000 tons of SO<sub>2</sub>, 60,000 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> and 6.6 million metric tons of carbon every year. For perspective, 60,000 tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, which is a precursor to ground-level ozone, is the amount released into the air by 3.1 million passenger cars. There are 1.7 million passenger cars registered in Tennessee.



## Nuclear Power 1AC

In summary, nuclear energy represents a unique value proposition: a nuclear power coplant provides large volumes of electricity—cleanly, reliably, safely and affordably. It provides future price stability and serves as a hedge against the kind of price and supply volatility we see with natural gas. And nuclear plants have valuable environmental attributes: They do not emit controlled air pollutants or carbon dioxide, and thus are not vulnerable to mandatory limits on carbon emissions. Other sources of electricity have some of these attributes. But none of them—not coal, natural gas or renewables—can deliver all of these benefits. Only nuclear power plants have all of these attributes, and that is why these plants are uniquely valuable.

### **C. The Federal Government Must Take Responsibility for Interim Storage of Nuclear Waste to Prevent Nuclear Material From Falling Into the Hands of Terrorists**

Deutch and Moniz, former undersecretaries of energy, '06 ["A Plan for Nuclear Waste", January 29, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/01/29/AR2006012900719.html>, accessed 6/23/08]

Fourth, a new era of global nuclear fuel cycle expansion poses proliferation risks. Iran, which is suspected of using nuclear power development to disguise a weapons program, may be a harbinger of more such confrontations. Urgent concrete action is needed to build on the recent administration initiative to improve the security of the global nuclear fuel supply.

What is certain is that a decision by the United States to recycle plutonium would upset these efforts. The link between management of spent fuel and the risk of proliferation is clear. If long-lived elements such as plutonium go with the spent fuel to a geological repository, they produce the long-term heating that will be, over many millennia, a threat to the integrity of the repository. If they are removed from the spent fuel by reprocessing, a proliferation risk is created.

What should be done? First, and most important, the government should take title to the spent fuel stored at commercial reactor sites across the country and consolidate it at one or more federal sites until a proper disposal pathway is created. This can be done safely and securely for an extended period and, indeed, such extended storage should be incorporated into a proper disposal strategy. It would take the pressure for a hasty disposal solution off both government and industry.



## Answers to Waste Not a Barrier

### **1. Waste Disposal is the Main Barrier to Expansion of Nuclear Power**

**Cross-apply our MIT evidence from Inherency. This evidence is much more specific than the Negative's.**

### **2. Non-Responsive**

**The Negative's evidence only says that waste disposal is not a barrier to licensing new plants. That's fine, the problem is that investors and utilities don't want to build new plants because they don't want to be stuck holding the bill for waste disposal. It is supposed to be the federal government's responsibility, and our plan has them live up to that obligation so that investors will be willing to fund new plants.**

### **3. Waste is an Obstacle to Funding New Nuclear Plants**

Gelinas, fellow at the Manhattan Institute, '07 [Nicole, "Nuclear Power: The Investment Outlook", June 1, [http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\\_01.htm](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper_01.htm), acc 6/23/08]

Until the question of long-term disposal of nuclear waste is settled, the issue could be an obstacle to funding new plants, as the on-site waste that would accumulate over years from new plants could exceed the maximum levels allowed under local permits in some cases.

### **4. Concerns About Waste Disposal Overwhelm All Other Incentives**

Parker and Holt, Congressional Research Service energy specialists, '07 [Larry and Mark, "Nuclear Power: Outlook for New US Reactors", March 9, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33442.pdf>, accessed 6/23/08]

In announcing the new reactor license applications, however, utilities have made clear that they are not committed to actually building the reactors, even if the licenses are approved. Large uncertainties about nuclear plant construction costs still remain, along with doubts about progress on nuclear waste disposal and concerns about public opposition. All those problems helped cause the long cessation of U.S. reactor orders and will need to be addressed before financing for new multibillion-dollar nuclear power plants is likely to be obtained.

## Answers to Clean Coal

### **1. No Impact**

**They say the coal industry has been cutting emissions for 20 years, but air pollution still kills tens of thousands of people every year and undermines the biodiversity that supports all life on Earth. Clearly these new technologies are not sufficient to solve the problems of air pollution from burning coal.**

### **2. Clean Coal is a Dangerous Lie That Will Result in Human Extinction**

Barry, political ecologist and conservation biologist, '07 [Glen, "Clean Coal, Forest Biofuel, and Other Fairy Tales", January 21, accessed 6/23/08, <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2007/01/clean-coal-forest-biofuel-and-other.html>

Two of the biggest, most dangerous lies being promoted in response to global warming are that clean coal exists and the world's forests are adequate to provide biofuel. Dirty coal and industrial forest harvest for energy only accelerates the root causes of looming Doomsday for the Earth - that is destruction of the biosphere's atmospheric and terrestrial ecosystems.

Coal burning and forest loss have been the leading culprit in climate change to date, and should their continued use at any scale be pursued as the solution to climate change and energy security, it will prove the death-knell for the Planet. We need less fossil fuel use and more forest regeneration, not the reverse.

The myth of "Clean Coal" is pernicious nonsense, as promised carbon sequestration technologies remain unproven, are not likely to be pursued at any scale anytime soon and are primarily used to put off limits on burning coal. Coal is cheap, plentiful and dirty. Carbon emissions from burning coal have been the leading cause of global warming. The world's coal reserves hold some 3500 gigatonne of carbon, compared to the atmosphere currently holding around 800 gigatonne (600 gigatonne before the industrial revolution). If this coal is burnt and carbon vented into the atmosphere the planet will be several times past the concentration of carbon dioxide considered able to be adapted to safely.

## Answers to Clean Coal

China is opening another coal plant every 7 to 10 days. The U.S. coal industry is rushing to build some 150 new plants before mandatory carbon caps, carbon taxes or carbon sequestration are put in place. Each of these new dirty coal plants uses the oldest of technologies, locking the world's two greatest polluters into dirty coal for at least 50 more years. I know of no plans to make carbon sequestration mandatory any time soon for new coal plants. It will be at least 10 years before we know if geosequestration even works. Carbon capture and storage is expensive, increasing the costs of power generation by 40 to 80%. Despite all the promises of coal gasification and carbon sequestration, it may never be possible to produce energy from coal without atmospheric carbon emissions.

### **3. "Clean Coal" Just Shifts the Pollutants From the Air to the Water- the Impact on Biodiversity is the Same**

Greenpeace '05 ["Unmasking the Truth Behind Clean Coal"]  
<http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/en/asia-energy-revolution/dirty-energy/clean-coal-myth>, accessed 6/23/08]

"Clean coal" methods only move pollutants from one waste stream to another which are then still released into the environment. Any time coal is burnt, contaminants are released and they have to go somewhere. They can be released via the fly ash, the gaseous air emissions, water outflow or the ash left at the bottom after burning. Ultimately, they still end up polluting the environment.

### **4. Turn. "Clean Coal" Diverts Research Funds From Renewable Energy**

Greenpeace '05 ["Unmasking the Truth Behind Clean Coal"]  
<http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/en/asia-energy-revolution/dirty-energy/clean-coal-myth>, accessed 6/23/08]

Despite over 10 years of research and \$5.2 billion of investment in the US alone , scientists are still unable to make coal clean. The Australian government spends A\$0.5 million annually to promote Australia's 'clean coal' to the Asia Pacific region. "Clean coal" technologies are expensive and do nothing to mitigate the environmental effects of coal mining or the devastating effects of global warming. Furthermore, clean coal research risks diverting investment away from renewable energy, which is available to reduce greenhouse gas emissions now.

## Extensions to Clean Coal Bad

### **( ) Clean Coal Still Produces Toxic and Acidic Runoff**

Green Peace '05 [Myths and Facts of "Clean Coal" Technology,  
<http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/en/asia-energy-revolution/dirty-energy/clean-coal-myth/clean-coal-myths-and-facts>, accessed 5/1/08]

Coal washing results in the formation of large quantities of slurry. This is placed in waste piles. Rain drains through the piles, picking up pollutants which end up in rivers and streams. This runoff is acidic and contains heavy metals.

### **( ) No Way to Prevent Mercury Emissions From Coal**

Green Peace '05 [Myths and Facts of "Clean Coal" Technology,  
<http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/en/asia-energy-revolution/dirty-energy/clean-coal-myth/clean-coal-myths-and-facts>, accessed 5/1/08]

According to a report by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) mercury and its compounds are highly toxic and pose a 'global environmental threat to humans and wildlife.' Exposure to it has been associated with serious neurological and developmental damage to humans. The report also states that coal-fired power and heat production is the largest single source of atmospheric mercury emissions. According to the Coal Utilization Research Council 'there are no commercial technologies available for mercury capture at coal-fuelled power plants'. Furthermore, a US Department of Energy commissioned report, states that the consistent, long-term performance of mercury control has yet to be demonstrated. Experimental removal of mercury is prohibitively expensive at \$761,000/kg mercury removed and even then 10% of the mercury still remains.

### **( ) "Clean Coal" Produces Equally Toxic Solid Waste**

Green Peace '05 [Myths and Facts of "Clean Coal" Technology,  
<http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/en/asia-energy-revolution/dirty-energy/clean-coal-myth/clean-coal-myths-and-facts>, accessed 5/1/08]

At a coal-fired power plant, coal is pulverised and burnt in a high temperature furnace. Various toxic gases and tiny particles are released from the furnace into the smokestacks; pollution devices are used to try to trap pollutants before they are released into the atmosphere. The use and disposal of solid wastes trapped in the furnace and the release of gases and fine particles from the smokestacks have severe impacts on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and people's health.

## Extensions to Clean Coal Bad

### **( ) “Clean Coal” is an Oxymoron – Every Step of the Process is Dangerous to the Environment and to Human Life**

Stockman, organizer of the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, '01 [“Clean Coal: The Mother of All Oxymorons”, March 15, <http://www.mindfully.org/Energy/Clean-Coal-Oxymoron.htm>, accessed 6/23/08]

Let's pretend for a moment that coal really can be burned cleanly. Before you burn it, you have to extract it. For the traditional deep mining areas, that means black lung disease for miners and eons of costly treatment for acid mine drainage. For certain other coal bearing areas of West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia, that means more mountaintop removal, more disappearing mountain communities, more forest destruction, more stream burials under valley fills, more disrupted groundwater, and more unknown long-term effects to ecosystems.

Next, you have to process the coal. That means washing it for market, which means huge slurry "ponds," with their toxic stew of heavy metals and coal cleaning chemicals, looming over downstream communities. One such "pond" breakthrough in October at a mountaintop removal site in Kentucky released 250 million gallons of thick black sludge, creating the worst-ever waste spill, for which cleanup is ongoing and costs are rising. Officials have warned that the cleanup may never be complete.

Next, you have to transport the coal to market. If that's by truck, you have more diesel-belching, overweight trucks careening dangerously along narrow mountain roads, causing occasional fatal accidents and destroying bridges and roads, which must be repaired at taxpayer expense. If that's by barge, then you may get increased river dredging. One dredge proposed for the Kanawha River in West Virginia would recover coal particles downstream from a chemical plant, possibly stirring up toxin-laced sediment.

Finally, after the coal is hypothetically "cleanly" burned, the coal ash -- known to contain heavy metals such as chromium, cadmium, arsenic and mercury -- must be disposed of. Conveniently, there are no federally enforceable rules for disposing of this ash. Most known storage methods are imperfect and can lead to leach the ash's toxic contents into aquifers. Groundwater takes a beating, and so, ultimately, does our health.

## Answers to No Terrorism Risk

### **1. History is on Our Side**

**The Negative's evidence claims that organizations like Al Qaeda are concerned about the political and physical survival. But they have already demonstrated a willingness to commit suicide attacks and to target civilians. If they are willing to crash planes into office buildings, they will be willing to do the same to nuclear storage facilities.**

### **2. Prefer Our Evidence**

**The Negative's evidence is outdated. It's from 1998, before the attacks of September 11, 2001! Our authors are more specific to contemporary terrorism threats such as al Qaeda.**

## Answers to No Terrorism Risk

### **3. Al Qaeda is Actively Seeking to Conduct Nuclear Terrorism Against the US**

Bunn '08 [Matthew, testimony before the committee on homeland security and governmental affairs, April 2, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/bunn-nuclear-terror-risk-test-08.pdf>, accessed 6/23/08]

Do terrorists want nuclear weapons? For a small set of terrorists, the answer is clearly "yes." Osama bin Laden has called the acquisition of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction a "religious duty." Al Qaeda operatives have made repeated attempts to buy nuclear material for a nuclear bomb, or to recruit nuclear expertise – including the two extremist Pakistani nuclear weapon scientists who met with bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri to discuss nuclear weapons. Before al Qaeda, the Japanese terror cult Aum Shinrikyo also made a concerted effort to get nuclear weapons. With at least two groups going down this path in the last 15 years, we must expect that others will in the future.

Is it plausible that a sophisticated terrorist group could make a crude nuclear bomb if they got HEU or separated plutonium? The answer here is also "yes." Making at least a crude nuclear bomb might well be within the capabilities of a sophisticated group, though a nuclear bomb effort would be the most technically challenging operation any terrorist group has ever accomplished. One study by the now-defunct congressional Office of Technology Assessment summarized the threat: "A small group of people, none of whom have ever had access to the classified literature, could possibly design and build a crude nuclear explosive device... Only modest machine-shop facilities that could be contracted for without arousing suspicion would be required." Indeed, even before the revelations from Afghanistan, U.S. intelligence concluded that "fabrication of at least a 'crude' nuclear device was within al-Qa'ida's capabilities, if it could obtain fissile material."

A terrorist cell of relatively modest size, with no large fixed facilities that would draw attention, might well be able to pull off such an effort – and the world might never know until it was too late.

## Answers to Terrorist Attack Won't Cause Leak

### **1. Prefer Our Evidence**

**Schultz '03 says that the risk is increased by the fact that on-site storage facilities are overloaded. Because they were never intended to store large quantities of nuclear waste, plants don't have the capacity to store all of the material for which they are currently responsible. This means they overload their storage tanks, increasing the risk of a leak in the event of a nuclear attack. The Negative evidence does not assume that the tanks are overloaded.**

### **2. It's Irrelevant**

**Our impact evidence says that the US will retaliate with nuclear weapons and kill hundreds of millions. Even if the terrorists didn't succeed in releasing radioactive waste, the fact that they tried would be enough to provoke retaliation and cause our impact.**



## Answers to Local Politics Blocks

### **1. No Impact**

**The Negative's evidence only says that some people oppose having a nuclear plant in their community. Even if this is true, there is no evidence that they could successfully block the construction of a plant.**

### **2. No impact**

**Nuclear plants don't have to be built everywhere, they can be build in the 36% of communities that are willing to accept a plant.**

### **3. The Economic Benefit to Communities Will Outweigh Safety Concerns**

McErlain '07 [Eric, "The Economic Impact of a Nuclear Power Plant", January 31, <http://neinuclearnotes.blogspot.com/2007/01/economic-impact-of-nuclear-power-plant.html>, accessed 6/23/08]

An Australian blog, Falkayn's Nest, is asking hard questions after reading a study authored by anti-nukes that claims local opposition is bound to stifle any and all development of new nuclear in Australia:

I wonder how long it takes before some enterprising local council works out that the impact on jobs, industry and local living conditions of a nuclear power plant far outweighs the potential and theoretical downsides?

As it turns out, his assumptions are on target. In a study that appeared recently in the International Journal of Nuclear Governance, Economy and Ecology, Roger Bezdek and Robert Wendling found that in seven regions with nuclear facilities...

[H]ousing and real estate values have benefited from the operation of nuclear facilities: total property values, assessed valuations and median housing prices have often increased at rates above the national and state averages. In each local area, housing prices were several times higher than prior to the opening of the nuclear facilities.

## Answers to Uranium Shortage

### **1. There Will Not Be a Shortage of Uranium**

Farrell '05 ["Looking at the Uranium Supply", June 14, accessed 6/23/08, <http://neinuclearnotes.blogspot.com/2005/06/looking-at-uranium-supply.html>]

Of course, known resources of economically and technologically recoverable uranium have expanded significantly since the 1970s and will continue to do so into the future. The world's uranium resources will increase due to improved knowledge of geology, enhanced extraction and reactor technology and the higher uranium prices spurred by demand growth.

Uranium is a ubiquitous element in the earth's crust and oceans, as is thorium, another important, naturally-occurring metal that can support nuclear fission. The world's 440 reactors use approximately 180 million pounds of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> annually, of which 56 million pounds are consumed by America's 103 operating reactors.

World demand is principally met from primary production (mining), liquidation of utility inventories, ever-improving fuel manufacturing and fabrication techniques and decommissioning nuclear weapons. Nearly half of the fuel used in U.S. nuclear energy plants is now derived from blended down uranium from decommissioned Russian nuclear weapons.

In what is the most successful nonproliferation program in history, the "Megatons-to-Megawatts" initiative, Russia has converted the highly enriched uranium (HEU) equivalent of nearly 10,000 warheads to low enriched uranium (LEU) for commercial fuel.

Forecasts of new nuclear generation expect approximately 40-60 new reactors worldwide by 2020. This will increase uranium demand to approximately 195 million pounds in 2010 and 240 million pounds by 2020. For an assumed price of \$30/lb U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) estimated world uranium resources in 2003 to be 3,537,000 metric tons, an amount adequate to fuel conventional reactors for approximately 50 years. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) further estimated all conventional uranium resources to be 14.4 million metric tons, an amount which would cover over 200 years' supply at current rates of consumption.

## Answers to Uranium Shortage

Importantly, these forecasts do not include non-conventional sources of uranium, such as those contained in phosphates or in seawater, which are currently not economic to extract but represent a near limitless supply of uranium to meet increased demand. Clearly, there are very adequate uranium (and thorium) resources to fuel the world's expanding nuclear fleet.

Of greater concern, however, is a general failure to recognize how applications of human ingenuity and technology have enhanced the world's supply of uranium. Higher capacity factors and reactor power levels, higher operating efficiencies, reprocessing of used nuclear fuel and development of new reactor designs are just a few examples of technological and operating improvements.

### **2. No Impact**

**Burning coal will result in human extinction. Even if there is a shortage of uranium, the Negative has no impact that can compare to extinction so you would still vote Affirmative.**

### **3. Uranium is Much Cheaper and Easier to Supply Than Oil**

World Nuclear Association '08 ["Supply of Uranium", June, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf75.html>, accessed 6/23/08]

Since uranium is part of the energy sector, another way to look at exploration costs is on the basis of energy value. This allows comparisons with the energy investment cost for other energy fuels, especially fossil fuels which will have analogous costs related to the discovery of the resources. From numerous published sources, the finding costs of crude oil have averaged around US\$ 6/bbl over at least the past three decades. When finding costs of the two fuels are expressed in terms of their contained energy value, oil, at US\$ 1050/MJ of energy, is about 300 times more expensive to find than uranium, at US\$ 3.4/MJ. Similarly, the proportion of current market prices that finding costs comprise are lower for uranium. Its finding costs make up only 2% of the recent spot price of US\$ 30/lb (\$78/kgU), while the oil finding costs are 12% of a recent spot price of US\$ 50/bbl.

By these measures, uranium is a very inexpensive energy source to replenish, as society has accepted far higher energy replacement costs to sustain oil resources. This low basic energy resource cost is one argument in favor of a nuclear-hydrogen solution to long-term replacement of oil as a transportation fuel.

## Answers to Transportation Turn

### **1. No Impact**

**A single canister of waste spilled at a remote storage facility would not be a disaster. Remember that in the status quo, burning coal will inevitably lead to human extinction!**

### **2. Prefer Our Evidence**

**Schultz '02 says that on-site storage facilities have exceeded their capacity and are now overloading containers. The Negative's evidence doesn't assume this when it compares the risks of on-site storage to transportation.**

### **3. Transporting Nuclear Waste is Safe**

Nuclear Energy Institute '08 ["Transportation", accessed 5/2/08,  
<http://www.nei.org/keyissues/nuclearwastedisposal/transportation/>]

Used nuclear fuel consists of ceramic pellets encased in metal tubes. The fuel cannot explode, and the massive containers in which it is transported can protect public health and the environment even if subjected to the highest temperatures seen in transportation accidents involving chemicals or other flammable materials. After extensive studies, both the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the National Academy of Sciences concluded that used nuclear fuel can be transported safely.

The nuclear energy industry has completed more than 3,000 shipments of used nuclear fuel over 1.7 million miles of U.S. highways and railroads. Over this period, fuel containers were involved in just eight accidents, and no radiation was released. These shipments include used nuclear fuel shipped back to manufacturers or research facilities.

## Answers to Transportation Turn

### **4. Transporting Nuclear Waste Does Not Create Terrorism or Accident Risk**

Dr. Chapin et al '02 ["Nuclear Power Plants and Their Fuel as Terrorist Targets", September 20, <http://www.radschihealth.org/rsh/Realism/RealismApp1b.pdf>]

Since 11 September 2001, the U.S. nuclear industry and its regulators have been reevaluating plant and fuel shipment safety. These studies are being kept secret. But it is no secret that basic engineering facts and laws of nature limit the damage that can result. Extensive analysis, backed by full-scale field tests, show that there is virtually nothing one could do to these shipping casks that would cause a significant public hazard. Before shipment, the fuel elements have been cooled for several years, so the decay heat and the shortlived radioactivity have died down. They cannot explode, and there is no liquid radioactivity to leak out. They are nearly indestructible, having been tested against collisions, explosives, fire, and water. Only the latest antitank artillery could breach them, and then, the result was to scatter a few chunks of spent fuel onto the ground. There seems to be no reason to expect harmful effects of the radiation any significant distance from the cask.

## Answers to Terrorism Turn

### **1. Non-Unique**

**The Negative's evidence says that other countries like England could also encourage proliferation by expanding nuclear power. That means these impacts will occur whether or not you pass the plan.**

### **2. Non-Unique. Rogue States Will Seek Nuclear Weapons Regardless of the US' Actions on Nuclear Energy**

Sweet, senior news editor at IEEE Spectrum, '06 [William, Kicking the Carbon Habit, p. 193]

There's a school of thought that any reliance on nuclear energy by anybody sets a bad example, and tempts wayward states to first acquire civil nuclear technology and then turn it to military ends. But this concern is hard to credit, on either theoretical or historical grounds. Is it really plausible that a country like North Korea or Iran would forego acquisition of nuclear technology just because the United States, Germany, or Japan decided to do so first? Obviously they have been assembling nuclear technology precisely in order to lay the groundwork for nuclear weapons programs, to the best of their ability, whatever other countries may do. While it's true that if every other country of the world gave up nuclear technology it would be harder for countries like Iran and North Korea to launch weapons efforts in the guise of energy programs, it would be a very high price to pay for a very uncertain reward.

## Answers to Terrorism Turn

### **3. No Impact. Nuclear Reactors Are Safe From Terrorist Attack**

Huber and Mills '05 [Peter and Mark, "Why the US Needs More Nuclear Power", Winter, [http://www.city-journal.org/html/15\\_1\\_nuclear\\_power.html](http://www.city-journal.org/html/15_1_nuclear_power.html), acc 6/23/08]

How worried should we really be in 2005 that accidents or attacks might release and disperse a nuclear power plant's radioactive fuel? Not very. Our civilian nuclear industry has dramatically improved its procedures and safety-related hardware since 1979. Several thousand reactor-years of statistics since Three Mile Island clearly show that these power plants are extraordinarily reliable in normal operation.

And uranium's combination of power and super-density makes the fuel less of a terror risk, not more, at least from an engineering standpoint. It's easy to "overbuild" the protective walls and containment systems of nuclear facilities, since—like the pyramids—the payload they're built to shield is so small. Protecting skyscrapers is hard; no builder can afford to erect a hundred times more wall than usable space. Guaranteeing the integrity of a jumbo jet's fuel tanks is impossible; the tanks have to fly. Shielding a nuclear plant's tiny payload is easy—just erect more steel, pour more concrete, and build tougher perimeters.

In fact, it's a safety challenge that we have already met. Today's plants split atoms behind super-thick layers of steel and concrete; future plants would boast thicker protection still. All the numbers, and the strong consensus in the technical community, reinforce the projections made two decades ago: it is extremely unlikely that there will ever be a serious release of nuclear materials from a U.S. reactor.

### **4. Case Outweighs**

**If the US does not expand nuclear power, then it will burn more coal, that's our Moore '05 evidence. This destroys biodiversity and guarantees human extinction. Even if the Negative wins this argument, the ultimate impact is one or two cities devastated by a terrorist attack. That's a tragedy, but it's nothing compared to human extinction. You would still vote Affirmative.**

## Extensions to Inherency

### **( ) Nuclear Power Will Disappear in the Status Quo**

MIT Nuclear Energy Study '03 ["The Future of Nuclear Power", acc 6/18/08  
<http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-full.pdf>]

Nuclear power is a special case, however. If current trends continue, nuclear power will gradually decrease and perhaps even disappear as part of the global energy portfolio, thus failing to make any long-term contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Few nuclear power plants are under construction worldwide, and of those, most are being built in a small number of developing countries or developed countries in East Asia. In most developed countries, the use of nuclear power is not expected to expand and, in many of these countries, including the United States, nuclear power has been explicitly excluded from policies to stabilize and reduce carbon emissions (e.g., direct and tax subsidies for renewable energy and energy conservation, high mandated purchase prices for renewable energy, renewable energy portfolio standards). In Britain, nuclear power plants pay a "carbon tax," even though they have essentially no CO2 emissions. We believe that a more objective approach will have a better chance at meeting the global warming challenge. Indeed, it is likely that our energy future will exploit all of the four options to one degree or another. This study addresses the issues associated with maintaining the nuclear power option.



## Extensions to Inherency

### **( ) Insufficient Investment in Nuke Electricity**

Fertel, Chief Nuclear Officer at the Nuclear Energy Institute, '04 [Marvin, "Testimony Before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, March 20, acc 6/23/08, <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2004/ussenatecmteferlextended>]

NEI believes that lack of investment in our nation's critical energy and electric power infrastructure is a major problem. Our country is not investing enough in new baseload coal and nuclear plants, and we are not investing enough in new electricity transmission.

NEI's assessment shows that approximately 183,000 megawatts of electricity generating capacity is 30-40 years old; approximately 104,000 MW is 40-50 years old. That represents about one-third of U.S. installed electric generating capacity, and is clear evidence that we are underinvesting for our energy future—relying too much on old, less efficient generating capacity and not investing in new, more efficient and cleaner facilities.

Investment in our country's electricity transmission system has fallen by \$115 million per year for the last 25 years, and investment in this area in 1999 was less than one-half of the level 20 years earlier—despite dramatic increases in the volumes of electricity being moved to market. One analysis<sup>7</sup> shows that simply maintaining transmission adequacy at its current level (which is widely acknowledged to be inadequate) would require a capital investment of \$56 billion by 2010, equal to the book value of the existing transmission system.

## Extensions to Harms – Terrorism

### **( ) On-Site Storage of Nuclear Waste Risks Terrorism**

Posner, federal appeals judge, '05 [Richard, "Nuclear Power", May 1, acc 6/23/08, [http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear\\_powerpo.html](http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear_powerpo.html)]

There are other negative externalities of nuclear power generation, however. One relates to the disposal of the spent nuclear fuel. There are two methods of disposal. The one used in the United States is storage. Because of local objections to nuclear waste, spent nuclear fuel is currently stored at the site of the nuclear plant itself. This is worrisome partly because of limited on-site storage space but more so because the danger of theft by terrorists is greater the greater the dispersion of the material. Many other countries avoid the storage problem by reprocessing the spent nuclear fuel. But reprocessing produces as a byproduct plutonium, which is readily convertible to nuclear bomb material.

So the problem of disposal assumes truly serious form because of the threat of terrorism, and of proliferation of nuclear weaponry more broadly. Al Qaeda is known to have expressed interest in acquiring nuclear bombs; and the 'dirty bomb' (a conventional explosive coated with radioactive material) seems an especially attractive terrorist device. The more nuclear power plants there are, the more weaponizable nuclear material there is, and so the greater is the threat of nuclear terrorism and proliferation. How much greater is difficult, probably impossible, to say.

## Extensions to Solvency – New Construction

### **( ) Interim Waste Storage is an Essential Incentive for Investment in New Nuclear Plants**

Fertel, Chief Nuclear Officer at the Nuclear Energy Institute, '04 [Marvin, "Testimony Before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, March 20, acc 6/23/08, <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2004/ussenatecmtefer telextended>]

We must accept that the operation of a permanent disposal facility at Yucca Mountain will not happen soon—certainly not by the 2017 date currently advertised by the Department of Energy.

An alternative must be found if we truly believe that nuclear is essential not only to achieve meaningful reductions in carbon emissions, but also to enhance our national energy security.

I support NEI's position that long-term interim storage is that alternative.

We must establish a process under which the federal government takes title to spent fuel, and moves it from reactor sites to one or more federal locations for consolidated interim storage.

Long-term interim storage would demonstrate that the government is capable of meeting its statutory obligation to remove spent fuel from our reactor sites.

It decouples the decision to build new nuclear power plants from the operation of a permanent disposal facility for used fuel or the waste byproducts of nuclear fission.

And it gives us time to complete the technology development to close the nuclear fuel cycle, which will dictate the type of waste byproduct that will require long-term disposal.

While permanent disposal at Yucca Mountain or a similar facility remains a long-term imperative, we lose nothing if the operational date slips to 2025 or 2035 or even some later date.

But we risk losing everything if we cannot tell our friends and neighbors, with confidence, that the federal government has met its commitment to safely store spent fuel.

## Extensions to Solvency – Pollution

### **( ) Nuclear Energy is the Only Viable Alternative to Coal – Without it, Pollution and Global Warming are Inevitable**

Huber and Mills '05 [Peter and Mark, "Why the US Needs More Nuclear Power", Winter, [http://www.city-journal.org/html/15\\_1\\_nuclear\\_power.html](http://www.city-journal.org/html/15_1_nuclear_power.html), acc 6/23/08]

But serious Greens must face reality. Short of some convulsion that drastically shrinks the economy, demand for electricity will go on rising. Total U.S. electricity consumption will increase another 20 to 30 percent, at least, over the next ten years. Neither Democrats nor Republicans, moreover, will let the grid go cold—not even if that means burning yet another 400 million more tons of coal. Not even if that means melting the ice caps and putting much of Bangladesh under water. No governor or president wants to be the next Gray Davis, recalled from office when the lights go out.

The power has to come from somewhere. Sun and wind will never come close to supplying it. Earnest though they are, the people who argue otherwise are the folks who brought us 400 million extra tons of coal a year. The one practical technology that could decisively shift U.S. carbon emissions in the near term would displace coal with uranium, since uranium burns emission-free. It's time even for Greens to embrace the atom.

### **( ) New Nuclear Plants Are Essential to Meeting Both Energy and Environmental Goals**

Fertel, Chief Nuclear Officer at the Nuclear Energy Institute, '04 [Marvin, "Testimony Before the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, March 20, acc 6/23/08, <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2004/ussenatecmtefer teextended>]

America's 103 nuclear power plants comprise a critical element of our energy portfolio. Nuclear power is vital not only to our nation's energy security and economic future but also to our environmental and clean air goals. The industry continues to operate nuclear plants safely and efficiently. During the past decade, performance and safety have been consistently at, or near, record levels. Nuclear power plants also are the most secure industrial facilities in the country.

The nuclear industry has significantly increased the amount of electricity that it generates over the past two decades. But for the nuclear industry to continue generating three-quarters of our nation's emission-free electricity, new nuclear plants must be built. The industry has made great strides toward its goal of constructing new nuclear plants and is committed to achieving this objective in the

## Extensions to Solvency – US Key

### **( ) US Action Key to the Worldwide Expansion of Nuclear Power**

MIT Nuclear Energy Study '03 [“The Future of Nuclear Power”, acc 6/18/08  
<http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-full.pdf>]

Among the major developed countries, the United States is unique in having a projected large increase in population and a concomitant large increase in total electricity demand. If the global deployment of nuclear power is to grow substantially by midcentury, the United States almost certainly must be a major participant. Nuclear power growth is unlikely to be very large in other key developed countries, such as Japan (with an anticipated population decline) or France (with a stable population and a power sector already dominated by nuclear power).

## Extensions to Solvency – Terrorism

### **( ) Nuclear Power Prevents Terrorism By Ending Foreign Energy Dependence**

Huber and Mills '05 [Peter and Mark, "Why the US Needs More Nuclear Power", Winter, [http://www.city-journal.org/html/15\\_1\\_nuclear\\_power.html](http://www.city-journal.org/html/15_1_nuclear_power.html), acc 6/23/08]

It must surely be clear by now, too, that the political costs of depending so heavily on oil from the Middle East are just too great. We need to find a way to stop funneling \$25 billion a year (or so) of our energy dollars into churning cauldrons of hate and violence. By sharply curtailing our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, we would greatly expand the range of feasible political and military options in dealing with the countries that breed the terrorists.

The best thing we can do to decrease the Middle East's hold on us is to turn off the spigot ourselves. For economic, ecological, and geopolitical reasons, U.S. policymakers ought to promote electrification on the demand side, and nuclear fuel on the supply side, wherever they reasonably can.

## Nuclear Power Negative – Table of Contents

Biodiversity Harms 1NC Frontline	248
Terrorism Harms 1NC Frontline	250
Solvency 1NC Frontline	252
Extensions to Clean Coal	254
Extensions to State Regulation	255
Extensions to Terrorism Turn	256
Clean Coal is Affordable	257

## Nuclear Power – Biodiversity Harms 1NC

### **1. Waste Disposal Issues Are Not a Barrier to Expanding Nuclear Power**

Parker and Holt, Congressional research specialists in Energy Policy, '07 ["Outlook for New US Reactors", <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33442.pdf>]

The extent to which the nuclear waste issue could inhibit nuclear power expansion is difficult to assess. NRC has determined that onsite storage of spent fuel would be safe for at least 30 years after expiration of a reactor's operating license, which was estimated to be as long as 70 years. As a result, the Commission concluded that "adequate regulatory authority is available to require any measures necessary to assure safe storage of the spent fuel until a repository is available." Therefore, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does not consider the lack of a permanent repository for spent fuel to be an obstacle to nuclear plant licensing. However, the Administration was concerned enough about repository delays to include a provision in its recent nuclear waste bill to require NRC, when considering nuclear power plant license applications, to assume that sufficient waste disposal capacity will be available in a timely manner.

### **2. New Coal Technology Has Reduced Emissions and Improved Air Quality**

Coalition for Affordable and Reliable Energy '06 ["Air Quality", accessed 6/18/08, [http://www.careenergy.com/cleaner\\_environment/air\\_quality.asp](http://www.careenergy.com/cleaner_environment/air_quality.asp)]

Our overall air quality is better now than it was 20 years ago. Part of this success is due to efforts by the coal-based electricity industry to reduce emissions.

Tremendous strides have been made over the past 20 years to reduce emissions from facilities that generate electricity from coal and to develop improved technologies that will improve coal's environmental compatibility for years to come. All while the amount of electricity generated from coal has increased.

America's electric industry has invested tens of billions of dollars in advanced technologies to improve the quality of the air over the past 30 years. In addition, each year electric utilities also spend between \$1.3 and \$3.3 billion on environmental practices (e.g., operation and maintenance). While this figure includes spending on all types of pollution controls, a significant portion is related to air emissions.

This investment has paid off. Between 1980 and 2001 (the last year data were available) emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), and particulate matter (PM-10) from electricity from coal have dropped.



## Nuclear Power – Biodiversity Harms 1NC

### **3. Coal Plants Will Be Virtually Emissions-Free In the Next Decade**

National Energy Technology Laboratory '08 ["Clean Power Generation",  
[http://www.netl.doe.gov/KeyIssues/clean\\_power.html](http://www.netl.doe.gov/KeyIssues/clean_power.html), accessed 6/18/08]

NETL is leading research, development and demonstration (RD&D) initiatives designed to fundamentally redefine tomorrow's coal power systems. Technologies now under development can make future coal systems dramatically more efficient and clean than today's typical plants, while helping to keep electricity affordable. RD&D programs under way today will make possible a near-zero-emissions coal power plant in the next decade.

## Nuclear Power – Terrorism Harms 1NC

### **1. Terrorist Attack Against a Nuclear Facility is Extremely Unlikely**

Sprinzak '98 [Ehud, "The Great Superterrorism Scare", September 28, <http://www.radiobergen.org/terrorism/super-1.html>, accessed 6/18/08]

Despite the lurid rhetoric, a massive terrorist attack with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons is hardly inevitable. It is not even likely. Thirty years of field research have taught observers of terrorism a most important lesson: Terrorists wish to convince us that they are capable of striking from anywhere at anytime, but there really is no chaos. In fact, terrorism involves predictable behavior, and the vast majority of terrorist organizations can be identified well in advance.

Most terrorists possess political objectives, whether Basque independence, Kashmiri separatism, or Palestinian Marxism. Neither crazy nor stupid, they strive to gain sympathy from a large audience and wish to live after carrying out any terrorist act to benefit from it politically. As terrorism expert Brian Jenkins has remarked, terrorists want lots of people watching, not lots of people dead. Furthermore, no terrorist becomes a terrorist overnight. A lengthy trajectory of radicalization and low-level violence precedes the killing of civilians. A terrorist becomes mentally ready to use lethal weapons against civilians only over time and only after he or she has managed to dehumanize the enemy. From the Baader - Meinhoff group in Germany and the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka to Hamas and Hizballah in the Middle East, these features are universal.

Finally, with rare exceptions--such as the Unabomber--terrorism is a group phenomenon. Radical organizations are vulnerable to early detection through their disseminated ideologies, lesser illegal activities, and public statements of intent. Some even publish their own World Wide Web sites. Since the 1960s, the vast majority of terrorist groups have made clear their aggressive intentions long before following through with violence.

We can draw three broad conclusions from these findings. First, terrorists who threaten to kill thousands of civilians are aware that their chances for political and physical survival are exceedingly slim. Their prospects for winning public sympathy are even slimmer. Second, terrorists take time to become dangerous, particularly to harden themselves sufficiently to use weapons of mass destruction. Third, the number of potential suspects is significantly less than doomsayers would have us believe. Ample early warning signs should make effective interdiction of potential superterrorists easier than today's overheated rhetoric suggests.

## Nuclear Power – Terrorism Harms 1NC

### **2. On-Site Waste Storage Structures Can Withstand a Terrorist Attack Without Leaking**

Nuclear Energy Institute '08 ["Plant Security", accessed 6/18/08  
<http://www.nei.org/keyissues/safetyandsecurity/plantsecurity/> ]

An independent study confirms that the primary structures of a nuclear plant would withstand the impact of a widebody commercial airliner. The Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) conducted a state-of-the-art computer modeling study on the impact of a Boeing 767 crash.

EPRI concluded that typical nuclear plant containment structures—as well as used fuel storage pools and steel-and-concrete fuel storage containers—would withstand the impact forces and protect the fuel.

## Nuclear Power – Solvency 1NC

### **1. Local Politics Block the Construction of New Nuclear Plants**

Gelinas, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, '07 [Nicole, "Nuclear Power: The Investment Outlook", June 1, [http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\\_01.htm](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper_01.htm), accessed 6/18/08]

Cost isn't the only issue, though. In the nuclear industry, other public perceptions matter. The perception of safety remains all-important, despite the comforting fact that no one has ever died in a domestic nuclear power incident. Although one attendee posited that "since the cold war, Americans haven't equated nuclear power with nuclear war" and several attendees cited a positive public attitude toward new nukes in the Southeast, it's still an open question whether state and local politicians will open the doors to their communities to new nuke operators. As a recent New York Times / CBS News poll found, 59 percent of Americans said that they wouldn't "accept a nuclear plant in their community," compared with 36 percent who would.

### **2. The US Does Not Have Enough Uranium to Support an Expansion of Nuclear Power**

Gelinas, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, '07 [Nicole, "Nuclear Power: The Investment Outlook", June 1, [http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\\_01.htm](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper_01.htm), accessed 6/18/08]

"We don't [currently] have the infrastructure to support a renaissance of nuclear power" in terms of securing an adequate long-term fuel supply, said another attendee, speaking of current levels of uranium production and enrichment. In fact, he noted, the nation barely has enough current sources of fuel to continue to supply the 104 plants already in operation.

It's unlikely that banks will offer twenty- or thirty-year debt to a new nuke project without a corresponding secure supply of fuel. But one \$1.7 billion new fuel-source project, jointly owned by the British, Dutch, and German governments, is likely already "sold out," with 80 percent spoken for via take-or-pay agreements to utilities. Moreover, in the absence of significant new investment in uranium mining and enrichment at sources in the U.S., Canada, and Australia, much of the near-term supply will come from Russian weapons, meaning that through heavy investments in nuclear power, the United States likely wouldn't be decreasing its international "energy dependence"—an oft-stated political goal behind heavy nuclear subsidies—but merely diversifying it.

## Nuclear Power – Solvency 1NC

### **3. Turn: Transporting Nuclear Waste Greatly Increases the Risk of Accidents and Proliferation**

Ledwidge, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, '01 [Lisa, "If not Yucca Mountain, then what?", December, <http://www.ieer.org/fctsheets/yuccaalt.html>, accessed 6/18/08]

Moving spent fuel to an interim spot (for instance a monitored retrievable storage facility proposed for the Skull Valley Goshute land in Utah) before any long-term management solution is decided upon carries a host of new risks arising from: transportation of the wastes; the possible need to transport wastes again; temptations to reprocess the spent fuel, causing more pollution and proliferation risks; safety problems associated with loading, unloading and reloading canisters; and hasty decisions regarding canisters that should be far more carefully made. These risks are both unnecessary and are qualitatively more serious than storage of spent fuel at reactor sites, which have, after all, been licensed for operation of reactors that generally carry far greater safety risks than spent fuel storage.

### **4. Turn: Expansion of Nuclear Power Guarantees Catastrophic Nuclear Terrorism**

Leggett, PhD in Earth Sciences, '03 [Jeremy, *The Party's Over*, p. 160]

If you accept that new generation of nuclear plants is needed, you have to accept that a new generation of terrorists is going to find a way to blow up a city or two. This is because wide international proliferation of nuclear power technology and know-how will be inevitable if the US and UK "lead by example" and introduce a new generation of reactors. Other countries will surely follow that lead. Conscience-stricken nuclear weapons designer Theodore Taylor, who died in 2004, opposed nuclear power as well as nuclear weapons for this reason. Competent graduate students could build a bomb easily, he used to say, given the wherewithal. With massive civil nuclear reactor construction programs underway around the world, they would have it.

## Extensions to Clean Coal

### **( ) Clean Coal Technology Will Reduce Emissions From Coal Plants**

Center for Affordable and Reliable Energy '06 ["Clean Coal Technology", acc 6/26/08, [http://www.careenergy.com/cleaner\\_environment/clean-coal-technology.asp](http://www.careenergy.com/cleaner_environment/clean-coal-technology.asp)]

Clean Coal Technologies—the products of research and development conducted over the past 20 years—have resulted in more than 20 new, lower-cost, more efficient and environmentally compatible technologies for electric utilities, steel mills, cement plants and other industries.

Clean coal technologies helped make it possible for U.S. utilities to meet more stringent Clean Air Act requirements while continuing to utilize America's most plentiful domestic energy resource—coal.

The original Clean Coal Technology Program, which began in 1986, focused on commercializing processes that helped reduce sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions and demonstrating more efficient and environmentally friendly alternatives to traditional pulverized coal boilers.

New programs in clean coal technology—such as the Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI)—are essential for building on the progress of the original Clean Coal Technology Program, finding solutions for reducing trace emissions of mercury; reducing or eliminating carbon dioxide emissions; and increasing fuel efficiencies. Over the longer term, research in clean coal technology will be directed toward developing coal-based hydrogen fuels. If coupled with sequestration, this will allow greater use of coal with zero emissions. The U.S. Department of Energy has announced a Presidential initiative to build "FutureGen," a \$1 billion project that will lead to the world's first emission-free plant to produce electricity and hydrogen from coal while capturing greenhouse gases.

## Extensions to State Regulation

### **( ) State Regulation Undercuts Federal Incentives**

Nuclear Energy Institute '07 ["Nuclear Industry Leaders Identify Challenges on Road to US Nuclear Energy Renaissance", May 24, accessed 6/18/08  
<http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/newsreleases/industryleadersindentifychallenges>]

While the federal government must play a role in providing the initial incentives to jump-start the industry, including, most particularly a robust and workable loan guarantee program, over the long term, both state regulators and the industry will have to step up if we are to successfully build the nuclear capacity the nation needs.

I have great concern that none of the current state regulatory models, be it rate base, integrated resource management or competition, will support the level of expenditure necessary to construct the next generation of plants.

The history of the last several decades, fairly remembered, makes plain that no regulatory model is safe in a time of rising prices.

## Extensions to Terrorism Turn

### **( ) Expanding Nuclear Power in the US Guarantees Proliferation, Greatly Increasing the Risk of Accidents and Terrorism**

Posner, federal appeals judge, '05 [Richard, "Nuclear Power", May 1, acc 6/23/08, [http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear\\_powerpo.html](http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear_powerpo.html)]

The negative externalities of nuclear power plants built only in the United States and other wealthy countries are small (with a qualification noted below), for these countries have the resources and the political will and capacity to secure nuclear power generation against both accidents and attacks. But if the U.S. were to commit itself to expanding its own nuclear generating capacity, it would be difficult to limit such expansion in Third World countries, where safety, terrorism, and proliferation risks are all much greater. Notice also that if only the U.S. expanded its nuclear power production, the impact on global warming would be even slighter than I have assumed.



## Clean Coal is Affordable

### **( ) With Continued Research and Development, Clean Coal Will Be Even Cheaper Than Today's Coal**

American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity '08 ["Affordable",  
<http://www.cleancoalusa.org/docs/affordable/>, accessed 6/23/08]

Using coal to generate electricity is one-third the cost of most other fuels, and as noted earlier - increasing our use of coal going forward will not drive up energy costs in other energy-consuming sectors.

Don't let the skeptics fool you. Even with the requirement to use advanced technologies to capture and store CO<sub>2</sub>, coal will remain an affordable energy option that we can rely on in the future.

Consider a recent study by the Coal Utilization Research Council (CURC) and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). These are two recognized experts in the field of advanced clean coal technologies. They agree that with prudent investments in technology the cost of using coal to generate electricity with carbon capture in the year 2020 will be cheaper (adjusted for inflation) than the cost of electricity produced by coal today without carbon capture.

## Russian Economy DA Negative – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	259
Answers to Non-Unique/Overheating	263
Answers to China/India	265
Answers to Inflation Turn	267
Answers to Reform Turn	268
Answers to Aggression Turn	269
Extensions to Uniqueness	270
Extensions to Link	272
Biofuels Links	273
Nuclear Power Links	274
RPS Links	275
Cap and Trade Links	276
Extensions to Internal Links	277

## Russian Economy DA 1NC Shell

### **A. Uniqueness. Oil Prices Are High and Rising in the Status Quo**

Agence France Presse '08 ["Oil Prices to Double by 2012", April 24, acc 6/23/08, [http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=080424190433.04dy6kj4&show\\_article=1](http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=080424190433.04dy6kj4&show_article=1)]

The price of oil is likely to hit 150 dollars (Canadian, US) a barrel by 2010 and soar to 225 dollars a barrel by 2012 as supply becomes increasingly tight, a Canadian bank said Thursday.

The CIBC report says the International Energy Agency's current oil production estimates overstate supply by about nine percent, since it wrongly counts natural gas liquids -- which are not viable for transportation fuel -- in its numbers.

Analyst Jeff Rubin in his report noted accelerating depletion rates in many of the world's largest and most mature oil fields. He estimates oil production will hardly grow at all, with average daily production between now and 2012 rising by barely a million barrels per day.

"Whether we have already seen the peak in world oil production remains to be seen, but it is increasingly clear that the outlook for oil supply signals a period of unprecedented scarcity," said Rubin.

"Despite the recent record jump in oil prices, oil prices will continue to rise steadily over the next five years, almost doubling from current levels."

## Russian Economy DA 1NC Shell

### **B. Links.**

#### **1. Alternative Energy Reduces Demand For Oil and Undermines the Economies of Oil-Producing Nations**

Longmuir, petroleum engineer, and Alhajji, energy economist, '07 [Gavin and AF, "Need for a Balancing Act", February 26, accessed 5/12/08 <http://www.mees.com/postedarticles/oped/v50n09-5OD01.htm>]

Thus, Western posturing over reducing the demand for oil could cause major oil exporters to react in a variety of ways, most of which would exacerbate rather than help the global energy situation. Even in a scenario where Western countries successfully replaced their demand for oil from alternative indigenous energy sources, they would still have to live on the same planet as former major oil-exporting countries whose fragile societies would then be faced with the additional economic strain of the loss of their main current source of revenue. Energy independence for current oil-importers may carry a high moral price. If a sharp decline in oil revenues leads to instability in the oil producing areas, the West will not be able to turn a blind eye to such conflicts. In the age of globalization, these countries are economic and political partners of the West. Political instability that results from declining oil revenues must be added as a potential cost of oil independence. In addition, it is unclear what will happen to the world monetary system without the trade in oil and the associated recycling of petrodollars. A change to a world where most industrial countries depend on their own domestic energy resources would require a major change in the world's financial and monetary system. Such a change will bring its own challenges and difficulties to all, including the industrial countries.

## Russian Economy DA 1NC Shell

### **2. A Sustained Reduction in Oil Prices Would Crash the Russian Economy**

Mityayev, RIA Novosti economic commentator, '08 [Oleg, "President Medvedev's Economic Challenges", May 7, <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20080507/106805663.html>]

Under a pessimistic scenario, the stagnation of the U.S. economy would last two years and spread to Europe, bringing oil prices down. However, the Russian government's economic advisers point to long-term macroeconomic stability in Russia, referring mainly to "safety bags" created mostly with export revenues, notably the Central Bank's international reserves and the reserve and national welfare funds.

But if oil prices plummet, although this is highly unlikely, these safety bags will suffice only for a year or two. After that, the ruble will start losing weight, along with people's real incomes. Worse still, Russia's manufacturing sector will lose contracts because investment programs will be curtailed due to a fall in export revenues.

In this event, the Russian economy will first overheat and then its growth will almost come to a standstill.

## Russian Economy DA 1NC Shell

### **C. Impact. Russian Economic Decline Causes Nuclear War**

Thompson '99 [Jim, "Threats to the Global Economy", March/April, <http://www.thetrumpet.com/index.php?page=article&id=952>, accessed 5/13/08]

The article also says, "At no time since the civil war of 1918-20 has Russia been closer to bloody conflict than it is today," and that "if internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause." As an indicator of Russia's present financial condition, the February 6 Economist states that "Western bankers say they would rather eat nuclear waste than lend to Russia in its current state."

Foreign Affairs concludes, "Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country....

"If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war."

## Answers to Non-Unique/Overheating

### **1. Affirmative Evidence is Not Relevant**

**The Kaluga and Nizhny evidence says nothing about inflation causing an economic collapse in the short- or long-term. It does not non-unique our impact.**

### **2. Oil Prices Will Remain High But Russian Inflation Will Taper Off in the Status Quo**

Sutela, Helsinki School of Economics, '08 [Pekka, "Economic Growth Remains Surprisingly High", April 2,  
<http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=ISFPub&fileid=2692ED19-912C-5B85-F349-D95864278C68&lng=en>, accessed 5/17/08]

There seem to be two prime reasons for such a forecasting error. First, the price of oil – and also of some other major Russian exportables – was higher than expected. While the forecasts were based on an expected price of \$50–70, the actual price at the end of the year was close to \$100. It should be remembered, however, that the average annual price was not all that far from the expected, and growth was strong already during the first half of the year, before the price peak.

Also the dollar, which remains the key contract currency for Russian exports, has weakened vis-à-vis the euro, which is the major currency in Russian import contracts. Therefore, Russia was not in a position to gain fully from stronger crude price. Opinions differ on the future price of crude oil. Many have raised their expectation to the level of \$85, while others remain true to the traditional \$50–70 forecast. Nevertheless, there seems to be a strong consensus on two matters. A collapse in the crude price is not in the cards. We remain in a high energy world for at least years to come. On the other hand, there is little reason to believe in another period of wildly surging energy prices. A future with stable energy prices suits Russia fine. Assuming that will in fact be the case, Russian growth forecasts are again at the 6 percent level. At the same time, there likely will be less inflationary pressure, and consequently annual price increases could be closer to five percent than ten percent.

## Answers to Non-Unique/Overheating

### **3. Economic Growth and Political Stability Will Continue in Russia**

Kvint, chair of the Department of Financial Strategy at the Moscow School of Economics '08 [Vladimir, "Russia's Surging Economy", January 8, acc 5/24/08, [http://www.russiablog.org/2008/01/forbes\\_russias\\_surging\\_economy.php](http://www.russiablog.org/2008/01/forbes_russias_surging_economy.php)]

With the firm belief that, especially in Russia, past is prologue, the first and most important economic trend of 2007 was that nation's continued political and economic stability. This has made possible, and will continue to enable, reliable forecasts of economic trends, and has attracted a great deal of foreign investment in Russia.

Such an ongoing process has also caused Russian entrepreneurs to maintain and increase their domestic investments, rather than invest abroad, as they did before. Moreover, it has resulted in job creation and stimulated economic growth, which is now approaching 8%.

Which indicators are proving the increasing stability and predictability of the Russian economy? First, there's the unprecedented rate of growth of foreign investment, which surged by a factor of 2.5 in 2007. None of the world's 15 leading national economies can compete with this achievement. Some \$100 billion was invested in Russia from abroad over the last 12 months, an all-time record for any emerging market country and a milestone of great historical and psychological significance for Russian business.



## Answers to China/India

### **1. The DA Still Links**

**Our Carey '03 evidence says that even small decreases in demand can cause a big drop in oil prices. The US is still the world's largest consumer of oil, and if it were able to offset a large percentage of its oil use, that would drastically affect global prices.**

### **2. Prefer Our Evidence**

**Our Carey and our Longmuir and Alhajji evidence specifically discuss the consequences of the US substantially increasing its alternative energy sources. The Affirmative's evidence only assumes a modest reduction in US demand due to recession, not the dramatic decrease that would occur if the US had a viable alternative to oil.**

### **3. Russia's Economy is Extremely Vulnerable to Fluctuations in World Oil Prices**

BBC News '04 ["Russia 'Overly Dependent on Oil'", February 18.  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/3500861.stm>, accessed 6/25/08]

Russia may be more dependent on oil sales revenue than originally thought as result of widespread tax evasion, says a World Bank report.

The energy sector may account for a quarter of Russia's gross domestic product, says the international body.

The State Statistics Committee puts the figure at 9%.

By increasing its dependency on oil exports, Russia is now more vulnerable to a sudden drop in oil prices, experts warn.

Avoiding tax

Oil exports - shored up by booming energy prices - have driven Russia's economy over the past year.

"The Russian economy is more exposed to world movements in energy prices than official GDP figures imply," the World Bank said.

## Answers to China/India

### **4. Other Countries, Including China, Will Model US Alternative Energy Technology**

Podesta, Stern, and Batton, Center for American Progress, '07 ["Capturing the Energy Opportunity", November 27, accessed 6/25/08, [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/11/energy\\_chapter.html](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/11/energy_chapter.html)]

American action will spur developing world action in two separate ways. First, the policy changes needed to cut carbon emissions in the United States are job-producing and growth-generating actions. Other countries will emulate them, just as China, Russia, Brazil, and other countries have adopted building energy codes and appliance efficiency standards based on U.S. models.

Second, the technologies needed to promote low-carbon economies are increasingly produced and sold in a global market. When America buys compact fluorescent lamps, most of them are made in China, so China automatically develops the manufacturing technology to use them domestically. When America requires that computers and TVs become more efficient, it affects the market in India and Africa. And conversely, when America lags in efficiency or renewable energy technology, either the rest of the world also lags or else other developed countries grab the market and control the export sales to the developing world.

## Answers to Inflation Turn

### **1. No Impact**

**The Affirmative has no evidence that corruption or inflation will lead to economic decline, which is a critical internal link to our scenario. This turn cannot access our nuclear war impact.**

### **2. Non-Unique**

**Cross-apply our Sutela '08 evidence that says inflation will not continue in the status quo. Even if the Affirmative wins that their plan stops Russian inflation, they gain no unique advantage from this because inflation is going to stop anyway.**

### **3. No Link- US Monetary Policy, Not Oil Prices, Causes Russian Inflation**

Gilman '08 [Martin, "The Fed Can Help Russia Lower Its Inflation", May 14, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/article/1028/42/362727.htm>, acc 6/25/08]

But it is clear that the problem with inflation is deeper and more widespread. From China to Saudi Arabia, the common cause seems to be the abundance of liquidity emanating primarily from Washington, as the Federal Reserve opens the spigot to cushion the economy-wide impact of the price collapse in the key U.S. housing market. With the dollar still fulfilling the role of the key reserve currency, it is hard for other countries to escape the fallout, and Russia is certainly no exception. In these circumstances, what can be done? The options are limited and none of them comes without serious side effects.

## Answers to Reform Turn

### **1. No Impact**

**The Affirmative's evidence only says that high oil prices are one barrier to reform. That doesn't prove that reform will occur if oil prices decline or that those reforms will be beneficial.**

### **2. The DA Impact Short-Circuits the Turn**

**The Affirmative's story is that an economic decline would force the Russian government to reform. But our Thompson '99 evidence says economic decline would lead to political instability, civil war, and ultimately nuclear war. The Affirmative concedes this point, which means that the Russian government would disintegrate before it had a chance to reform as a result of economic decline.**

### **3. Time Frame Favors the Negative- Economic Decline Must Precede Political Reform**

Sigov, former Russian journalist, '08 [Mike, "Medvedev's Lack of Independence is No Joke", March 9,  
<http://www.toledoblade.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080309/COLUMNIST25/803090339>, accessed 5/26/08]

Optimists in the West are saying that the dependence of Russia's overheating economy on oil and natural gas exports could undermine it in the future if the world economy dips into a recession and energy prices fall.

That may be true. But that scenario is not going to happen tomorrow.

The situation in Russia will have to get much worse economically before it can get better politically.

## Answers to Aggression Turn

### **1. It's Too Late- Russia is Already Acting Aggressively Towards Georgia**

Civil Georgia '08 ["Russia Takes 'Provocative Steps' With Georgia", May 7, <http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=17780>, accessed 6/25/08]

"In recent days and weeks, the Russian government has taken what we would call provocative actions which have increased tensions with Georgia," White House spokeswoman Dana Perino told reporters. "These steps have significantly and unnecessarily heightened tensions in the region," she said. Georgia has tried to reassert control over Abkhazia and South Ossetia since they broke away in the early 1990s. Russia has said its troop increases were aimed at countering an attack planned by Georgia on Abkhazia and it denied the drone shootdown. Perino urged the Russian government to reiterate its commitment to Georgia's territorial borders and sovereignty, reverse the troop movements and "cease from further provocation. "In contacts with both the Russian and Georgian governments at the highest levels, the United States has firmly reiterated our support for Georgia's territorial integrity and strongly urged Russia to de-escalate and reverse its measures," she said. The United States and Western allies have suspected Russia of trying to punish Georgia -- a small Caucasus country on Russia's southern border -- for its attempt to join the NATO alliance which Washington supports.

### **2. The Affirmative's Story is Self-Contradictory**

**Their Szrom and Brugato evidence claims that Russia can be more aggressive when countries like the US depend on them for oil and can't act against them, but the Week Daily evidence claims that the US would intervene in a conflict between Russia and Georgia. Either Russia won't invade Georgia for fear of US retaliation or the US won't get involved for fear of losing access to Russian oil- either way, there's no world war impact.**

### **3. Our Impacts Outweigh**

**Even if the Affirmative wins this turn, the original nuclear war impact outweighs it. You are forced to choose between a world with high oil prices, where there is a risk of world war but no indication that this would go nuclear, or a world with low oil prices, where Russia disintegrates into civil war and nuclear war is inevitable. You must vote Negative to avert the risk of catastrophic nuclear war.**

## Extensions to Uniqueness

### **( ) Oil Prices Will Continue to Rise**

Ragsdale, Petroleum News, '08 [Rose, "High Oil Prices?", January 13, <http://www.petroleumnews.com/pntruncate/416233463.shtml>, accessed 5/22/08]

If you think \$100 per barrel oil is costly, consider \$180 per barrel oil. The former is here, while the latter may be in our not-too-distant future, according to two well-known oil industry analysts.

While energy prices retreated during the second week of January amid continued signs of a slowing economy and forecasts for mild weather in the Northeast, crude oil prices are still hovering about 70 percent higher than year-ago levels.

The litany of reasons for this rapid run-up in prices has been well publicized, but the key question is where oil prices will go from here.

Oil industry guru Matthew R. Simmons says he has no clue and little concern about what will happen to oil prices in the short term.

"At some point, high prices will make an impact. But oil prices have risen 10-fold in the last nine years, and it hasn't hurt the economy. I don't know where oil is going in the short term. It's a very volatile market. A year ago, oil prices broke \$50 a barrel," Simmons told Petroleum News in a Jan. 8 interview.

In the long term, Simmons expects oil prices to continue to rise.

### **( ) Cap-and-Trade System Reduces Demand for Oil**

Climate Changes News '07 [accessed 6/25/08, [http://www.climatechangenews.org/newsArchive/newsArchive2007\\_sept-dec.html](http://www.climatechangenews.org/newsArchive/newsArchive2007_sept-dec.html)]

Yes, OPEC is now "pledging \$750 million for research into climate change technology" (while opposing a cap-and-trade system). [Note to President Bush, Newt Gingrich, and Bjørn Lomborg -- it ain't a good sign when your climate strategy is the same as OPEC's.] OPEC, however, seems a tad confused on just what a technology-based strategy could do for oil: OPEC is worried that a new international accord could cramp fast-growing Middle East economies, where oil use is rising more than 4 percent a year. And the oil cartel is concerned that a broader cap-and-trade system for greenhouse gas emissions could place heavy costs of petroleum products and reduce consumption.

## Extensions to Uniqueness

### **( ) Increasing Demand Will Continue to Drive Up Oil Prices**

Mouawad '08 [Jad, "Gas Prices Soar, Posing a Threat to Family Budget", 2/27, [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/27/business/27gas.html?\\_r=1&bl=&ei=5087&en=fbfa2e2586c552a8&ex=1204779600&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/27/business/27gas.html?_r=1&bl=&ei=5087&en=fbfa2e2586c552a8&ex=1204779600&pagewanted=all&oref=slogin), 6/25/08]

But global oil demand, the relentless driver behind higher prices, is still expected to increase by 1.4 million barrels a day this year, analysts estimate. That growth, from China and the Middle East, may help keep prices up, whatever happens to the American economy.

According to the Energy Department's latest forecast, gasoline prices should peak near \$3.40 a gallon this spring. That figure would match the inflation-adjusted record price for gasoline that was reached in early 1981.

But many outside analysts consider the government's forecast conservative, foreseeing a sharper spike as refiners come out of the seasonal maintenance period and start producing summer-grade gasoline in March and April.

"We've gone this high without the normal summer dynamics," said Tom Kloza, publisher and chief oil analyst at the Oil Price Information Service. "That's when I think we will have the big jump — of 50 cents to 75 cents a gallon."

Kloza said he expects gasoline to peak around \$3.50 to \$3.75 a gallon nationwide. Geoff Sundstrom, AAA's spokesman, echoed that view and added that \$4-a-gallon gasoline is possible this summer. "We've gone from a worrying situation for gasoline to one that is quite alarming," Sundstrom said.

Oil prices are unlikely to drop any time soon, analysts said. Barclays Capital recently raised its long-term prediction, saying prices could reach \$137 a barrel in 2015, up from a previous target of \$93 a barrel.

"The remorseless move up in long-run prices has not yet fully played out," Barclays analysts said in a note to investors.

## Extensions to Links

### **( ) Reducing US Oil Consumption Lowers Prices Globally**

Congressional Budget Office '02 ["Reducing Gasoline Consumption", November, <http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=3991&type=0&sequence=2>, acc 6/23/08]

Reducing U.S. oil consumption could have other benefits. Because the United States is such a large consumer, a significant drop in its demand would tend to lower the world price of oil. If collusion by oil suppliers did not keep that price from falling, a policy that reduced U.S. consumption would save money not only because the nation would buy less oil but because it would spend less on the oil it did buy.



## Biofuels Links

### **( ) Biofuels Lower Oil Prices**

Batten and Caldwell, Center for American Progress, '08 ["Energy Diversity Dividends", March 24, accessed 6/25/08, [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/03/energy\\_diversity.html](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/03/energy_diversity.html)]

New commodities market analysis by Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. proves the point the Center for American Progress has been making for a while now—that the boom in biofuels production is reducing the cost of oil around the world.

That conclusion may seem improbable given the dramatic run up in oil prices over the past five years. But the analysis by Merrill commodities market strategist Francisco Blanch (as reported today by the Wall Street Journal) says that:

"Oil and gasoline prices would be about 15 percent higher if biofuel producers weren't increasing their output. That would put oil at more than \$115 a barrel, instead of the current price of around \$102. U.S. gasoline prices would have surged to more than \$3.70 a gallon, compared with an average of a little more than \$3.25 today."

## Nuclear Links

### **( ) Nuclear Energy Paves the Way for Hydrogen Vehicles, Which Dramatically Reduce Demand for Oil**

Zwaniecki '06 [Andrzej, "US Nuclear Power Industry Sees Expansion in Near Future", May 3, <http://www.america.gov/st/washfile-english/2006/May/20060503162613SAikceinawz0.1928675.html>, acc 6/25/08]

Nuclear energy is likely to displace even more harmful emissions if, as envisioned by the administration, advanced reactors are used to produce hydrogen. Hydrogen-fueled vehicles, with almost no emissions, not only would reduce dramatically the demand for oil but also, as dramatically, would cut harmful emissions from the transportation sector, another major source of greenhouse gases and other pollutants.

## RPS Links

### **( ) Renewable Portfolio Standards Are Designed to Reduce US Oil Imports and Lower Oil Prices**

Frost & Sullivan '07 ["Oil Imports and Oil Prices Drive United States to Increase Renewable Energy Capacity", August 29,  
<http://www.newswiretoday.com/news/22860/>, accessed 6/23/08]

"Rising oil imports and the volatility of oil prices drives the United States to increase its renewable energy capacity," notes Frost & Sullivan Research Analyst Saranya Sundaram. "The Energy Policy Act was passed in the year 2005, targeting that the amount of renewable energy fuels consumed each year should reach 7.5 billion gallons by the year 2012. This is in line with U.S. President George Bush's vision to reduce 75 percent of the country's oil imports from the Middle East region by 2025."

Furthermore, the renewable portfolio standards (RPS) and renewable fuel standards mandates will likely propel the market's growth. RPS is a flexible market-driven policy formulated to ensure that a growing percent of electricity produces from renewable energy sources and is enforced in nearly 21 states in the United States. Keeping with the mandate's objectives, California has set a target of 12 percent of its total electricity to generate from wind and geothermal energy. New York State will make efforts to increase its total electricity generated from renewable energy sources from 19 percent in 2006 to 25 percent by 2013.

## Cap-and-Trade Links

### **( ) Cap-and-Trade Would Reduce US Consumption of Gasoline**

Congressional Budget Office '02 ["Reducing Gasoline Consumption", November, <http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=3991&type=0&sequence=2>, accessed 6/23/08]

Other policy changes could decrease gasoline consumption by raising its price. For example, lawmakers could increase the federal tax on gasoline, which now stands at 18.4 cents per gallon. Or they could institute a cap-and-trade program for the carbon dioxide emissions that result when gasoline is burned. (Those emissions are referred to here as carbon emissions for short.) Under a cap-and-trade program, the government would set a limit on carbon emissions from U.S. gasoline consumption. Companies would be required to hold rights--called allowances--for each metric ton of carbon contained in the gasoline that they produced or imported for domestic consumption. Holding the allowances would become a cost of doing business and would lead to higher prices at the gas pump.

## Extensions to Internal Link

### **( ) Reducing Demand in the US Crashes Oil Prices and Russia's Economy**

Carey, reporter for *Business Week*, '03 [John, "Taming the Oil Beast", February 24, [http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/03\\_08/b3821001.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/03_08/b3821001.htm)]

Yet reducing oil use has to be done judiciously. A drastic or abrupt drop in demand could even be counterproductive. Why? Because even a very small change in capacity or demand "can bring big swings in price," explains Rajeev Dhawan, director of the Economic Forecasting Center at Georgia State University's Robinson College of Business. For instance, the slowdown in Asia in the mid-1990s reduced demand only by about 1.5 million bbl. a day, but it caused oil prices to plunge to near \$10 a barrel. So today, if the U.S. succeeded in abruptly curbing demand for oil, prices would plummet. Higher-cost producers such as Russia and the U.S. would either have to sell oil at a big loss or stand on the sidelines. The effect would be to concentrate power--you guessed it--in the hands of Middle Eastern nations, the lowest-cost producers and holders of two-thirds of the known oil reserves. That's why flawed energy policies, such as trying to override market forces by rushing to expand supplies or mandating big fuel efficiency gains, could do harm.

### **( ) Only Booming Oil Revenues Are Keeping Russia's Economy Afloat**

Arvedlund '04 [Erin, "Russia Told it Understates Dependence on Oil Sales", 2/19, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C02EED6123DF93AA25751C0A9629C8B63>, accessed 6/25/08]

Russia's economy is more deeply dependent on oil and gas than previously thought, with energy making up an estimated 25 percent of output instead of the 9 percent attributed to it in Russia's own accounts, the World Bank said on Wednesday in an economic report.

Russia's greater dependence on oil also meant that the country's extremely successful recovery is "much more vulnerable to fluctuations in international oil prices," Christof Ruehl, chief economist for the World Bank in Moscow, said at a news conference here.

Since the United States-led invasion of Iraq, oil prices have been climbing. Brent crude oil for March delivery rose to \$35.88 a barrel on Wednesday, its highest level since Jan. 20.

Russia's economy grew 7.2 percent in 2003, and Mr. Ruehl said that roughly 3.2 percentage points of that growth came from oil revenues.

## Extensions to Internal Link

### **( ) Sustained Decline in Oil Prices Would Tank Russia's Economy**

Hanson, associate fellow in the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Royal Institute for International Affairs, '04 [Philip, "How Sustainable is Russia's Energy Power?", April 2, <http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=ISFPub&fileid=2692ED19-912C-5B85-F349-D95864278C68&lng=en>, accessed 6/23/08]

When commentators describe recent Russian economic growth as "oil-fuelled," however, they are quite right. When oil prices (and hence oil-product and gas prices) rise, Russian export earnings rise and this wealth feeds into business profits, government revenue and personal income, in turn fuelling investment, government spending and household consumption, raising demand for the output of the rest of the Russian economy (and for imports), and thus indirectly boosting production as a whole.

Therefore Russian GDP is sensitive to the international price of oil. A sustained fall in the oil price would slow and even, if large enough, reverse Russian economic growth. The Institute of the Economy in Transition estimated that a fall to \$25/barrel in the Brent oil price between 2005 and 2009 would generate a fall in GDP in 2009 (Gaidar 2007, p. 255). A more recent exercise by Merrill Lynch analysts concludes that a fall to \$50/barrel would (other things equal, and against the background of 8.1 percent growth in 2007) lower Russian GDP growth to 5.3 percent (*Vedomosti* 3 March 2008).

## Extensions to Internal Link

### **( ) The Health of Russia's Economy is Heavily Dependent on Oil**

United Nations Economic Commission of Europe '02 ["Russia: An Engine of Growth for the CIS", May 2, <http://www.unece.org/press/pr2002/02gen10e.htm>]

The strong impact of oil revenue on Russia's macroeconomic performance is illustrated in charts 3.1.13 and 3.1.14. According to different estimates, ceteris paribus, a change in world oil prices by one dollar is likely to be associated with a 0.4 to 0.6 percentage point change in Russia's GDP and with a change in fiscal revenue amounting to \$0.8-\$0.9 billion.

The heavy reliance on oil exports, however, is a mixed blessing for the Russian economy. In times of boom, as seen during the past three years, it may provide a welcome boost to the economy; but things may go into reverse when both prices and demand weaken. On the other hand, long booms based on oil exports carry risks due to the dangers of the "Dutch" disease.

If Russia is to follow the path of industrial modernization, it will have to aim to gradually reduce its reliance on oil exports. However, the short-term outlook still heavily depends on the performance of the oil sector. On balance, given the current trends, real oil revenue in 2002 is likely to remain sufficiently high to continue to provide a positive impulse to the economy.

## Russian Economy DA Affirmative – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline	281
Extensions to Non-Unique/Overheating	286
Extensions to Aggression Turn	288
Extensions to Economy Turn	289
Extensions to China/India	290
Nuclear Power Link Takeouts	291



## Russian Economy DA 2AC Frontline

### **1. Non-Unique. High Oil Prices Overheat Russia's Economy and Will Cause Collapse in the Status Quo**

Kaluga and Nizhny, staff writers for *The Economist*, '08 ["Smoke and Mirrors", February 28, accessed 5/26/08, [http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=10765120](http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10765120)]

The share of oil and gas in Russia's GDP has increased, according to the Institute of Economic Analysis, from 12.7% in 1999 to 31.6% in 2007. Natural resources account for 80% of exports. Like a powerful drug, oil money has masked the pain caused to the Russian economy by the Kremlin. But the disease remains.

To appreciate the impact oil prices have on the economy, compare real GDP growth of about 7% with growth measured in international prices. In dollar terms, says Rory MacFarquhar of Goldman Sachs, Russia's economy has grown on average by 27% a year, the fastest of any big economy since 2000. The flow of petrodollars is fanning a massive consumption boom, making Russia the sixth-biggest market in Europe. Disposable incomes (and retail trade) have been growing twice as fast as GDP.

The problem, says Peter Aven, the head of Alfa Bank, is that Russia has failed to convert the oil stimulus into domestic production. Imports are growing much faster than manufacturing. The rapid real appreciation of the rouble is hurting Russia's producers, and many goods are of poor quality. This is why Algeria says it wants to return 15 military jets it purchased from Russia.

Productivity remains far below that of most developed countries. In the first years after the 1998 crisis, labour and capital efficiency went up by 5.8% a year. But that growth was driven by using spare capacity left from Soviet times. Sustaining it will require more investment.

Meanwhile the economy, unable to digest the money generated by the oil-and-gas boom, is clearly overheating. Inflation moved into double digits in late 2007, pushed up by, among other things, a huge inflow of capital attracted by swelling reserves and the strong rouble. Unlike oil revenues, which can be partially channelled into the stabilisation fund, this money cannot easily be absorbed.

## Russian Economy DA 2AC Frontline

### **2. No Link. China, India, and the Middle East Have Replaced the US as the Main Drivers of Oil Prices**

Shenk '08 [Mark, "Emerging Market Oil Use Exceeds US as Prices Rise", April 21, <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601109&sid=acpwND3.n05g&refer=home>, accessed 6/25/08]

Traffic jams in Beijing and humming air conditioners in Dubai are replacing U.S. highways and suburbs as the driver of global oil prices.

China, India, Russia and the Middle East for the first time will consume more crude oil than the U.S., burning 20.67 million barrels a day this year, an increase of 4.4 percent, according to the International Energy Agency in Paris. U.S. demand will contract 2 percent to 20.38 million barrels daily, the IEA says.

Economic growth of more than 8 percent in China and India, coupled with increasing car ownership among the countries' combined populations of 2.45 billion people, will more than compensate for falling U.S. demand. Oil use worldwide will increase 2 percent this year because of growth in emerging markets, the Paris-based IEA says.

"Does the U.S. matter anymore?" said Mike Wittner, head of oil research at Societe Generale SA in London. "Has the U.S. mattered for the last few years? It is debatable. As far as the oil market is concerned, demand growth is going to be continued to be driven by China and the Middle East."

## Russian Economy DA 2AC Frontline

### **3. Turn. High Oil Prices Lead to Corruption and Inflation That Ultimately Harm Russia's Economy**

Matthews '08 [Owen, "Economy of Clay", May 17, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/135877>, accessed 6/25/08]

But in truth, the Russian economy as a whole is an edifice with feet of clay. The bling and glitter of the capital obscures a harsh reality: the architecture of Russia's economy is no more solid than that of an inflatable children's castle at fairground, with energy and commodity prices the wind that keeps it inflated. Yes, the Russian economy has been growing fast. But little of that growth has spilled over into the real Russian economy. Rather, the boom has, in many ways, held back Russia's non-commodities economy from growing: rampant inflation, spiraling real-estate prices and higher labor costs, bureaucratic corruption, expensive credit and bad governance have combined to stifle the competitiveness of many Russian businesses.

"Russia's macroeconomic performance has been stellar," says economic analyst Anders Aslund. "But Russia's oil surplus is so huge that it hides flaws in economic policy; the longer oil prices remain high, the worse economic policy will become. Booms breed complacency and corruption."

### **4. Turn. High Oil Prices Prevent Reform and Are Worse for Russia's Economy**

Antonov '01 [Mikhail, "Money Tests", December 28, <http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/5618-8.cfm>, accessed 6/26/08]

These are mostly just emotions. From the strategical point of view, it is high prices that are dangerous for Russia. Like cheap foreign loans, they relax the government. There appears a temptation: not to change anything, just distributing dollars and everyone is happy. The most important economic reforms of the past years took place in Russia in such periods, when oil prices were low - 1985, 1991, 1998.

## Russian Economy DA 2AC Frontline

### **5. Aggression Turn**

#### **a. High Oil Prices Lead to Aggressive Russian Foreign Policy**

Szrom and Brugato, American Enterprise Institute, '08 [Charlie and Thomas, "Liquid Courage", February 22, accessed 5/21/08, <http://www.american.com/archive/2008/february-02-08/liquid-courage>]

Of course, oil prices are not the sole determinant of Russian foreign policy: Moscow might have acted less aggressively if a more Western-friendly leader had been in charge. But an increase in oil prices has freed Putin from various international constraints and enhanced his leverage abroad in several ways.

Oil revenue has let Russia erase its debt to international lending organizations. By 2006, it had entirely paid off its International Monetary Fund obligations, which totaled \$16.8 billion in 1999. Russia no longer needs Western cash—and therefore Western friendship—to keep its economy afloat.

New oil funds have also made Russia less dependent on neighboring trading partners, which has allowed Moscow to use trade cutoffs as a political tool. In November 2005, Russia banned imports of Polish meat; in January 2006, it cut off purchases of Ukrainian meat and dairy products; and later that year it blockaded Georgia's economy almost entirely. All three of these countries—through their pro-Western foreign policy orientations—had offended Moscow.

With its vast oil wealth, Russia can now purchase the military tools needed to buttress an aggressive foreign policy. Between 2001 and 2007, its defense spending grew from \$7.3 billion to \$31 billion, an increase of more than 400 percent. Russian pilots barely flew 20 hours a month in 1999; that number increased to as many as 70 hours a month by 2003. In October 2003, Russia opened its first new base in Central Asia since the end of the Cold War. In 2005-2006, Russia received over a dozen ICBMs, two strategic bombers, 15 fighters, 15 satellites, 48 T-90 tanks, over 250 APCs, and 7,500 vehicles.

## Russian Economy DA 2AC Frontline

Russia is planning for an ambitious military buildup through 2015: 60 Iskander missiles, over 1,000 new and modernized aircraft, five nuclear-powered submarines, 69 SS-27 strategic nuclear missiles—the list goes on. Three new satellites launched in January give Russia's Glonass system, an alternative to the U.S. Global Positioning System, coverage of 83 percent of the globe.

Putin described the scope of these plans in October 2007: "Our plans aren't just big, they are grandiose, and they are perfectly doable." Oil wealth has simply given Russia's elites a more confident outlook, emboldening them to act more assertively abroad. Russian foreign minister Sergei Lavrov has stated that "it would be right to say that we view our role in global energy supply as a means for ensuring our foreign policy independence."

### **b. Aggressive Russian Foreign Policy Sparks Conflict in Georgia That Escalates Into World War**

The Week Daily '08 ["Could Abkhazia Spark a World War?", May 8, [http://www.theweekdaily.com/news\\_opinion/world\\_news\\_opinion/40962/could\\_abkhazia\\_spark\\_a\\_world\\_war.html](http://www.theweekdaily.com/news_opinion/world_news_opinion/40962/could_abkhazia_spark_a_world_war.html), accessed 5/21/08]

With or without formal NATO membership, said Anne Applebaum in *Slate*, "the West will have to come up with a major response" if Russia invades Georgia. Georgia is "an emerging democracy" with troops in Iraq, and it has "many implicit assurances of security" from the U.S. and NATO. This is worrisome. World War I had a similarly obscure start, and trouble in Abkhazia could "become the starting point of a larger war."

It certainly could, said Alexander Golts in *The Moscow Times*, but not because Russia or Georgia actually wants "this conflict to escalate toward a military conflict." Both sides have political and strategic reasons to provoke the other, but they are playing a dangerous game of brinksmanship. The two sides' "aggressive" posturing could sharply escalate out of control, like at the start of World War I, and that could have "tragic consequences for the entire world."

## Extensions to Non-Unique

### **( ) Oil Prices Will Fall in the Status Quo**

Kaluga and Nizhny, staff writers for *The Economist*, '08 [Smoke and Mirrors, 2/28, [http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=10765120](http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10765120)]

Yet the truth is that Russia's economy began its rebound 18 months before he became president. Behind it lie three factors: a revival of private initiative, oil prices that have risen fourfold during his presidency and macroeconomic stability. Only the third can be credited to Mr Putin. The economy is now more dependent on oil than ever. And the outlook is bleaker: a slowing world economy means that oil prices may not rise further, and could even fall.

### **( ) Russian Recession Coming in the Status Quo**

Hanson, associate fellow in the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Royal Institute for International Affairs, '04 ["How Sustainable is Russia's Energy Power?", April 2, <http://se2.isn.ch/serviceengine/FileContent?serviceID=ISFPub&fileid=2692ED19-912C-5B85-F349-D95864278C68&lng=en>, accessed 6/23/08]

These worries about Russian export capability in the medium and long term could (just about) be misplaced. Even if they are, the question remains whether Russia's oil-fuelled economy can continue to grow fast. There are several grounds for skepticism so far as Russia is concerned, over the next few years.

The oil price might, despite conventional wisdom to the contrary, fall significantly and for a substantial period. Slowdown or recession in the West is one likely influence. More speculatively, and looking further ahead, it may be noted that it is precisely when everyone expects the oil price to stay high long-term that there is an incentive for business to invest in energy-saving equipment.

The Russian non-oil, non-gas, non-metals economy is vulnerable to the continuing rise in the real effective exchange rate of the ruble, reducing its competitiveness. This "Dutch disease" effect is one element in the natural resource curse. Already there is evidence that, product group by product-group, imports have been rising faster than domestic production (Ollus and Barisitz 2007).

The spare capacity that assisted recovery growth after the big drop in output in 1989–99 has been used up. The working-age population began to fall in 2007.

## Extensions to Non-Unique

### **( ) Collapsing Oil Prices and Russian Depression Are Inevitable**

Dranitsyna '08 [Yekaterina, "Economic Growth Will Continue, Report Says", February 22, <http://www.sptimes.ru/story/25125>, accessed 6/26/08]

However, after the economic upsurge, the Russian market "will be inevitably exhausted, and capital flight will begin," the report said. In the face of the global crisis, there is no way to avoid an economic depression and capital outflow, the expert concluded. Russia will only postpone these negative effects.

As a result of the falling production output all over the world, the price of oil will fall, which will undermine Russian raw material producers, the report said. Other experts said that the Russian economy will attract foreign investment in 2009 as well. "In 2008, slowing credit growth is likely to bring GDP growth down to seven percent. I still expect high growth and double-digit inflation in 2008," said Alexander Morozov, chief economist at HSBC Bank for Russia and the CIS.

"A return to single-digit inflation is unlikely before 2009, when the recent deceleration in money supply growth should have helped to dampen price pressures. That creates an overall favorable growth environment for investment, complemented by other strong macroeconomic fundamentals (high reserves, low debt, a positive current account and a stable ruble)," Morozov said.

He saw weakening of capital inflows as a positive factor that might help restrain money supply growth. "However, any positive impact resulting from this factor would most likely be seen only in 2009," he said.

Among the negative trends, Morozov indicated that the Russian economy is overheated. "As economic growth has accelerated, so has inflation," he said.

## Extensions to Aggression Turn

### **( ) Energy Profits Encourage Russian Aggression**

Teslik, assistant editor, Council on Foreign Relations, '08 [Lee, "Russia's Economic Pipeline", [http://www.cfr.org/publication/15630/russias\\_economic\\_pipeline.html](http://www.cfr.org/publication/15630/russias_economic_pipeline.html)]

This boom has brought increased political power, which analysts say the Kremlin has eagerly flexed. The row over Kosovo's independence provides an example. After threatening to block UN recognition of Kosovo, Moscow negotiated a natural gas deal that gives the Kremlin substantial control over Serbia's natural gas industry (Eurasia Monitor). At the same time, Russia threatened to cut gas shipments (ChiTrib) to regional rivals like Ukraine. The BBC credits newfound Russian economic stability for Putin's "confident swagger" in regional politics. The Economist quotes one unnamed European leader as saying, "Russia is getting stronger; we are getting weaker." The same article features a graphic demonstrating Russia's chokehold on Europe's natural gas industry.

### **( ) Russia Uses Energy as a Weapon Against Former Soviet States**

Padden '07 [Brian, "Resurgent Russia Sees Oil as a Weapon", December 24, <http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2007-12/2007-12-24-voa41.cfm?CFID=243522199&CFTOKEN=32535999>, accessed 6/26/08]

That was not the experience of Ukraine and Belarus. Since 2006, Russia has temporarily cut off energy supplies to each of the countries at least once over price disputes and has threatened more action. Vladimir Milov, President of the Moscow Energy Policy Institute says Russia has been using energy to punish former Soviet states.

"The use of energy as a political weapon in recent years is a banal way to deal with dissenting countries Russia would like to keep in its orbit of foreign influence, but cannot," said Milov.



## Extensions to Economy Turn

### **( ) Slowdown Would Help Russia's Economy**

Bryanski '08 [Gleb, "Deputy C.Bank Chief Sees Signs Russia Overheating", 2/7, <http://in.reuters.com/article/asiaCompanyAndMarkets/idINL0791210220080207>]

The Russian economy is growing too fast and a modest slowdown may be needed to prevent overheating, a senior central banker said on Thursday, in a rare sign of dissent from President Vladimir Putin's goal of rapid growth. The Russian economy, propelled by high consumer demand, grew by 7.4 percent in 2006 and by 8.1 percent in 2007. Government officials expect growth to slow to 6.7 percent this year.

"There are certain symptoms of overheating ... A certain cooling of the pace of economic growth would not do any harm," First Deputy Chairman of the central bank Alexei Ulyukayev told a panel discussion.

"The overheating is a very serious, a fundamental risk for our economy," he said, noting that in China, the authorities have been trying to curb growth.

## Extensions to China/India

### **( ) China and India Are Driving the Current Oil Boom**

Mouawad and Wedigier '07 [Jad and Julia, "Warning on Impact of China and India Oil Demand", November 7, [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/07/business/07cnd-energy.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/07/business/07cnd-energy.html?_r=1&oref=slogin), accessed 6/26/08]

In unusually urgent tones, the International Energy Agency warned that demand for oil imports by China and India will almost quadruple by 2030 and could create a supply "crunch" as soon as 2015 if oil producers do not step up production, energy efficiency fails to improve and demand from the two countries is not dampened.

"At current prices the market is signaling that stocks need to be higher, something that is in the power of producers to address," Nobuo Tanaka, executive director of the I.E.A., told journalists at a briefing in London. "Since this time last year, the world outlook has deteriorated. Demand is higher and supply worsening."

Bolstered by speedy economic development and industrialization, energy demand from Asia has been one of the main contributors to higher oil prices. Over the last two years, China and India accounted for about 70 percent of the increase in energy demand and the world's energy needs would increase 55 percent by 2030. Another reason for higher prices is investments not made by oil producers, including the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, the agency said.

Strong demand has helped push oil prices to a series of records in recent weeks. Crude oil rose 1 percent, to \$97.62 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange and futures climbed to \$98.62, the highest intraday price since trading began in 1983. Prices are closing in on a record level, adjusted for inflation, of \$101.70 a barrel in April 1980.

High economic growth in China and India could push oil prices to \$159 a barrel by 2030, the agency said. Fatih Birol, the agency's chief economist and the lead author of its flagship publication, The World Energy Outlook 2007, presented today, said that while economic growth should be encouraged because it helps to meet increasing energy demand through fostering innovation, it needs to happen in tandem with policies for energy efficiency.

## No Link to Nuclear

### **( ) No Link to Nuclear**

Posner, federal appeals judge, '05 [Richard, "Nuclear Power", May 1, acc 6/23/08, [http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear\\_powerpo.html](http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2005/05/nuclear_powerpo.html)]

But the effect of a gradual, incremental increase in nuclear power generation on the demand for oil would be modest. And a more important policy goal than reducing the price of oil is reducing our dependence on foreign, especially Middle Eastern, oil. This could be done by a heavy tax on oil, which would reduce the demand for oil much more than a modest increase in nuclear electrical generation would do.

### **( ) Nuclear Power Will Not Reduce Demand for Oil**

Lippman, adjunct scholar with the Middle East Institute, 08 [Thomas, "What Nuclear Power Can't Replace", January 5, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/01/04/AR2008010403563.html>, accessed 5/27/08]

Unfortunately, that is not true. The vast majority of the oil consumed in the United States is used for transportation, not for electricity generation. No amount of nuclear power will make much difference in our demand for oil because oil powers our cars and trucks, not our electricity plants.

According to the Energy Department's Energy Information Administration, less than 6 percent of U.S. electric generating capacity is oil-fueled, and most of the generating plants that do run on oil are backup units operated only at times of highest demand.

Nuclear power could supplant coal, but not oil.

## CO2 Good DA Negative – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	293
+ 291	
RPS Links	296
Nuclear Power Links	298
Biofuels Links	300
Cap and Trade Links	302
Extensions to Uniqueness	304
Extensions to Impacts	306
Answers to No Scientific Consensus	310
Answers to Not Real World	312
Answers to Weeds and Pests Turns	313
Land Shortage Impacts	314
Tropical Deforestation Impacts	315
Rice Impacts	321
China/India Impacts	325
Biodiversity Impacts	329
Erosion Impacts	331

## CO 2 Good DA – 1NC Shell

### **A. Uniqueness. Fossil Fuel Burning And Co2 Production Will Remain At High Levels**

Interesting Energy Facts March 24, 2008

<http://interestingenergyfacts.blogspot.com/2008/03/fossil-fuels-dominant-but-dangerous.html>

More than 6 billion gigatons of carbon dioxide is produced per year because of the burning of fossil fuels and natural processes are only capable in absorbing just about half of this amount and so we have every year increase of about 3 billion gigatons of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Fossil fuels currently provide about two thirds of US electricity and about 85 % of all the energy consumed in the US. US dependence on fossil fuels is traditional and therefore dominant because America owes to fossil fuels great deal of its economic power, so it's very likely that this reliance on fossil fuels will continue in the next decades despite some significant progresses in alternative energy sources.

### **B. Links.**

#### **1. The Plan Reduces Co2 – [Insert Link Card Here to Specific Plan]**

## CO 2 Good DA – 1NC Shell

### **2. Increased Co2 Is The Key To Averting Massive Food Shortages In The Future**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, November 16, 2005 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/w/summaries/war.php>

Within this context, Idso and Idso (2000) developed and analyzed a supply-and-demand scenario for food in the year 2050. Specifically, they identified the plants that at the turn of the century supplied 95% of the world's food needs and projected historical trends in the productivities of these crops 50 years into the future, after which they evaluated the growth-enhancing effects of atmospheric CO2 enrichment on these plants and made similar yield projections based on the increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration likely to have occurred by that future date. This exercise revealed that world population would likely be 51% greater in the year 2050 than it was in 1998, but that world food production would be only 37% greater if its enhanced productivity comes solely as a consequence of anticipated improvements in agricultural technology and expertise. However, they further determined that the consequent shortfall in farm production could be overcome - but just barely - by the additional benefits anticipated to accrue from the aerial fertilization effect of the expected rise in the air's CO2 content, assuming no Kyoto-style cutbacks in anthropogenic CO2 emissions. These findings suggest that the world food security envisioned by President Carter is precariously dependent upon the continued rising of the air's CO2 concentration. As Sylvan Wittwer (Director Emeritus of Michigan State University's Agricultural Experiment Station) stated in his 1995 book, Food, Climate, and Carbon Dioxide: The Global Environment and World Food Production: "The rising level of atmospheric CO2 could be the one global natural resource that is progressively increasing food production and total biological output, in a world of otherwise diminishing natural resources of land, water, energy, minerals, and fertilizer. It is a means of inadvertently increasing the productivity of farming systems and other photosynthetically active ecosystems. The effects know no boundaries and both developing and developed countries are, and will be, sharing equally."

## CO 2 Good DA – 1NC Shell

### **C. Impact.**

#### **1. Hundreds Of Millions Of People Are At Risk Of Dying**

Art Robinson, Research Professor, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, News With Views, May 9, 2008 <http://www.newswithviews.com/Robinson/art3.htm>

Hundreds of millions of human beings live today on the very edge of existence -- with all of their available resources consumed in the quest for food, shelter, and the minimum necessities of life. Without world technology and the energy that makes that technology possible, these people will slip from the lower rungs of human existence and will die.

#### **2. The Impact Outweighs The Case. The Risk Of Catastrophic Food Shortages Is Higher Than Global Warming**

Drs. Craig and Keith Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, June 2001 <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V4/N24/EDIT.php>

To be fair, most of the quoted atmospheric scientists still feel we should err on what they believe to be the side of caution with respect to the potential climate change problem by beginning to restrict anthropogenic CO2 emissions. And if that were the only problem we faced, who could argue with them? But potential CO2-induced global warming is not the only problem we face. In fact, CO2-induced global warming plays a poor second fiddle to the agriculturally-driven environmental problem for which enhanced CO2 emissions could well provide the extra help we need to avert it. This being the case, and in view of the additional fact that the agriculturally-driven environmental problem is much more likely to occur than is the global warming problem, it is our belief that logic demands that anthropogenic CO2 emissions be allowed to take their "natural" course, as dictated by the market place and sound science, since mandated CO2 reductions would appear to have a much greater likelihood of hurting the biosphere (by reducing our ability to avert the agricultural problem) than helping it (by preventing hypothetical CO2-induced global warming).

## Links Extensions – Renewable Portfolio Standards

### **( ) RPS Decreases Greenhouse Gases**

Pew Center on Global Climate Change, May 2, 2008

[http://www.pewclimate.org/what\\_s\\_being\\_done/in\\_the\\_states/rps.cfm](http://www.pewclimate.org/what_s_being_done/in_the_states/rps.cfm)

Most of these requirements take the form of “renewable portfolio standards,” or RPS’s, which require a certain percentage of a utility’s power plant capacity or generation to come from renewable sources by a given date. The standards range from modest to ambitious, and definitions of renewable energy vary. Though climate change may not be the prime motivation behind some of these standards, the use of renewable energy does deliver significant GHG reductions.

### **( ) Renewable Electricity Standards Would Reduce Co2**

Consumer Federation of America, NO TIME TO WASTE, October 2007 p.5

While the renewable electricity standard would not cut oil imports, it would lower natural gas consumption, lowering prices and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The primary impact would be a cumulative reduction of approximately 250 million tons of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

### **( ) RPS Would Replace Coal Burning**

World Nuclear News, Spero News, June 13, 2007

<http://www.speroforum.com/site/article.asp?id=9899>

The EIA concluded that the increase in renewable generation stimulated by such an RPS primarily displaces coal-fired generation. By 2030, coal generation is 3086 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh) with the RPS compared with 3330 billion kWh in the reference case, a reduction of some 7%. Coal generation is still expected to grow significantly from 2000 billion kWh in 2005.



## Links Extensions – Renewable Portfolio Standards

### **( ) An RPS Would Be The Key Component In Reducing CO2**

Stephen Filler, New York Solar Energy Industries Association, GREEN COUNSEL, July 27, 2007 <http://nylawline.typepad.com/greencounsel/2007/07/federal-renewab.html>

Renewable energy standards are among the most important components of climate change legislation, ensuring that an increasing percentage of our energy demand comes from renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, and hydro power. The U.S. House of Representatives is currently considering an amendment to the proposed energy bill that would require that 20% of U.S. electricity demand come from renewable energy sources

## Link Extensions – Nuclear Energy

### **( ) Nuclear Energy Mitigates Carbon Dioxide Production**

Nuclear Energy Institute 2008

<http://www.nei.org/keyissues/protectingtheenvironment/climatechangeinitiatives/>

Carbon mitigation strategies from Princeton University, Columbia University's Earth Institute, Harvard University and the Pew Center on Global Climate Change have reached a similar conclusion: A clear path toward meeting the global challenge of reducing greenhouse gases relies in part on an expanded portfolio of low-emission sources of electricity, including nuclear power.

### **( ) Nuclear Energy Can Replace Fossil Fuel Burning**

New York Times (Editorial) May 13, 2006

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/13/opinion/13sat1.html>

There is good reason to give nuclear power a fresh look. It can diversify our sources of energy with a fuel — uranium — that is both abundant and inexpensive. More important, nuclear energy can replace fossil-fuel power plants for generating electricity, reducing the carbon dioxide emissions that contribute heavily to global warming. That could be important in large developing economies like China's and India's, which would otherwise rely heavily on burning large quantities of dirty coal and oil.

### **3. Nuclear Energy Replaces Huge Amounts Of CO2**

The Denver Post January 25, 2008

[http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci\\_8070598](http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci_8070598)

Proponents of nuclear energy also say that reactors currently operating in the United States prevent emissions of 682 million tons of carbon dioxide every year. As Moore recently explained, the "104 nuclear plants that are operating across the United States are the equivalent of taking 100 million cars off the road." Nuclear energy, in other words, blows away any other alternative source of energy as viable and environmentally friendly.

## Link Extensions – Nuclear Energy

### **( ) Environmentalists Support Nuclear Energy To Reduce CO2**

Gwyneth Cravens, DISCOVER, April 25, 2008

<http://discovermagazine.com/2008/may/02-is-nuclear-energy-our-best-hope>

Writing in the British newspaper The Independent, Lovelock stated in an op-ed: "We have no time to experiment with visionary energy sources; civilisation is in imminent danger and has to use nuclear—the one safe, available energy source—now or suffer the pain soon to be inflicted by our outraged planet." Lovelock explained that his decision to endorse nuclear power was motivated by his fear of the consequences of global warming and by reports of increasing fossil-fuel emissions that drive the warming. Jesse Ausubel, head of the Program for the Human Environment at Rockefeller University, recently echoed Lovelock's sentiment. "As a green, I care intensely about land-sparing, about leaving land for nature," he wrote. "To reach the scale at which they would contribute importantly to meeting global energy demand, renewable sources of energy such as wind, water, and biomass cause serious environmental harm. Measuring renewables in watts per square meter, nuclear has astronomical advantages over its competitors." All of this has led several other prominent environmentalists to publicly favor new nuclear plants.

## Link Extensions – Biofuels

### **( ) Biofuels Reduce CO2 Emissions From Gasoline**

David Hayes, Progressive Policy Institute, March 6, 2007

[www.ppionline.org/ppi\\_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=900170&contentID=254211](http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=116&subsecID=900170&contentID=254211)

Then, of course, there are the environmental benefits. Unlike gasoline made from oil, which releases carbon dioxide (CO2) into the atmosphere when it is used in internal combustion engines, biofuels are "climate-neutral." Burning them does not add new greenhouse gases to the atmosphere, since the growth and destruction of the crops that biofuels are made from is part of the natural cycle of CO2 absorption (during growth) and release (during destruction or decomposition).

### **( ) Crops For Biofuels Are A CO2 Sink**

Maarten Chrispeels, professor UC Davis, Division of Biological Sciences, February 17, 2008

[http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20080217/news\\_lz1e17kay.html](http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20080217/news_lz1e17kay.html)

Biofuels can help mitigate this global climate change phenomenon because they are made from plants and algae that absorbed carbon dioxide in the process of photosynthesis. When we burn fossil fuels, we add carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, but burning biofuels releases carbon dioxide that was taken out of the atmosphere by plants or algae a few days, weeks or years earlier. So, we create a carbon cycle, helping to prevent further buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

### **( ) Efficient Processes Reduce Energy Used In Making Ethanol**

David Moberg, senior editor, In These Times, April 11, 2007

[http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/3095/biofuels\\_promise\\_or\\_peril/](http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/3095/biofuels_promise_or_peril/)

Other experts respond that their calculations of this energy balance fail to reflect the efficiencies of new facilities, overcount energy inputs and ignore the energy value of byproducts, such as the distillers' mash that animals can eat. In fact most studies show that ethanol from corn provides more energy than goes into its production, according to a 2006 review by Berkeley scientists Alexander Farrell, Daniel M. Kammen and others.

## Link Extensions – Biofuels

### **( ) Newer Methods Reduce Greenhouse Gases Even More**

David Moberg, senior editor, In These Times, April 11, 2007  
[http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/3095/biofuels\\_promise\\_or\\_peril/](http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/3095/biofuels_promise_or_peril/)

Farming techniques and the choice of crops determine the extent to which biofuels reduce GHGs. For corn-based ethanol, the estimates range from a 36 percent reduction in GHGs to a 29 percent increase, depending on cultivation practices. The best reduction would come from using woody plants and grasses, like miscanthus and switchgrass, which could reduce GHGs by 90 percent compared to gasoline. In addition, some cellulosic feedstock plants can thrive in soils that are marginal or depleted, possibly enriching and saving the topsoil while sequestering carbon.

## Link Extensions – Cap and Trade

### **( ) Cap/Trade Policies Create Huge And Fast CO2 Reductions**

Maria Surma Manka, Green Options, March 27, 2007  
[mariasurmamanka.greenoptions.com/2007/03/27/is-cap-and-trade-the-best-co2-policy/](http://mariasurmamanka.greenoptions.com/2007/03/27/is-cap-and-trade-the-best-co2-policy/)

Bill Chameides (chief scientist, Environmental Defense) argued that the fastest, most cost-effective way to reduce CO2 emissions is with a policy called cap-and-trade. This system tells big emitters – like powerplants, automobile manufacturers, etc – that they have to cut their CO2 emissions by a certain amount by a certain date. For companies that make deeper cuts than what is required, a credit is issued and can be traded (sold) to other emitters that don't meet the targets. With this system, explained Chameides, government plays "a fairly light role" by ensuring that technologies are valid and are reducing emissions, while carbon dioxide becomes a commodity and sold on the open market. Companies are rewarded for innovations that take them beyond targets set by lawmakers.

### **( ) Carbon Markets Have Achieved Real Solvency In Europe**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008  
[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

While supporters agree that carbon markets alone cannot reduce emissions, they insist they can change behaviour. They noted that the European system has resulted in a number of coal plants being mothballed and they predict they will spur investment in expensive but clean technologies like solar energy and carbon sequestration and storage in which carbon dioxide is stored underground.

## Link Extensions – Cap and Trade

### **( ) The Plan Will Spillover To A Global Climate Regime**

Michael Casey, Business Report, April 4, 2008

[http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964](http://www.busrep.co.za/index.php?from=rss_Business%20Report&fArticleId=4336964)

The carbon market is getting a boost in negotiations this week in Bangkok to piece together a new global warming pact aimed at keeping temperatures from rising so high they trigger an environmental disaster. Negotiators have until late 2009 to complete work on an agreement to take effect when the Kyoto Protocol runs out at the end of 2012. Emissions trading is seen by many as the glue that will hold the system together by reducing greenhouse gas production while generating funds to develop clean technology and help poor countries adapt to environmental changes such as rising sea-levels. "A functioning carbon market will be critical to a successful agreement," UN climate chief Yvo de Boer told The Associated Press ahead of the Bangkok meeting.

### **( ) The "Cap" Reduces CO2 Emissions**

Center for American Progress, January 16, 2008

<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/01/capandtrade101.html>

Each large-scale emitter, or company, will have a limit on the amount of greenhouse gas that it can emit. The firm must have an "emissions permit" for every ton of carbon dioxide it releases into the atmosphere. These permits set an enforceable limit, or cap, on the amount of greenhouse gas pollution that the company is allowed to emit. Over time, the limits become stricter, allowing less and less pollution, until the ultimate reduction goal is met. This is similar to the cap and trade program enacted by the Clean Air Act of 1990, which reduced the sulfur emissions that cause acid rain, and it met the goals at a much lower cost than industry or government predicted.

## Uniqueness Extensions - Food Supplies Will Remain Precarious

### **( ) The Risk Of Shortages And High Prices Will Continue For Decades**

The Market Oracle February 22, 2008

<http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article3782.html>

Michael Schmitz, an agricultural economist and professor, used databases to forecast how far trends would last when global conditions change like they have recently. The professor says that the current shortages and price hikes are not a phenomenon that will end in a few months -- or even in a few years. Schmitz predicts: "This could continue for two or three decades." (Spiegel Online) The world faces a serious food crunch "that is not getting nearly enough attention from global leaders" the head of the world's biggest fertilizer producer warned last month. Global grain reserves are "precarious" at only 1.7 months of consumption according to Bill Doyle, CEO of PotashCorp.

### **( ) Food Prices Crisis Will Continue**

Katarina Wahlberg, Social and Economic Policy Program Coordinator, Global Policy Forum, March 3, 2008

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/hunger/general/2008/0303foodcrisis.htm>

Food prices have soared because agricultural production has not kept up with the rising demand of cereals for food consumption, cattle feeding and biofuel production. For the first time in decades, worldwide scarcity of food is becoming a problem. Global cereal stocks are falling rapidly. Some predict that US wheat stocks will reach a 60-year low in 2008. Population growth in poor countries is boosting the grain demand for food consumption. But cereal demand for the feeding of cattle is increasing even more rapidly as consumers in both rich countries and fast growing economies are eating more dairy and meat.



## Uniqueness Extensions - Food Supplies Will Remain Precarious

### **( ) Production Of Food Is Strained To The Breaking Point**

Katarina Wahlberg, Social and Economic Policy Program Coordinator, Global Policy Forum, March 3, 2008

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/hunger/general/2008/0303foodcrisis.htm>

According to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), world production of cereal, vegetables, fruit, meat and dairy increased in 2007. But, prices will remain high or grow even further in the coming years, as production is not growing fast enough to keep up with rising demand. Production is increasing mainly in the US, the EU, China and India. Not counting China and India, cereal production in poor countries decreased, due in part to climate change related emergencies such as droughts and floods. In addition to a tight supply and demand situation, soaring petroleum prices contribute to higher food prices by raising costs of transportation, fertilizers, and fuel for farm machinery. Moreover, financial investors speculating in commodity prices aggravate prices and increase volatility in the market.

## Base Impact Scenario Extensions

### **( ) Increasing CO2 Solves Nitrogen, Water And Land Use Shortages – Which Are Essential To Prevent Mass Starvation**

Sherwood Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, June 6, 2007

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansen critique.jsp>

Since atmospheric CO2 is the basic "food" of nearly all plants, the more of it there is in the air, the better they function and the more productive they become. For a 300-ppm increase in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration above the planet's current base level of slightly less than 400 ppm, for example, the productivity of earth's herbaceous plants rises by something on the order of 30% (Kimball, 1983; Idso and Idso, 1994), while the productivity of its woody plants rises by something on the order of 50% (Saxe et al., 1998; Idso and Kimball, 2001). Thus, as the air's CO2 content continues to rise, so too will the productive capacity or land-use efficiency of the planet continue to rise, as the aerial fertilization effect of the upward-trending atmospheric CO2 concentration boosts the growth rates and biomass production of nearly all plants in nearly all places. In addition, elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations typically increase plant nutrient-use efficiency in general - and nitrogen-use efficiency in particular - as well as plant water-use efficiency, as may be verified by perusing the many reviews of scientific journal articles we have produced on these topics and archived in the Subject Index of our website (www.co2science.org). Consequently, with respect to fostering all three of the plant physiological phenomena that Tilman et al. (2002) contend are needed to prevent the catastrophic consequences they foresee for the planet just a few short decades from now, a continuation of the current upward trend in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration would appear to be essential.

## Base Impact Scenario Extensions

### **( ) Rising Levels Of CO2 Are The Only Way To Avoid Massive Food Shortages And Biosphere Destruction In The Future**

Sherwood Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, June 6, 2007

<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansencritique.jsp>

In the case we are considering here, for example, the degree of crop yield enhancement likely to be provided by the increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration expected to occur between 2000 and 2050 has been calculated by Idso and Idso (2000) to be sufficient - but only by the slightest of margins - to compensate for the huge differential that is expected to otherwise prevail between the supply and demand for food earmarked for human consumption just 43 years from now. Consequently, letting the evolution of technology take its natural course, with respect to anthropogenic CO2 emissions, would appear to be the only way we will ever be able to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to support ourselves in the year 2050 without the taking of unconscionable amounts of land and freshwater resources from nature and decimating the biosphere in the process.

## Base Impact Scenario Extensions

### **( ) CO2 Increases Global Agricultural Productivity**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

Can the case for atmospheric CO2 enrichment be made any clearer? Automatically, and without investing a single hard-earned dollar, ruble or whatever, people everywhere promote the cause of peace when they utilize energy produced by the burning of fossil fuels; for CO2 - one of the major end-products of the combustion process - is the very elixir of life, being the primary building block of all plant tissues via the essential role it plays in the photosynthetic process that sustains nearly all of earth's vegetation. And as with any production process, the insertion of more raw materials (in this case CO2) into the front of the production line results in more manufactured goods coming out the end of the line, which in the case of enhanced plant growth and development is biosphere-sustaining food. Consequently, in light of the former president's statement that "leaders of developing nations must make food security a priority" for "there can be no peace until people have enough to eat," one can begin to appreciate the role of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content within this important context.

### **( ) CO2 Increases Are Necessary To Solve Global Food Shortages In The Future**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

In investigating the subject in more detail, Idso and Idso (2000) developed a supply-and-demand scenario for food in the year 2050, wherein they identified the plants that currently supply 95% of the world's food needs and projected historical trends in their productivities (based on the assumption of continued increases in agricultural knowledge and expertise) 50 years into the future. Under this scenario, they found that world food production would rise by about 37% between the start of the 21st century and its midpoint, but that world food needs, which they equated with world population, would likely rise by 51% over the same period. Fortunately, they additionally calculated that the shortfall in production could be overcome (but only barely) by the benefits anticipated to accrue from the many productivity-enhancing effects of the expected concomitant rise in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration.

## Base Impact Scenario Extensions

### **( ) Increasing CO2 Boosts Food Crop Yields By 30-50% - And Are Equitably Distributed**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

Requirement No. 1: The agricultural benefits to be reaped should be equitably distributed among all nations. First of all, what are the agricultural benefits of elevated atmospheric CO2? For a 300 ppm increase in the air's CO2 content, they are 30 to 50% increases in the yields of nearly all food crops. As for their equitable distribution among all nations, the fact that CO2 is well mixed throughout the atmosphere insures that all nations will share equally in the availability of this great resource and its proven yield-enhancing properties.

### **( ) CO2 Increases Agricultural Yields Everywhere – Overcomes Food Distribution Barriers**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

Requirement No. 2: Local food production should be enhanced worldwide. The nice thing about the aerial fertilization effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment in this regard is that it is a blessing that transcends all political barriers. As Wittwer (1995) has so eloquently put it, the effects of elevated CO2 "know no boundaries and both developing and developed countries are, and will be, sharing equally," for "the rising level of atmospheric CO2 is a universally free premium, gaining in magnitude with time, on which we all can reckon for the foreseeable future."

## Answers To: No Scientific Consensus

### **1. Studies Show Many Benefits Of CO2 On Agriculture**

S. Fred Singer, research professor, George Mason University, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February 2008 p.23

Plants use CO<sub>2</sub> to produce the organic matter out of which they construct their tissues. Higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air enable plants to grow bigger, produce more branches and leaves, expand their root systems, and produce more flowers and fruit [Idso 1989]. Laboratory experiments show that a 300 ppm increase in the CO<sub>2</sub> content typically raises the productivity of most herbaceous plants by about one-third [Kimball 1983; Idso 1992]. Some 176 experiments on trees and other woody plants reveal a mean growth enhancement of 48 percent for a 300 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> content [Poorter 1993; Ceulemans and Mousseau 1994; Wullschlegel et al. 1995, 1997].

### **2. Open-Air Studies Confirm CO2 Increases Agricultural Yields**

Roger Gifford, CSIRO Plant Industry, Australia, New Phytologist, 2004 vol 163 (2) pp. 221-5

Lisa Ainsworth reported results of a statistical meta-analysis of results now available from experiments conducted over several years in 12 large-scale FACE facilities on four continents (Long et al., 2004). This again confirmed, with greater statistical rigour and for a much wider range of species including crops, pasture species and trees, most of the conclusions of the evaluation by Kimball et al. (2002) for a CO<sub>2</sub> concentration of 550 ppmv. In addition, she noted that, in the open field, elevated CO<sub>2</sub> increased apparent quantum yield of light-limited photosynthesis by 13% (a figure close to the theoretical short-term response expectation), that growth under water or N stress exacerbated the response of stomatal conductance to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and agricultural yield increased by 17% (average of C3 and C4) a figure similar to the average of 15% (scaled to 550 ppmv CO<sub>2</sub>) reported by Kimball (1986) for prior chamber studies.

## Answers To: No Scientific Consensus

### **3. Many Studies Prove Fertilization Effects**

Peter Soule, Department of Geography and Planning, Appalachian State University, New Phytologist, 2006 volume 171(2) pp. 379-90

Two major environmental issues have arisen regarding the increasingly CO<sub>2</sub>-rich world of the late 20th and early 21st centuries: climatic change, and plant responses to the environment. While the implications of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> for potential climatic change have received the majority of attention, the potential role of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization in plant growth and subsequent ecosystem dynamics may be equally important. Results from reviews of numerous controlled studies for agricultural crops (Kimball et al., 2002), ecosystems (Nowak et al., 2004) and trees (Norby et al., 1999; Ainsworth & Long, 2005) indicate consistently that most species respond significantly to 'step' increases in elevated CO<sub>2</sub>. Further, for many species/ecosystems these responses have been sustained in long-term experiments (Hättenschwiler et al., 1997; Idso & Kimball, 2001; Ainsworth et al., 2003; Rasse et al., 2005).

### **4. Studies Over Large Areas, Extended Times, And Different Climates Confirm FACE And Lab Studies**

Peter Soule, Department of Geography and Planning, Appalachian State University, New Phytologist, 2006 volume 171(2) pp. 379-90

In summary, we explored whether the observed physiological responses of plants exposed to step increases of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in laboratory, open-top chamber, FACE and CO<sub>2</sub>-vent settings also exist over: (1) large geographical areas; (2) extended time periods; (3) different climates; and (4) under modest increases in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. We hypothesized that ponderosa pine, a widespread species in the American west that has great ecological and economic value, would respond to gradual increases in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> over the past 50 yr, and that these effects would be most apparent during drought stress and on environmentally harsh sites. Overall, our results support these hypotheses. We conclude that it is likely an atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>-driven growth-enhancement effect exists for ponderosa pine growing under specific natural conditions within the interior Pacific Northwest.

## Answer to: Not Real World

### **1. Satellite Observations Prove Earth's Vegetation Has Grown Tremendously In The Past 20 Years Due To CO2 Increases**

Center for the study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, January 10, 2008 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/g/summaries/greeningearth.php>

Be that as it may, the important take-home message of Nemani et al.'s study is that satellite-derived observations indicate that the planet's terrestrial vegetation significantly increased its productivity over the last two decades of the 20th century, in the face of a host of both real and imagined environmental stresses, chief among the latter of which was what climate alarmists routinely claim to be unprecedented CO2-induced global warming, which they routinely represent as being anathema to life on earth. However, the doomsayers are 180 degrees out of phase with reality in this contention, as earth's vegetation has spoken loud and clear - by its ever-increasing growth rate - that it actually loves higher air temperatures and atmospheric CO2 concentrations.

### **2. Example Of Soybeans – CO2 Increasing Yield**

Debra Levey Larson, University of Illinois, March 11, 2008  
[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2008-03/uoi-a-icd031108.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2008-03/uoi-a-icd031108.php)

(Soil scientist Michelle) Wander said that carbon dioxide is rising every year in the atmosphere because of human use of fossil fuel and deforestation. "We attribute the higher soybean yields over the past several decades to the rising carbon dioxide levels in the Earth's atmosphere – some attribute a 10 percent increase in soybean yields already due to this carbon dioxide fertilization effect.



## Answer to Weeds and Pests Turns

### **1. CO2 Combats Worst Weeds**

Sherwood Idso, Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, CO2 Science Magazine, March 19, 2003  
[http://www.co2science.org/edit/v6\\_edit/v6n12edit.htm](http://www.co2science.org/edit/v6_edit/v6n12edit.htm)

In the case of weeds, Conway and Toenniessen speak of one of Africa's staple crops, maize, being "attacked by the parasitic weed Striga (Striga hermonthica), which sucks nutrients from roots." This weed also infects many other C4 crops of the semi-arid tropics, such as sorghum, sugar cane and millet, as well as the C3 crop rice, particularly throughout much of Africa, where it is currently one of the region's most economically important parasitic weeds. Here, too, materials archived on our website describe how atmospheric CO2 enrichment greatly reduces the damage done by this devastating weed.

### **2. CO2 Combats Pests**

Sherwood Idso, Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, CO2 Science Magazine, March 19, 2003  
[http://www.co2science.org/edit/v6\\_edit/v6n12edit.htm](http://www.co2science.org/edit/v6_edit/v6n12edit.htm)

In the case of insects and plant diseases, atmospheric CO2 enrichment also helps prevent crop losses. In a study of diseased tomato plants infected with the fungal pathogen *Phytophthora parasitica*, which attacks plant roots inducing water stress that decreases yields, for example, the growth-promoting effect of a doubling of the air's CO2 content completely counterbalanced the yield-reducing effect of the pathogen (Jwa and Walling, 2001). Likewise, in a review of impacts and responses of herbivorous insects maintained for relatively long periods of time in CO2-enriched environments as described in some 30-plus different studies, Whittaker (1999) noted that insect populations, on average, have been unaffected by the extra CO2. Since plant growth is nearly universally stimulated in air of elevated CO2 concentration, however, a smaller proportion of it would thus be likely to be consumed by herbivorous insects in a high-CO2 world.

## Extensions to: Land Shortage Impact

### **1. Increasing CO2 Helps The Preservation Of Land, And Subsequently Many Species**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

If one were to pick the most significant problem currently facing the biosphere, this would probably be it: a single species of life, Homo sapiens, is on course to completely annihilate fully two-thirds of the ten million or so other species with which we share the planet within a mere hundred years, simply by taking their land. Global warming, by comparison, pales in significance. Its impact is nowhere near as severe, being possibly nil or even positive. In addition, its root cause is highly debated; and actions to thwart it are much more difficult, if not impossible, to both define and implement. Furthermore, what many people believe to be the cause of global warming, i.e., anthropogenic CO2 emissions, may actually be a powerful force for preserving land for nature.

### **2. Biodiversity Key To Human Survival**

Working Paper on Climate Change, Loss of Biodiversity and Deforestation, March 6-7, 2007

<http://www.asem.mim.dk/NR/rdonlyres/4271D755-2C34-44B6-8A53-3767D7D76A01/0/WPonBiodiversityandDeforestation280207.pdf>

Biodiversity is the foundation for the goods and services provided by ecosystems that are crucial for human survival and well being. Loss of biodiversity has negative affects on several aspects affecting human life such as food and energy security and access to clean water and raw materials. The livelihood of many indigenous and local communities, in particular, is adversely affected since their communities are so directly dependent on the products and services provided by the ecosystems they inhabit.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) CO2 Increases Tropical Rainforests**

Center for the study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, January 10, 2008 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/g/summaries/greeningearth.php>

In a satellite study of the world's tropical forests, Ichii et al. (2005) "simulated and analyzed 1982-1999 Amazonian, African, and Asian carbon fluxes using the Biome-BGC prognostic carbon cycle model driven by National Centers for Environmental Prediction reanalysis daily climate data," after which they "calculated trends in gross primary productivity (GPP) and net primary productivity (NPP)." This work revealed that solar radiation variability was the primary factor responsible for interannual variations in GPP, followed by temperature and precipitation variability, while in terms of GPP trends, Ichii et al. report that "recent changes in atmospheric CO2 and climate promoted terrestrial GPP increases with a significant linear trend in all three tropical regions." In the Amazonian region, the rate of GPP increase was 0.67 PgC year<sup>-1</sup> decade<sup>-1</sup>, while in Africa and Asia it was about 0.3 PgC year<sup>-1</sup> decade<sup>-1</sup>. Likewise, they report that "CO2 fertilization effects strongly increased recent NPP trends in regional totals."

### **( ) New Study Proves Strong CO2 Fertilization Effects On Forests**

Jian-Guo Huang, Durable Forestry Management Department Chair, University of Quebec, CRITICAL REVIEWS IN PLANT SCIENCE, 2007 vol 26 p. 283

The CO2 fertilization effect hypothesis, i.e., rising atmospheric CO2 has a positive effect on tree growth due to increasing availability of carbon, was extensively tested by CO2 enrichment experiments and empirical dendrochronological studies. In this paper, we compared and synthesized the literature from both CO2 enrichment experiments on seedlings or young trees and empirical tree-ring studies detecting CO2 fertilization effect to assess whether CO2 fertilization effect occurs in tree-rings in natural forests. Considerable CO2 enriched experiments demonstrated significantly positive physiological and growth responses of trees to CO2, providing strong evidence to support the direct CO2 fertilization effect (increased photosynthesis, water use efficiency, above- and belowground growth) and thus allowing predication of which ecosystems might be most responsive to CO2.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) New Study Shows CO2 Strengthens Tropical Forests**

Center for the study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, May 7, 2008

<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V11/N19/B2.php>

Based on their examination of the pertinent scientific literature, and using a mixture of observations and climate model outputs together with a simple parameterization of leaf-level photosynthesis incorporating known temperature sensitivities, Lloyd and Farquhar say they could find "no evidence for tropical forests currently existing 'dangerously close' to their optimum temperature range," as is often suggested by climate alarmists. Quite to the contrary, in fact, they say they found that increases in photosynthetic rates associated with increases in ambient CO2 over forthcoming decades should "more than offset" any decline in photosynthetic productivity due to higher leaf temperatures, leaf-to-air vapor pressure deficits or autotrophic respiration rates. In addition, they argue that "the magnitude and pattern of increases in forest dynamics across Amazonia observed over the last few decades are consistent with a CO2-induced stimulation of tree growth." Not only have past increases in the atmosphere's CO2 content and temperature been a boon to the productivity of Amazonia's tropical forests -- as well as all of the world's other tropical forests ( see Trees (Types - Tropical) in our Subject Index) -- it would appear from the materials reviewed by these two highly-regarded scientists, as well as their own original research, that the productivity of earth's tropical forests will likely rise even higher in response to predicted future increases in the air's temperature and CO2 concentration.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) Survey Of 186 Scientific Studies Show CO2 Increases Forest Growth**

Center for the study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, January 10, 2008 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/g/summaries/greeningearth.php>

In a review of these several global forest studies, as well as many others (which led to their citing 186 scientific journal articles), Boisvenue and Running (2006) examined reams of "documented evidence of the impacts of climate change trends on forest productivity since the middle of the 20th century." In doing so, they found that "globally, based on both satellite and ground-based data, climatic changes seemed to have a generally positive impact on forest productivity when water was not limiting," which was most of the time, because they report that "less than 7% of forests are in strongly water-limited systems." Hence, and in spite of what climate alarmists routinely describe as unprecedented increases in the "twin evils" of rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations and air temperatures (which some have described as being greater threats to the world than global terrorism or nuclear warfare), there has in fact been what Boisvenue and Running call a significant "greening of the biosphere," and the world's forests in particular.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) Tropical Forests Crucial For Biodiversity**

Environment for Beginners, 2006

<http://www.environmentforbeginners.com/content/view/52/1/>

Forests stabilize the climate in general. The plants enrich the soil by recycling the nutrients through the shedding of leaves and seeds. They also regulate the water cycle by absorbing and redistributing rainwater quite equally to every species living within its range, which is known as the economy of water. Overall, forests provide perfect habitats for life to flourish on land. They actually contain most of the living species, particularly in the case of tropical forests where up to 90% of the planet's species live. Tropical forests possess the highest level of biodiversity and therefore provide the biggest genes reservoir.

### **( ) Remaining Forests Key To Human Survival**

Environment for Beginners, 2006

<http://www.environmentforbeginners.com/content/view/52/1/>

Most countries don't have proper regulations and the exploitation of forests has been quite anarchic. If we continue at this rhythm, we will lose all tropical forests before 2100. But there is a way to ethically exploit our forests. We can find many exploitable natural products without clear cutting the area. For example, rubber is a product extracted from the tropical forest and does not require clearing up the area, which shows that the exploitation can be done in a sustainable way. Techniques like these have been massively promoted in recent years in order to save the unique Amazonian forest. What we have left in the world is crucial to maintain biodiversity, find new medicine and absorb air pollution. Those things are unconditionally linked to human survival.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) Pressures For Deforestation Will Continue**

Environment for Beginners, 2006

<http://www.environmentforbeginners.com/content/view/52/1/>

Deforestation has been going on for centuries and is intimately correlated with population growth. Besides colonisation, we cut trees for practically the same reasons as hundreds of years ago: to increase land for agriculture and pasture, as well as to produce lumber for heating, construction and other material. For agriculture and pasture, burning the area is often used to flatten the ground, which emits an important amount of carbon dioxide each time. We also create big industrial projects such as artificial water basins to produce hydro electricity. Industrial development has often been responsible for deforestation, and has threatened in some cases the ways of life of certain populations.

### **( ) Deforestation Is Irreversible**

Environment for Beginners, 2006

<http://www.environmentforbeginners.com/content/view/52/1/>

By eliminating forests, we kill most of the biodiversity in the area. In some places in tropical forests that means it would take another 100 millions years to recreate the same biodiversity; some of the species are unique in the world and they quickly disappear following the destruction of their habitat. Deforestation provokes irreversible damage and reforestation is not entirely making it up for it.

## Extension to: Tropical Deforestation Impact

### **( ) Tropical Forests Key To Human And Other Species Survival**

Rebecca Lindsey, Earth Observatory, March 30, 2007  
<http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Library/Deforestation/>

In addition, the genetic diversity of tropical forests is basically the deepest end of the planetary gene pool. Hidden in the genes of plants, animals, fungi, and bacteria that have not even been discovered yet may be cures for cancer and other diseases or the key to improving the yield and nutritional quality of foods—which the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization says will be crucial for feeding the nearly ten billion people the Earth will likely need to support in coming decades. Finally, genetic diversity in the planetary gene pool is crucial for the resilience of all life on Earth to rare but catastrophic environmental events, such as meteor impacts or massive, sustained volcanism.



## Extension to: Rice Impact Scenario

### **( ) CO2 Helps Rice Survive Drought**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, 2004  
<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculturerice.php>

Recovery from the drought-induced water stress was also more rapid in the elevated CO2 treatment. At panicle initiation, for example, Widodo et al. observed that "as water was added back following a drought induction, it took more than 24 days for the ambient CO2 [water]-stressed plants to recuperate in midday leaf CER, compared with only 6-8 days for the elevated CO2 [water]-stressed plants." Similarly, they report that "for the drought imposed during anthesis, midday leaf CER of the elevated CO2 [water]-stressed plants were fully recovered after 16 days of re-watering, whereas those of the ambient CO2 [water]-stressed plants were still 21% lagging behind their unstressed controls at that date." Hence, they logically concluded that "rice grown under future rising atmospheric CO2 should be better able to tolerate drought situations."

### **( ) CO2 Strengthens Rice Production Many Ways**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, 2004  
<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculturerice.php>

In summary, as the CO2 concentration of the air continues to rise, rice plants will likely experience greater photosynthetic rates, produce more biomass, be less affected by root parasites, and better deal with environmental stresses, all of which effects should lead to greater grain yields. For additional results confirming this conclusion, see Rice (dry weight, photosynthesis) in the Plant Growth Data section of our website.

### Extension to: Rice Impact Scenario

#### **( ) Rice Will Be Able To Feed The World With Sustained CO2**

Sherwood, Keith and Craig Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, March 1, 2006, vol 9 number 9  
<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V9/N9/EDIT.php>

Fortunately, we have a strong ally in the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 concentration that may help us meet and surmount this daunting global challenge. Atmospheric CO2 enrichment, for example, has been demonstrated to significantly increase rice photosynthesis and biomass production (see our compilations of over 100 individual experimental results for photosynthesis and biomass responses of rice to CO2-enriched air in the Data section of our website). In addition, elevated CO2 concentrations have been shown to enhance the ability of rice to cope with both biotic and abiotic stresses (see Agriculture (Species - Rice) in our Subject Index). Hence, in addition to our purposeful directed efforts to increase rice yields in the years and decades to come, we will experience the unplanned help provided by the CO2 emissions that result from the burning of fossil fuels. Working together, these two positive forces may help us meet the clear and present need to ramp up rice production to the degree required to adequately feed the world a mere quarter-century from now, and to do so without usurping all of the planet's available land and water resources and thereby consigning the bulk of "wild nature" to the ash heap of history. Without the help of both approaches, we will in all likelihood fail and, with the rest of the biosphere, suffer unimaginable negative consequences.

## Extension to: Rice Impact Scenario

### **( ) Increased Rice Supply Is Necessary To Feed 5 Billion**

Sherwood, Keith and Craig Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, March 1, 2006, vol 9 number 9  
<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V9/N9/EDIT.php>

What will it take to feed five billion rice consumers in 2030? That is the question that plagues the mind of Gurdev S. Khush (2005) of the International Rice Research Institute in Metro Manila, Philippines. "According to various estimates," in his words, "we will have to produce 40% more rice by 2030 to satisfy the growing demand without affecting the resource base adversely," because, as he continues, "if we are not able to produce more rice from the existing land resources, land-hungry farmers will destroy forests and move into more fragile lands such as hillsides and wetlands with disastrous consequences for biodiversity and watersheds," echoing sentiments previously expressed by Wallace (2000), Tilman et al. (2001; 2002), Foley et al. (2005), and Green et al. (2005). Hence, as Khush puts it, the expected increase in the demand for food "will have to be met from less land, with less water, less labor and fewer chemicals."

## Extension of Impact: China and India Example

### **( ) CO2 Is Increasing Agricultural Productivity In China**

CO2 Science Magazine, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, April 30, 2008 <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V11/N18/B2.php>

CZhu et al. say their results indicate that "climatic changes in China have eased some critical climatic constraints on plant growth." They note, for example, that "water availability most strongly limits vegetation growth over 28% of the whole country surface, whereas temperature limits growth over 43% and radiation over 29%," but they report that "from 1982 to 1999, modeled NPP increased by 1.42% per year in water-limited regions of Northwest China, 1.46% per year in temperature-limited regions of Northeast China and Tibet Plateau, and 0.99% per year in radiation-limited regions of South China and East China." Summed over the entire 18-year period, total Chinese terrestrial vegetation NPP increased by 24.2%. Last of all, they report that "interannual variations of NPP in Chinese terrestrial vegetation are positively correlated with global increases in atmospheric CO2 growth rate, indicating that NPP in Chinese terrestrial vegetation will increase with the global increases in atmospheric CO2 growth rate." [Zhu, W.Q. et al, "Comprehensive Analysis of the Impact of Climatic Changes on Chinese Terrestrial Net Primary Productivity, Chinese Science Bulletin, 52: 3253-3260, 2007]

### **( ) CO2 Can Overcome Effects Of Warming On Rice In India**

P. Krishnan, Division of Biochemistry, Plant Physiology and Environmental Sciences, Central Rice Research Institute, India, AGRICULTURE, ECOSYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT, October 2007 vol. 122, issue 2, p. 233

Impact of elevated CO2 and temperature on rice yield in eastern India was simulated by using the ORYZA1 and the INFOCROP rice models. The crop and weather data from 10 different sites, viz., Bhubaneswar, Chinsurah, Cuttack, Faizabad, Jabalpur, Jorhat, Kalyani, Pusa, Raipur and Ranchi, which differed significantly in their geographical and climatological factors, were used in these two models. For every 1 °C increase in temperature, ORYZA1 and INFOCROP rice models predicted average yield changes of -7.20 and -6.66%, respectively, at the current level of CO2 (380 ppm). But increases in the CO2 concentration up to 700 ppm led to the average yield increases of about 30.73% by ORYZA1 and 56.37% by INFOCROP rice.

## Extension of Impact: Water Shortage

### **( ) Study Proves CO2 Mitigates The Effects Of Drought**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, August 1, 2007 <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V10/N31/B1.php>

As Li et al. state in the title of their paper with respect to the specific ecosystem they studied, "elevated CO2 mitigates the adverse effects of drought on daytime net ecosystem CO2 exchange and photosynthesis in a Florida scrub-oak ecosystem." Or as they state more generally in the concluding sentence of their paper, "studies such as the one reported here strongly support the conclusion that the effects of rising atmospheric CO2 on plant and ecosystem processes [PN and NEE] are likely to be greater during drought."

### **( ) Increased CO2 Solves Land, Water And Food Scarcity**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006  
<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

Although the impending biological crisis and several important elements of its potential solution are thus well defined, Tilman et al. (2001) report that "even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems." However, we have a powerful ally in the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration that can provide what we can't. For a nominal doubling of the air's CO2 content, for example, the productivity of earth's herbaceous plants rises by 30 to 50% (Kimball, 1983; Idso and Idso, 1994), while the productivity of its woody plants rises by 50 to 80% (Saxe et al. 1998; Idso and Kimball, 2001). Hence, as the air's CO2 content continues to rise, so too will the land use efficiency of the planet rise right along with it. In addition, atmospheric CO2 enrichment typically increases plant nutrient use efficiency and plant water use efficiency (see Nitrogen Use Efficiency and Water Use Efficiency in our Subject Index). Thus, with respect to all three of the major needs noted by Tilman et al. (2002), increases in the air's CO2 content pay huge dividends, helping to increase agricultural output without the taking of land away from nature.

## Extension of Impact: Water Shortage Scenario

### **( ) CO2 Is The Only Way To Sustain Human Population Growth Without Depleting Water And Land**

Sherwood, Keith and Craig Idso, CO2 Science Magazine, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, April 30, 2008 Volume 11, Number 8  
<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V11/N18/EDIT.php>

First, some of the world's most prominent ecologists have concluded that even with all agricultural advancements they can anticipate over the next few decades, we may still not be able to grow sufficient food to sustain the planet's human population without appropriating for this purpose vast amounts of land and water that are currently needed to support the other species with which we share the earth. Second, we have calculated that the crop yield enhancements and water-use efficiency increases that should be caused by the expected increase in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration between now and the year 2050 should be sufficient, but only barely, to enable us to grow the crops we will need at that time on the lands and with the water that we currently use for this purpose. If we are to prevent the extinctions of innumerable species of plants and animals that many see occurring only half a human lifespan from now, we must pursue a course of action that is congruent with the one we outline here.

## Extension of Impact: Water Shortage

### **( ) Water Shortages Threaten The Planet And Human Survival**

Maude Barlow, chair of Food and Water Watch, Foreign Policy in Focus, February 25, 2008 <http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/5016>

The three water crises – dwindling freshwater supplies, inequitable access to water and the corporate control of water – pose the greatest threat of our time to the planet and to our survival. Together with impending climate change from fossil fuel emissions, the water crises impose some life-or-death decisions on us all. Unless we collectively change our behavior, we are heading toward a world of deepening conflict and potential wars over the dwindling supplies of freshwater – between nations, between rich and poor, between the public and the private interest, between rural and urban populations, and between the competing needs of the natural world and industrialized humans.

### **( ) There Are Many Possible Sites For Water Conflicts**

Maude Barlow, chair of Food and Water Watch, Foreign Policy in Focus, February 25, 2008 <http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/5016>

Around the world, more that 215 major rivers and 300 groundwater basins and aquifers are shared by two or more countries, creating tensions over ownership and use of the precious waters they contain. Growing shortages and unequal distribution of water are causing disagreements, sometimes violent, and becoming a security risk in many regions.

## Extension of Impact: Water Shortage

### **( ) Water Scarcity Will Cause Unrest And Conflict**

Global Water Futures, Sandia National Laboratories, CSIS, Addressing Our Global Water Future, September 30, 2005 [www.sandia.gov/water/docs/CSIS-SNL\\_OGWF\\_9-28-05.PDF](http://www.sandia.gov/water/docs/CSIS-SNL_OGWF_9-28-05.PDF)

Water scarcity and poor water quality could lead to increased potential for domestic instability and heightened transnational tensions. History shows that in many regions around the world, water has been a source of considerable cooperation between nations sharing water resources. However, increasing populations and water scarcities may bring about a different future. In the years ahead, instability or conflict related to water supplies will likely take two forms: (1) domestic unrest caused by the inability of governments to meet the food, industrial, and municipal needs of its citizens, and (2) hostility between two or more countries—or regions within a country—possibly leading to greater insecurity or conflict, caused by one party disrupting the water supply of another.



## Extension of Impact: Species Extinction

### **( ) Higher CO2 Levels Boost The Number Of Species**

S. Fred Singer, research professor, George Mason University, atmospheric and space physicist, NATURE, NOT HUMAN ACTIVITY, RULES THE CLIMATE, February 2008 p. 22

An extensive scholarly literature documents the fact that increases in CO<sub>2</sub> give rise to many changes that are beneficial. In the geologic past, CO<sub>2</sub> levels have been many times higher than present values (Figure 24) and have sustained a large flora and fauna [Berner 1997; Berner and Kothaualla 2001; IPCC-AR4 2007, p. 441].

### **( ) Warmer World Offers More Opportunity For Species, Not Less**

Sherwood Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, June 6, 2007  
<http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/education/reports/hansen/hansen critique.jsp>

These observations, which are similar to what has been observed in many other plants, suggest that when the atmosphere's temperature and CO2 concentration rise together (Cowling, 1999), the vast majority of earth's plants would likely not feel a need (or only very little need) to migrate towards cooler regions of the globe. Any warming would obviously provide them an opportunity to move into places that were previously too cold for them, but it would not force them to move, even at the hottest extremes of their ranges; for as the planet warmed, the rising atmospheric CO2 concentration would work its biological wonders, significantly increasing the temperatures at which most of earth's C3 plants - which comprise about 95% of the planet's vegetation - function best, creating a situation where earth's plant life would actually "prefer" warmer conditions.

## Extension of Impact: Species Extinction

### **( ) Increased CO2 Saves Species**

CO2 Science, January 11, 2006

<http://www.co2science.org/subject/a/summaries/agriculture.php>

In conclusion, it would appear that the extinction of two-thirds of all species of plants and animals on the face of the earth is essentially assured within the next century, unless world agricultural output is dramatically increased. This unfathomable consequence hangs over us simply because we will need more land to produce what is required to sustain ourselves and, in the absence of the needed productivity increase, because we will simply take land from nature to keep ourselves alive. It is also the conclusion of scientists who have studied this problem in depth that the needed increase in agricultural productivity is not possible, even with anticipated improvements in technology and expertise. With the help of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content, however, we should be able - but just barely - to meet our expanding food needs without bringing down the curtain on the world of nature. That certain forces continue to resist this reality is truly incredible. More CO2 means life for the planet; less CO2 means death ... and not just the death of individuals, but the death of species. And to allow, nay, to cause the extinction of untold millions of unique plants and animals has got to rank close to the top of all conceivable immoralities. We humans, as stewards of the earth, have got to get our priorities straight by getting our facts straight. We have got to do all that we can to preserve nature by helping to feed humanity; and to be successful, we have got to let the air's CO2 content rise. Any policies that stand in the way of that objective are truly obscene.

## Extension of Impact: Soil Erosion

### **( ) CO2 Will Increase Soil Erosion**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, March 7, 2007 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/s/summaries/soilerosion.php>

In conclusion, the results of the many studies we have discussed in this brief review would appear to suggest that the historical increase in the air's CO2 concentration has significantly reduced the erosion of earth's valuable topsoil over the past several decades, and that the continuing increase in atmospheric CO2 has the potential to maintain this trend, and perhaps even accelerate it, throughout the foreseeable future.

## Extension of Impact: Soil Erosion

### **( ) Study Proves CO2 Decreases Soil Erosion**

Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, March 7, 2007 <http://www.co2science.org/subject/s/summaries/soilerosion.php>

Prior et al. (2004) note that "enhanced aboveground crop growth under elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, leading to more soil surface residue and greater percent ground cover (Prior et al., 1997) coupled with positive shifts in crop root systems (Prior et al., 2003), may have the potential to alter soil structural characteristics." Hence, they decided to see if this inference was indeed true, and if it was true, to see if elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations tended to enhance or degrade soil physical properties, by growing plots of soybean and sorghum plants from seed to maturity for five consecutive growing seasons within open-top chambers maintained at atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations of either 360 or 720 ppm. The soil in which the plants grew had been fallow for more than 25 years prior to the start of the study and was located within a huge outdoor bin. At the end of each growing season, aboveground non-yield residues (stalks, soybean pod hulls and sorghum chaff), including 10% of the grain yield, were allowed to remain on the surfaces of the plots to simulate no-tillage farming. Measurements of various soil properties made at the beginning of the experiment were then compared with similar measurements conducted at its conclusion. The researchers found that elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (1) had no effect on soil bulk density in the sorghum plot, but lowered it in the soybean plot by approximately 5%, (2) had no effect on soil saturated hydraulic conductivity in the sorghum plot, but increased it in the soybean plot by about 42%, (3) increased soil aggregate stability in both plots, but by a greater amount in the soybean plot, and (4) increased total soil carbon content by 16% in the sorghum plot and 29% in the soybean plot. Consequently, the soils of both plots experienced some improvements in response to the experimental doubling of the air's CO<sub>2</sub> content, although there were more and greater improvements in the soybean plot than in the sorghum plot. Prior et al. thus concluded that their results "indicate potential for improvements in soil carbon storage, water infiltration and soil water retention, and reduced erosion," which valuable positive consequences they rightly describe as "CO<sub>2</sub>-induced benefits."

## CO2 Good DA Affirmative – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline	334
Extension to Uniqueness	337
Extension to Case Outweighs	338
Extension to Benefits Exaggerated	339
Extension to Fertilization Unproven	340

## CO2 Good DA/Affirmative Answers - Frontline

### **1. Non-Unique**

**There is a gigantic increase in CO2 built into the system already. That's enough to gain the beneficial effects of CO2 on the biosphere.**

### **2. The Fertilization Benefits Of CO2 Are Exaggerated.**

Environmental Defense Fund: Global Warming Myths and Facts, January 3, 2008  
<http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=1011>

Even though higher levels of CO2 can act as a plant fertilizer under some conditions, scientists now think that the "CO2 fertilization" effect on crops has been overstated; in natural ecosystems, the fertilization effect can diminish after a few years as plants acclimate. Furthermore, increased CO2 may benefit undesirable, weedy species more than desirable species.

### **3. The Benefits Of CO2 Are Outweighed By The Negative Effects Caused by CO2.**

New Scientist Special Report, March 24, 2008  
<http://environment.newscientist.com/channel/earth/climate-change/dn13517-major-food-source-threatened-by-climate-change.html>

The drop in yield caused by rising temperatures can be counteracted by the boost to photosynthesis provided by the increased levels of carbon dioxide driving climate change. But when Ainsworth pooled the studies, she found that effect is not strong enough to counteract the stress plants suffer at high temperatures. Harvests will also be reduced by rising ground-level ozone concentrations. They are caused by nitrogen oxides (NOX) from power stations that catalyse the formation of ozone in warm and sunny conditions. Ainsworth's review found that ozone concentrations of around 60 parts per billion, which have already been recorded on farms in China and the United States, cause yields to drop by 14%.

## CO2 Good DA/Affirmative Answers - Frontline

### **4. The Benefits of CO2 are Based on Lab Studies which are Not the Same as Real World Settings**

Toronto Globe and Mail, February 24, 2007 <http://www.heatisonline.org/>

Scientists have made another worrisome discovery, this time about carbon dioxide itself, the main greenhouse gas, which is vital for plant development. It had been assumed in the 1980s, based on greenhouse experiments, that an atmosphere richer in carbon dioxide would stimulate plant growth, raising some crop yields by as much as 30 per cent. That is part of the reason why, up until now, few people worried much about agriculture and global warming. It was thought that, while climate change might wreak havoc on ice-dependent polar bears and low-lying coastal cities, it held a verdant lining for farmers. But new research published last year based on experiments in the U.S., Japan, Switzerland and New Zealand found the beneficial effects of carbon dioxide were vastly overrated when crops were grown in the more realistic setting of open farm fields, rather than in greenhouses. Corn yields didn't rise at all, and the rise in wheat and rice yields was less than half previous estimates.

### **5. Other Constraints, Such As Water, Nutrients In The Land, Technology Etc. Are More Important Than CO2 In Determining Crop Levels.**

## CO2 Good DA/Affirmative Answers - Frontline

### **6. CO2 Would Increase Weeds And Pests And This Would Counteract The Benefits Of CO2.**

Tom Christopher, Science Writer, New York Times Magazine June 29, 2008  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/29/magazine/29weeds-t.html?pagewanted=3&\\_r=1&ref=world](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/29/magazine/29weeds-t.html?pagewanted=3&_r=1&ref=world)

(Lewis) Ziska (weed ecologist with the Agricultural Research Service), together with Bunce, has been testing the effects of changing CO2 concentrations on a range of crop and weed species. Wending his way through a basement full of pumps, filters and boxlike aluminum growth chambers, Ziska showed himself to be a connoisseur of atmospheres. Peering at the instrument panel outside one growth chamber, he noted a CO2 concentration of 310 p.p.m. "That's a 1957 atmosphere, the year of my birth," he said. What he and his colleagues have found, he said, is that weeds benefit far more than crop plants from the changes in CO2 and that the implications of this for agriculture and public health are grave.

### **7. The CO2 Benefits Are Temporary At Best – And May Suppress Agriculture In The Longer Term**

Jack Morgan, Science Magazine, December 6, 2002 vol 298  
<http://www.heatisonline.org/contentserver/objecthandlers/index.cfm?id=4172&method=full>

Photosynthesis of almost all grass species is stimulated in the short term by increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations (3), suggesting that the potential exists for productivity responses of most grasses to increased CO2. However, this potential is often unrealized or declines over time because of plant metabolic adjustments that optimize resource use (4), or because the soil cannot keep pace with the greater demand for soil nutrients by faster growing CO2-enriched plants. Longer term adjustments to CO2 involve changes in soil nutrient cycling, which may further modulate plant responses. Under CO2 enrichment, greater amounts of carbon may enter the soil organic pools, either as litter or root exudates, and may fuel microbial growth and demand for soil nutrients. This, in turn, can immobilize soil nutrients, making them less available to plants, and can reduce or eliminate a plant's ability to respond to CO2.



## Extensions to Uniqueness

### **( ) Carbon Dioxide Emissions Accelerating Rapidly – Enough CO2 in the Atmosphere to Achieve the Benefits**

Francis Moore, Earth Policy Institute, April 9, 2008  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Indicators/CO2/2008.htm>

Global carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from the burning of fossil fuels stood at a record 8.38 gigatons of carbon (GtC) in 2006, 20 percent above the level in 2000. Emissions grew 3.1 percent a year between 2000 and 2006, more than twice the rate of growth during the 1990s. Carbon dioxide emissions have been growing steadily for 200 years, since fossil fuel burning began on a large scale at the start of the Industrial Revolution. But the growth in emissions is now accelerating despite unambiguous evidence that carbon dioxide is warming the planet and disrupting ecosystems around the globe.

## Extensions to "Case Turns the DA"

### **( ) Climate Change Threatens Global Food Supplies**

Lester Brown, Director, Earth Policy Institute, April 16, 2008  
<http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/2008/Update72.htm>

Beyond this, climate change presents new risks. Crop-withering heat waves, more-destructive storms, and the melting of the Asian mountain glaciers that sustain the dry-season flow of that region's major rivers, are combining to make harvest expansion more difficult. In the past the negative effect of unusual weather events was always temporary; within a year or two things would return to normal. But with climate in flux, there is no norm to return to. The collective effect of these trends makes it more and more difficult for farmers to keep pace with the growth in demand. During seven of the last eight years, grain consumption exceeded production. After seven years of drawing down stocks, world grain carryover stocks in 2008 have fallen to 55 days of world consumption, the lowest on record. The result is a new era of tightening food supplies, rising food prices, and political instability. With grain stocks at an all-time low, the world is only one poor harvest away from total chaos in world grain markets.

## Extensions to "Benefits Exaggerated"

### **( ) Heat Will Prevent The Benefits Of Co2**

Elizabeth Ainsworth, Photosynthesis Research Unit, Department of Plant Biology, University of Illinois, Global Change Biology, 2008 volume 14, p. 1642-50

There are a variety of mechanisms of rice responses to high temperature which limit the yield response to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>. Matsui et al. (1997) demonstrated that high temperatures during flowering increased pollen sterility. Such high spikelet temperatures might be exacerbated by reductions in transpiration and therefore evaporative cooling of the leaf canopy at elevated [CO<sub>2</sub>] (Bernacchi et al., 2007). Further, panicle weight and HI were adversely affected by high temperatures in three different rice cultivars regardless of growth [CO<sub>2</sub>] (Moya et al., 1998). Without continued use of N-fertilizer and identification of rice germplasm that is tolerant to high temperatures, CO<sub>2</sub>- induced yield gains will most likely be limited in the future.

## Extensions to: Fertilization Unproven

### **( ) It's Risky to Rely on the CO2 Fertilization Effect Because It is So Unproven**

Center for Global Development, September 13, 2007  
<http://allafrica.com/stories/200709130522.html?page=2>

This carbon fertilization effect has been demonstrated in laboratories, but recent open-air field experiments indicate smaller gains. The alternative set of estimates of less serious impacts in developing countries and slightly positive impacts in some rich countries assumes that there will be a substantial carbon fertilization effect. William Cline (senior fellow at the Center for Global Development) says that although a carbon fertilization effect of the magnitude he uses (+15 percent by the 2080s) is plausible, it remains uncertain. "I think it would be extremely risky to assume that carbon fertilization is the solution to this problem," Cline said.

## Business Confidence Disadvantage

1NC Shell	342
Answers to Economy Down	345
Answers to Business Confidence Low	347
Answers to Resiliency	348
Answers to Energy Prices Harming US Economy	349
Answers to Price Stability Turn	350
Answers to Green Collar Jobs	351
RPS Links	352
Cap-and-Trade Links	360
Biofuels Links	372
Links – Consumer Spending	377
Links – Small Businesses	378
Links – Manufacturing	381
Impacts	382

## Shell – Business Confidence

### **A. Uniqueness – despite tax rebates and higher spending a recession is still possible**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,  
[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

Nigel Gault, economist at Global Insight, said the US economy has shown resilience but that it "is still too early to turn our thoughts away from recession and towards recovery." Global Insight is predicting a contraction of 0.9 percent in the second quarter. Largely due to the impact of tax rebates, it sees 2.3 percent growth in the third quarter and overall yearly growth at a tepid 1.2 percent. "The worst of the financial turmoil may be behind us, but the impacts on the economy will linger," Gault said.

### **B. Links**

#### **1. Shifting away from fossil fuels raises energy costs to businesses, harming business confidence**

Lain Murray, Director of Projects and Analysis and Senior Fellow in Energy, Science, and Technology at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "A Free Market Approach to Energy Security "Addiction to Oil" and other Myths are Dangerous to America", April 17, 2008.  
[cei.newschurn.com/cei\\_files/fm/active/0/Iain%20Murray%20-%20Energy%20Security%20-%20FINAL.pdf](http://cei.newschurn.com/cei_files/fm/active/0/Iain%20Murray%20-%20Energy%20Security%20-%20FINAL.pdf)

Oil, gasoline, and other fossil fuels have literally supplied the engine of American economic growth over the past century. To abandon their use prematurely would be a massive mistake, weakening America just as it needs to be at its strongest. America has weathered energy crises in the past, and will do so again. As long as U.S. policy makers maintain an open and competitive economy, we can continue to meet energy challenges well into the future.

## Shell – Business Confidence

### **2. Without business confidence, companies are reluctant to invest, cause an economic collapse**

John Braithwaite, Australian Research Council Federation Fellow @ Australian National University, Chair of the Regulatory Institutions Network, March 2004, "Emancipation and Hope", The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 592 Annals 79, p. L/N

The challenge of designing institutions that simultaneously engender emancipation and hope is addressed within the assumption of economic institutions that are fundamentally capitalist. This contemporary global context gives more force to the hope nexus because we know capitalism thrives on hope. When business confidence collapses, capitalist economies head for recession. This dependence on hope is of quite general import; business leaders must have hope for the future before they will build new factories; consumers need confidence before they will buy what the factories make; investors need confidence before they will buy shares in the company that builds the factory; bankers need confidence to lend money to build the factory; scientists need confidence to innovate with new technologies in the hope that a capitalist will come along and market their invention. Keynes's ([1936]1981) General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money lamented the theoretical neglect of "animal spirits" of hope ("spontaneous optimism rather than . . . mathematical expectation" (p. 161) in the discipline of economics, a neglect that continues to this day (see also Barbalet 1993).

## Shell – Business Confidence

### **D. Impact - Economic decline risks extinction**

Bearden, Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army, 2000 (Tom, June 24,  
<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3aaf97f22e23.htm>, Accessed 9/11/03)

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.



## AT: Economy is Down

### **1. Economic analysts agree – the US economy is recovering**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,

[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

WASHINGTON: A growing number of analysts are expressing confidence that the worst may be over for the US economy, even if it struggles for some time due to weak housing, tight credit and high energy costs. The latest data suggests the world's biggest economy may have averted a calamitous downturn, and could even escape recession, by the most common definition.

### **2. Despite setbacks, the US economy is showing strong signs**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,

[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

"The US economy continues to labor under the averse effects of three powerful shocks: the housing slump, the credit crunch, and the spike in energy prices," says Josh Feinman, chief economist of Deutsche Bank's DB Advisors. "Remarkably, the economy has been able (barely) to keep its head above water despite all the negative shocks, a testament to its underlying resiliency, an aggressive policy response, and the relative strength of global growth." Feinman predicts the US economy, which saw sluggish growth at a 0.6 percent pace in the past two quarters, will see a pickup to a 1.0 percent pace in the second quarter and 2.0 percent in the July-September quarter.

## AT: Economy is Down

### **3. Federal tax stimulus will help the economy**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,  
[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

Spending should get a further lift as the government sends out tax rebates of about 107 billion dollars in the coming weeks as part of a 168-billion-dollar economic stimulus package. "The impact of fiscal stimulus is probably the most important issue in the US economic outlook during the summer months," said Goldman Sachs economist Andrew Tilton.

### **4. Federal interest rate cuts are helping the US economy**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,  
[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

The broad US stock market has rebounded some 10 percent since mid-March, when the Federal Reserve helped support a rescue of investment giant Bear Stearns, which was widely seen as a turning point for the credit crisis and market confidence. Analysts credit the aggressive cuts in interest rates by the Fed along with efforts to boost liquidity to the troubled finance sector, as well as the government's stimulus package.

## AT: Business Confidence Low

### **1. New reports indicate business confidence is rising**

MarketWire, May 9 2008. <http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release.do?id=854442>

BUFFALO GROVE, IL--(Marketwire - May 9, 2008) - The Small Business Research Board (SBRB) U.S. Small Business Confidence Index (SBCI) increased to 43.67 in the first quarter of 2008, an upturn of nearly 10 points (29.5%) from the previous quarter, according to a report issued here today.

### **2. Key regions are increasing business confidence**

MarketWire, May 9 2008. <http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release.do?id=854442>

Businesses in the Midwest and the South -- the same regions that provided the foundation for optimism in the first half of 2007 when the SBCI rose from 41 to 46 -- remain consistent with the national average. Each of those regions reported slight increased confidence indexes looking toward a better economy and revenue increases, based on the previous report. The Southern states are most optimistic in regard to their hiring expectations with an increase of 14 points over the results from the first quarter report. The Midwestern states are most optimistic in regard to revenue increase expectations with a 12 point jump over the results from the same first quarter report.

### **3. Surveys indicate that nation-wide business confidence is rising**

MarketWire, May 9 2008. <http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release.do?id=854442>

Nationally, small business owners and managers throughout the U.S. reported slightly higher levels of expectations for the next 12 months in all three categories comprising the confidence index. Only 37% of the respondents indicated they intend to increase hiring the next 12 months, a slight increase of 13 points from the 24% who reported increased hiring in the previous study. Of the participants, 42% said they believe the economy will improve, 13 points higher than the last study. The current report also showed 52% of the businesses are projecting revenue increases, 4 points higher than the 48% last quarter.

## AT: Resiliency

- 1. The Affirmative would be a huge hit to the economy** – the plan is the first major regulation in almost a decade. This would freeze any chance of a recovery
- 2. Even if the economy were resilient** – the plan would greatly increase the cost of doing business by driving up energy costs. This would overcome any residual resiliency left in the US economy.
- 3. The US Economy is a "Powder-Keg" – it could Easily Collapse**

China View, July 21, 2008. [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-07/21/content\\_8739426.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-07/21/content_8739426.htm)

California-based IndyMac, which specialized in a type of mortgage that often required minimal documents from borrowers, became the third largest banking failure in U.S. history days ago, as a housing bust and credit crunch strain financial institutions. "I fear that we're sitting on a financial powder keg," said Senator Richard C. Shelby of Alabama, senior Republican on the upper house's Banking Committee

## AT: Energy Prices Harming US Economy

### **1. Economists believe energy prices will stabilize soon**

Houston Chronicle, May 15, 2008

<http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/ap/fn/5782768.html>

Rebecca Braeu, an economist at John Hancock Financial in Boston, said she believed oil prices will fall to around \$100 per barrel by the end of this year. She believes this will help restrain overall inflation in 2008 to an increase of around 3.5 percent, down from last year's 4.1 percent rise, which had been the highest in 17 years. "A deceleration in energy prices coupled with lower wage pressures coming from a slowing economy bodes well for lower inflation," she said.

### **2. Inflation and energy prices are stabilizing**

AFP, May 15, 2008.

<http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5hhhGC9gezartVETSxITAErWFuZww>

WASHINGTON (AFP) — US consumer prices rose a moderate 0.2 percent in April, as energy costs appeared to stabilize after sharp gains earlier this year, a government report showed Wednesday. The gain was a notch lower than most economists had expected, but analysts said roiling oil, gasoline and food prices are likely to stoke inflationary pressures in coming months.

### **3. Energy prices are stable but still a threat**

AFP, May 15, 2008.

<http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5hhhGC9gezartVETSxITAErWFuZww>

The scant change to energy costs last month and price declines on big-ticket items like new vehicles helped offset a sharp spike in food costs, and economists said that inflation risks remain a threat to the economy. "It appears on the surface as if inflation is tame. But for the average family who is not going to buy a vehicle or a computer this year, conditions are distressing," said Joel Naroff, the president of Naroff Economic Advisors.

## AT: Price Stability Turn

### **1. Predictability is critical to business confidence**

John St John Cooper, Columnist, 11-15-93, "Confidence Based on Predictability Essential to Success", PR Newswire, p. L/N

"Predictability is the mother of confidence, and we want government to provide a steady, growing economic environment in which we can develop our businesses with that confidence," the CBI conference in Harrogate was told today (Monday) by Clive Thompson, chairman of the SE Region and group chief executive of the Rentokil Group. He added: "We in the CBI are no longer on the outside looking in - we're right on the inside. But being on the inside demands we express our views responsibly and completely. It is insufficient to put the business view in isolation without thought or concern for the requirements of the other parts of the economy. "We cannot ignore the demands of health, education, social services and transport on the public purse. Clearly, tax revenue directed towards business means less resources for other important requirements in the economy. Recognition brings responsibility." He went on to advocate government focusing on creating an environment in which business could create success. "We don't want radical changes of policy and direction much loved by politicians. Peaks and troughs have done more to wipe out the confidence so necessary for investment in research and development, speculative new projects, and investment in plant and machinery than any misguided political dogma. "Businessmen invest in their businesses and take risks in new ventures if they believe they will be working in a business friendly environment. Confidence is the key, and for those who have to invest in the future, predictability is the mother of that confidence."

**2. The Plan Creates Price Volatility** – even if renewables are more stable, the transition will not be a stable one. The plan is a regulation out of the blue, so it will naturally cause price spikes.

## AT: Green Collar Jobs

### **1. Green collar jobs are harmful because they detract from other jobs**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

Myron Ebell, the institute's director of energy and global warming policy, argues that creating green jobs often does not create jobs on a net basis.

"If you create jobs in wind power or ethanol," he said, "that will take away jobs in other industries," like building and operating conventional gas turbine power plants.

### **2. Green collar jobs are a fad**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

Ebell suggested that green jobs might not prove to be so great. "There will undoubtedly be a lot of jobs created in industries that are considered green or fashionable," he said. "Some will last a long time, and some will go like the dot-coms."

## RPS Link – Consumers

### **( ) RPS would increase consumer electricity prices**

Edison Electric Institute, December 4, 2007

[http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy\\_news/federal\\_rps.htm](http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy_news/federal_rps.htm)

Congress is expected to begin consideration this week of an energy bill that includes a provision to impose a 15-percent federal renewable portfolio standard (RPS). Under a federal RPS mandate, electric utilities would be required to meet a certain percentage of their electricity sales each year with electricity produced from a limited list of renewable resources or through the purchase of renewable credits from other renewable generators or the Department of Energy.

A federal RPS mandate would raise electricity prices for many consumers; upset ongoing renewable energy programs in the states; create winners and losers among states, electricity generators and electricity suppliers; and impose new burdens on electric reliability. Moreover, a federal RPS mandate is not a solution to achieving energy independence, nor is it a cost-effective means of reducing greenhouse gases.

### **( ) RPS would result in a decrease in energy supply, causing consumer price increases**

Edison Electric Institute, December 1, 2007

[http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy\\_news/federal\\_rps.htm](http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy_news/federal_rps.htm)

The RPS mandate could cost electricity consumers billions of dollars in higher electricity prices, with no guarantee that additional renewable generation will actually be developed. A nationwide RPS mandate will lead to a massive wealth transfer from electricity consumers in states with little or no renewable resources to the federal government or to states where renewables are more abundant.



## RPS Link – Consumers

### **( ) RPS is an electric tax – causing higher costs to consumers**

Edison Electric Institute, December 1, 2007

[http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy\\_news/federal\\_rps.htm](http://www.eei.org/newsroom/energy_news/federal_rps.htm)

A federal renewable portfolio standard (RPS) mandate is little more than a regressive electricity tax, because utilities in many states will have to comply by making payments to the federal government or buying credits from out of state. These increased electricity costs will be passed along to consumers and businesses, with no guarantee that additional renewable generation will actually be developed. Because low-income households spend more of their disposable income on energy—currently 14 percent—they will be most impacted.

### **( ) Consumers would pay billions in higher energy costs after a renewable portfolio standard**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,

[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

The amendment would impose a significant increase in electricity costs on consumers. The Bingaman RPS amendment could cost as much as \$127 billion in higher electricity prices for consumers over the life of the mandate. At its peak in 2030, the RPS mandate could cost consumers almost \$10 billion in higher electricity prices.

## RPS Link – Manufacturing

### **( ) A federal RPS would be crippling blow to the manufacturing sector**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

RPS costs will be imposed concurrently with massive environmental costs. Power generators are expected to incur new environmental compliance costs of \$5-10 billion annually within the next decade to deal with air quality requirements related to ozone, particulate matter, mercury and other issues. Imposing a multi-billion dollar RPS mandate on top of that, during roughly the same time frame, could be a crushing blow to a critical sector of our nation's economy.

### **( ) Evidence from state based RPS demonstrates its negative effects on manufacturing**

William Yeatman is an Energy Policy Analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI). Myron Ebell is the Director of Energy and Global Warming Policy at CEI. "Gone with the Wind Renewable Portfolio Standard Threatens Consumers and the Industrial Heartland" June 12, 2007. [cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf](http://cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf)

Although 21 states have already passed a renewable portfolio standard, this is not an argument in favor of a federal RPS. These RPS states tend to have a much higher potential for renewable energy, less energy-intensive manufacturing, or both. In the RPS states that do have considerable manufacturing, the effect of adopting an RPS has been to raise electricity prices and push manufacturing into states or other countries with lower electricity prices. Therefore, a federal RPS would require states with low electricity prices and proportionately lower renewable energy potential, such as is found in our industrial heartland, to raise electricity prices to a level that would force their industries to migrate overseas to countries with cheaper energy rates and no renewable portfolio standards.

## RPS Link – Manufacturing

### **( ) Federal RPS mandate would harm manufacturing regions**

William Yeatman, Energy Policy Analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI). Myron Ebell, Director of Energy and Global Warming Policy at CEI. "Gone with the Wind Renewable Portfolio Standard Threatens Consumers and the Industrial Heartland" June 12, 2007. [cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf](http://cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf)

But not every state suffers high electricity costs, nor is every state endowed with windy plains. For example, the Southeast is a region where consumers enjoy some of the lowest electricity rates in the land, largely due to reliance on coal-fired generation. On the other hand, the Southeast has the least wind potential in the country, closely followed by the Midwest. The impact of a federal RPS on manufacturing regions with low electricity costs and low wind energy potential promises to raise electricity rates considerably. (Map 4)

## RPS Link – Manufacturing

### **( ) Federal studies confirm manufacturing would be hurt by a federal RPS**

William Yeatman, Energy Policy Analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI). Myron Ebell, Director of Energy and Global Warming Policy at CEI. "Gone with the Wind Renewable Portfolio Standard Threatens Consumers and the Industrial Heartland" June 12, 2007. [cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf](http://cei.org/pdf/5982.pdf)

According to the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis' industry specialization index, which measures states' level of industrial specialization, the Upper Midwest and the Southeast are more dependent on the manufacturing sector than other regions. Although manufacturers have moved their factories from states with high electricity costs to these states with lower electricity costs, a federal RPS would then tend to drive these industries to foreign countries with lower electricity rates.

### **( ) Manufacturing industries would be harmed by higher electricity prices**

Alyssa Kagel, staffwriter for Plenty Magazine, "Power Outage" December 21, 2007, [http://www.plentymag.com/features/2007/12/power\\_outage.php](http://www.plentymag.com/features/2007/12/power_outage.php)

Besides the fairness argument, opponents say meeting national standards will significantly increase the price of electricity, both for consumers and manufacturers. According to a fact sheet produced by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI), the association of US shareholder-owned electric companies, "The RPS mandate could cost electricity consumers billions of dollars in higher electricity prices."

## RPS Link – Deadline

### **( ) 2020 is an impossible deadline to meet – causing higher electricity prices**

Alyssa Kagel, staffwriter for Plenty Magazine, "Power Outage" December 21, 2007,  
[http://www.plentymag.com/features/2007/12/power\\_outage.php](http://www.plentymag.com/features/2007/12/power_outage.php)

The time frame is another point of contention. Critics say the increase mandated by a national RPS just isn't feasible. Meeting a 15 percent RPS would require "a 400-percent jump from the roughly three percent of total generation that renewable energy sources now put onto the US power grid—in just 12 years" according to EEI.

### **( ) Unrealistic targets cause higher energy prices due to restricted supply of electricity**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

The RPS amendment is really just an energy tax on traditional energy resources, such as coal, natural gas and nuclear energy. The RPS percentage targets are so unrealistic that they cannot be fully met by only building new renewable generation. Utilities will be forced to purchase renewable energy credits from the federal government or companies trading credits to meet their mandated RPS requirement.

### RPS Link – Uncertainty

#### **( ) Uncertainty of renewable energy availability will undermine business confidence**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

The costs of renewable energy will be an “add-on” to providing reliable, around-the-clock power to consumers. Many renewable energy resources are intermittent by nature. Utilities cannot tell their consumers that they will deliver power only when the wind blows or the sun shines. Utilities will still need to build generating facilities using conventional fuels—most likely natural gas—to meet consumers’ needs for reliable power on short notice.

#### **( ) Renewable energy is intermittent and unpredictable – undermining business confidence**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

In order to meet the 10 percent mandate by 2020, more than 32,000 megawatts of renewable capacity would have to be added, assuming that this capacity operates at 100 percent 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. However, this is an unrealistic assumption because most renewable energy resources are intermittent in nature.

#### **( ) Unpredictability of renewable energy would cause overbuilding and additional business costs**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

The percentage targets in the Bingaman amendment are based on amounts of energy produced, not capacity. Therefore, in many cases utilities would have to “overbuild” their renewable capacity in order to meet the targets. The most promising renewable energy technology, wind energy, operates at only about 30-40 percent of capacity. Therefore, almost three times this amount of capacity would be required to generate the mandated levels of electricity from renewables!

## RPS Link – Indirect Costs

### **( ) New transmission lines, energy facilities, and other infrastructure will increase the cost of renewable energy**

National Association of Manufactures, July 2007,  
[http://www.nam.org/s\\_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878](http://www.nam.org/s_nam/doc1.asp?CID=202504&DID=226878)

An RPS mandate will also require additional indirect costs. New high-voltage transmission lines often must be built in order to move electricity from wind energy facilities, which are usually located in remote areas, across long distances to populated areas where the power is needed. These transmission expansions can cost approximately \$1 million to \$3 million per mile to build.

## Cap and Trade – Generic Links

### **( ) Studies indicate cap and trade would cost the US economy 1.7 trillion dollars**

Robert Bluey, contributor, Town Hall.com, May 18, 2008.

[http://www.townhall.com/Columnists/RobertBluey/2008/05/18/mccains\\_global\\_warming\\_plan\\_threatens\\_economy](http://www.townhall.com/Columnists/RobertBluey/2008/05/18/mccains_global_warming_plan_threatens_economy)

Several studies of the cap-and-trade proposal reveal its high costs. The Heritage Foundation last week released its analysis of Lieberman-Warner, showing skyrocketing energy costs, millions of jobs lost and falling middle-class income. "The burden would be shouldered by the average American," the study's authors conclude. "The bill would have the same effect as a major new energy tax—only worse. Increases are set by forces beyond legislative control." The resulting higher prices for electricity, natural gas and home heating oil would send a typical consumer's total annual energy bill through the roof—\$938.63 more in 2030 than 2012 after adjusting for inflation, according to the Heritage study. Based on Department of Labor data, that equals about six weeks' worth of groceries for a family of four. The impact on the overall the economy is even more alarming. The current U.S. economic output of \$14 trillion would sharply decline by 2018 because of higher energy prices. Even under the most generous assumptions, the Heritage study estimates cumulative losses to gross domestic product (GDP) would be \$1.7 trillion by 2030 after adjusting for inflation. The total could be as high as \$4.8 trillion.



## Cap and Trade – Generic Links

### **( ) US agencies project an enormous loss to the economy**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to President Reagan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"  
[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Cap-and-trade regulations would likely impose a large cost on the U.S. economy. The U.S. Energy Information Agency (EIA) estimates that overall economic growth could decline by up to 4.2 percent if a cap-and-trade system were implemented to achieve the Kyoto Protocol targets (7% below 1990 GHGs by 2008-2012). The costs to reach the ultimate goal of some GHG control proponents (e.g., reducing GHGs to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050) would be significantly greater. However, these estimates assume that the government will auction off the rights to emit greenhouse gases as opposed to simply giving these rights away, which is the approach often discussed in the U.S. and what has actually been implemented in Europe.

### **( ) Energy supply shocks harm the entire economy**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Reagan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"  
[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

The U.S. economy's past experience with energy supply shocks supports the conclusions of the EIA study. During the previous oil supply shocks (energy supply shocks) of 1974-75, 1979-81 and 1990-91, the economy declined, unemployment rose, and the stock market declined in value. Based on the energy efficiency responses to the energy supply shocks of the 1970s, the U.S. economy could be 5.2 percent smaller in 2020 compared to what would otherwise be expected if cap-and-trade regulations are imposed. This equates to a potential income loss of about \$10,800 for a family of four for the initial Kyoto GHG reduction target.

## Cap and Trade – Generic Links

### **( ) Cap and trade would have significant harm to us economic growth**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

These policies are commonly referred to as "cap-and-trade" regulations. The costs of reducing GHGs through cap- and-trade regulations are not trivial. If implemented, cap-and-trade policies would add significant costs to production and would likely have a severe negative impact on the long-term U.S. growth. We review the economics behind cap- and-trade policies, and illustrate the adverse economic impacts that can be expected from the implementation of cap-and-trade regulations.

### **( ) Lack of feasible technology would make cap and trade harm the us economy**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Cap-and-trade regulations would likely impose large economic costs on the U.S. economy. The EIA estimates that overall economic growth could decline by as much as 4.2 percent for just the initial cap of 7%. These estimates assume, however, that the government will auction off the rights to emit GHGs as opposed to simply giving them away at no cost – the approach most commonly discussed in the U.S. and the approach actually implemented in Europe. When coupled with the lack of feasible technological alternatives, the economic impact from a cap-and-trade regulation could be even larger.

## Cap and Trade – Generic Links

### **( ) Cap and trade would seriously harm the US economy**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Cap and trade bills are nothing short of a government re-engineering of the American economy. And S. 2191, with its aggressive targets to reduce emissions from fossil fuel use, would put the nation on a path of serious economic harm not justified by any benefits.

## Cap and Trade – Consumers

### **( ) Cap and trade would cost the average family over \$2,000 a year**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Carbon dioxide is the unavoidable byproduct of fossil fuel combustion, which currently provides 85 percent of America's energy. Thus, it will be very costly to move away from this preferred energy source, and especially doing so as expeditiously as S. 2191 requires. A study by Charles River Associates puts the cost (in terms of reduced household spending per year) of S. 2191 at \$800 to \$1,300 per household by 2015, rising to \$1,500 to \$2,500 by 2050.[2] Electricity prices could jump by 36 to 65 percent by 2015 and 80 to 125 percent by 2050.[3] No analysis has been done on the impact of S. 2191 on gasoline prices, but an Environmental Protection Agency study of a less stringent cap and trade bill estimates impacts of 26 cents per gallon by 2030 and 68 cents by 2050.[4]

### **( ) EIA study indicates consumers would be seriously harmed by a cap and trade system**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

The implications of such a discrepancy are significant. Due to the reduction in economic growth, by 2020 every man, woman, and child would be about \$2,700 poorer than the baseline scenario – or about \$10,800 for a family of 4.13 Furthermore, the lack of current technological alternatives limits the ability to offset these impacts. To the extent that GHG emissions constraints are more binding, the overall adverse economic impact could be slightly larger. This analysis, along with the EIA study, and the prior episodes of drastic oil reduction illustrate the types of economic consequences that would likely occur in the U.S. from ill-conceived cap-and-trade policies.

## Cap and Trade – Unexpected Costs

### **( ) Europe's attempt with Kyoto shows there will be unexpected costs associated with cap and trade**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Even these cost projections may underestimate the true costs, because they assume no unpleasant surprises. But the world has already witnessed many unpleasant surprises with Europe's ongoing efforts to impose a cap and trade program under the Kyoto Protocol, the international climate treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

## Cap and Trade – Manufacturing

### **( ) Cap and trade will cause outsourcers and harm the manufacturing sector**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"  
[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

By limiting the supply of fossil fuels, S. 2191 would raise the cost of energy. For consumers, cap and trade means more expensive gasoline and electricity as well as net job losses in energy-dependent sectors. Senator Lieberman himself concedes costs into the hundreds of billions of dollars. And as the Congressional Budget Office has noted, such energy cost increases act as a regressive tax on the poor.[8]

### **( ) Cap and trade will eliminate over 2 million jobs**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"  
[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

The net job losses from S. 2191 are estimated by Charles River Associates to be 1.2 million to 2.3 million by 2015.[9] Some of these jobs will be lost for good, due to the impact of higher energy costs on economic activity. Others, chiefly in the manufacturing sector, will be sent overseas. In the very likely event that S. 2191 significantly raises domestic manufacturing costs and that developing nations refuse to impose similar restrictions, the American economy could experience a substantial outsourcing of manufacturing jobs to those nations with lower energy costs.

## Cap and Trade – Future Bills

### **( ) Cap and trade causes future environmental bills – this would cause further economic harm**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

It is a near certainty that the first climate bill enacted will not be the last one. In fact, most major environmental organizations have already criticized S. 2191 and other pending global warming bills as inadequate, or as at best "a good first step." The economic impacts of S. 2191, though substantial in their own right, could be a mere down payment toward costlier subsequent measures.

## Cap and Trade – Price Volatility

### **( ) Cap and trade causes price volatility – making an unpredictable environment**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

In economic terminology, cap-and-trade operates as a "quantity constraint" as the scheme establishes (or constrains) the GHGs that can be produced. As a quantity constraint, cap-and-trade regulations inherently create more price volatility in the GHG allowance market, as has already been observed in Europe. The Congressional Budget Office has also raised the price volatility issue, concluding that cap-and-trade regulations are not sound policies for addressing global warming.

### **( ) Unknown market conditions means cap and trade will lead to price volatility**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Significant price volatility emerges in the market because the supply-and-demand curves are not known to policymakers when initial cap-and-trade policies are established. Furthermore, the supply-and-demand curves will shift over time, and oftentimes in unpredictable ways. By definition of the cap-and-trade quantity constraint, the quantity of the GHGs allowances cannot change and may become substantially stricter in subsequent years. Changes in supply-and-demand, then, can only be accommodated through changes in prices (see Appendix II). This process may lead to extreme price volatility in the emissions allowance market and the markets for goods and services produced under emissions caps.



## Cap and Trade – Price Volatility

### **( ) European examples demonstrate how a cap results in extreme price instability**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

The European experience with cap-and-trade exemplifies these fundamental flaws. The value of the GHG allowances in Europe nose-dived in April 2006 due to a mismatch between the allowances granted and actual market demand. While some observers try to explain these variations as a result of poor planning on the part of governments, such extreme price volatility is a natural consequence of policies that arbitrarily cap quantities. As shown in Appendix II, this price volatility is what should have been predicted prior to Europe's implementation of cap-and-trade. The European experience supports the contention that cap-and-trade is not the appropriate policy response for addressing the issues related to GHG emissions.

## Cap and Trade – Inefficiency

### **( ) Technical verification techniques are imprecise – resulting in an inefficient market, manipulation, and fraud**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Technical difficulties in measuring and verifying the validity of traded GHG allowances imply that the global market will be inefficient, and subject to manipulation and fraud. Government regulations that fail to delineate future GHG control levels add more uncertainty. These uncertainties raise further questions regarding the efficacy of the cap-and-trade regulations.

### **( ) Tech inefficiencies undermine predictability**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Technical difficulties in measuring and verifying the validity of traded GHG emissions allowances imply that the global market for GHG emissions will likely be inefficient. Government regulations that fail to define the precise levels of GHG emissions far into the future add another layer of uncertainty, disrupting the ability of businesses to effectively plan and grow their businesses in the future. These uncertainties raise further questions regarding the efficacy of the cap-and-trade regulations.

## Cap and Trade – Deadline

**( ) Cap and trade will not generate enough energy to replace fossil fuels – driving prices up further**

Arthur Laffer, Former Economic Advisor to Regan, And, Wayne Winegarden, Senior Economist at Arduin, Laffer, & Moore, 2007, "The Adverse Economic Impacts of Cap-and-Trade Regulations"

[www.junkscience.com/Cap\\_and\\_Trade\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_September\\_2007.pdf](http://www.junkscience.com/Cap_and_Trade_Economic_Analysis_September_2007.pdf)

Fossil fuels (oil, coal and natural gas) provide 86 percent of our current energy needs. It is not currently feasible for the alternative energy sources to significantly expand their energy contribution sufficiently in the near-term to substitute for the demand growth, according to the EIA. Consequently, a GHG cap could effectively become an energy production cap – or an energy supply shock.

## Biofuels Link – Manufacturing

### **( ) A transformation to bio-diesel would cost jobs in the oil and gas industry**

Jerry Taylor, Cato Institute, January 31, 2008, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/2008/01/31/flex-fuel-nonsense/>

The conceit that government can create jobs by creating industries out of whole cloth glosses over the fact that the money needed to create those industries and those jobs starves other industries of cash that will, in turn, eliminate other jobs. While it's not inconceivable that government could on balance create more jobs than it destroys in this manner (that is, that the industry created is more labor-intensive than the industries harmed), that's still not a good reason to go forward. After all, one might on balance increase employment in the United States by banning modern farm machinery and food imports, which would put a lot of people into the fields. But no sane person would endorse such a thing on economic grounds. Economic growth occurs when we increase productivity, and we don't necessarily do that by biasing investment toward labor-intensive activities.

### **( ) The manufacturing industry has resisted a bio-diesel switch**

Bio-Diesel Magazine, April 2007.

[http://www.biodieselmagazine.com/article.jsp?article\\_id=1541&q=nd&category\\_id=16](http://www.biodieselmagazine.com/article.jsp?article_id=1541&q=nd&category_id=16)

SB74 would exempt biodiesel fuels from state sales and excise taxes. SB75 would mandate that the state only purchase diesel-powered vehicles that come with a warranty on the engine, something the diesel manufacturing industry has resisted. SB76 would establish the California Biodiesel Investment Account, which would offer incentives such as grant money to local governments, farmers and research agencies to build fueling stations, grow feedstock crops and develop new biodiesel technologies. Hearings on most of these bills were to take place in late March.

## Biofuels Link – Food Prices

### **( ) A new focus on biofuels would cause food inflation – undermining the economy**

Jeff Poor, News Busters, February 21, 2008 <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/jeff-poor/2008/02/21/abc-ignores-how-biofuel-mandate-contributes-inflation>

"World News with Charles Gibson" explained on February 20 that biofuels are driving up food prices, which is driving up inflation. The Consumer Price Index (CPI), a key inflation reading, rose 0.4 percent in January according to the Labor Department, matching December's rise. "Blame it on the price of wheat," said ABC correspondent Sharon Alfonsi. "Demand for alternative energy has farmers planting less wheat and more corn - the key ingredient of ethanol. Add the growing appetite for wheat from developing countries and the supply is strained. Alfonsi added, "U.S. wheat stock piles have hit a 60-year low and wheat prices have never been higher. That means the cost of pasta has doubled and that loaf of bread - it'll cost you an extra 20 cents. Economists say it is the fastest-rising rate of food inflation in nearly 15 years."

### **( ) An ethanol switch would push up food prices by reducing the supply of grain**

Environmental News Service, January 25, 2008. <http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/jan2008/2008-01-25-insbro.asp>

We are witnessing the beginning of one of the great tragedies of history. The United States, in a misguided effort to reduce its oil insecurity by converting grain into fuel for cars, is generating global food insecurity on a scale never seen before. The world is facing the most severe food price inflation in history as grain and soybean prices climb to all-time highs. Wheat trading on the Chicago Board of Trade on December 17th breached the \$10 per bushel level for the first time ever. In mid-January, corn was trading over \$5 per bushel, close to its historic high. And on January 11th, soybeans traded at \$13.42 per bushel, the highest price ever recorded. All these prices are double those of a year or two ago.

## Biofuels Link – Flex Fuels

### **( ) Ethanol will not realistically become competitive – raising costs to consumers**

Lain Murray, Director of Projects and Analysis and Senior Fellow in Energy, Science, and Technology at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "A Free Market Approach to Energy Security Why "Addiction to Oil" and other Myths are Dangerous to America", April 17, 2008.

E85 as a fuel source is also problematic. America's entire current corn crop could not support a shift over to E85, displacing as little as 12 percent of the entire gasoline demand, according to some estimates. Burning food as fuel is simply not efficient. To meet even modest demands for replacement of gasoline and continue to feed Americans and their livestock, millions of acres of land would need to be clear-cut to provide growing room. Because much of this land would be of poor quality, even more land would be needed to get the same yield. This also applies to cellulosic ethanol, which would require vast amounts of switch grass to be grown, but the technology for which is not yet available on an operational scale.

### **( ) A flex fuel mandate would harm us competitiveness**

Lain Murray, Director of Projects and Analysis and Senior Fellow in Energy, Science, and Technology at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "A Free Market Approach to Energy Security Why "Addiction to Oil" and other Myths are Dangerous to America", April 17, 2008.

The ethanol industry is only economic with vast subsidies. Any flex fuel vehicle mandate would require backing from a massive system of handouts and incentives just to stay afloat. This would be a massive drain on the economy and put America at a significant competitive disadvantage. This would help lower the price of oil, but the biggest beneficiaries of that will be the Chinese, who will leap at the chance to use a more efficient source of energy at a lower cost.

## Biofuels Link – Small Businesses

### **1. Ethanol costs cripples small businesses**

Lain Murray, Director of Projects and Analysis and Senior Fellow in Energy, Science, and Technology at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "A Free Market Approach to Energy Security Why "Addiction to Oil" and other Myths are Dangerous to America", April 17, 2008.

Even some ethanol investors do not believe that a production mandate is all that is needed for the spread of E85. Venture capitalist Vinod Khosla, who has bet heavily on ethanol, has called for mandates on oil companies to include E85 pumps at filling stations. While the corrosion problems with ethanol relating to vehicle design have largely been solved, corrosion remains a serious problem for the bulk transport and dispensing of ethanol. As a result, E85 pumps cost around \$17,000 to install. Upgrading an existing pump costs at least \$5,000.<sup>19</sup> This means that, while the cost to large gas dispensing enterprises would be bearable, it would be crippling to smaller and independent filling station operators without any assurance that consumers would be willing to buy the product.

### **2. Small businesses are the backbone of the us economy**

Small Business Majority, 2007. <http://smallbusinessmajority.org/>

The backbone of the American economy, 25 million small businesses make up 52% of private sector workforce. Small business creates 75% of all new jobs and anchors our communities. It's time that we recognize our importance to America's future and exercise our majority status. Our voice needs to be heard in government.

## Biofuels Link – Price Floors

### **( ) Price floors don't create certainty – legislation is non-binding**

Jerry Taylor and Peter Van Doren, The CATO Institute, May 29, 2006  
[http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=6410](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=6410)

Convinced by the case for a price floor? If so, consider this. Given the fact that no Congress can bind future Congresses (laws passed today can easily be repealed tomorrow), what do you think the chances are that a \$60 per barrel price floor would survive in a world in which oil were selling for \$20 a barrel in world markets? After all, it wouldn't take long for people to figure out that the gasoline for which they're paying \$2.75 a gallon might only cost \$1.35 if Congress would take its boot off the consumer's throat.

### **( ) In times of low gas prices congress will remove the price floor**

Jerry Taylor and Peter Van Doren, The CATO Institute, May 29, 2006  
[http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=6410](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=6410)

The very real chance that a future Congress would repeal the price floor would discourage both producers and consumers from factoring the price floor in to their investment decisions, and rightly so. Congress is constantly reneging on past promises with regards to public policy. Only a fool would take political promises about future tax or regulatory policy to the bank.



## Link – Consumer Spending

### **( ) Consumer spending is keeping the US out of a recession**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,

[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

Some of the recent economic reports have defied forecasts of a sharp decline in US growth. Retail sales fell 0.2 percent in April but, excluding vehicle sales, were up 0.5 percent, suggesting resilience in consumer spending, the backbone of US economic activity. "We think the economy is beginning to recover after a sharp two-quarter slowdown," said Bear Stearns economist David Malpass. "We still don't expect a recession. We think consumer resilience, as shown in April's non-auto consumption and sales data, is likely, not the deeper slump assumed in recession forecasts."

### **( ) Consumer confidence and spending are driving new economic expansion**

The Economic Times of India, May 18, 2008,

[http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International\\_Business/Worst\\_may\\_be\\_over\\_for\\_US/articleshow/3050284.cms](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/International_Business/Worst_may_be_over_for_US/articleshow/3050284.cms)

"A significant rebound in confidence and spending could fan hopes of a quicker recovery, while a failure of the economy to respond to the stimulus would be a significant disappointment to policymakers and the markets." New home construction starts rose 8.2 percent in April to an annual rate of 1.032 million unit. Even though the gains were in the multifamily segment and single-family homes slumped, analysts said it was good news. "While we may not yet have absolutely hit bottom, it is beginning to look as if the end may be near," said Joel Naroff at Naroff Economic Advisors.

## Link – Small Businesses

### **( ) Small businesses are the backbone of the US economy**

Small Business Majority, 2007. <http://smallbusinessmajority.org/>

The backbone of the American economy, 25 million small businesses make up 52% of private sector workforce. Small business creates 75% of all new jobs and anchors our communities. It's time that we recognize our importance to America's future and exercise our majority status. Our voice needs to be heard in government.

### **( ) Small businesses drive new job growth and many other critical economic indicators**

Grant Ferguson, productivity strategist, 2008. <http://ezinearticles.com/?Small-Businesses-Form-The-Economic-Backbone-of-America&id=317310>

U.S. DEPENDS ON SMALL BUSINESSES: SBA statistics released in 2006 suggested that small businesses form the backbone of the U.S. economy. These companies:

- \* Comprised 65 percent of the net new jobs.
- \* Formed the majority of the 4.1 million minority-owned and 6.5 million women-owned companies.
- \* Were a half-million of the new firms (with employees) started in the last measured year.
- \* Generated 26 percent of all export value and were 97 percent of America's exporters.
- \* Employed over 50 percent of the U.S. non-farm private sector workers.
- \* Represented more than 24 million of the firms located throughout America.
- \* Produced between 13 to 14 times as many patents per employee than large patenting firms.
- \* Created more than 50 percent of the United State's nonfarm private domestic product.
- Made up 99.7 percent of all U.S. employers.

## Link – Small Businesses

### **( ) Small Businesses are necessary to the economy**

Angela Wilson, Carolyn Larson, Shari Jacobson, Business Reference Service, 1994  
<http://www.loc.gov/rr/business/guide/guide3/guide3.html>

Small business and entrepreneurship form an integral part of a healthy national economy. In recent years various factors, such as the impact of privatization and specialization in industry and corporate restructuring and downsizing as influenced by new management theories such as Thomas Peters'"Liberation Management: Necessary Disorganization for the Nanosecond Nineties" (New York, A.A. Knopf, 1992), have combined to encourage the emergence of more small and medium-sized companies. At the same time new opportunities for such companies are seen in the wooing of small business into exporting and international trade, and the creative efforts of major corporations in the area of business community development. The valuable contributions of such small businesses are widely recognized by all sectors of society, as can be seen by the many efforts to aid small businesses taking place at the federal, state, and local level. Such efforts range from new rulings of the Securities and Exchange Commission simplifying its filing requirements for small businesses making stock offerings to the public to a revamping of business school curriculums to include the study of small business entrepreneurship.

## Link – Small Businesses

### **( ) Manufacturing industry creates millions of jobs**

Tony Friscia, President of ARM research, "The Hidden Backbone of U.S. Manufacturing: Weakening Under Chemical Cost and Supply Pressures". 2007  
[www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy](http://www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy)

Manufacturing is essential to the long-term prosperity of the United States. As a driver of innovation and provider of millions of highly paid jobs, U.S. manufacturing remains a cornerstone of the American economy as well as a source of essential products for consumers. Productivity gains, which have annually run in the 3% to 5% range since the mid-1990s, are only the most recent chapter in a story of advancement, problem solving, and value creation that reaches back to the earliest days of industrialization in the United States. But there are clouds on the horizon as the 21st century opens.

### **( ) Higher energy prices will undermine manufacturing competitiveness**

Tony Friscia, President of ARM research, "The Hidden Backbone of U.S. Manufacturing: Weakening Under Chemical Cost and Supply Pressures". 2007  
[www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy](http://www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy)

As manufacturing in America becomes increasingly intertwined with the 21st-century global supply chain, policy decisions that may seem distant to the making of products from electronics to food are starting to have an impact on competitiveness. Energy policy, in particular, is affecting U.S. manufacturing competitiveness via the chemical sector, whose production infrastructure and raw materials costs are heavily impacted by government policy and regulation, especially toward natural gas. Natural gas is unique because it is a continental market based on pipelines rather than a global market based on shipping.

## Link – Manufacturing

### **( ) Higher energy costs raise the cost of chemicals – a critical component of manufacturing**

Tony Friscia, President of ARM research, “The Hidden Backbone of U.S. Manufacturing: Weakening Under Chemical Cost and Supply Pressures”. 2007 [www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy](http://www.nam.org/chemicalcoststudy)

For well over a century, manufacturing in the United States has created high-paying jobs, new wealth, and quality consumer products for the nation. Today’s increasingly global supply chain has brought U.S. manufacturing into ever closer contact and partnership with producers around the world. Our research indicates that U.S. manufacturing will be competitively disadvantaged because of a cost-driven domestic chemical industry abroad, which supplies so many raw materials to so many sectors. The domestic chemical infrastructure is the backbone for many manufacturers in the United States, yet it is essentially invisible to the consumers who enjoy the chemical- based products it produces. This backbone is straining under heavy cost pressure and declining availability and it is difficult to replace. The risk is that a wide range of down- stream manufacturers who use chemicals will increasingly become less competitive and that high that production facilities, especially those of larger companies, will move offshore.

## Impact – Economy

### **( ) An economic decline causes war**

Mead 1998 – Senior Fellow Council on Foreign Relations LA Times, 8-23

Even with stock markets tottering around the world, the president and the Congress seem determined to spend the next six months arguing about dress stains. Too bad. The United States and the world are facing what could grow into the greatest threat to world peace in 60 years. Forget suicide car bombers and Afghan fanatics. It's the financial markets, not the terrorist training camps that pose the biggest immediate threat to world peace. How can this be? Think about the mother of all global meltdowns: the Great Depression that started in 1929. U.S. stocks began to collapse in October, staged a rally, then the market headed south big time. At the bottom, the Dow Jones industrial average had lost 90% of its value. Wages plummeted, thousands of banks and brokerages went bankrupt, millions of people lost their jobs. There were similar horror stories worldwide. But the biggest impact of the Depression on the United States--and on world history--wasn't money. It was blood: World War II, to be exact. The Depression brought Adolf Hitler to power in Germany, undermined the ability of moderates to oppose Joseph Stalin's power in Russia, and convinced the Japanese military that the country had no choice but to build an Asian empire, even if that meant war with the United States and Britain. That's the thing about depressions. They aren't just bad for your 401(k). Let the world economy crash far enough, and the rules change. We stop playing "The Price is Right" and start up a new round of "Saving Private Ryan."

## Business Confidence Disadvantage Affirmative Answers

2AC Frontline

384

383

332 S. Michigan Ave, Suite. 500 ·  
Chicago, Illinois 60604



312-427-0175  
[www.urbandebate.org](http://www.urbandebate.org)

## Affirmative Answers

### **1. Non-Unique. Business Confidence is Low**

Business First, June 30, 2008.

<http://www.bizjournals.com/louisville/stories/2008/06/30/daily13.html>

National City Corp. said Monday that its Business Confidence Index declined to an all-time low of 57.8 as respondents expressed concerns about the ramifications of Midwest flooding and the continued struggles of the U.S. automotive industry.

### **2. Non-Unique. Flooding is hurting Business Confidence**

Dayton Business Journal, June 30, 2008

<http://www.bizjournals.com/dayton/stories/2008/06/30/daily1.html>

National City's monthly business confidence survey hit a record low in June, helped along by growing gloom in its territories affected by recent flooding, the bank said.

Only 57.8 percent of respondents expressed confidence in the economy, down from more than 60 percent in May, National City said in a news release. States affected by flooding had the largest drops: Missouri's economic outlook results fell to 59 percent from 77.4 percent over the month; Illinois' to 61.7 percent from 71.2 percent; and Indiana's to 66.9 percent from 70.7 percent.

### **3. Non-Unique. The overall economy is down**

Baltimore Sun, July 1, 2008.

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/business/investing/bal-bz.economy01jul01,0,6320565.story>

NEW YORK - It's all too clear that the economy is in a rough patch. The dollar's weak, energy and food costs are high, the stock market is down, oil is at record levels and housing values have lost years of gains. What's next?



## Affirmative Answers

### **4. No Link. Markets Are resilient – the economy won't collapse**

Irwin Kellner, chief economist for MarketWatch and distinguished scholar of economics at Dowling College in Oakdale, N.Y., Baltimore Sun, July 1, 2008.  
<http://www.baltimoresun.com/business/investing/bal-bz.economy01jul01,0,6320565.story>

We are bumping along a bottom. But it is really amazing that bumping along a bottom is all that's happened, given the one-two punch that was doled out to us. I am talking, of course, about the bursting of the housing bubble, and the resulting credit crisis from the securitization of the housing market - packaging mortgages so they could be resold to investors.

### **5. Non-Unique. The Economy will continue to decline for at least a year**

Irwin Kellner, chief economist for MarketWatch and distinguished scholar of economics at Dowling College in Oakdale, N.Y., Baltimore Sun, July 1, 2008.  
<http://www.baltimoresun.com/business/investing/bal-bz.economy01jul01,0,6320565.story>

All this is affecting the consumer. Falling housing prices dissuade builders from building, and they affect individual perceptions. People are feeling less rich than before because their homes are worth less. This will take another one year or more to unwind.

### **6. Non-Unique. The market will keep falling**

Irwin Kellner, chief economist for MarketWatch and distinguished scholar of economics at Dowling College in Oakdale, N.Y., Baltimore Sun, July 1, 2008.  
<http://www.baltimoresun.com/business/investing/bal-bz.economy01jul01,0,6320565.story>

The market hasn't fully discounted the hit to corporate profits that the one-two punch has dealt. ... But, at worst, I believe the Dow can sink another 5 percent to 10 percent or so from current levels. At best, it will stay flat, always looking over its shoulder for bad news. We will continue to have plenty of days when the Dow is down 1 percent to 2 percent, and then up the same amount.

## Affirmative Answers

### **7. Turn. High Oil Costs Will Harm the Economy – the Plan Solves This by Creating a Transition to Renewable Energy**

Institute for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Energy, "Fats, Choices, and Challenges" 2007  
[http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts\\_security.htm](http://www.energyxxi.org/xxi/Resources/facts_security.htm)

The impact of energy on jobs, business, and the economy extends far beyond the energy sector itself. Increases in prices mean that consumers have less to spend on other goods and services. Higher energy costs result in lower returns on capital investment, making each worker less productive and adversely affecting wages. Corporate decisions on where to locate, expand, and create jobs depend significantly on the reliability and affordability of fuel and power. Energy imports also substantially expand the U.S. trade deficit.

By one estimate, on average, every time oil prices go up 10%, 150,000 Americans lose their jobs. The impact of potential supply disruptions—as the result of terrorism, weather, global competition for resources, or bad policy decisions—would be even more devastating to our economy, mobility, and even our ability to defend the nation.

### **8. Turn. Renewable energy has higher price stability than traditional energy**

Alan Noguee et al. Clean Energy Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists, "The Projected Impacts of a National Renewable Portfolio Standard" *The Electricity Journal*, May 2007.

Lacking long fuel supply chains, renewable energy facilities are also not vulnerable to supply shortages or disruptions, price spikes, price increases, or price manipulation. And because they do not use volatile fuel or produce dangerous wastes, renewable energy facilities (except large hydropower dams) do not present inviting targets for sabotage or attack.

## Affirmative Answers

### **9. Turn. Green jobs will help the economy**

International Herald Tribune, March 26, 2008.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/03/26/business/gcollar.php?page=2>

"The development of a green economy creates a broad new set of opportunities," Quam said. "When I first started looking at this area, many people commented on how this will be as big as the Internet. But this is so much bigger than the Internet. The only comparable example we can find is the Industrial Revolution. It will affect every business and every industry."

Jones, the president of Green for All, joined the green economy after graduating from Yale Law School. He became executive director of the Ella Baker Center for Human Rights in Oakland, using that position to start a program that trains low-income workers in how to weatherize homes and install solar panels. Jones calls such jobs green pathways out of poverty. "We need people who are highly educated at the theoretical level," he said, "and we need people who are highly educated at the level of skilled labor."

## Coal Good DA Negative – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	389
Answers to Poverty Rampant	393
Answers to China/India	394
Answers to Economy Turn	395
Answers to Biodiversity Turn	397
Extensions to Land Reclamation	398
Answers to Tourism Turn	399
Extensions to Low Wages	401
Extensions to Uniqueness – Coal Industry	402
Steel Impact Scenario	403
Steel Uniqueness	405
Steel Links	406
Steel Links – Cap and Trade	407
Steel Internal Links	408

## Coal DA 1NC Shell

### **A. Uniqueness. High Coal Prices Are Fueling An Economic Resurgence for Mining Communities**

Mufson and Harden, Washington Post Staff Writers, '08 [Steven, "Coal Can't Fill World's Burning Appetite", March 20, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/19/AR2008031903859\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/19/AR2008031903859_pf.html), accessed 6/17/08]

Long considered an abundant, reliable and relatively cheap source of energy, coal is suddenly in short supply and high demand worldwide.

An untimely confluence of bad weather, flawed energy policies, low stockpiles and voracious growth in Asia's appetite has driven international spot prices of coal up by 50 percent or more in the past five months, surpassing the escalation in oil prices.

The signs of a coal crisis have been showing up from mine mouths to factory gates and living rooms: As many as 45 ships were stacked up in Australian ports waiting for coal deliveries slowed by torrential rains. China and Vietnam, which have thrived by sending goods abroad, abruptly banned coal exports, while India's import demands are up. Factory hours have been shortened in parts of China, and blackouts have rippled across South Africa and Indonesia's most populous island, Java.

Meanwhile mining companies are enjoying a windfall. Freight cars in Appalachia are brimming with coal for export, and old coal mines in Japan have been reopened or expanded. European and Japanese coal buyers, worried about future supplies, have begun locking in long-term contracts at high prices, and world steel and concrete prices have risen already, fueling inflation.

In the United States, the boom in coal exports and prices has helped lower the trade deficit, which declined last year for the first time since 2001. The value of coal exports, which account for 2.5 percent of all U.S. exports, grew by 19 percent last year, to \$4.1 billion, the National Mining Association said. An even bigger increase is expected this year.

## Coal DA 1NC Shell

### **B. Links**

#### **1. Alternative Energy and Government Regulation Reduce Demand for Coal**

Arch Coal '04 [S-3 SEC Filing, 11/24, <http://sec.edgar-online.com/2004/11/24/0000950152-04-008593/Section8.asp>, accessed 6/17/08]

The demand for and pricing of our coal is greatly influenced by consumption patterns of the domestic electric generation industry, and any reduction in the demand for our coal by this industry may cause our profitability to decline.

Demand for our coal and the prices that we may obtain for our coal are closely linked to coal consumption patterns of the domestic electric generation industry, which has accounted for approximately 92% of domestic coal consumption in recent years. These coal consumption patterns are influenced by factors beyond our control, including the demand for electricity, which is significantly dependent upon general economic conditions, summer and winter temperatures in the United States, government regulation, technological developments and the location, availability, quality and price of competing sources of coal, alternative fuels such as natural gas, oil and nuclear and alternative energy sources such as hydroelectric power. Demand for our low sulfur coal and the prices that we will be able to obtain for it will also be affected by the price and availability of high sulfur coal, which can be marketed in tandem with emissions allowances in order to meet Clean Air Act requirements. Any reduction in the demand for our coal by the domestic electric generation industry would result in a decline in our revenues and profit, which could be material.

Extensive environmental laws and regulations affect the end-users of coal and could reduce the demand for coal as a fuel source and cause the volume of our sales to decline.

## Coal DA 1NC Shell

### **2. Decreasing Demand for Coal Will Quickly Plunge Entire Mining Communities Into Poverty**

Roemaker, economic analyst at the Center for Business and Economic Research, '01 [Jonathan, "The Economic Impact of Coal in Appalachian Kentucky", <http://gatton.uky.edu/cber/Downloads/Roemaker02.htm>, accessed 6/17/08]

While income, earnings, and employment are important aggregate indicators of the economic health of a region, they are not the sole indicators. Due to the fact that the coal mining industry accounts for such a large share of the local economy in many of the coal producing counties in the Kentucky ARC counties, changes in the industry can often have a large and dramatic impact on the rate of social welfare dependency in these counties.

Recent research concerning the linkage between the performance of major industries and key socioeconomic indicators, including social welfare dependency, has been explored by Dr. Dan A. Black, as well as others. The coal mining industry frequently offers relatively high paying jobs to workers with low general skill levels, although it is most often the case that these workers have developed industry-specific skills for use in coal mining. The result is that losses in coal mining earnings in these counties often leads to increased poverty and dependence on social welfare programs. The opposite is also true. As earnings in the industry increase, poverty and social welfare dependency often decrease.

## Coal DA 1NC Shell

### **C. Impact. Poverty is Structural Violence That Outweighs the Threat of War**

Gilman, president of Context Institute '83 [Robert, "Structural Violence", <http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC04/Gilman1.htm>, accessed 6/25/08]

The human tendency toward, and preparations for, open warfare are certainly the most spectacular obstacles to peace, but they are not the only challenges we face. For much of the world's population, hunger, not war, is the pressing issue, and it is hard to imagine a genuine peace that did not overcome our current global pattern of extensive poverty in the midst of plenty.

Hunger and poverty are two prime examples of what is described as "structural violence," that is, physical and psychological harm that results from exploitive and unjust social, political and economic systems. It is something that most of us know is going on, some of us have experienced, but in its starker forms, it is sufficiently distant from most North American lives that it is often hard to get a good perspective on it. I've come across an approach that seems to help provide that perspective, and I'd like to describe it.



## Answers to Poverty Rampant in Appalachia

### **1. Appalachian Economy Strong Now**

**Cross-apply the Mufson and Harden '08 1NC Uniqueness evidence. The recent boom in the coal industry is boosting the economy in Appalachia.**

### **2. Poverty on the Decline in Appalachia**

Appalachian Regional Commission '01 ["Poverty in America",  
<http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=2919>, accessed 6/25/08]

Fortunately, these common stereotypes of chronic poverty in Appalachia seem to have changed during the 1990s. As shown in Table 1 (page 6), the poverty rate in Appalachia declined by nearly two percentage points, from 15.4 percent in 1990 to 13.6 percent in 2000. More than 100,000 fewer people in Appalachia lived in poverty at the end of the 1990s than at the beginning. Over the same period, the poverty rate in the rest of the nation decreased from 12.9 percent in 1990 to 12.3 percent in 2000. Not only did poverty rates in Appalachia decline during the 1990s, but Appalachian poverty rates converged with the rest of the country.

### **3. The Risk of Our Impact is Linear**

**Even if poverty is a problem now, the plan will hurt the US coal industry, destroy jobs in Appalachia, and cause more poverty.**

## Answers to China and India

### **1. US is Key**

**Cross-apply the Arch Coal '04 1NC link which says that US electric utilities are the major drivers of domestic coal prices and that alternative energy sources would decrease demand and hurt the profitability of the US coal industry.**

### **2. Prefer Our Evidence**

**A coal company knows more about coal prices than a newspaper reporter. Also, our evidence is specific to coal prices in the US and the profitability of the US coal industry, which is the internal link to our impact scenario.**

### **3. US is the Largest Market**

**The US is still one of the largest consumers of coal in the world. If the US drastically reduces its coal consumption, that will decrease demand and drive down coal prices.**

### **4. This Argument Takes Out the Affirmative's Harms**

**If China and India consume so much coal the US market is irrelevant, then they would also swamp the US' contribution to air pollution and global warming. Since the Aff doesn't solve for pollution caused by coal burning in India and China, they can't solve these advantages.**

## Answers to Economy Turn

### **1. Mining Drives the Entire Appalachian Economy**

**Cross-apply our Roenker '01 1NC link evidence which says that there is a direct correlation between the profitability of the US coal industry and the poverty rate in Appalachia. This isn't just because of the people who get jobs as miners. Mining fuels secondary industries in the region, such as shipping, and brings money into rural economies to support many small businesses.**

### **2. Prefer Our Evidence**

**Roenker is highly educated economist who works in the Appalachian region, making him the most qualified source in the round. Also, our argument is based on empirical data about poverty and the coal industry.**

## Answers to Economy Turn

### **3. Demand For Coal is Creating New, High-Paying Mining Jobs**

Nichols '08 [Reuters staff, "US Miners Prosper as World Demand for Coal Booms", [http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us\\_nm/usa\\_coal\\_boom\\_dc\\_2&printer=1;\\_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F](http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us_nm/usa_coal_boom_dc_2&printer=1;_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F), accessed 6/2/08]

After years of cutbacks, mining companies are scrambling to rebuild the work force.

"For years, there was never anybody added to the work force. Now, everybody's 50-something," said Keith Shalvey, manager of Mine No. 4.

Some companies are offering incentives to keep veterans and hire rookies for a job that is already high-paying.

The work remains dangerous, although it is much safer than in the past. Thirty-three people died in coal mines last year, U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration data show.

Union scale for a trainee is \$21.27 an hour plus benefits, UMWA's Smith said. With overtime, some miners earn \$90,000 or more a year.

The explosive growth of world demand and the increase in prices have had an effect on U.S. production.

Year-to-date U.S. coal output rose to 447.7 million tons through May 17, compared with 433.3 million tons through May 17 last year, a 3.4 percent increase, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

## Answers to Biodiversity Turn

### **1. No Link**

**This turn is specific to mountaintop removal mining, which is only one of the ways in which coal is mined. There is no evidence connecting the plan to a reduction in that type of mining.**

### **2. Turn- Land Reclamation After Mining Makes the Region More Biodiverse Than Ever**

Mountaintop Mining '08 ["Mountaintop Mining", <http://www.mountaintopmining.com/>, accessed 6/18/08]

The coal industry does an excellent job of reclamation. The people who work for coal companies live in the same area and have a great deal of pride in their company's reclamation efforts. One of the favorite reclamation uses today, that has been strongly encouraged by fish and wildlife governmental agencies and environmental groups, is leaving the land in a condition that will enhance use by fish and wildlife. We've seen a resurgence of wildlife at reclaimed mine sites across the region because of leaving open spaces, trees and shrubs that provide nourishment for wildlife and ponds that contain water year round. There is more wildlife than ever, in part because of reclaimed coal lands. It was on reclaimed land where over 150 mountain elk were released recently in Kentucky. As a practical matter, this could not have occurred other than on a reclaimed coal mine site.

### **3. Modern Mining Operations Minimize Environmental Impact and Preserve Biodiversity**

World Coal Institute '08 ["Environmental Impacts of Coal Mining", accessed 6/25/08, <http://www.worldcoal.org/pages/content/index.asp?PageID=126>]

Coal mining – particularly surface mining – requires large areas of land to be temporarily disturbed. This raises a number of environmental challenges, including soil erosion, dust, noise and water pollution, and impacts on local biodiversity.

Steps are taken in modern mining operations to minimize these impacts. Good planning and environmental management minimizes the impact of mining on the environment and helps to preserve biodiversity.

## Extensions to Land Reclamation

### **( ) Land Reclamation Restores the Environment After Surface Mining**

American Coal Foundation '07 ["Coal and the Environment",  
<http://www.teachcoal.org/aboutcoal/articles/coalenv.html>, accessed 6/18/08]

In the past, coal mining often left behind landscapes that were unattractive and unproductive. Animals and plant life that once thrived in an area could no longer survive in conditions produced by coal mining. Today, thanks to land reclamation, it can be difficult to tell the difference between land that has been mined and land that has not.

Land reclamation is the process of protecting, restoring, or improving land before, during, and after surface mining. This means that the land is preserved, nature is protected, and water and soil are conserved. Ultimately, the land can become productive farmland, be restored to forest, or undergo development as a lake.

## Answers to Tourism Turn

### **1. Non-Unique**

**The coal mining of the past has already disrupted tourism in some regions, making mining the only viable industry. The residents of those communities should be allowed to make a living in the only way available to them.**

### **2. No Link**

**Cross-apply our American Coal Foundation '07 evidence which says that modern land reclamation practices restore the environment so well that you can't tell where mining has taken place.**

### **3. Turn: Coal Mines can be Tourist Attractions**

**After the mining is finished, they can be converted into museums that exhibit the history and heritage of mining communities.**

### **4. Tourism Creates Mostly Low-Wage Jobs and Cannot Sustain an Economy on Its Own**

Plushnick-Masti '08 [Ramit, "Rust Belt Communities Turn to Tourism for a Lift", May 29, <http://www.wtop.com/?nid=111&sid=1411810>, accessed 6/18/08]

But tourism is largely a low-wage industry highly sensitive to economic turns. Big investments, like Autoworld, the multimillion-dollar indoor amusement park in Flint, Mich., that went bankrupt months after opening, are susceptible to failure.

Experts also say it takes years for a place to reinvent itself and conjure up images of a pastoral vacation spot rather than a smoke-filled industrial town.

"Tourism can be a great secondary industry. It can also be a great primary industry, but there's got to be something else in that community. It can't stand alone," said Erick Byrd, an assistant professor of travel and tourism at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

## Answers to Tourism Turn

### **5. Turn - Mining Levels Land and Makes Construction for Tourism Possible**

Mountaintop Mining '08 ["Mountaintop Mining",  
<http://www.mountaintopmining.com/>, accessed 6/18/08]

The future of Appalachia has to be tied to economic diversity. A mono-industry economy is not healthy for the long-term viability of a region. Ideally, jobs that pay factory wages are the goal. Higher wages insure that every household can sustain a decent standard of living. Tourism has been touted by many as a viable alternative. An editorial by Bill Bishop with the Lexington Herald-Leader made a very eye-opening point that tourism is principally built on minimum wage jobs and that tourism alone is no bargain for a region. One major drawback facing the region is the availability of level land out of the floodplain---something people in the rest of the country take for granted. For an individual to create level land in mountainous terrain, this task is difficult and financially almost impossible. The responsible use of MOUNTAINTOP MINING creates level land, land that has the potential for many other uses.



## Extensions to Tourism Jobs Low-Wage

### **( ) Low-Paying Tourism Jobs Cannot Replace Mining**

Plushnick-Masti '08 [Ramt, "Rust Belt Communities Turn to Tourism for a Lift", May 29, <http://www.wtop.com/?nid=111&sid=1411810>, accessed 6/18/08]

But William Stull, a professor of economics at [Temple University](#) in Philadelphia, warns that the low-paying jobs tourism creates cannot revive Rust Belt communities.

To prop up their shrinking tax bases, Rust Belt towns must attract companies that hire educated workers, Stull said. Tourism could, however, force them to clean up and attract higher-end companies, he said.

"There's no way that this (tourism) could possibly replace the jobs and the economic base in these areas," Stull said. "It's impossible."

## Extensions to Uniqueness – Coal industry

### **( ) High Coal Prices Are Creating Jobs in Mine Country**

Nichols '08 [Reuters staff, "US Miners Prosper as World Demand for Coal Booms", [http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us\\_nm/usa\\_coal\\_boom\\_dc\\_2&printer=1;\\_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F](http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us_nm/usa_coal_boom_dc_2&printer=1;_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F), accessed 6/2/08]

Coal's upturn, which began in 2004 for the met side and 2007 for the steam side, has ended two decades of decline, said Pearce Hammond, who heads coal and alternative energy analysis at the investment bank, Simmons & Co.

Since the beginning of the year, the Dow Jones coal index is up 39 percent. Shares of Walter Industries, meanwhile, have skyrocketed more than 140 percent.

"Companies are announcing expansions, opening new mines, and we're not seeing many close," said Phil Smith, spokesman for the United Mine Workers of America, which represents about a quarter of U.S. coal miners.

### **( ) High Demand Is Boosting the US Coal Industry**

Nichols '08 [Reuters staff, "US Miners Prosper as World Demand for Coal Booms", [http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us\\_nm/usa\\_coal\\_boom\\_dc\\_2&printer=1;\\_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F](http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080523/us_nm/usa_coal_boom_dc_2&printer=1;_ylt=AkzK4HH0Pswoiw3UT49SuAcXIr0F), accessed 6/2/08]

Two thousand feet under the west Alabama woods, dust flies as a machine chews into the Blue Creek coal seam, mining black gold for a booming world market that is lifting the once-laggard U.S. coal industry.

Economic growth in Asia has outrun world coal supply, pushing buyers to the United States -- a market traditionally viewed as too expensive -- for backup. Bad weather and producer problems around the world have fed the frenzy.

## Steel Impact Scenario

### **1. Discouraging Coal-Generated Electricity Displaces the US Steel Industry**

Nucor '06 ["Maintaining Globally Competitive American Steel Producers", July 24, [www.steelnet.org/new/20060724.doc](http://www.steelnet.org/new/20060724.doc), accessed 6/25/08]

Nucor became the nation's largest steel producer by applying revolutionary, energy efficient technology to transform an environmental blight (mounting piles of junked autos and appliances) into new steel. Recycling scrap metal enabled Nucor to become one of the leading steel producers in the world, while also setting the benchmark for minimal energy use and environmental impact per ton of steel produced. In the future, Nucor and the rest of the American steel industry will face higher energy costs and stricter environmental controls than our foreign competitors in developing nations. If we can't compete because of higher energy costs, then foreign steel will displace our domestic production. This would increase world energy consumption, pollution, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, besides destroying high-paying U.S. jobs.

Basic changes are required in U.S. energy policy to ensure that reasonably priced natural gas and electricity are available for U.S. steelmakers and other energy intensive industries (aluminum, cement, and fertilizers). Due to state and federal policies that encourage severe over-reliance on natural gas, electric utilities in recent years have built new electric generating plants fueled almost exclusively by natural gas, a situation that will likely continue throughout the decade. The industrial sector, including Nucor, competes with these electric utilities for supplies of natural gas who now consume more gas than the residential sector and more than the commercial sector. In the past year, gas prices reached historic highs, and exhibited dramatic volatility.

Steelmakers and other industrials have a strong interest in influencing a more balanced energy policy to help reduce the excessive linkage between electricity prices and natural gas prices, by flattening peak electric demand to reduce the electric utilities' requirements for natural gas, and by stimulating more coal and nuclear baseload capacity. Advanced metering and time-of-day meters can help do that in the commercial and residential sectors. Finally, U.S. climate change policy should do more than further raise energy prices for energy intensive industrials like steel. That policy should encourage foreign steelmakers to match the efficiency and low GHG emissions intensity of domestic steelmakers.

## Steel Impact Scenario

### **2. Viability of Domestic Steel Industry Key to Military Readiness**

United Steel Workers '07 ["Steel and the National Defense", January, [http://www.usw.org/usw/program/adminlinks/docs/Steel\\_and\\_National\\_Defense.pdf](http://www.usw.org/usw/program/adminlinks/docs/Steel_and_National_Defense.pdf), accessed 6/19/08]

This analysis presented by the U.S. steel industry addresses the importance of domestically produced steel to our nation's overall national defense objectives and the increased need for steel to bolster our economic and military security. The President and other U.S. government leaders have recognized repeatedly the critical interdependence of steel and national security. The American steel industry and the thousands of skilled men and women who comprise its workforce produce high quality, cost-competitive steel products for military use in applications ranging from aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines to Patriot and Stinger missiles, armor plate for tanks and field artillery pieces, as well as every major military aircraft in production today. These critical applications require consistent, high quality on-shore supply sources.

While leading-edge defense applications represent only a small portion of overall domestic sales of steel products, defense-related materials are produced on the same equipment, using some of the same technology, and are developed by the same engineers who support the larger commercial businesses of steel companies in the U.S. Thus, the companies are not typical defense contractors who derive the majority of their sales and profits from their defense business.

It is the overall financial health of U.S. steel producers, and not simply the profitability of their defense business, that is essential to their ability to be reliable defense suppliers.

### **3. Decline in Military Readiness Leads to War**

Spencer, research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, '00 ["The Facts About Military Readiness", <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm>]

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

## Steel Uniqueness

### **( ) Steel Industry Doing Well Now**

World Coal Institute '07 ["Coal & Steel", accessed 6/26/08  
[http://www.worldcoal.org/assets\\_cm/files/PDF/coal\\_steel\\_final.pdf](http://www.worldcoal.org/assets_cm/files/PDF/coal_steel_final.pdf)]

Over the last 35 years steel production worldwide has almost doubled, from less than 600 million tonnes (Mt) in 1970 to around 1.2 billion tonnes in 2006. The period 2000-2006 has seen unprecedented growth, with global figures rising over 47%.

Much of the demand for steel is being driven by the strong and rapid economic growth of China and India. In 2006, economic growth rates in those countries were 11% and 9% respectively. With a population of over 1 billion in India, and almost 1.3 billion in China, the demand for products and services has fuelled an almost insatiable demand for steel. China and India together consumed over 445Mt of steel in 2006, around 40% of total global crude steel consumption. This is set to continue as India is projected to eclipse China in population size by 2025 and the two countries will account for around 36% of the global population.

## Steel Links

### **( ) Coal is Key to the Steel Industry**

World Coal Institute '07 ["Coal & Steel", accessed 6/26/08  
[http://www.worldcoal.org/assets\\_cm/files/PDF/coal\\_steel\\_final.pdf](http://www.worldcoal.org/assets_cm/files/PDF/coal_steel_final.pdf)]

Global steel production is reliant on coal. Coal is a direct input in the production of steel – almost 70% of the steel produced today uses coal. The remainder is produced using electricity – often generated using affordable and reliable coal.

## Steel Link: Cap-and-Trade

### **( ) Cap-and-Trade Hurts the Steel Industry**

Nucor '06 ["Maintaining Globally Competitive American Steel Producers", July 24, [www.steelnet.org/new/20060724.doc](http://www.steelnet.org/new/20060724.doc), accessed 6/25/08]

The mechanism for legislating U.S. regulation of GHG emissions will likely be mandatory "cap and trade." There is little dispute that cap and trade regulation of GHG emissions will further raise U.S. energy prices, the only issue is, how much? As discussed above, U.S. steelmakers are already paying much more for energy than their foreign counterparts in developing nations. Inevitably, further hikes in U.S. energy prices will shift market share in international trade to foreign competitors with lower product prices, but higher GHG intensity. Steel, that Nucor now supplies domestically from recycled scrap, will come from foreign competitors, who must transport, with great expenditure of energy and consequent GHG emissions, iron ore to these foreign mills, and finished steel to our shores. These transport-related GHG emissions are in addition to the inherently greater GHG intensity of foreign steel production. This will raise the world's GHG emissions. (The same is true for other U.S. energy-intensive manufacturers who use recycled materials as a large percentage of their feed stocks.)

## Steel Internal Links

### **( ) Steel Key to Military Readiness**

United Steelworkers '07 ["Domestically-Produced Steel Critical to National Defense and Security", January 10, <http://www.usw.org/usw/program/content/3683.php>]

The critical interdependence of domestically-produced steel and America's national security is detailed in a new industry analysis released today, which urges public policies that promote further investment in domestic manufacturing rather than increasing reliance on foreign sources of steel and steel-related products.

Issued by the American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI), Steel Manufacturers Association (SMA), Specialty Steel Industry of North America (SSINA) and United Steelworkers (USW), the analysis explains that the U.S. steel industry's ability to supply the defense establishment will depend on its ability to compete in its commercial markets and maintain an onshore manufacturing presence. With much of America's steel-related manufacturing base being moved offshore due to market distorting, and often illegal, foreign government incentives and unsound economic policies at home, the U.S. military could lose its principal source of strategic metals. If this were to occur, the United States would become dangerously dependent upon unreliable foreign sources of supply.

The report details the importance of domestically-produced steel to our national defense. In so doing, it highlights the increased need for steel to improve our major military platforms, strengthen the nation's industrial base and harden our vital homeland security infrastructure. It notes further that all segments of the domestic steel industry contribute directly or indirectly to the defense industrial base. From missiles, jet aircraft, submarines and Humvees, domestic and specialty metals play an important direct role in the strength of the U.S. military.



## Coal Good DA Affirmative – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline	410
Extensions to Non-Unique	415
Extensions to Link Takeout	416
Extensions to China/India	417
Link Takeout – Nuclear Power	418
Answers to Steel Impact Scenario	419

## Coal DA 2AC Frontline

### **1. Non-Unique. Poverty is Already Rampant in Appalachia**

Baran '04 [Madeleine, "Poverty Still Pervasive Throughout Much of Appalachia", 6/17, [http://newstandardnews.net/content/?action=show\\_item&itemid=565](http://newstandardnews.net/content/?action=show_item&itemid=565), acc 6/1/08]

Only eight of the 410 counties in Appalachia are equal to or better than the national average on indicators like per-capita income, poverty, and unemployment rates, according to Ohio News Now. All eight counties are urban or suburban. Poverty remains the worst in central Appalachia, including eastern Kentucky. Of the 91 counties classified by the ARC as 'distressed,' are in eastern Kentucky. In these areas, poverty rates are double the national average, according to the AP.

Even these figures do not tell the whole story. The Ironton Tribune reports that Congressman Ted Strickland (D-Ohio), has asked the ARC and Ohio Governor Bob Taft to revise the qualifications for 'distressed' counties. In a letter to the governor and the ARC, Taft argues that the US Labor Department's unemployment figures are misleading. In Lawrence County, the local government reported an unemployment rate of 17.9 percent--three times the Labor Department's figure. Taft writes, "Of this 17.9 percent, [more than] 10 percent are individuals who are unemployed but who have simply given up and stopped seeking work, a measure that is not included in the Department of Labor's official measure of unemployment."

### **2. No Link. Demand From India and China Will Continue to Drive Up Coal Prices**

Michael '08 [Brandon, "Black Gold", June 6, [http://globalpensions.com/showPage.html?page=gp\\_display\\_feature&tempPageId=798166](http://globalpensions.com/showPage.html?page=gp_display_feature&tempPageId=798166), accessed 6/9/08]

World coal consumption is about 5.3 billion tons annually, of which approximately 75% is used for the production of electricity. As developing countries such as India and China become more industrialized, the demand for thermal coal to power production plants and provide electricity increases. According to the International Energy Agency, total global energy demand will rise by 1.8% a year, with consumption growing fastest in emerging countries. The International Energy Agency has said that "demand for coal in China and India will soar 73% between 2005 and 2030 as they seek to fuel economic growth".

## Coal DA 2AC Frontline

China is the world's fastest growing economy, currently burning coal to generate almost 80% of its electricity needs. Thermal coal prices from the Australian port of Newcastle, a benchmark for Asian spot coal prices, are near all-time highs. The price of coal, for example, which was trading at just over \$40 per metric ton in late 2006, is now \$130 per metric ton, an increase of 225%, largely as demand from China and India surges.

In a recent report, UBS stated it expected this trend to continue and has pushed up price estimates for the next two years by 28% and 40% respectively. The report further stated the "region and China are currently heading toward historically unprecedented coal tightness driven by constrained infrastructure and growing demand". Additionally, mine closures due to environmental and health considerations, inadequate rail and port infrastructure and rising operating costs are also helping to drive prices higher.

### **3. Turn. Modern Mining Techniques Create Few Jobs and Devastate the Appalachian Economy**

Appalachian Voices '08 ["What Are the Economic Consequences of Mountaintop Removal in Appalachia?" <http://www.appvoices.org/index.php?/mtr/economics/>]

Mountaintop removal is a mining technique designed, from the very start, to take the labor force out of the mining operation. What used to take hundreds of miners employed for decades, now takes a half dozen heavy equipment operators and blasting technicians a couple of years. According to the bureau of labor statistics, in the early 1950's there were between 125,000 and 145,000 miners employed in West Virginia; in 2004 there were just over 16,000. During that time, coal production has increased.

This decline in the workforce continues today. Draglines and other advances in technology resulted in a 29% decline in mining jobs during 1987 and 1997, while coal production rose 32 percent during the same period.

Despite claims that mountaintop removal increases local tax revenues, counties that produce coal are devastated by poverty, school closings, and unemployment. McDowell County has produced more coal than any other county in West Virginia, and for many years in the nation, yet the median household income is \$19,931 and 37.7% of residents live in poverty. In 2000, the Appalachian Regional Commission classified more than three quarters of Appalachian Coal counties as "economically distressed."

## Coal DA 2AC Frontline

### **4. Biodiversity Turn**

#### **a. Coal Mining Destroys Habitats in Some of the Most Biodiverse Regions of the Country**

Appalachian Voices '08 ["What Are the Environmental Impacts of Mountaintop Removal?" accessed 6/10/08,  
[http://www.appvoices.org/index.php?/mtr/environmental\\_impacts/](http://www.appvoices.org/index.php?/mtr/environmental_impacts/)]

This is occurring right at the heart of one of the nation's main hotspots of biological diversity. According to the Nature Conservancy, the mountain region including southwest Virginia, southern West Virginia, eastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee contains some of the highest levels of biological diversity in the nation.

This, as it turns out, is precisely the region where mountaintop removal is spreading the fastest. Already, more than a quarter of the mountains in the southern West Virginia coalfields have been leveled. Because there has been no significant effort to track the spread of mountaintop removal by government agencies, and the maps provided by coal companies to state agencies on the locations of valley fills and mined areas are so inaccurate as to be worthless for scientific purposes, there is very little scientific information on the effects of mountaintop removal. The one major governmental report on mountaintop removal that has come out, while based on faulty data, did report significant environmental impacts from mountaintop removal.

Here are some of the impacts and concerns expressed in the final EPA report:

- \* More than 7 percent of Appalachian forests have been cut down and more than 1,200 miles of streams across the region have been buried or polluted between 1985 and 2001.
- \* Over 1000 miles of streams have been permitted to be buried in valley fills. (for scale, this is a greater distance than the length of the entire Ohio River).
- \* Mountaintop removal mining, if it continues unabated, will cause a projected loss of more than 1.4 million acres by the end of the decade—an area the size of Delaware—with a concomitant severe impact on fish, wildlife, and bird species, not to mention a devastating effect on many neighboring communities.

## Coal DA 2AC Frontline

### **b. Biodiversity is the Single Most Important Impact in the Debate— Without It, Extinction is Inevitable and Nothing Else Matters**

Caldwell '04 [Joseph, "Preserving Biodiversity", May 23,  
<http://www.foundationwebsite.org/Miscellany2.htm>, accessed 6/26/08]

It is a shocking commentary on the human species – supposedly intelligent – that it is in the process of destroying the very biosphere on which is it totally dependent for its existence. Fermenting yeast in a vat of beer do a similar thing – reproduce to the limit, until they suffocate in their own waste. Humankind is in the midst of the planet's sixth mass species extinction. Large human numbers and industrial activity are the direct cause of the extinction of 30,000 – 150,000 species every year, out of the total of just a few million on the planet. The normal rate of extinction, prior to the modern era, was a few species per century.

Incredibly, not a single world leader is calling for a reduction in industrial activity. All national leaders and world organizations, such as the World Bank and the United Nations, are calling for even more industrial activity. The US was willing to go to war in Iraq over oil, which will all be gone (planet-wide) by 2050, but it did not even consider going to war against Brazil, which causes the destruction of about 10,000 square miles of Amazon rain forest, and the extinction of thousands of species, every year.

It is amazing to listen to the candidates in the US presidential race, and to hear what they are discussing, while the biosphere dies. None of the issues that they are discussing will matter a whit if the biosphere is destroyed, or if the human species becomes extinct. After each statement that a candidate makes, ask yourself, "Yes, but how does that affect the species extinction?" Or, "Yes, but how does that affect global warming." Or, "Yes, but will this matter after six billion people die when global oil reserves exhaust?" You will soon find out that what they are discussing is, in the face of our imminent demise, totally irrelevant.

Saving the planet is the only thing that matters. If the biosphere is destroyed, all of the issues about unemployment, poverty, race or sex discrimination, abortion and terrorism will be irrelevant. Preserving biodiversity is the only game in town.

## Coal DA 2AC Frontline

### **5. Mining Causes Poverty By Undermining the More Profitable and Sustainable Tourism Industry**

Appalachian Voices '08 ["What Are the Economic Consequences of Mountaintop Removal in Appalachia?" accessed 6/10/08,  
<http://www.appvoices.org/index.php?/mtr/economics/>]

"West Virginia's waterways are among the state's most valuable tourist attractions. Canoeists and fishermen come for the pleasures of rivers meandering under umbrellas of green or dancing in sunlight. The valley fills bury streambeds and contaminate streams with sediment from the mines."

In looking across the southern and central Appalachian region, the evidence speaks for itself. Mountain counties in Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee that have no coal industry have enjoyed some of the greatest economic growth and property value increases in the country over the past few decades. Because of the booming economy built around tourism, for instance, Watauga County, North Carolina, has maintained one of the lowest unemployment rates of all 100 North Carolina counties in recent years. In contrast, the coal-producing counties to the north suffer some of the highest unemployment rates, lowest education rates, and highest poverty in the nation.

In the biggest coal producing state in Appalachia, West Virginia, tourism already contributes more to the economy, and creates far more jobs, than the coal industry and has for more than a decade. It doesn't take an economist to tell you that mountaintop removal is permanently destroying the best economic assets that mountain counties have: the beautiful and ancient Appalachian Mountains themselves.

## Extensions to Non-Unique

### **( ) Poverty is Widespread in Appalachia, in Part Because of Mining**

Appalachian Poverty Project '08 ["Appalachian Poverty", <http://www.app-pov-proj.org/5.html>, accessed 5/24/08]

Poverty in Appalachia is widespread and severe. The poorest families seem to gravitate to areas that are often called the "hollows". The hollows are back areas in the mountains - these areas are largely owned by coal companies and many of the poor live there as squatters. The coal companies do not seem to care that the squatters are there and seem to expect them. When the coal "plays out", the mining operations move out and the squatters move in. A new community then begins.

## Extensions to Link Takeout

### **( ) Mining Employs Only 2% of the Workforce in Appalachia**

Baran '04 [Madeleine, "Poverty Still Pervasive Throughout Much of Appalachia", 6/17, [http://newstandardnews.net/content/?action=show\\_item&itemid=565](http://newstandardnews.net/content/?action=show_item&itemid=565), accessed 6/1/08]

Poverty in Appalachia has a long history--from immigrants who settled in the hills and died young in coal mines at the turn of the century to today's impoverished residents who work at Wal-Mart, McDonald's and Dairy Queen after being laid off from mining and manufacturing jobs.

Most of the jobs were lost as industries switched from Appalachia's bituminous coal to cleaner-burning Western coal. Between 1950 and 1960, more than 640,000 Appalachians lost coal and agricultural jobs, according to the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mining now employs just two percent of the workforce in Appalachia's coal-producing region, according to the ARC. In the last four years, 4,000 coal miners have lost their jobs. Around 1,500 still die each year from black lung disease, according to the United Mine Workers of America.

Most of the mining jobs have been replaced by low-paying, non-unionized service sector jobs. In 2000, the service sector employed more than half of all Appalachian workers. Two million of these workers are in occupations classified as particularly low-skilled and low-paying.



## Extensions to China/India

### **( ) No Link. China and India Are the Key Drivers of Coal Prices**

Simpkins, Associate Editor of Money Morning, '08 [Jason, "Why Coal is About to Double in Price", <http://www.moneymorning.com/2008/02/14/outlook-2008-why-coal-the-worlds-forgotten-fossil-fuel-is-about-to-double-in-price/>, 2/14, accessed 6/12/08]

The catalyst behind coal's record run is all about basic supply and demand. Demand has soared over the past several years, as emerging nations like China and India have undergone a rapid economic and industrial expansion.

"All over the world everyone is looking for coal because all economies are developing ... so they need energy ... that's why we are in this situation," Exxaro Resources Ltd. (OTC: [EXXAY](#)) Chief Executive Officer Sipho Nkosi told the Daily Dispatch.

Coal supplies 40% of the planet's energy needs. Japan - one of the world's largest importers - has been burning through its reserves since an earthquake damaged a key nuclear power station. India has been shipping in more coal, as well, despite already large domestic reserves.

India picked up its coal production by a third over the past decade and half, according to the BP Statistical Review of World Energy, but its consumption has also jumped by a hefty 40% during that period. India counts on coal for nearly 70% of its total energy supply.

Demand even is even burgeoning in the United States, which has several coal-fired electric plants under construction, meaning coal demand might jump by another 50 million tons annually.

However the biggest surge in demand has come from China, home to 1.3 billion people and the world's fastest-growing economy. Coal provides 78% of its energy needs, and coal demand in China jumped nearly 9% - meaning it now accounts for a full quarter of the world's annual coal consumption, according to The Wall Street Journal.

## Link Takeout – Nuclear Energy

### **( ) Nuclear Energy Will Not Offset Coal Anytime Soon**

Boyle, Australia-Pacific Editor for Platts Global Coal, '06 [Matthew, "China, India Demand Cushions Prices", December, [http://www.platts.com/Magazines/Insight/2006/december/2LU00612G0Nv7125Q8J58e\\_1.xml](http://www.platts.com/Magazines/Insight/2006/december/2LU00612G0Nv7125Q8J58e_1.xml)], accessed 6/16/08]

But nuclear units take a decade to plan and build, and even nuclear advocates say predicted demand is so high that all energy sources are needed. The available short-term choices for baseload power continue to be coal and natural gas, of which coal continues to be cheaper. Soaring demand in China and India, together with solid supply-demand fundamentals elsewhere in Asia and in Europe and North America, bode well for the global coal markets for 2007.

## Answers to Steel Impact Scenario

### **1. Non-Unique. The Domestic Steel Industry is Threatened Now**

Nevers '07 [Charles, "Steel Industry Said Vital to National Security",  
[http://chestertontribune.com/Business/steel\\_industry\\_said\\_vital\\_to\\_nat.htm](http://chestertontribune.com/Business/steel_industry_said_vital_to_nat.htm)]

Yet a reliable homegrown supply of strategic steel is under threat, the AISI believes, because U.S. steelmakers are under threat: "market-distorting foreign competition"—think China, for instance—and "U.S. economic policies that are hostile to domestic investment and U.S.-based manufacturing"—high costs related to energy consumption, environmental regulations, and employee benefits—are exerting destabilizing pressure on this country's manufacturing base.

### **2. Non-Unique. Competition From China Undermines the US Steel Industry**

Visclosky, US Congressman, '07 [Pete, "US Must Address Chinese Exports of Steel Pipe and Tube", May 14, accessed 6/26/08  
[http://www.house.gov/list/press/in01\\_visclosky/Pipe\\_and\\_Tube.html](http://www.house.gov/list/press/in01_visclosky/Pipe_and_Tube.html)]

China is a leading exporter of an array of steel pipe, tube, and fittings products. In fact, import data shows that Chinese imports increased 81 percent, from 350,000 to 631,000 tons, in the first quarter of 2007 over the first quarter of 2006. It is estimated that imports from China in 2007 will be approximately 3.9 million tons, or approximately 30 percent of the U.S. market. As illustrated on the enclosed chart, overall imports have consistently increased.

By not addressing this unfair advantage held by the Chinese steel industry, Northwest Indiana steelworkers could suffer. According to the Committee on Pipe and Tube Imports (CPTI), Allied Tube and Conduit, located in Harvey, Illinois, is one of the nation's largest pipe and tube producers and has over 500 employees that live in Northwest Indiana. Allied is an important customer of the area steel mills because it purchases hot-rolled steel to make pipe and tube products.

"If we allow the Chinese steel industry to continue down the path they are on, we will see more outsourcing of American steel jobs, and the domestic steel industry will be weakened," said Visclosky. "We must not let our own trade policies hurt our economic security, and I urge to Trade Rep. Schwab to immediately address these critical issues with the Chinese."

## Answers to Steel Impact Scenario

### **3. No Link**

**Negative evidence assumes policies that encourage consumption of natural gas. Plans that promote nuclear, biofuels, or renewable energy would not compete with the steel industry for natural gas supplies.**

### **4. American Military Hegemony Causes Nuclear Proliferation**

Easterbrook '03 [Gregg Easterbrook, "American Power Moves Beyond the Mere Super," The New York Times, April 27, 2003]

Which means: the global arms race is over, with the United States the undisputed heavyweight champion. Other nations are not even trying to match American armed force, because they are so far behind they have no chance of catching up. The great-powers arms race, in progress for centuries, has ended with the rest of the world conceding triumph to the United States.

Now only a nuclear state, like, perhaps, North Korea, has any military leverage against the winner. Paradoxically, the runaway American victory in the conventional arms race might inspire a new round of proliferation of atomic weapons. With no hope of matching the United States plane for plane, more countries may seek atomic weapons to gain deterrence.

North Korea might have been moved last week to declare that it has an atomic bomb by the knowledge that it has no hope of resisting American conventional power. If it becomes generally believed that possession of even a few nuclear munitions is enough to render North Korea immune from American military force, other nations -- Iran is an obvious next candidate -- may place renewed emphasis on building them.

### **5. Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is the Single Greatest Threat to Human Existence**

Miller, assistant professor of economics at Smith College, 2002 [James, National Review Online, <http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-miller012302.shtml>]

Even the short-term survival of humanity is in doubt. The greatest threat of extinction surely comes from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. America should refocus her foreign policy to prioritize protecting us all from atomic, biological, and chemical weapons.

## States Counterplan

1NC Shell – RPS	422
Answers to Permutation	424
Answers to International Business Confidence	425
Answers to Can't Act Together	427
Solvency – RPS	428
Answers to Constitutionality	432
1NC Shell – Cap-and-Trade	436
Solvency – Cap-and-Trade	437
Answers to Permutation	438
Answers to Businesses Prefer Federal Regulation	439
Answers to Counterplan Unconstitutional	441
Answers to Soft Power	444
1NC Shell – Biofuels	445
Solvency – Biofuels	446
Solvency – Renewables	451
Solvency – Enforcement	452

1NC – States (RPS)

**A. Text. The fifty states and all relevant territories will enact a renewable portfolio standard requiring that 20% of the energy used in their state or territory come from a renewable source of energy by the year 2020.**

**B. Non-Topicality. The counter plan does not use the United States federal government.**

**C. Competition. The counter plan competes through net benefits: it does not link to the disadvantages.**

## 1NC – States (RPS)

### **D. Solvency. Thirteen states have already enacted successful Renewable Portfolio Standards. Most states have been successful at implementing their renewable energy standards**

Mary Ann Ralls, The author joined the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) as Senior Regulatory Counsel in April 2005, Energy Law Journal 2006. lexis

Many of these programs have been in place long enough for the states or other implementing entities to gauge their efficacy, and to refine or even restructure the programs if necessary to take into account evolving state or local factors. This is the flexibility factor that is essential in designing and operating any renewable program, as discussed infra at Part IV.B to Part IV.F. Accordingly, many programs have been amended to require or recommend higher standards than those originally established. California, already considered a sort of juggernaut for renewable issues, appears to be in the final stages of gaining approval for accelerating its RPS from 20% of retail sales by retail sellers by 2010 to 33% by the end of 2020. n50 Likewise, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC), on March 14, 2006, issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to increase the standard for a utility's renewable portfolio from 1.1% in 2007-2012 to 15% by 2025, with 30% of renewables coming from DG resources. n51 Wisconsin recently revisited its 1999 standard when the [\*459] Wisconsin State Legislature enacted SB 459, under which the statewide renewable goal for retail sales increased from 2.2% by 2012 to 10% by the end of 2015. n52 New Jersey is giving California a run for its money for the most aggressive RPS. In April 2006, the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities significantly increased, based on classes or tiers of renewable energy, the standard to 22.5% by 2021. n53 While it is difficult to measure the cumulative renewable energy from all of these programs, one study projected that compliance with RPS and renewable goals would result in an increase from ten gigawatts (GWs) in 2003 to forty GWs in 2015. n54 However, because a growing number of states are increasing the levels of renewable energy required, n55 this cumulative could correspondingly be greater.

## Answer to: Permutation

**1. The permutation is impossible** – Extend out Harvard law journal evidence from the 1NC shell. If the federal government and the states act simultaneously then counter plan would be struck down.

**2. The plan and the counter plan are Mutually Exclusive due to the supremacy clause**

Harvard Journal on Legislation Winter, 2008 p.1n

In spite of the leakage of economic benefits to other states n133 and the possible dormant Commerce Clause problems posed by measures adopted to stop such leakage, n134 states continue to adopt new RPSs and to increase the [\*280] proportions of renewable energy that existing programs require. n135 However, the mounting pressure for federal legislation that addresses global climate change n136 raises an important question: what would the continued legality of state renewable portfolio standards be if a federal RPS or other program addressing global climate change were enacted? As was mentioned in Part II of this Note, Congress has the power to explicitly authorize states to incorporate into their RPS programs economic restrictions that burden interstate commerce. n137 Along the same lines, Congress could just as easily provide explicit authorization for states to adopt RPS programs themselves in spite of any federal legislation with which they might overlap. However, absent such explicit authorization, a federal RPS program could create a different kind of constitutional barrier to state RPS programs, one which could result in the invalidation of such programs altogether: federal preemption under the Supremacy Clause. n138

**3. The permutation still links to the disadvantage because it involves federal action.**



## Answers to: International Business Confidence

### **1. The counter plan solves international business investment - States are substitutes for federal policy**

The New York Sun February 24, 2005 p.lexis-nexis

California is another leader. Its renewable portfolio standard law (RPS) calls for 20% renewable energy share by 2017. Moreover, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has already approved regulations to reduce significantly exhaust from cars and trucks by 2016. The ruling means that automakers will be forced to provide individual passenger cars with average fuel economy of 25% to 35% higher than present, potentially forcing Detroit to put significantly more efficient hybrid electric and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles on the road to retain market share. The response to California's ruling is typical. The industry is suing to prevent implementation. But the die of political will is cast. Other states, notably New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, are watching carefully with plans to follow suit if the legal dust clears.

It remains unclear whether the new national energy bill under consideration will end up promoting renewable energy standards as a key national strategy for the country. Federal funding for solar energy research and development is embarrassingly small at only \$80 million a year. But it probably doesn't matter, given state-level policy. The number of states with RPS laws (over 20 now) continues to grow. Moreover, 14 states have renewable energy funds. New York State, for example, will give out \$14 million a year through its Smart Energy program, California \$135 million a year through 2012.

**2. the counter plan and the plan solve the same way** – They are both mandates on electricity companies *within* the fifty states, because of this, any reason why the counter plan does not attract business investment would also apply to the plan.

## Answers to: International Business Confidence

### **3. The states are similar enough to attract business investment**

Harvard Journal on Legislation Winter, 2008 p.In

Renewable portfolio standards are becoming an increasingly popular way for states to achieve the environmental and other benefits that result from a greater reliance on renewable energy. As of August 29, 2007, twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia had enacted RPSs; n19 only seven of these programs were enacted before 2002, n20 and only one was enacted before 1997. n21 On February 22, 2007, Minnesota enacted what has been called the [\*263] "most aggressive" renewable portfolio standard in the nation. n22 Amended Minnesota Statute section 216B.1691 requires electric utilities to "procure sufficient electricity generated by an eligible energy technology to provide ... at least the following standard percentages of [each] utility's total retail electric sales to retail customers in Minnesota ... by the end of the year indicated:" (1) 12% by 2012; (2) 17% by 2016; (3) 20% by 2020; and (4) 25% by 2025. n23 In general, other states' programs are structured similarly, with standards requiring that renewable energy sources ultimately satisfy 10% to 33% of these states' electrical energy needs by final deadlines that are typically between the years 2015 and 2025. n24

## Answers To: Can't Act Together

### **( ) There are empirical examples of states acting together to solve climate problems**

Energy Information Administration, June 2007.

[www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/servicerpt/prps/pdf/sroiaf\(2007\)03.pdf](http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/servicerpt/prps/pdf/sroiaf(2007)03.pdf)

As previously noted, almost half the States have adopted an RPS or similar renewable energy target policy. In addition, a number of States, particularly in the Northeast and Western United States, have taken initial steps to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. At the Federal level, key renewable energy subsidies are scheduled to expire within the next 2 years, and there are a number of proposals in Congress to establish national carbon dioxide emission legislation.

## States Solvency - RPS

### **( ) State based RPS systems can have a large effect on the national energy market**

Ryan Wiser, Wiser Consulting, "Evaluating State Renewables Portfolio Standards: A Focus on Geothermal Energy" 2003.  
[www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf](http://www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf)

The RPS, or RPS-like mandates, has been established in 13 U.S. states: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin. An important observation is that there is no single way to design an RPS, and each of these states has crafted their policies differently, sometimes radically so. These design variations are discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, and in Appendix A and E. Though the majority of existing RPS policies have only recently been established, their impact over time could be substantial. In fact, these policies have already begun to have an impact; this is especially apparent for wind power, and to a far lesser degree for geothermal.

### **( ) There are many successful state based RPS systems**

Ryan Wiser, Wiser Consulting, "Evaluating State Renewables Portfolio Standards: A Focus on Geothermal Energy" 2003.  
[www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf](http://www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf)

Despite limited experience to date, a variety of states are succeeding on one or more of the outcome-based criteria. In sum, based on the outcome criteria, Texas, Minnesota, and Iowa rate most highly: these RPS policies have worked or are working. Texas' RPS has perhaps shown the most success overall in effectively supporting renewable energy markets. The Texas policy has driven substantial new wind power additions, has done so with reasonable cost impacts that are being passed on to customers, and retail suppliers appear as if they will fully comply with the policy.

## States Solvency - RPS

### **( ) There are many examples of effective state RPS policies**

Ryan Wiser, Wiser Consulting, "Evaluating State Renewables Portfolio Standards: A Focus on Geothermal Energy" 2003.  
[www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf](http://www.geocollaborative.org/publications/RPS.pdf)

Importantly, the UCS estimates assume that the state RPS programs are designed effectively, and therefore represent an upper bound on the possible impacts of existing state RPS policies; as we show later in this report, the assumption that all state RPS policies will be designed effectively is aggressive. Though one might quibble with some of the details behind the estimate, the figure clearly shows that, in aggregate, the 13 state RPS policies have the possibility of driving a substantial amount of renewable energy development. Unfortunately, because many state RPS policies are at an early stage of implementation or design, it is not possible to estimate the projected mix of renewable resources that will be used to meet individual state RPS policies.

## States Solvency - RPS

### **( ) States solve better due to resource diversification**

Mary Ann Ralls, The author joined the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) as Senior Regulatory Counsel in April 2005, Energy Law Journal 2006. lexis

Furthermore, many states require their state agencies to procure power from renewable sources. Connecticut's Green Power Purchase Plan directs state agencies and universities to purchase renewable power, with a goal of meeting 20% of power needs by 2010 and up to 100% in 2050. n59 Similarly, state agencies in New Jersey are required to purchase an aggregate of 12% of their energy usage from renewable sources, and New York's Renewable Power Procurement Policy committed the state government to purchase 10% of its power from renewables by 2005 and 20% by 2010. n60 Likewise, local governments are establishing their own programs: Montgomery County, Maryland purchases 5% of its power from wind sources; Portland, Oregon has [\*460] met its current goal of 12% renewable purchases, with an eye towards 100%; and Conway, South Carolina's Green Power Purchasing program obligates the city to purchase fifty 200 kilowatt-hour (kWh) blocks of electricity per month that is generated by landfill gas. n61 Several states require utilities to offer their customers green power under specified tariffs: Iowa requires all utilities operating within the state to offer green power options to their customers; and electric utilities in Minnesota must offer green power as well. n62 At the local level, many municipalities and cooperatives have established their own green power purchasing programs. n63

## States Solvency - RPS

### **( ) Local solutions are best for dealing with energy issues**

Mary Ann Ralls, The author joined the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) as Senior Regulatory Counsel in April 2005, Energy Law Journal 2006. lexis

Renewable advocates have been urging flexibility in designing renewable programs for years. In 2001, the Texas RPS was touted as a success in that it demonstrated that a RPS, if designed properly, can deliver a "low-cost, flexible, and effective support mechanism for renewable energy." n83 Moreover, an analysis of state programs undertaken in 2001 concluded that state experiences showed that "an RPS can be ineffective unless careful attention is given to the [\*464] details of the RPS design." n84 It is essential to design a renewable standard or goal that incorporates many separate elements including structure, size, administration, policy goals, resource eligibility, production targets, and coordination with other policies such as financial incentives, and most importantly, the flexibility to reassess and refine all of the above. n85 The congressional debate of S. Amdt. 791 focused on whether or not elements of the proposed RPS would prove too intractable concerning factors such as reliability, costs, and eligible renewable sources to ensure its own effectiveness. It is often said "the devil is in the details," which is precisely the reason why renewable programs should be left to those who understand the mechanics of obtaining cleaner power that is also reliable and cost-effective.

### **( ) Many states already have RPS**

Ben Lieberman, Senior Policy Analyst for Energy and the Environment in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation., August 1, 2007.

<http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/wm1581.cfm>

About half the states already have their own renewable portfolio standards (such as California, New York, and Texas), and others have opted not to have them. There is no good reason for the federal government to step in with a costly, one-size-fits-all measure.

## Answers To – Constitutionality

### **( ) States can legally trade energy credits**

Kirsten H. Engel, Associate Professor, Tulane Law School., Ecology Law Quarterly 1999 lexis

[\*264] To date, renewable portfolio standards have been enacted as part of the electricity restructuring legislation or procedures of six states: Maine, n54 Nevada, n55 Arizona, n56 Massachusetts, n57 Connecticut, n58 and New Jersey, n59 several of which authorize implementation through a tradable credit scheme. n60 In addition, [\*265] the Clinton Administration's proposed federal electricity industry restructuring legislation n61 and several restructuring bills previously introduced in Congress n62 contain renewable portfolio standards. These federal legislative proposals, nearly all of which also provide for a system of tradable credits, lay the foundation for a future federal renewable portfolio standard implemented according to a marketable permit system.



## Answers To – Constitutionality

**( ) At most, the court would only strike down the credit trading – not the actual mandate for 20% renewable energy by 2020**

Kirsten H. Engel, Associate Professor, Tulane Law School., Ecology Law Quarterly  
1999 lexis

Unrestricted interstate trading in renewable energy credits could, however, discourage a state from adopting a renewable portfolio standard implemented through a tradable energy credit system. If an energy retailer in Maine purchases energy credits from a California wind power generator and uses them to satisfy its obligations under Maine's renewable portfolio standard, numerous problems could result. For example, given that wind-derived power currently exceeds the costs of fossil-fuel-derived power, energy users in Maine could be forced to pay higher energy costs to support the generation of renewable power being produced in California, while California residents would enjoy the geographically localized benefits associated with renewable power production, including cleaner air and jobs. Consequently, a trading mechanism becomes less attractive. Granted, the residents of Maine benefit from the reduced risk of global warming attributable to a greater reliance upon nonpolluting, renewable fuels. n73 This public good, however, is unlikely to encourage Maine to enact a renewable portfolio standard. As long as some other state is supporting renewable power, residents in all other states receive this benefit at no cost. An economically rational state politician would therefore prefer to free ride on the reduction of global warming by other states and [\*271] instead spend her constituency's tax dollars on measures guaranteed to bring benefits her constituents are otherwise unable to obtain. n74

## Answers To – Constitutionality

**( ) If both in-state and out-of-state companies face the same restrictions, the counter plan would survive constitutional challenges.**

Harvard Journal on Legislation Winter, 2008 In

On the other hand, RPS programs with in-state consumption, metering, or sales requirements would likely survive scrutiny under the dormant Commerce Clause. n83 First, courts will probably not subject such restrictions to the "strict scrutiny" test because they do not facially discriminate against out-of-state sources: n84 renewable power from both in-state and out-of-state sources would have to pass identical even-handed tests under all three types of restrictions to be eligible to satisfy the RPS obligations. n85 As such, courts would analyze these restrictions under the Pike test. n86 The putative local benefits, including a cleaner local environment and greater decentralization of local power generation, would likely be considered substantial, just as the environmental benefits of prohibiting the sale of milk in plastic, nonreturnable, nonrefillable containers were in Clover Leaf Creamery. n87 By contrast, the incidental burdens on interstate commerce would likely be considered small or nonexistent, since it is unlikely that the proportion of new, renewable [\*272] power from outside states under the restrictions would be significantly different from the proportion of old, nonrenewable power from outside states displaced by the program, due to the already existing physical constraints on power transmission. n88 Accordingly, it is unlikely that the burdens on interstate commerce would be considered "clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits." n89 However, in addition to the likely lesser effectiveness in retaining economic benefits as compared with an in-state or in-region location requirement, in-state consumption, sales, and metering requirements would also likely add administrative complexity to an RPS program and, to some extent, reduce the flexibility and economic efficiency provided by a tradable renewable energy credit system. n90

## Answers To – Constitutionality

### **( ) State legislators can write a constitutionally safe RPS**

Harvard Journal on Legislation Winter, 2008 p.In

Finally, the validity of RPS energy eligibility restrictions that are based on the provision of benefits to the state and of state subsidization of in-state renewable energy generation under the dormant Commerce Clause will likely depend on the particulars of how those program elements are structured. Under *West Lynn Creamery*, discriminatory subsidies of in-state renewable energy generation would likely risk invalidation if they were linked too closely to system benefits charges that were levied against in-state and out-of-state generation in general. n98 Benefits tests, n99 as long as they rejected economic benefits resulting from discrimination against interstate commerce, would likely survive under the Pike test, assuming that they were implemented in a manner that was not unduly burdensome on such commerce. Although Rader and Hempling endorse benefits tests, n100 administration of such tests would seem to present serious difficulties. Formulations of these tests that employed measurable, concrete criteria would likely be facially discriminatory towards interstate commerce and, thus, be virtually per se invalid. n101 More vague formulations would raise administrability problems n102 and might also be struck down under the dormant Commerce Clause if they effectively gave state commissions discretion to implement [\*274] standards in a discriminatory manner. n103 Considering these problems, it is not surprising that no states, to date, have implemented this approach. n104

## 1NC - State Counter Plan – Cap and Trade

**A. Text. The fifty states and all relevant United States' territories should implement a cap-and-trade policy with a goal of reducing its global warming pollution emissions at least 20 percent below 2000 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 2000 levels by 2050. The cap should cover all major sources of emissions and all major heat-trapping gas emissions. A substantial majority of allowances should be auctioned, using auction revenues to invest in alternative energy**

**B. Non-Topicality. The counter plan does not use the United States Federal Government. The Counter Plan is fair for the negative to run because it tests if federal action is necessary to solve the affirmative.**

**C. Competition. The counterplan competes through net benefits. There is a less of a link to the disadvantages from state action than from federal action.**

**D. Solvency. Many states have Successful cap and trade systems**

Reiner Musier, CMO and VP of APX Industries, et al., 2008 ["Cap and Trade, From all Sides Now", [www.apx.com/documents/APX-Cap-and-Trade-Overview.pdf](http://www.apx.com/documents/APX-Cap-and-Trade-Overview.pdf)]

Similar results were achieved by another cap and trade program, the NOx Budget Program, which began in 1999 as a regional program under the Ozone Transport Commission to reduce seasonal emissions of nitrogen oxides that contribute to smog. The NOx Budget Program replaced an existing technology standard, which was the traditional approach to emission reductions prior to the advent of trading programs. It was later expanded in 2003 to a federal program comprising 22 states. Like the acid rain program, the NOx Budget Program also achieved, and in fact, exceeded its emission reduction goal at costs that were far lower than projected. Although there was significant volatility in allowance prices during the early years of the trading program, once capped entities gained experience with the program and the market matured, prices stabilized at a level (about \$2000 - \$3000 per ton) that was at the low end of the projected cost range.<sup>4</sup>

## Cap and Trade Solvency

### **( ) Ten states have already implemented a cap and trade system**

Reiner Musier, CMO and VP of APX Industries, et al., 2008 ["Cap and Trade, From all Sides Now", [www.apx.com/documents/APX-Cap-and-Trade-Overview.pdf](http://www.apx.com/documents/APX-Cap-and-Trade-Overview.pdf)]

All the major U.S. presidential candidates have said they support this method as an important tool for addressing global warming. In the eastern U.S., 10 states have cooperated to adopt and implement the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, which will begin operation in 2009. Similar initiatives are underway in California (under AB32), the West (the Western Climate Initiative, which includes 9 States and 3 Canadian Provinces), and the Midwest (the Midwest Greenhouse Gas Accord).

### **( ) Many state examples of cap and trade**

Matthew D. Zinn, Environmental Law Fellow, California Center for Environmental Law and Policy, University of California, Berkeley, 2007 [Ecology Law Quarterly, 2007 p.lexis]

This increasing public concern accompanies a proliferation of state, and even local, experiments with public policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. n194 To name only a few, these initiatives include the following: a comprehensive greenhouse gas emission cap in California, n195 a cap-and-trade program for major utilities' emissions of carbon dioxide in nine Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states, n196 emissions standards for automobile [\*103] emissions of greenhouse gases in California and ten follow-on states, n197 state executive orders setting aggressive targets for greenhouse gas reductions, n198 and renewable energy portfolio standards for regulated utilities in a host of states. n199 Several states have also adopted a litigation strategy including lawsuits against large greenhouse gas emitters and the federal EPA, which has refused to regulate greenhouse gas emissions. n200 Although the leaders in these efforts are mainly the same states that took a leadership role in an earlier era of environmental law, the initiatives are to some extent spreading across the political map. n201

## Answers to Permutation

- 1. The Permutation cannot solve the link to the Disadvantage because it still uses federal action.**
- 2. The Permutation is a new link to the disadvantage because now businesses will have to reduce their carbon emissions twice as much due to overlapping regulations.**

## AT: Businesses Prefer Federal Regulation

### **1. Businesses are less threatened by state regulation**

David A. Dana, Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law, November 1995, ["ARTICLE: THE CASE FOR UNFUNDED ENVIRONMENTAL MANDATES" University of Southern California, P.lexis]

Both the race-to-the-bottom and local capture accounts build on an empirical proposition that has abundant support: Businesses often have greater political clout within the state and local political regimes where their principal operations are based than within the federal [\*33] political regime. n89 Some businesses enjoy, in effect, a home court advantage. One would naturally expect such businesses to oppose federal environmental regulation and, to the extent they are unable to defeat such regulation altogether, to push for as large a state and local government role in the implementation of the regulation as possible.

### **2. Firms prefer the flexibility of state-solutions**

J.R. DeShazo, Professor and Director of the Lewis Center, UCLA School of Public Affairs, June 2007, [ "Symposium: RESPONSES TO GLOBAL WARMING: THE LAW, ECONOMICS, AND SCIENCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE: ARTICLE: TIMING AND FORM OF FEDERAL REGULATION: THE CASE OF CLIMATE CHANGE" University of Pennsylvania Law Review, p.lexis]

Where, by contrast, a state merely regulates "end-of-pipe" pollution by establishing standards that permit flexible compliance (perhaps by allowing installation of technology at a local facility, fuel switching, or other strategies), industry may not be as moved to seek a federal preemptive solution. The affected industry might instead choose to bear these costs locally, or might relocate to a more favorable jurisdiction (consistent with the race-to-the-bottom hypothesis). In the end, of course, the calculation comes down to cost: where a [\*1509] regulation allows for flexibility in compliance, firms are better able to find least-cost solutions.

## AT: Businesses Prefer Federal Regulation

### **3. Critical industries to the US economy prefer state based regulation because they are more familiar with local lawmakers and enforcement**

Joe Knollenberg, congressperson, fall 1996, [Fordham Environmental Law Journal, ESSAY: WHAT IS THE MOST COMPELLING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE FACING THE WORLD ON THE BRINK OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: SPACE SUITS, LAB COATS, BUSINESS SUITS, AND TIE-DYES, p.lexis]

Small business is hit hardest by federal regulation. Mark Isakowitz of the National Federation of Independent Business noted that there is

growing bipartisan agreement about two phenomena that are taking place in America's small business sector. Number one, virtually all job growth in this country comes from small business. And number two, the burden created by federal regulations falls predominately and disproportionately on the very people we rely on to create these jobs. n48

Moreover, small business is less equipped to comply with each and every regulation. As we move into the twenty-first century we must move away from the perception that regulations only affect businesses like General Motors, McDonalds, and DOW Chemical. The local cleaner and hardware store and eventually the economy as a whole will have to bear this burden as well.



## AT: Counter Plan is Unconstitutional

### **1. Legal experts argue that cap and trade is constitutional**

Patricia Weisselberg, graduate of the University of San Francisco School of Law, Summer 2007 ["Comment: Shaping the Energy Future in the American West: Can California Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Out-of-State, Coal-Fired Power Plants Without Violating the Dormant Commerce Clause?" University of San Francisco of Law Review, p.lexis]

The few voluntary programs that Gross refers to, and the research and technology development incentives that CEED describes, fall far short of the comprehensive federal legislation required to preempt state law in this area. n148 Where the area of regulation is one traditionally reserved for local or state police power regulation, courts must exercise a strong presumption against implied federal preemption in the absence of evidence of the "clear and manifest purpose of Congress." n149 Regulation of utilities that provide electricity to local retail customers is a police power long reserved to the states - FERC has no jurisdiction over such utilities. n150 The voluntary GHG emissions reduction programs Gross refers to were established by the executive branch, n151 not by Congress, and are not evidence that it is the clear and manifest purpose of Congress to preempt the state police power [\*207] in this area. Therefore, SB 1368 is not preempted by federal law; the dispositive question is whether the law is constitutionally permissible in light of the dormant Commerce Clause.

## AT: Counter Plan is Unconstitutional

### **( ) Lack of federal regulation makes state cap and trade constitutional**

Patricia Weisselberg, graduate of the University of San Francisco School of Law, Summer 2007 ["Comment: Shaping the Energy Future in the American West: Can California Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Out-of-State, Coal-Fired Power Plants Without Violating the Dormant Commerce Clause?" University of San Francisco of Law Review, p.lexis]

The Act clearly passes this threshold test. There is no federal law instituting a mandatory GHG emissions standard as part of a cap and trade program for power plants. The Senate never ratified the Kyoto Protocol. n142 In place of mandatory regulations, the federal government has instituted programs through which industries may voluntarily [\*206] reduce their GHG emissions. n143 The voluntary nature of the federal programs has left the field open for states to impose mandatory reductions in power plants' GHG emissions.

### **( ) Uniform state regulations are constitutional**

Patricia Weisselberg, graduate of the University of San Francisco School of Law, Summer 2007 ["Comment: Shaping the Energy Future in the American West: Can California Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Out-of-State, Coal-Fired Power Plants Without Violating the Dormant Commerce Clause?" University of San Francisco of Law Review, p.lexis]

Turning to the Act, and viewing it in the context of the broad policies of the dormant Commerce Clause, it is clear that the Act does not contradict the policies behind the doctrine. First, SB 1368 does not promote economic protectionism. It does not give California businesses an economic advantage over businesses in other states because the GHG emissions standard applies to all electricity providers, both in-state and out-of-state, who wish to enter into long term contracts with California utilities.

## AT: Counter Plan is Unconstitutional

### **( ) The public health aspects of climate change allow state to regulate under their “police powers”**

Patricia Weisselberg, graduate of the University of San Francisco School of Law, Summer 2007 [“Comment: Shaping the Energy Future in the American West: Can California Curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Out-of-State, Coal-Fired Power Plants Without Violating the Dormant Commerce Clause?” University of San Francisco of Law Review, p.lexis]

Third, the Act regulates the purchase and distribution of electricity within California, n166 which is a valid exercise of the State's police power to regulate its own internal commerce. In addition, the Act is intended to protect California residents against perils to their health, safety, and well being caused by global warming. Thus, SB 1368 is a valid exercise of the State's police power and should be upheld, even if it has a considerable influence on interstate commerce.

## AT: Soft Power

### **1. Counterplan Solves Soft Power**

**International actors would care more about the fact that the United States has enacted a cap-and-trade policy to reduce global warming, not what level of government passed the law.**

### **2. Counterplan Sends a Better Signal**

**This would be a historic moment when all 50 states act in unison to curb global waring. If anything, this would send a better signal indicating the US was serious about global warming**

### **3. States Are Acknowledged as Important Actors for Sustainable Development**

Donald A. Brown, Program Manager for United Nations Organizations with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Summer 1996. [ARTICLE: Thinking Globally and Acting Locally: The Emergence of Global Environmental Problems and the Critical Need to Develop Sustainable Development Programs at State and Local Levels in the United States, Dickinson Journal of Environmental Law & Policy p. lexis]

The international signatories to Agenda 21 understood the importance of local governments in encouraging sustainable development. Probably nowhere in the world is the role of local governments so essential to a nation's sustainable development efforts than in the United States, with our historical tradition of federalism, community cohesion, and local autonomy. This Part examines how Agenda 21's drafters foresaw the local government role and why, in the United States in particular, state and local governments are an indispensable factor in achieving a sustainable future.

## States Counterplan 1NC Frontline – Biofuels

**A. Text. In order to create incentives for biofuels as an alternative to oil, the fifty states and all relevant territories should impose a flexible tax rate that requires oil to cost at least \$50-per-barrel of oil, collectively allocate \$500 millions for research and development of cellulosic biofuels, require all car sales in their state to have to offer a flex-fuel option for every model of car, and offer tax credits for the creation of biofuels pumps at filling stations.**

**b. Non-Topicality. The counter plan does not use the federal government**

**C. Competition. The counter plan competes through net benefits. The disadvantage links to the plan but not the counter plan.**

**D. Many states have successful renewable fuel standards**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

[“Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards”,

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

The propagation of state-level renewable portfolio standards (RPS) across the United States has resulted in an increase of more than 4,000 MW of renewable energy capacity to date (UCS 2006a, EIA AEO 2006). Internationally, these policies are also increasing in popularity (von der Linden et al. 2005). RPS policies use the same mandate or obligation system as renewable fuels standards, in that they set targets for renewable energy within a sector and allow the market to develop the least-cost means to that end. The connection to renewable energy markets, as well as the similarity of mechanism, allows policymakers to take lessons learned from RPS development and incorporate them into Renewable Fuel Standards (RFS) development. This section presents an overview of the most overarching lessons and how they might be applied to RFS policies.

## States Solve - Biofuels

### **( ) States can give ethanol incentives**

Vernon R. Eidman, "Renewable Liquid Fuels: Current Situation and Prospects" Choices, 2006. Vol 21, issue 1. p.15-19

A second program provides a 10-cent per gallon production income tax credit on up to 15 million gallons of production annually. Originally, the size of the plant eligible for the income tax credit was limited to 30 million gallons per year. Under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the size limitation on the production capacity for small ethanol plants increased from 30 million to 60 million gallons. The credit can be taken on the first 15 million gallons of production. In addition to the federal programs, many states offer incentives for ethanol plants built in their state.

### **( ) States can increase demand for biofuels**

Vernon R. Eidman, "Renewable Liquid Fuels: Current Situation and Prospects" Choices, 2006. Vol 21, issue 1. p.15-19

At the state level, many states passed legislation favorable to biodiesel in recent years ranging from tax exemptions to infrastructure incentives. Minnesota enacted a statewide law requiring the state's diesel fuel to be comprised of 2 percent biodiesel. The law became effective in September 2005 when the state's biodiesel production capacity moved above 8 million gallons per year.

## States Solve - Biofuels

### **( ) Multiple states have an ethanol RFS**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

The potential market to which the RFS applies can be defined by the fuel targeted for replacement with renewable energy, the specific fleets to which the requirement applies, and whether there are any thresholds that must be met before the policy is triggered. To date, state-based RFS policies have defined specific market boundaries for the fuels and vehicles to which they apply. Table 6 shows that the market boundaries can include the type of fuel, the grade of fuel, and the specific fleets to which the RFS applies. For example, most states have (or have proposed) an ethanol and/or biodiesel requirement that applies to the total sales by volume of gasoline (for ethanol) or diesel fuel (for biodiesel) in the state. Alternatively, Missouri and Montana focus their efforts on all non-premium motor gasoline sales, but still require that the replacing fuel is ethanol.

## States Solve - Biofuels

### **( ) States are the best actors to implement renewable fuel standards due to their flexibility**

E. Brown, et al. National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

Best practices and experience from an evaluation of renewable portfolio standards (RPS) in the United States and international RFS policies can inform U.S. state-level policy by illustrating the importance of policy flexibility, binding targets, effective cost caps, and tradable permits. Understanding and building on the experiences from these previous policies can improve the policy mechanism and further develop a market for renewable fuels to meet the goals of improved economy, environment, and fuel self-sufficiency.

### **( ) Greater flexibility means the counter plan solves better**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

The benefit to limiting the policies to specific renewable fuel types is that it minimizes uncertainty in meeting the goal. However, the limitation reduces the incentives for continued development of other innovative and cost-effective renewable fuels technologies. Without direct market competition among renewable fuels, there is no certainty that ethanol and biodiesel are the most efficient fuels for meeting the goals of increased national security and economic development, as well as decreasing the environmental impact of transportation fuels, the stated primary drivers of state level RFS policies.



## States Solve - Biofuels

### **( ) Just allowing for an ethanol/biodeisel option is enough to solve for the affirmative**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

In addition to specific fuel-type requirements, most of the enacted RFS policies explicitly require volumetric substitutions of gasoline or diesel across the entire market. Most require that all gasoline sold into the market contain a certain percentage of ethanol (e.g., 2% or 10%, typically) and/or that diesel fuel sold must contain a certain percentage of biodiesel (e.g., 2% typically). There are two exceptions to these rigid volumetric requirements. First, the Iowa RFS requires the equivalent amount of 25% of in-state gasoline sales will be replaced with either ethanol (either E85 or E10) or biodiesel (minimum of B1). Despite limited fuel choices, the policy offers some flexibility rather than dictating the state's fuel mix, allowing producers and distributors to decide how to best meet the policy. This flexibility provides the market with the ability to decide: (1) which fuel works best, based on market conditions (feedstock prices, availability, performance, economics, etc.); (2) whether to sell higher concentrates of ethanol (E85) or biodiesel (B20 or B100) to a smaller percentage of their customers to meet the requirement; and/or (3) whether producers decide to sell the required amount of renewable fuel primarily outside of the coldest winter months, when there are less concerns for fuel quality.<sup>7</sup>

## States Solve - Biofuels

### **( ) There are historical examples of states solving for renewable fuel**

E. Brown, et al. National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007  
["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",  
[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

Prior to 2006, two U.S. states and several countries implemented these market-based policies. In 2006, the U.S. federal government began implementation of a national-level RFS, and eight more states enacted RFS policies to promote economic growth, reduce dependence on foreign oil, and reduce the transportation sector impact on the environment. Seventeen more states have recently considered legislation. The increase in renewable fuel policy activity captures the interest in promoting renewable fuels, but also allows for constructive comparison of approaches and possible impacts for the state, nation, and industry.

### **( ) State competition and innovation will result in superior solvency for the counter plan**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007  
["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",  
[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

In the United States, the RFS is directed toward the ethanol market, with instruction to the implementing agency (Environmental Protection Agency) to include cellulosic ethanol beyond 2012. While this provides incentive for innovation in the ethanol market, it does not provide for the development of a true, market based, renewable fuels standard as it does not promote cross-fuel competition and least cost compliance. Increased flexibility in policy compliance increases the opportunity for economically efficient competition in the renewable fuels market.

## States Solve – Renewable Energy

### **( ) States would try to increase the amount of alternative energy more than the federal government**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

Further, limiting the types of fuels able to fulfill the requirement has the potential to stifle innovation in the development of new renewable fuels to meet the goals of the government. Some states have recognized this challenge and allowed for other alternative or renewable fuels to meet the goals of the RFS. The Louisiana statute, for example, allows for other alternative fuels<sup>6</sup> to meet the fuel requirement (Louisiana 2006); and the proposed rules for state vehicles in Tennessee allow for expansion of fuel types to meet the requirement (Tennessee 2006a), possibly indicating a trend toward increased policy flexibility.

### **( ) State level action is ideal for improving the renewable energy market**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

["Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards",

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

Overall, activity in development of renewable fuels standards worldwide is evolving at a rapid pace, and lessons from existing and proposed policies as well as those in different sectors can inform the development of new policies. Challenges to policy development include the creation of clear and flexible goals with transparent compliance mechanisms and strong enforcement provisions. In addition, policies with strong stakeholder input and state support illicit buy-in from implementers and are more likely to lead to accomplishing stated goals. In the longer term, policies with fuel flexibility provisions will contribute most to innovation of lowest cost fuels for compliance and long-term meeting of the drivers behind encouraging and building a competitive market for renewable fuels.

## States Solve – Enforcement

### **( ) States can police their policies very effectively**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

[“Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards”,

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

Most currently enrolled RFS policies do not have detailed enforcement provisions included in their legislation and assign the development of regulations regarding compliance to a state agency. Because most policies were passed in the past year, regulations are not currently available, so it is difficult to estimate the extent to which enforcement will be included. Iowa offers relatively more detail within the legislation by allowing the state to initiate an “alternate civil enforcement action...for at least one hundred dollars but not more than one thousand dollars for each violation. Each day that a continuing violation occurs shall be considered a separate offense. If a party...fails to pay...the penalty...within thirty days...the state may initiate a criminal prosecution.” (Iowa 2006). Legislative direction regarding the repercussions of noncompliance to the agency responsible for developing regulations is a representation of active state support for the development of a market for renewable fuels.

### **( ) Non-compliance penalties show the states are dedicated to ethanol**

E. Brown, et al., National Renewable Energy Laboratory, January 2007

[“Understanding and informing Policy Environment: State-Level Renewable Fuel Standards”,

[dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy\\_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf](http://dnr.louisiana.gov/sec/execdiv/techasmt/energy_sources/renewable/UnderstandingandInformingPolicy-StateRFS.pdf)]

These compliance (and noncompliance) mechanisms send signals to market stakeholders regarding the importance of meeting the state obligations and goals. There is evidence within existing policies that enforcement of binding targets is critical to meeting program goals. For example, the longest running RFS – Hawaii’s 1994 law – did not contribute to the development of an ethanol market (the policy goal) until an enforcement policy was enacted when the legislation was amended in 2004 (Hawaii Revised Statutes 2006). Based on the Hawaii experience, as well as lessons learned by renewable portfolio standard policies (see section below), an enforceable policy is critical to the policy meeting its goals.

## States Counterplan Affirmative Answers

2AC Frontline – RPS	454
Strike Down	458
Uncertainty	459
2AC Frontline – Cap-and-Trade	461
2AC Frontline – Biofuels	464

## 2AC Frontline – RPS

**1. Permutation** – both the state governments and the federal government can enact a renewable portfolio standard. This would ensure there is better enforcement and funding of the counter plan if both the federal government and the state governments are involved.

**2. no solvency for the competitiveness advantage** – international businesses are not likely to view state action as confidently as the federal government, therefore resulting in less investment in renewable energy

**3. no solvency for the environmental racism advantage** – state action is seen as an excuse for the federal government not to deal with racism. we should not “footnote” racism by pushing it off on another actor.

## 2AC Frontline – RPS

**4. The Counterplan is unconstitutional** – it requires interstate trade of energy credits – resulting in the counter plan being struck down. it has zero solvency.

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, "Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard", *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

In 1992 utilities in Wyoming convinced the Supreme Court to overturn an Oklahoma statute requiring the state's regulated utilities to consume a certain percentage of Oklahoma-mined coal.<sup>40</sup> But the Supreme Court's 2002 decision upholding the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's jurisdiction over the transmission component of retail sales may be the starkest signal yet that regulated utilities can call upon the federal government to intervene when they feel unfairly. Thus, it is only a matter of time before utilities and lawmakers challenge the constitutionality of certain state RPS mandates.<sup>42</sup> Nevada, New Jersey, and Texas have all adopted restrictions that only count in-state renewable resources toward their respective RPS mandates. Similarly, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the District of Columbia stipulate that RPS-eligible renewable resources must come from within PJM's territory.<sup>43</sup> Some states have gone so far as to devalue RECs from other states. California's RPS, for example, requires RECs to be bundled with the electricity generated from renewable resources (which has the practical effect of restricting unbundled RECs from other states).<sup>44</sup> Even the California Public Utilities Commission has warned state policymakers that their position on out-of-state RECs may be constitutionally questionable.<sup>45</sup> While the legality of these restrictions has yet to be challenged on Commerce Clause grounds, Eisen warns that state and federal regulators are starting to engage in a kind of "Commerce Clause brinksmanship."<sup>46</sup> As recently as 2006, Constellation Energy threatened to sue Maryland's Public Utility Commission on Commerce Clause grounds for rejecting its merger with Baltimore Gas and Electric.<sup>47</sup> If a state RPS were found to violate the Commerce Clause, the practical effect would be its immediate repeal. While state legislatures could try to craft an RPS that would pass Constitutional muster or appeal to a higher court, one successful challenge would be enough to risk a cascade of copy-cat litigation as regulated entities piggyback on judicial precedent. In any event, the result is a risky and unpredictable regulatory environment threatening the longevity of state-based RPS mandates and the long-term stability of the nation's renewable energy market.

## 2AC Frontline – RPS

### **5. States often adopt differing interpretations of what counts for “renewable energy” – resulting in a conflicting business climate and less investment in renewable energy**

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, “Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard”, *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

Amid this complex tangle of regulations, stakeholders and investors must not only grapple with inconsistencies, they are forced to decipher vague and often competing state statutes.<sup>16</sup> In Connecticut, an unclear description of “electric suppliers” enabled the state’s Department of Public Utility Control to exempt two of the state’s largest utilities from RPS obligations. These exemptions created uncertainty over whether the statute would be enforced against any utilities at all.<sup>17</sup> In testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Don Furman, a senior vice president at PacifiCorp, lamented how “for multi-state utilities, a series of inconsistent requirements and regulatory frameworks will make planning, building, and acquiring generating capacity on a multi- state basis confusing and contradictory.”<sup>18</sup> The current state-by-state approach to RPS is also creating unanticipated difficulties to the expansion of distributed generation technologies. by forcing unusually prohibitive operational procedures. Inconsistent tariff structures and interconnection requirements add complexity (and therefore cost) to distributed generation projects. In fact, the Clean Energy Group, a coalition of electric generating and electric distribution companies committed to responsible environmental stewardship, forecasts that fuel cells and community-scale wind energy projects are unlikely to play a meaningful role in state RPS markets until policymakers adopt a more comprehensive and uniform approach.<sup>19</sup>

Contradictory and imprecise definitions of “renewable energy” in state RPS mandates make deciding what qualifies as a “renewable energy credit” exceedingly difficult. State-by-state differences and restrictions have splintered the national renewable energy market into regional and state markets with conflicting rules on the treatment and value of RECs.



## 2AC Frontline – RPS

### **6. State action will be tied up in the courts over legal uncertainties. This undermines the solvency for both advantages**

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, “Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard”, *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

In many states, ambiguities within the statutes and unclear expiration targets have created confusion among regulated utilities, resulting in protracted and expensive lawsuits. In Massachusetts, a vague definition of “renewable resources” precipitated legal battles over whether hydroelectric facilities were included in the standard or not.<sup>21</sup> In New Mexico, ambiguity over whether the state’s RPS applied to existing or new renewable energy technologies prompted a lawsuit from El Paso Electric that went all the way to the New Mexico Supreme Court.<sup>22</sup>

## Strike Down

**( )\_The counter plan violates the commerce clause of the constitution. it will be struck down, resulting in zero solvency.**

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, "Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard", *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

Joel B. Eisen doesn't mince words in declaring his belief that the retail electricity market represents the essence of interstate commerce: Electricity involves a national marketplace that reaches every American and cannot be carved into neatly defined or clearly distinct markets and regulatory jurisdictions. It is perhaps the clearest case of unfettered Commerce Clause jurisdiction extant today. Yet, state RPS mandates remain at perpetual risk from constitutional legal challenges. In many ways, the tension of state RPS policies regulating an interstate electricity market is founded on a legal house of cards that could collapse at any time. Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes." In the many years since ratification of the Constitution, the U.S. Supreme Court and other lower courts have consistently repealed state legislation that may hinder or prohibit interstate trade.

## Uncertainty

### **( ) Businesses would view a national rps as more certain – and therefore results in more solvency for competitiveness**

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, "Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard", *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

It should be apparent that a federal RPS would provide more clarity than a mishmash of state laws simply by preempting poorly conceptualized state statutes and providing a consistent regulatory framework. A federal mandate, for example, could clearly establish which utilities are subject to the regulation and could adopt a precise but flexible definition of eligible renewable resources. The best approach would refrain from mandating specific renewable energy technologies, adopting instead a requirement that eligible electricity be derived from renewable fuels. For example, a federal RPS could define as "renewable" any electricity derived from solar, wind, geothermal, sustainable biomass, or water energy, without specifying the technology required to harness that energy.

## Uncertainty

**( ) States are known for modifying their rps standards over the years. the counter plan just looks like another modification, and therefore will not spur investment**

Benjamin K. Sovacool is a Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices in New York, "Big Is Beautiful, The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard", *The Electricity Journal*, 2007.

The complexity of state-based RPS statutes is compounded by uncertainty over the duration of many state RPS programs. Stakeholders trying to plan investments in state renewable energy markets are tormented with unknowns.<sup>27</sup> New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island, for example, will review and potentially modify their RPS schemes in 2008, 2009, and 2010, respectively. Hawaii's standard expressly allows for its requirements to be waived if they prove to be "too costly" for retail electric providers and consumers.<sup>28</sup> Arizona, New Mexico, and Maine may terminate their RPS programs entirely.<sup>29</sup> When policy stability is assured, long-term project financing follows. But potential investors are less likely to assume risks where legislative or regulatory commitments are weak or constantly changing. Ten years ago, researchers at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory estimated that these uncertainties may increase the costs of renewable energy projects up to 50 percent compared with the probable costs under stable regulatory environments.<sup>30</sup> It is not hyperbole to suggest, therefore, that the instability inherent in a state-based approach to RPS is dramatically distorting private investments in renewable energy generation nationally.

## 2AC Frontline – Cap-and-Trade

**1. Permutation** – both the federal government and the states can act to reduce co2

**2. Counterplan links harder to the Business Confidence Disadvantage. Businesses prefer national regulation to state regulations**

Matthew D. Zinn, Environmental Law Fellow, California Center for Environmental Law and Policy, University of California, Berkeley, 2007 [Ecology Law Quarterly, 2007 p.lexis]

Moreover, as state efforts proliferate and diversify into a "patchwork" of varying regulatory requirements, pressure builds on state-regulated and potentially regulated firms to support preemptive federal regulation to impose uniformity and level the national playing field. n202 Indeed, the state regulatory landscape is beginning to look very much like that of the 1960s and 1970s, when a diversity of state programs precipitated the federalization of air and water quality regulation. n203 And Congress has begun to investigate and deliberate about the risks of climate change and potential mitigation, n204 and policy entrepreneurs with an eye on nationwide office have taken up climate change as an issue ripe for credit claiming and begun to offer competing proposals. n205 In fact, as this Article goes to press, the Supreme Court has just held upheld a challenge by several states and environmental groups to EPA's decision to refuse to regulate greenhouse gases under the mobile source provisions of the Clean Air Act. n206 Although the Court's decision does not guarantee that EPA will decide to regulate automobile emissions of greenhouse gases on remand, it certainly adds to the pressure on the agency to do so. That in turn puts pressure on the automobile industry to support comprehensive legislation to regulate greenhouse gas emissions to spread the regulatory burden to other carbon-intensive sectors of the economy. n207

## 2AC Frontline – Cap-and-Trade

### **3. The counter plan is unconstitutional and will be struck down**

Yvonne Gross, J.D. candidate, Thomas Jefferson School of Law, Fall, 2005  
[Thomas Jefferson Law Review, "NOTE: KYOTO, CONGRESS, OR BUST: THE CONSTITUTIONAL INVALIDITY OF STATE CO<sub>2</sub> CAP-AND-TRADE PROGRAMS" p.lexis]

This Note argues that while states have laudable reasons for addressing climate change concerns by attempting to regulate GHGs, such efforts are invalid in the face of fundamental [\*208] constitutional considerations. Any state or regional cap-and-trade program faces three different challenges. First, by their very nature, state-level CO<sub>2</sub> cap-and-trade programs as applied to the electric power sector create an undue burden on interstate commerce and discriminate against out-of-state commerce. States will be unable to establish a cap-and-trade program that is the least restrictive alternative to reducing emissions of GHGs, because while CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted from a number of different sectors, cap-and-trade programs tend to isolate a particular sector such as electric power generation. Scientific uncertainty regarding the causes of global warming will also make it difficult for a state to establish that there will in fact be a local benefit to regulating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. n12 Secondly, state-level cap-and-trade programs face a hurdle in the Supremacy Clause, which preempts any such programs because Congress intended to comprehensively occupy the field of regulation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Third, state cap-and-trade programs can be viewed as interfering with the federal government's power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, thus violating the Foreign Affairs Clause. These three constitutional concerns mean that any such state or local programs will be challenged and almost certainly struck down before they are even implemented. As such, any climate change policy to reduce GHGs must apply at the national level in order to avoid constitutional barriers. n13

**4. The counter plan cannot solve the soft power advantage** – in fact, it highlights the lack of federal action on global warming.

## 2AC Frontline – Biofuels

**1. Permutation** – Both the federal government and the states will impose a \$50-per-barrel price floor on oil, allocate \$500 millions for research and development of cellulosic biofuels, require all car manufacturers to offer a flex-fuel option for every model of car, and offer tax credits for the creation of biofuels pumps at filling stations.

**2. The Permutation solves best** - By creating more incentives for biofuels, the permutation will result in more biofuels produced more quickly. This means better solvency for both advantages.

**3. Counterplan links harder to the Business Confidence Disadvantage. Businesses prefer national regulation to state regulations**

Matthew D. Zinn, Environmental Law Fellow, California Center for Environmental Law and Policy, University of California, Berkeley, 2007 [Ecology Law Quarterly, 2007 p.lexis]

Moreover, as state efforts proliferate and diversify into a "patchwork" of varying regulatory requirements, pressure builds on state-regulated and potentially regulated firms to support preemptive federal regulation to impose uniformity and level the national playing field. n202 Indeed, the state regulatory landscape is beginning to look very much like that of the 1960s and 1970s, when a diversity of state programs precipitated the federalization of air and water quality regulation. n203 And Congress has begun to investigate and deliberate about the risks of climate change and potential mitigation, n204 and policy entrepreneurs with an eye on nationwide office have taken up climate change as an issue ripe for credit claiming and begun to offer competing proposals. n205 In fact, as this Article goes to press, the Supreme Court has just held upheld a challenge by several states and environmental groups to EPA's decision to refuse to regulate greenhouse gases under the mobile source provisions of the Clean Air Act. n206 Although the Court's decision does not guarantee that EPA will decide to regulate automobile emissions of greenhouse gases on remand, it certainly adds to the pressure on the agency to do so. That in turn puts pressure on the automobile industry to support comprehensive legislation to regulate greenhouse gas emissions to spread the regulatory burden to other carbon-intensive sectors of the economy. n207

## Carbon Tax Counterplan - Table of Contents

1NC Shell	465
Extension to Competition	467
Extension to Solvency	469
Net Benefit: Business Confidence	476
Net Benefit: Competitiveness	477
Answer To: High Gas Prices	478
Answer To: Uncertainty	479
Answer To: Hurts the Poor	480
Answer To: Corruption	483
Answer To: Acid Rain Solvency	485
Answer To: Unpopular	486
Answer To: International Cooperation	487



## 1NC Shell

**Text:** The United States Federal Government should implement a carbon tax policy designed to achieve [the same increase in alternative energy as the affirmative plan]. The government will implement offsetting reductions in other taxes so as to make the carbon tax policy revenue neutral.

**Observation One: The Counterplan Doesn't have to be Non-Topical.** The negative team's responsibility is to defeat the affirmative plan, not the entire resolution. We should be searching for the best policy option, which is the counterplan. This is not unfair to the affirmative as they could have run a carbon tax as their plan if they had wanted to.

**Observation Two: The Counterplan is Competitive.** It avoids the disadvantages of the affirmative plan. Carbon Taxes are Superior to Quantity Targets.

Los Angeles Times May 28, 2007

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ed-carbontax28may28,0,2888366.story?coll=la-opinion-leftrail>

Carbon taxes avoid all that. A carbon tax simply imposes a tax for polluting based on the amount emitted, thus encouraging polluters to clean up and entrepreneurs to come up with alternatives. The tax is constant and predictable. It doesn't require the creation of a new energy trading market, and it can be collected by existing state and federal agencies. It's straightforward and much harder to manipulate by special interests than the politicized process of allocating carbon credits. And it could be structured to be far less harmful to power consumers. While all the added costs under cap-and-trade go to companies, utilities and traders, the added costs under a carbon tax would go to the government — which could use the revenues to offset other taxes. So while consumers would pay more for energy, they might pay less income tax, or some other tax. That could greatly cushion the overall economic effect.

## 1NC Shell

### **Observation Three: The Counterplan Solves for Alternative Energy**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, April 15, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/myths/>

Standards and subsidies are blunt instruments -- vehicle efficiency standards don't influence vehicle usage, for example -- and are often contested for years and then undermined by "gaming" (viz., the 20-year stasis in CAFE standards, or tax credits for hybrid SUV's). Moreover, fuel usage is ever-changing and diffuse (more than 55% of petroleum is not used in cars or light trucks, for example), while efficiency standards are by nature both usage-specific and frozen in time. As for supply, it is the rare energy subsidy that has actually brought forth meaningful amounts of new energy. Economic theory predicts, and hard experience confirms, that only taxes on fuels can create the clear, rapid, across-the-board incentives needed to propel a massive shift to clean alternatives.

## Extension to Competition: Carbon Tax Better than Cap and Trade

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Are Superior To Cap-And-Trade**

Los Angeles Times May 28, 2007

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ed-carbontax28may28,0,2888366.story?coll=la-opinion-leftrail>

And yet for all its benefits, cap-and-trade still isn't the most effective or efficient approach. That distinction goes to Method No. 3: a carbon tax. While cap-and-trade creates opportunities for cheating, leads to unpredictable fluctuations in energy prices and does nothing to offset high power costs for consumers, carbon taxes can be structured to sidestep all those problems while providing a more reliable market incentive to produce clean-energy technology.

## Extension to Competition: Carbon Tax Better than Cap and Trade

### **2. Carbon Tax Superior To Cap-And-Trade – Many Reasons**

Charles **Komanoff**, **Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

We regard a carbon tax as superior to a carbon cap-and-trade system, for five fundamental reasons:

- \* Carbon taxes will lend predictability to energy prices, whereas cap-and-trade systems will do little to mitigate the price volatility that historically has discouraged investments in less carbon-intensive electricity generation, carbon-reducing energy efficiency and carbon-replacing renewable energy.

- \* Carbon taxes can be implemented much sooner than complex cap-and-trade systems. Because of the urgency of the climate crisis, we do not have the luxury of waiting while the myriad details of a cap-and-trade system are resolved through lengthy negotiations.

- \* Carbon taxes are transparent and easily understandable, making them more likely to elicit the necessary public support than an opaque and difficult to understand cap-and-trade system.

- \* Carbon taxes can be implemented with far less opportunity for manipulation by special interests, while a cap-and-trade system's complexity opens it to exploitation by special interests and perverse incentives that can undermine public confidence and undercut its effectiveness.

- \* Carbon tax revenues can be rebated to the public through dividends or tax-shifting, while the costs of cap-and-trade systems are likely to become a hidden tax as dollars flow to market participants, lawyers and consultants.

## Extension to Solvency: Carbon Tax Is Easy to Implement

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Are Easy To Calculate**

Charles **Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

The carbon content of every form of fossil fuel, from anthracite to lignite coal, from residual oil to natural gas, is precisely known. So is the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> released into the atmosphere when the fuel is burned. A carbon tax thus presents few if any problems of documentation or measurement. As discussed here, administering a carbon tax should be simple; utilizing existing tax collection mechanisms, the tax would be paid far "upstream" (e.g., at the point where fuels are extracted from the Earth and put into the stream of commerce, or imported into the U.S.). Fuel suppliers and processors would pass along the cost of the tax to the extent that market conditions allow.

### **( ) Revenue Neutral Carbon Taxes Are Easy To Implement**

Charles **Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

A carbon tax should be revenue-neutral. At least that's what we (Carbon Tax Center) and many other carbon tax proponents are advocating. Revenue-neutral means that little if any of the tax revenues raised by taxing carbon emissions would be retained by government. The vast majority of the revenues would be returned to the American people, with some small amount utilized to mitigate the otherwise negative impacts of carbon taxes on low-income energy users. Two primary return approaches are being discussed. One would rebate the revenues directly through regular (e.g., monthly) equal dividends to all U.S. residents. In effect, every resident would receive equal, identical slices of the total revenue pie. Just such a program has operated in Alaska for three decades, providing residents with annual dividends from the state's North Slope oil revenues. In the other method, each dollar of carbon tax revenue would trigger a dollar's worth of reduction in existing taxes such as the federal payroll tax or state sales taxes. As carbon-tax revenues are phased in (with the tax rates rising gradually but steadily, to allow a smooth transition), existing taxes will be phased out and, in some cases, eliminated. This "tax-shift" approach, while less direct than the dividend method, would also ensure that the carbon tax is revenue-neutral.

## Extension to Solvency: Carbon Tax Is Easy to Implement

### **( ) Revenue Neutral Green Taxes Are Easy To Devise**

Kevin Hassett, senior fellow, director of economic policy studies, American Enterprise Institute, ON THE ISSUES, August 9, 2007  
[http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub_detail.asp)

We should also implement a green tax swap. A green tax swap is the implementation of environmentally motivated taxes with the revenues used to lower other taxes in a revenue-neutral reform. For example, Congress could reduce reliance on oil and other polluting sources of energy through the implementation of a carbon tax. The revenues could be used to finance corporate tax reform or to finance reductions in the payroll tax.[12] Consider a tax of \$15 per metric ton of carbon dioxide. Focusing only on carbon[13] and assuming a short-term reduction in carbon emissions of 10 percent in response to the tax, a \$15-per-ton tax rate would collect nearly \$80 billion a year, a number that represents 28 percent of all corporate taxes collected in the United States in 2005. Assuming the carbon tax was fully passed forward into consumer prices, it would raise the price of gasoline by 13 cents a gallon, the cost of electricity generated by natural gas by 0.6 cents per kWh, and the cost of electricity generated by coal by 1.4 cents per kWh.

## Extension to Solvency: Reduces Coal Consumption

### **( ) Carbon Tax Would Hit Coal Harder Than Oil Or Natural Gas**

Charles **Komanoff**, **Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

Per unit of energy (or Btu), natural gas emits the least CO<sub>2</sub> of any fossil fuel when burned, and coal the most, with petroleum (oil) products such as gasoline occupying the middle range. Generally, a Btu from coal produces 30% more carbon dioxide than a Btu from oil, and 80% more than from natural gas. A carbon tax would follow these proportions, taxing coal somewhat more heavily than petroleum products, and much more than natural gas.

## Extension to Solvency: Reduces Fossil Fuel Burning

### **( ) The Carbon Tax Would Encourage Reductions In Fossil Fuel Consumption**

Charles **Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

A carbon tax must be the central mechanism for reducing carbon emissions. Currently, the prices of gasoline, electricity and fuels in general include none of the costs associated with devastating climate change. This omission suppresses incentives to develop and deploy carbon-reducing measures such as energy efficiency (e.g., high-mileage cars and high-efficiency heaters and air conditioners), renewable energy (e.g., wind turbines, solar panels), low-carbon fuels (e.g., biofuels from high-cellulose plants), and conservation-based behavior such as bicycling, recycling and overall mindfulness toward energy consumption. Conversely, taxing fuels according to their carbon content will infuse these incentives at every chain of decision and action — from individuals' choices and uses of vehicles, appliances, and housing, to businesses' choices of new product design, capital investment and facilities location, and governments' choices in regulatory policy, land use and taxation.



## Extension to Solvency: Energy Price Spikes

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Will Reduce Energy Price Spikes Compared To Cap-And-Trade**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

Carbon Taxes Will Lend Predictability to Energy Prices. With carbon taxes ramped up through a multi-year phase-in, future energy and power prices can be predicted with a reasonable degree of confidence well ahead of time. This will make it possible for literally millions of energy-critical decisions — from the design of new electricity generating plants to the purchase of the family car to the materials used in commercial airframes — to be made with full cognizance of carbon-appropriate price signals. In contrast, a cap-and-trade program will exacerbate the volatility of energy prices since the price of carbon allowances will fluctuate as weather and economic factors affect the demand for energy. The vaunted advantage of cap-and-trade — that future levels of carbon emissions can be known ahead of time — is mostly notional, moreover, since most cap-and-trade systems under discussion include a "safety-valve" for auctioning off additional carbon allowances if the price of allowances exceeds a predetermined level. And even certainty in future emission levels is of questionable value, since there is no agreed-upon trajectory of emissions for achieving climate stability and preventing disaster. The real target for which the U.S. must aim is to reduce carbon emissions as much as possible, and then more.

## Extension to Solvency: Easier than Quantity Caps

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Can Be Implemented More Quickly Than Cap-And-Trade**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

Carbon Taxes Will Provide Quicker Results. The taxes themselves can be designed and adopted quickly and fairly. Cap-and-trade systems, by contrast, are devilishly complex and will take years to develop and implement. Thorny issues must be addressed intellectually and resolved politically; the proper level of the cap, timing, allowance allocations, certification procedures, standards for use of offsets, penalties, regional conflicts, the inevitable requests for exceptions by affected parties and a myriad of other complex issues must all be resolved before cap-and-trade systems can be implemented. During this time, polluters will continue to emit carbon with no cost consequences.

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Are Much Easier To Implement Than Cap-And-Trade**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

Carbon Taxes Are Transparent and Are Easier to Understand than Cap-and-Trade. A carbon tax is transparent and easy to understand; the government simply imposes a tax per ton of carbon emitted, which is easily translated into a tax per kWh of electricity, gallon of gasoline or therm of natural gas. By contrast, the prices for carbon set under a cap-and-trade system will vary with market fluctuations and be impossible even for big business (let alone small businesses or consumers) to predict. A cap-and-trade system will require a complex and difficult to understand market structure in order to balance the many competing interests and ensure that the trading system minimizes abuse and maximizes real carbon reductions.

## Extension to Solvency: Easier than Quantity Caps

### **( ) Carbon Taxes Can Be Applied More Broadly Than Cap-And-Trade**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

Carbon Taxes Address All Sectors and Activities Producing Carbon Emissions. Carbon taxes target carbon emissions in all sectors — energy, industry and transportation — whereas at least some cap-and-trade proposals are limited to the electric industry. It would be unwise to ignore the non-electricity sectors that account for 60% of U.S. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

## Additional Net Benefit: Business Confidence

### **1. Carbon Taxes Better for Business Confidence**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

The "emissions certainty" touted by cap-and-trade supporters was recently put in perspective by the Financial Times: "[Carbon cap-and-trade systems] fix the amount of carbon abated, not its price. Getting the amount of emissions a little bit wrong in any year would hardly upset the global climate. But excessive volatility or unduly high prices of quotas on carbon emissions might disrupt the economy severely. [Carbon] taxes create needed certainty about prices, while markets in emission quotas [i.e., cap-and-trade systems] create unnecessary certainty about the short-term quantity of emissions." Financial Times, Carbon Markets Create a Muddle, April 26, 2007.

### **2. Price Volatility With Cap-And-Trade Will Discourage Innovation**

Los Angeles Times May 28, 2007  
<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ed-carbontax28may28,0,2888366.story?coll=la-opinion-leftrail>

Cap-and-trade would also have a nasty effect on consumers' power bills. Say there's a very hot summer week in California. Utilities would have to shovel more coal to produce more juice, causing their emissions to rise sharply. To offset the carbon, they would have to buy more credits, and the heavy demand would cause credit prices to skyrocket. The utilities would then pass those costs on to their customers, meaning that power bills might vary sharply from one month to the next. That kind of price volatility, which has been endemic to both the American and European cap-and-trade systems, doesn't just hurt consumers. It actually discourages innovation, because in times when power demand is low, power costs are low, and there is little incentive to come up with cleaner technologies. Entrepreneurs and venture capitalists prefer stable prices so they can calculate whether they can make enough money by building a solar-powered mousetrap to make up for the cost of producing it.

## Additional Net Benefit: Competitiveness

### **( ) The Predictability Provided By The Carbon Tax Would Mitigate Its Economic Impact Compared To The Alternatives**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, April 15, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/myths/>

What causes economic havoc isn't high energy prices or even rising prices, but price volatility. Even fairly steep price increases can be manageable so long as they're regular and predictable, particularly now that the share of economic activity occupied by the fossil fuels sector is at an historic low. And carbon taxes need not be draconian to accomplish their mission. Our program of recurring annual increases of \$37 per ton of emitted carbon equates to 5-10% increases in energy prices per annum (with the percentages shrinking as the "base" rises and as non-fossil energy assumes a larger share). By comparison, the average annual real increase in U.S. gasoline prices in 2003-07 was 11%, and this didn't stop the economy from growing at 3% a year. Needless to say, the true threat to the economy (and everything else) is unchecked climate change, as the Stern Report has shown.

### **( ) Carbon taxes would help U.S. Competitiveness**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, April 15, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/myths/>

In reality, increased energy taxes will shrink the trade deficit (by cutting both volumes and pre-tax prices of foreign oil), while reduced reliance on oil imports will make it harder to justify military expenditures and activities on grounds of protecting foreign supplies. The higher prices will also spark innovation in clean, efficient technologies better suited for world markets than, say, supersized automobiles. Finally, taxing energy will create parity with our traditional competitors -- the EU and Japan -- while encouraging like-minded actions in the emerging powerhouses of India and China.

## Answer to: Higher Gas Prices Make Taxes Irrelevant

### **( ) Energy Taxes Can Change Habits – Current Economic Growth Masks The Impact Of Rising Gasoline Prices On Consumption**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, April 15, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/myths/>

First, though gasoline prices have risen, they've gone up far less than is commonly believed. The U.S. average inflation-adjusted pump price in 2007 was only 54% higher than the 2003 price, not 100% or 200% higher. Second, use of gasoline and other energy is heavily driven by economic activity, and the U.S. economy expanded vigorously over these 4 years. Thus, the flattening in gasoline use during the recent expansion (up just 1.0% a year while GDP grew at 2.9% annually) demonstrates price elasticity. Price-responsiveness will grow over longer periods, as households have opportunities to buy more fuel-efficient vehicles and appliances and society transitions to a more fuel-efficient infrastructure -- once we enact fuel or carbon taxes to send clear and strong price signals.

## Answer to Uncertainty

### **( ) While Equal In Theory, In Practice Carbon Tax Certainty Is Crucial Compared To Cap-And-Trade**

Kevin Hassett, senior fellow, director of economic policy studies, American Enterprise Institute, ON THE ISSUES, August 9, 2007  
[http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub_detail.asp)

We note that a carbon tax is preferable to a carbon cap-and-trade system, as is currently implemented in Europe. While a carbon charge and a cap-and-trade system could be designed to bring about the same reduction in carbon emissions in a world with no uncertainty over marginal abatement costs, the instruments are not equivalent in a world with uncertainty. Given the uncertainties with respect to the introduction of new technologies to reduce carbon emissions, tax and permit systems can have very different efficiency costs. Because global warming depends on the stock of carbon in the atmosphere rather than on emissions in any one year, the expected efficiency costs of a carbon charge policy are likely to be much lower than the costs of a carbon cap-and-trade system.

## Answer To: Carbon Taxes Hurt the Poor

### **1. Carbon Taxes Can Be Made Progressive**

Charles **Komanoff**, **Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

A carbon tax, like any flat tax, is regressive — by itself. However, the regressivity of a carbon tax can be minimized, and perhaps eliminated altogether, by keeping the tax revenue-neutral in a way that protects the less affluent. The operative fact is that wealthier households use more energy. They generally drive and fly more, have bigger (and sometimes multiple) houses, and buy more stuff that requires energy to manufacture and use. As a result, most carbon tax revenues will come from families of above-average means, along with corporations and government. That is why the two “return” approaches discussed above — carbon dividends or tax-shifting — can turn the carbon tax into a progressive tax. Because income and energy consumption are strongly correlated, most poor households will get more back in carbon dividends than they will pay in the carbon tax. The overall effect of a carbon tax-shift could be equitable and perhaps even “progressive” (benefiting lower-earning households).



## Answer To: Carbon Taxes Hurt the Poor

### **2. Carbon Taxes Will Be More Equitable Than Cap-And-Trade**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

Carbon Taxes Can Produce a Far More Equitable Result than Cap-and-Trade. As discussed in our Issue Paper, Managing the Impacts, carbon taxes can be used to fund progressive tax-shifting to reduce regressive payroll or sales taxes. The costs of cap-and-trade systems, both implementation and the costs incurred as more expensive technologies replace older and less expensive coal-fired combustion, are far more likely to be imposed upon consumers with less possibility of rebating or tax-shifting. Moreover, because cap-and-trade relies on market participants to determine a fair price for carbon allowances on an ongoing basis, it could easily devolve into a self-perpetuating province of lawyers, economists, lobbyists and other market participants bent on maximizing their profits on each cap-and-trade transaction. As Holman W. Jenkins, Jr. stated in his Jan. 24, 2007 Wall Street Journal "Business World" column (subscription only):

General Electric, DuPont, Alcoa, Caterpillar and other industrial pigpens this week endorsed cap-and-trade limits on carbon dioxide, which would turn their established habit of using the atmosphere as a free waste disposal into a property right, worth billions. Talk about a low-hanging fruit. They are accustomed to treating carbon dumping as a gimme. Now they'd at least be in a position to get paid for dumping less.

The dollars that will be funneled into making the market work could be better spent reducing regressive taxes, protecting poorer households and/or helping consumers use less energy.

## Answer To: Carbon Taxes Hurt the Poor

### **3. Carbon Taxes Will Be More Progressive**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

The wealthy use more energy by far. For example, for every gallon of gas used by the poorest quintile (20%) of households, the richest quintile use three to four gallons. (See Slideshow, Slide #26.) The same holds for electricity, jet fuel, even diesel that fuels the trucks that deliver goods. Energy taxes can therefore be made progressive, i.e., beneficial to people of below-average means, by redistributing the tax revenues equally to all. As an alternative, the carbon tax revenues could be directed to "tax-shifting" -- reducing regressive taxes such as state sales taxes and federal social security check-offs. (See our Issues page, Managing the Impacts.) Energy-efficiency measures can be targeted to subsets of the population that stand to be harmed, such as the rural poor who must drive long distances for work. What's really regressive is the ongoing laissez-faire rises in fuel prices, not a penny of which is rebated to the public.

## Answer to: Carbon Taxes will be Corrupted

### **1. The Simplicity Of The Carbon Tax Will Help Prevent Corruption Of The Law**

Charles Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center, May 14, 2008  
<http://www.carbontax.org/issues/carbon-taxes-vs-cap-and-trade/>

A Carbon Tax's Simplicity Inoculates it Against the Perverse Incentives and Potential for Profiteering that Will Accompany Cap-and-Trade. In contrast to the simple and straightforward process of implementing a carbon tax, the protracted negotiations necessary to implement a cap-and-trade system will provide constant opportunities for the fossil fuel industry and other invested parties to shape a system that maximizes their financial self-interests as opposed to an economically efficient system that maximizes societal well-being. If allowances are allocated based on some type of baseline reflecting past pollution (which has been the practice with NOx and SO2 trading programs), rather than being auctioned, polluters will have perverse incentives to maximize emissions before the cap-and-trade system goes into effect in order to "earn" those pollution rights. (The voluntary carbon cap-and-trade system currently operating has already been criticized for questionable offsets that have produced huge profits but little environmental benefit.

### **2. Cap-And-Trade Easy To Corrupt**

Los Angeles Times May 28, 2007  
<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-ed-carbontax28may28,0,2888366.story?coll=la-opinion-leftrail>

The latter problem might be avoided in the U.S. by beefing up the Environmental Protection Agency. But there's reason to suspect that many of the corporate interests pushing for a federal cap-and-trade program are hoping for a seat at the table when credits are passed out, and they will doubtless fudge numbers to maximize their credits; some companies stand to make a great deal of money under a trading system. Also hoping to profit, honestly or not, would be carbon traders. Large financial institutions would jump into the exchange to collect commissions on carbon trades, just as they do with crude oil and wheat. This presents opportunities for Enron-style market manipulation.

## Answer to: Carbon Taxes will be Corrupted

### **3. Carbon Taxes More Difficult To Corrupt Through Lobbying**

Kevin Hassett, senior fellow, director of economic policy studies, American Enterprise Institute, ON THE ISSUES, August 9, 2007  
[http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.26625/pub_detail.asp)

Moreover, while a cap-and-trade system could be designed in which the carbon permits are sold rather than given away, experience to date suggests that they will be given away. In that case, governments give up substantial revenue with cap-and-trade systems with which they could lower other distortionary taxes, as discussed in this On the Issues. In a related vein, cap-and-trade systems generate substantial rent-seeking behavior, as firms lobby for grandfathering and generous allowances of permits once a program is put in place. While firms are likely to lobby over the specific carbon charge rate and possibly coverage of the tax, a carbon charge is not conducive to lobbying over allocations, unlike permit systems.

## Answer to: Cap and Trade Worked for Acid Rain

### **1. Success Of Acid Rain Cap-And-Trade Not Analogous To Carbon Burning Reductions**

Charles **Komanoff, Economist, Carbon Tax Center**, May 23, **2008**  
<http://www.carbontax.org/introduction/#what>

CTC has no ideological animus against cap-and-trade systems. In fact, the U.S. sulfur dioxide cap-and-trade system instituted in the early 1990s deserves some of the credit for efficiently reducing acid rain emissions from power plants. However, the scale of a carbon trading system — it would be up to 100 times larger than that for sulfur — combined with the lack of readily available “technical fixes” for filtering or capturing CO<sub>2</sub>, appear to rule out the sulfur cap-and-trade system as a model for carbon.

## Answer to: Taxes Unpopular

### **1. Political Opposition To Carbon Tax Can Be Reduced Through Offsetting Tax Cuts**

Gregory **Mankiw, professor economics, Harvard**, New York Times, September 16, **2007**  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/16/business/16view.html>

Yet this natural aversion to carbon taxes can be overcome if the revenue from the tax is used to reduce other taxes. By itself, a carbon tax would raise the tax burden on anyone who drives a car or uses electricity produced with fossil fuels, which means just about everybody. Some might fear this would be particularly hard on the poor and middle class. But Gilbert Metcalf, a professor of economics at Tufts, has shown how revenue from a carbon tax could be used to reduce payroll taxes in a way that would leave the distribution of total tax burden approximately unchanged. He proposes a tax of \$15 per metric ton of carbon dioxide, together with a rebate of the federal payroll tax on the first \$3,660 of earnings for each worker.

## Answer to: Quantity Targets Better for International Cooperation

### **1. Carbon Taxes Would Be Easier To Use As A Basis For A Global Climate Regime Than Cap-And-Trade**

Gregory **Mankiw, professor economics, Harvard**, New York Times, September 16, **2007**

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/16/business/16view.html>

Agreement on a truly global cap-and-trade system, however, is hard to imagine. China is unlikely to be persuaded to accept fewer carbon allowances per person than the United States. Using a historical baseline to allocate allowances, as is often proposed, would reward the United States for having been a leading cause of the problem. But allocating carbon allowances based on population alone would create a system in which the United States, with its higher standard of living, would buy allowances from China. American voters are not going to embrace a system of higher energy prices, coupled with a large transfer of national income to the Chinese. It would amount to a massive foreign aid program to one of the world's most rapidly growing economies. A global carbon tax would be easier to negotiate. All governments require revenue for public purposes. The world's nations could agree to use a carbon tax as one instrument to raise some of that revenue. No money needs to change hands across national borders. Each government could keep the revenue from its tax and use it to finance spending or whatever form of tax relief it considered best.

## Carbon Tax Counterplan Affirmative Answers

2AC Frontline

489



## 2AC Frontline

**1. Permutation: do both. The Best Policy Would be to Have Quantity Targets and Use Carbon Taxes to Get to those Targets. It is the best of Both Worlds.**

**2. The Negative Indictments of Quantity Targets Don't Assume the Specific Details of Our Plan.**

**3. Quantity Target Policies Are More Certain To Reach Targets Than Carbon Taxes**

William Chameides, Environmental Defense, Science Magazine, March 23, 2007 p.1670

As the United States moves inevitably toward climate legislation, discussion has shifted from the science to the policy options for slowing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other greenhouse gases. Some favor a tax on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions--referred to as a C tax (1). Others favor government subsidies (2). If high enough to alter consumer behavior, a carbon tax would reduce emissions by raising the effective price of carbon-intensive energy relative to carbon-free sources. Subsidies may speed development of specific, targeted low-C technologies. But a market-based system with an economywide cap on emissions and trading of emission allowances would do the same, while having distinct advantages (3). Most important, a cap-and-trade system, coupled with adequate enforcement, assures that environmental goals actually would be achieved by a certain date. Given the potential for escalating damages and the urgent need to meet specific emission targets (4), such certainty is a major advantage. A federal cap-and-trade system could be incorporated into existing emissions trading frameworks and markets, such as the Kyoto Protocol's international market or subnational ones like the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative.

## 2AC Frontline

### **4. Hard Quantity Caps More Certain To Solve, Carbon Tax May Not Solve**

Nat Keohane, Director of Economic Policy and Analysis, Environmental Defense Fund, September 17, 2007

[http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw\\_response/](http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw_response/)

Why is this better? We need a hard cap on carbon to ensure that greenhouse gas concentrations don't reach dangerous levels. A tax would provide some incentive for reducing emissions, but it would leave the amount of reductions up in the air - literally. Moreover, a tax wouldn't provide the same spur to innovation that an emissions market would. A carbon tax would only give us technologies that are cheaper than the tax - it caps innovation rather than emissions.

### **5. Carbon Tax Plans Without Increased Spending On Alternatives Won't Work**

Monica Prasad, fellow, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, New York Times March 23, 2008

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/25/opinion/25prasad.html>

The next president of the United States seems sure to be more committed to environmental policy than the current president is, and a carbon tax is high on everyone's list of options. Indeed, a carbon tax has been promoted almost as a panacea — just pop in the economic incentives and watch them work their magic. But unless steps are taken to lock the tax revenue away from policymakers and invest in substitutes, a carbon tax could lead to more revenue rather than to less pollution.

## 2AC Frontline

### **6. Cap-And-Trade Systems Create Incentives For Biodiversity-Friendly Carbon Storage Options**

William Chameides, Environmental Defense, Science Magazine, March 23, 2007  
p.1670

Cutting emissions of pollutants is admittedly not as complicated as cutting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and transaction costs can be a factor. Nevertheless, the United States was able to reduce sulfur oxide emissions ahead of schedule and at 30% of the projected cost using a market-based cap-and-trade system (5). Elimination of lead from gasoline and phase-out of ozone-depleting chemicals were also facilitated by emissions trading programs. Offsetting emissions by storing carbon in soils, forests, and other forms of biomass in the United States has the potential to offset 10 to 20% of U.S. emissions in 2025 at relatively low cost (see chart below and table S1). International opportunities also exist. Deforestation of tropical rainforests is currently estimated to cause more than 7000 million metric tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the equivalent of about 25% of worldwide emissions from fossil fuel burning today; in 2025 the percentage is estimated to be about 15% (table S2). Using an international cap-and-trade market to compensate nations for slowing deforestation would bring a significant block of emissions under management, while preserving irreplaceable ecosystems and providing income to developing economies (6-8).

## 2AC Frontline

### **7. Quantity Targets are Superior To Carbon Tax In Achieving International Agreement**

Nat Keohane, Director of Economic Policy and Analysis, Environmental Defense Fund, September 17, 2007

[http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw\\_response/](http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw_response/)

Mankiw's second argument rests on the dubious assertion that a global carbon tax would be "easier to negotiate" than an international cap-and-trade system. But this flies in the face of economics and political reality, as well as the expert judgment of many economists who have studied this topic in detail. For an international system to minimize costs, the marginal cost of emissions reductions must be the same everywhere - that is, the cost of cutting a ton of CO2 must be the same in Beijing and Boston. This means that the tax must be the same everywhere. Does anyone think that China and India would - or should - accept the same carbon tax as the U.S. and Europe? An international cap-and-trade system is a more natural framework for inviting participation by developing countries. It provides an automatic mechanism for rich countries to compensate poor countries while still taking advantage of the low-hanging fruit (the cheap emissions reductions) that are possible in the developing world. It's the difference between saying to China and India and the rest of the developing world, "If you join this international agreement, you can tax your citizens!" versus "If you join this international agreement and accept a binding cap, you can sell permits into our market!"

### **8. Carbon Taxes Aren't Working In European Nations**

Monica Prasad, fellow, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, New York Times March 23, 2008

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/25/opinion/25prasad.html>

But a carbon tax isn't a new idea. Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden have had carbon taxes in place since the 1990s, but the tax has not led to large declines in emissions in most of these countries — in the case of Norway, emissions have actually increased by 43 percent per capita. An economist might say this is fine; as long as the cost of the environmental damage is being internalized, the tax is working — and emissions might have been even higher without the tax. But what environmentalist would be happy with a 43 percent increase in emissions?

## 2AC Frontline

### **9. Carbon Tax Policies Just As Vulnerable To Corruption**

Nat Keohane, Director of Economic Policy and Analysis, Environmental Defense Fund, September 17, 2007

[http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw\\_response/](http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw_response/)

Prof. Mankiw gives two reasons for supporting a tax over a cap-and-trade system. First, he argues that a carbon tax would raise revenue that could be used for other purposes, such as reducing the federal payroll tax. But carbon tax revenues could just as easily be returned to power companies and other carbon emitters. A carbon tax is not a magic wand to ward off the scramble for spoils that accompanies any new source of revenue in Washington.

### **10. Carbon Tax Can't Encourage Reductions in Deforestation**

Nat Keohane, Director of Economic Policy and Analysis, Environmental Defense Fund, September 17, 2007

[http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw\\_response/](http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2007/09/17/mankiw_response/)

Another key to minimizing costs is achieving the widest possible participation. In addition to China and India, a cap-and-trade framework provides incentives for tropical forest nations to reduce deforestation - a proposal our international team calls Compensated Reduction. A carbon tax would do nothing to address the deforestation problem, which accounts for 20 percent of greenhouse gas emissions.

## 2AC Frontline

### **11. Since The Impacts Of Global Warming Are Non-Linear, Quantity Targets, Not Price Targets, Make The Most Sense**

Nat Keohane, Director, Econ. Policy and Analysis, Environmental Defense Fund,  
Feb. 21, 2008

[http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2008/02/21/cbo\\_report\\_tax\\_vs\\_cap/](http://environmentaldefenseblogs.org/climate411/2008/02/21/cbo_report_tax_vs_cap/)

Far from being constant and predictable, the damage from climate change is nonlinear and uncertain. Scientists tell us that climate change is subject to "tipping points" - that after a certain threshold is reached, climate can change in qualitative and discontinuous ways. For example, at 32°F ice changes to water. The best known climate tipping point affects the Greenland Ice Sheet, which could begin a slow, irreversible meltdown if global temperature passes a certain threshold. (For more on tipping points, see our post on "9 Dangerous Tipping Elements".) A carbon cap sets a quantity target - the amount of emissions is certain, the price is uncertain. A carbon tax sets a price target - the price is certain, and the amount of emissions is uncertain. If the amount of emissions has a predictable cost, then it makes sense to base policy on price. But this is not the case in a climate system subject to tipping points. If we exceed our "carbon budget", the costs could become astronomical. Scientists may differ on exactly what our carbon budget should be, but there's no question that a quantity target is what's required. When the central problem is setting the right quantity - how much we can safely emit in total - then the arguments that support a carbon tax flip in favor of cap-and-trade. The CBO report actually acknowledges this. Almost as an aside, the report points out that the existence of a threshold or "tipping point" for the consequences of climate change "could make a cap more efficient than a tax."

### **12. The CP Is Topical – It's An Incentive To Increase Alternative Energy.**

The negative has the burden to refute the resolution, not agree with it. The resolution exists to divide ground fairly, we have to be topical, they have to be non-topical. While finding the best policy is important, so is the underlying notion of the fairness of the set up. If the rules aren't fair, then the best policy can't be correctly evaluated.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Table of Contents

1NC Frontline	496
Link Extensions – Incentives	500
Link Extensions – Cap and Trade	501
Link Extensions – Nuclear Power	506
Link Extensions – Biofuels	508
Link Extensions – Carbon Taxes	510
Extensions for Alternative	511
Extensions for Impacts	513

## Environmental Justice Critique – 1NC Frontline

### **A. Thesis – Energy Policies That Harm Communities Of Color Amount To Environmental Racism**

Deborah Robinson, Executive Director, Intl. Possibilities Unlimited, 2001  
<http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/jpc/echoes/echoes-17-02.html>

In the United States, the victims of environmental racism are African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, who are more likely than Whites to live in environmentally hazardous conditions. Three out of five African Americans live in communities with uncontrolled toxic waste sites. Native American lands and sacred places are home to extensive mining operations and radioactive waste sites. Three of the five largest commercial hazardous waste landfills are located in predominantly African American and Latino communities. As a consequence, the residents of these communities suffer shorter life spans, higher infant and adult mortality, poor health, poverty, diminished economic opportunities, substandard housing, and an overall degraded quality of life. Environmental racism, therefore, is a new manifestation of historic racial oppression.



## Environmental Justice Critique – 1NC Frontline

### **B. Link. Market-Based Solutions – “Incentives” – Encourage Pollution In Low Income Communities**

Stephen M. Johnson, professor, Mercer Law School, Market-Based Pollution Controls and Environmental Justice, 2003  
<http://www.law.mercer.edu/elaw/smj.htm>

While the traditional command and control approach has not prevented environmental injustice, market-based approaches will inevitably exacerbate the problems. Although the traditional command and control laws do not require the government to avoid disparate impacts, they also do not affirmatively encourage unequal distribution of pollution. By contrast, many market-based approaches affirmatively encourage polluters to shift pollution to low-income communities. Classical economic theory suggests that in a free market economy, resources are shifted to those uses in which the value to consumers, as measured by their willingness to pay is highest. That is when the market is operating efficiently. However, most economists incorporate “ability to pay” into “willingness to pay”, so that an efficient economic system by definition will shift pollution to low-income communities. Because wealthy communities are willing to pay (or rather able to pay) more for clean air and clean water than low-income communities, the market operates efficiently when it funnels those resources to the wealthy communities, rather than the low-income communities. In addition, many market failures prevent low-income communities from even participating in the bargaining process for environmental and health benefits. (a) Information deficits; (b) financial limits; and (c) limited opportunities for public participation reduce the opportunities for low-income communities to participate in the bargaining for environmental and health benefits.

## Environmental Justice Critique – 1NC Frontline

### **C. Impact. Failure To Adopt An Environmental Justice Paradigm Will Lead To Human Extinction**

Tom Stephens, Lawyer, Detroit, COUNTERPUNCH, March 28, 2005  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/stephens03282005.html>

Trying to protect the essential environmental interests and fundamental human rights of indigenous peoples, and other people of color and low-income people, within the dominant, hierarchical and linear framework of what we know as "environmental law," is like trying to fit a big round ball into a small square box. It is bound to fail. And because of the huge global issues at stake in today's world regarding environmental health and human survival, if we continue to pursue this failed strategy, we will eventually fail ecologically, socially, economically, and as a matter of human survival. No amount of scientific regulation or careful legal or administrative weighing of data will change this stark reality.

## Environmental Justice Critique – 1NC Frontline

### **D. Alternative: Decentering The Debate On Environmental Justice Is The Way To Fully Interrogate Policy Ideas**

Larry Lohmann, Corner House researcher, CARBON TRADING: A Critical Conversation on Climate Change, Privatisation and Power, Development Dialogue, #48 Sept. 2006 p. 350-1

Every individual showing concern over the climate crisis deserves respect. But respect also involves acknowledging that different people have different backgrounds, loyalties and understandings. The notion that the ideas of a Lovelock, a Watson or an IPCC should go uninterrogated by Indian villagers, Peruvian fisherfolk, or poor communities across the fence from Louisiana oil refineries is simply irrational. Such ideas need to be evaluated by people who know from experience what commodification of land, water and air mean to the poor, what the effects of nuclear contamination are, and how the World Bank's climate policy works on the ground – and who have their own interests and are evolving their own contributions toward dealing with the crisis. The initiatives of organisations and networks such as Oilwatch, Palang Thai, Platform, Friends of the Earth, the Centre for Science and Environment, Rising Tide, the New Economics Foundation, the Durban Group for Climate Justice and tens of thousands of other groups, many of them located at the grassroots in both South and North, already go far beyond the default thinking of global elites. But work on climate change and the search for ways out of the crisis can't be carried forward fruitfully without an even more thoroughgoing decentering of the debate. Any study of 'alternatives' must begin with this truth – not with a call for yet more formulas to feed to, and nourish, the institutions that bear so much of the responsibility for the climate crisis and many others.

## Environmental Justice Critique – "incentives" Link

### **( ) Climate Justice Requires Rejecting Market Orthodoxy**

M.K. Dorsey, professor of global environmental policy, Dartmouth College, Foreign Policy in Focus, June 19, 2007 <http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/4313>

The demand for climate justice is thus a subset of a wider set of discussions and demands for environmental justice. These demands are not just positions against authority. To the contrary, demanding climate justice is an expression of hope -- indeed, desire and love -- and a demand for objectives rooted in collective decision-making that are well beyond the provisional scope of power as presently conceived. The climate justice movement is therefore one of liberation as well as economic and ideological sovereignty. Prophetically, the struggle for climate justice dares to demand changing the world without reproducing hierarchical state or market power. Those articulating the demand for climate justice are by no means uniform in belief or message. Yet they represent a coherent if eclectic mix of ways of knowing, bound together by one common belief: that the present market orthodoxies are insufficient to resolve the crisis of climate change, and other paths are both necessary, practical, and possible. To the extent to which the dominant ideological and economic orthodoxies fail to address the crisis, they are increasingly beleaguered and withering. The demand for climate justice at its broadest coincides both pragmatically and inspirationally with playwright and former Czech president Vaclav Havel's suggestion: "We must not be afraid of dreaming the seemingly impossible if we want the seemingly impossible to become a reality."

## Environmental Justice Critique – Cap and Trade Links

### **( ) Cap And Trade Proposals Increase Environmental Injustice**

M.K. Dorsey, professor of global environmental policy, Dartmouth College, Foreign Policy in Focus, June 19, 2007 <http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/4313>

On a global scale, carbon trading is little more than an untested economic experiment that may not avert climate catastrophe in time. Moreover, carbon trading aids and abets climate injustice. In the main, trading is designed to parcel, privatize, and sell the right to pollute carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The very same petroleum, natural gas, and electricity concerns disproportionately responsible for carbon dioxide emissions and climate change -- who denied the existence of climate change and are now urging gradual steps to address it -- all stand to make windfall profits on untested and perhaps unverifiable cap-and-trade schemes buoyed up by increasingly fraudulent numbers of "offset projects."

## Environmental Justice Critique – Cap and Trade Links

### **( ) Permit Trading Policies Encourage Toxic Hot Spots In Low-Income Communities**

Stephen M. Johnson, professor, Mercer Law School, Market-Based Pollution Controls and Environmental Justice, 2003  
<http://www.law.mercer.edu/elaw/smj.htm>

Let's look first at pollution trading programs to see the potential disparate impacts. The major distributional concern raised by pollution trading systems is that while trading programs limit the total amount of pollution that can be discharged through the program, most trading programs do not impose geographic limits on trades. As a result, while the programs may reduce overall pollution levels, they could actually increase pollution levels in specific areas, creating "toxic hot spots." Because it is often easier for new companies to install new technologies or change production process to reduce pollution than it is for older companies to retrofit their plants to reduce pollution, older, heavily polluting industries are most likely to find that it is more cost-effective for them to continue polluting and to buy the right to pollute than to install new controls. Older plants already have incentives to continue to pollute at levels higher than new plants because many of the federal environmental laws include grandfather provisions that allow older plants to comply with less stringent standards than new plants. The result is likely to be that the "toxic hot spots" that are created will likely be centered around older, heavily polluting industries. If the trading programs create hot spots, economic theory suggests that the hot spots will most likely occur in low-income communities. There are several reasons for this. First, heavily polluting industries are more often sited in low income communities, according to federal pollution data. Second, low income communities may be less likely to urge a polluter to implement new pollution controls instead of buying the right to pollute, because they may fear that if they pressure the polluter to adopt new controls, the polluter may decide to close, depriving them of essential jobs and tax revenue. Finally, low income communities often lack the political power to influence industries to adopt new pollution controls instead of buying pollution rights.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Cap and Trade Links

### **( ) International Trading Markets Create Global Hot Spots**

Center for Progressive Reform, 2005

<http://www.progressiveregulation.org/perspectives/intlenvironJustice.cfm>

But even a well-developed emissions trading approach poses environmental justice problems. One danger of such market-based programs is that they can create “hot spots,” or concentrations, of emissions and thus potentially create (or aggravate) racial and class inequalities in the distribution of pollution and its impacts. (See CPR’s Emission Trading Perspective) The Kyoto Protocol’s market-based options for greenhouse gas reductions raise other environmental justice concerns as well. For instance, Kyoto would allow developed countries like the United States to invest in large-scale fast-growing tree plantations (so-called “carbon sinks”) in developing countries to earn tradable carbon credits. This approach would result in further deforestation in these countries, deplete water resources and increase poverty. Tree plantations do not allow for biological diversity, demand massive use of chemicals, and allow for future logging activities. The loss of biological diversity, in particular, has severe distributional consequences because local communities in or near the lands targeted for plantations depend on the plants native to their surroundings for food, medicine, clothing, shelter and cultural survival. Thus, these plantations threaten to cause social and cultural disruption for these communities.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Cap and Trade Links

### **( ) Carbon Markets Abstract The Concept Of Place, Leading To Adverse Environmental Impacts On Low-Income Communities**

Larry Lohman, Carbon Trading, Climate Justice and the Production of Ignorance: Ten Examples, Development, 2008 p.4

Third, if carbon markets necessarily abstract from *how* emissions cuts are made, they also abstract from *where* they are made - again in the cause of maximizing cost-effectiveness. But this abstraction systematically obscures the significance of place. This gap is likely to be damaging to social equality, since the industries most firmly locked into fossil fuel exploitation or use, and most likely to be carbon pollution right buyers, tend to have a disproportionate adverse effect on poorer and disadvantaged communities. Carbon trading also requires downplaying the different ecological effects that pollution can have in different biomes. Another way carbon trading encourages ignorance has to do with the way it discounts the enormous distances between, on the one hand, carbon-credit figures appearing on computer screens in the urban offices of carbon consultants, UN officials, bankers, hedge fund managers and ministries and, on the other, the complex politics, biology and physics of hydroelectric dam or wind farm sites in less industrialized countries, together with the social and technological arenas in which flows of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse molecules are imagined and negotiated by scientists and technicians. British buyers of offsets from a company that has contracted with an elite conservationist organization in Rajasthan to provide biogas cooking stoves for rural villagers near a remote tiger reserve 7,000 kilometres away are unlikely ever to have the chance to verify what effects the project is having on local wood-gathering practices or class relations, much less its climatic effects (Ghosh and Kill, forthcoming). Yet they are encouraged to believe that they can understand all factors relevant to the transaction.



## Environmental Justice Critique – Cap and Trade Links

### **( ) Empirically, The Cap-And-Trade Policy For Acid Rain Had Adverse Environmental Justice Effects**

Larry Lohmann, Corner House researcher, CARBON TRADING: A Critical Conversation on Climate Change, Privatisation and Power, Development Dialogue, #48 Sept. 2006 p. 350-1

In geographical terms, though, the effects have clearly been uneven. While sulphur dioxide levels fell in the aggregate during the 1990s, they barely changed in the swath from Columbus, Ohio, to northern West Virginia. Hot spots have persisted east of Erie, Pennsylvania and near Kingston and Oswego, New York and Oak Ridge, Tennessee, according to the National Atmospheric Deposition Program. Since 1995, according to a study by the United States Public Interest Research Group, 300 of the 500 dirtiest plants actually increased sulphur dioxide emissions.<sup>214</sup> The government's Environmental Protection Agency found that emissions increased in Texas and Alabama, with effects felt in Florida.<sup>215</sup> In the 1990s, some locations, a large majority of which were poor and predominantly communities of colour, reported increased emissions of sulphur dioxide and resultant toxic co-pollutants such as particulate matter and volatile organic compounds. <sup>216</sup> This prompted the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, a government appointed body, to oppose any expansion of pollution trading schemes in the US and called on the US government to address the environmental justice impacts of emissions trading.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Nuclear Power Links

### **( ) Nuclear Plants Are Sited In Poor Communities**

Nuclear Information and Resource Service, 2004  
<http://www.nirs.org/ejustice/ejustice.htm>

Environmental Justice is the concept that major polluting projects should not have a disproportionate impact on minority and poor communities. Nuclear waste dumps, toxic incinerators, atomic reactors and other such facilities typically are located where there is cheap land, cheap facilities, and little organized opposition. Too often, this has been in minority and poor communities that have felt powerless to oppose corporate giants.

### **( ) Nuclear Energy Impacts Communities Of Color Many Ways**

“Energy and Environmental Justice,” Energy Justice Network, November 2007 p.1

Nuclear power disproportionately affects communities of color, from the mining of uranium on Native American lands, to the targeting of black and Hispanic communities for new uranium processing facilities to the targeting of black and Hispanic and Native American communities for so-called “low-level” nuclear waste disposal sites. All of the sites proposed for “temporary” and permanent storage of high-level nuclear waste (nuclear reactor fuel rods) have been Native American lands.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Nuclear Power Links

### **( ) Nuclear Accident Would Kill Thousands Of Nearby Residents**

Brice Smith, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, INSURMOUNTABLE RISKS: The Dangers of Using Nuclear Power to Combat Global Climate Change, 2006, Exec. Summary p. 9

In addition to its link to nuclear weapons proliferation, the potential for a catastrophic reactor accident or well coordinated terrorist attack to release a large amount of radiation makes nuclear power a uniquely dangerous source of electricity. Such a release could have extremely severe consequences for human health and the environment, would require very expensive cleanup and decontamination efforts, and would leave buildings and land dangerously contaminated well into the future. Adding to the uncertainty of estimating the potential impacts of such accidents is the fact that the last systematic analysis released by the U.S. government was completed nearly a quarter of a century ago. That study, entitled Calculation of Reactor Accident Consequences for U.S. Nuclear Power Plants (CRAC-2) conducted at Sandia National Laboratories, found that a worst case accident at many power plants could cause tens of thousands of deaths from prompt radiation effects and long-term fatal cancers and cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damage.

### **( ) Burden Of Nuclear Waste Falls On Indigenous Peoples**

Brice Smith, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, INSURMOUNTABLE RISKS: The Dangers of Using Nuclear Power to Combat Global Climate Change, 2006, Exec. Summary p. 13

Finally, the difficulty of managing the radioactive wastes generated by the nuclear fuel cycle is one of a longest standing challenges accompanying the use of nuclear power. In addition to its long half-life and its high radiotoxicity, the existence of large quantities of weapons usable plutonium in the spent fuel from commercial power plants complicates the waste management problem by raising concerns over nuclear weapons proliferation.<sup>63</sup> This link between nuclear waste and nuclear weapons makes reprocessing technologies highly undesirable, even if they could somehow be made economical and could overcome their significant environmental problems. Finally, it is important to note that the impacts of nuclear waste have so far fallen disproportionately on Indigenous Peoples in the United States and around the world, which raises serious concerns about environmental justice.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Biofuels Links

### **1. Ethanol Refineries Emit Toxic Pollution And Look To Be Sited Near Other Power Plants**

Energy Justice Network, Factsheet: Ethanol Biorefineries, March 6, 2007  
<http://www.energyjustice.net/ethanol/factsheet.html>

Ethanol production is very energy intensive, requiring mini-power plants just to produce the steam they need. Some proposed ethanol plants have sought to locate next to existing trash incinerators, waste coal power plants or other industries capable of sharing steam with their new industrial neighbors. This may save energy, but it results in the concentrating of polluting industries in already poisoned communities. Most ethanol plants have their own power production facilities, usually burning natural gas, but nearly all of the proposed new facilities would burn coal, due to high gas prices.<sup>19</sup> Some of the proposed ethanol plants are seeking to install gasification-style incinerators capable of burning anything from very toxic waste streams like trash, tires, plastics, construction and demolition wood waste to lesser contaminated wastes like animal, crop and food production wastes and forestry residues. All of these fuels have their own set of contaminants that would be released into the community through air pollution and the production of toxic ash. Since the facility can make more money serving as a waste disposal site by taking the more dangerous waste streams, this economic incentive will encourage these plants to become de facto incinerators for trash and tires.

### **2. Ethanol Production Releases Pollution In Nearby Areas**

Energy Justice Network, Factsheet: Ethanol Biorefineries, March 6, 2007  
<http://www.energyjustice.net/ethanol/factsheet.html>

Other parts of the biorefinery production process release pollution as well. Prodded by hundreds of complaints at the Gopher State Ethanol plant in St. Paul, where residents complained that the plant smelled like "rubbing alcohol mixed with burning corn," the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency began testing emissions from the plant. They found high levels of carbon monoxide, methanol, toluene and other Volatile Organic Compounds, including formaldehyde and acetaldehyde, both of which are known to cause cancer in animals.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Biofuels Links

### **( ) Law Suits Don't Solve Ethanol Production Air Pollution**

Energy Justice Network, Factsheet: Ethanol Biorefineries, March 6, 2007  
<http://www.energyjustice.net/ethanol/factsheet.html>

The EPA then tested other ethanol plants and concluded that "most, if not all" ethanol plants are emitting air pollutants at many times the rate allowed by their permits. Between 2002 and 2005, EPA settled cases with ADM and Cargill, the largest ethanol producers, over their 9 ethanol plants, forcing them to pay out over \$485 million for these and other facilities, mostly to invest in afterburners to burn off the exhaust gases that cause most of the odors. Settlements with 12 Minnesota ethanol plants resulted in similar requirements to cut back on emissions of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, particulates, and other hazardous pollutants. Even after installing new equipment, neighborhood residents continue to complain of odors and ill health effects, since emissions still continue through leaking pipes and through vents when the pollution control equipment isn't working.

## Energy Taxes Links

### **( ) Energy Taxes Have Regressive Impacts**

Stephen M. Johnson, professor, Mercer Law School, Market-Based Pollution Controls and Environmental Justice, 2003  
<http://www.law.mercer.edu/elaw/smj.htm>

Pollution taxes can also have disparate impacts on low income communities because they can have a regressive impact. For instance, low income households would feel the impacts of an energy tax more keenly than high income households because low income households spend a greater proportion of their income on heat, electricity and gasoline than high-income households. Similarly, variable rate waste disposal fees impose more significant financial burdens on low income residents than on higher income residents.

## Alternative Extensions

### **( ) Decentering Has Achieved Progressive Social Analysis Before**

Larry Lohmann, Corner House researcher, CARBON TRADING: A Critical Conversation on Climate Change, Privatisation and Power, Development Dialogue, #48 Sept. 2006 p. 350-1

Radical university scholars are sometimes ridiculed for the funny words they use. But behind some of their words lurk useful ideas. One such word is 'decentering'. The old standard elite university curricula, many radical academics say, should perhaps not be thrown out, but rather 'decentered': modified and expanded to include suppressed voices and achievements. Traditional fields of study should not be abandoned, but supplemented and opened up to critique from outsiders with different stakes in the issues, in the way Indian thinkers have been able to 'digest' colonialism, 73 Colombian peasants to rework early European economic thinking for their own purposes<sup>74</sup> and feminists to get under the skin of the biases shaping the work of a Locke or Malthus. This is perhaps the way that the climate change literature now spilling onto the pages of newspapers worldwide has to be thought about. Insofar as this literature has been digested only by people of a single social background, it has inspired only limited – and sometimes self-contradictory – political thinking. Its shocking conclusions have led all too often merely to empty calls for political leaders to 'do something' or to the technical and market fixes that have been the subject of this special report.

## Alternative Extensions

### **( ) Alternative – Critiquing Market Alternatives Is Essential To Create New Tools To Address Environmental Problems**

Larry Lohmann, The Corner House, UK, Researcher, Science as Culture, September 2005 vol. 14. No. 3, p. 230

To explain the persistence of the Kyoto 'technical fix' (a fix that does not fix), it is perhaps first necessary, as this article has suggested, to grasp the growing extent to which the imaginations of political activists, physical scientists and technocrats alike have been captured and constrained by 'free market' ideology in a pervasive context of privatization, corporatized science, and domination by experts. Caught between the Kafkaesque logic of the carbon technocracy and the debunking attitude of its opponents at the grassroots, many concerned intellectuals and climate activists have become more credulous than either. On a deeper level, it is useful to look past the 'failure' (in climate mitigation terms) of the attempt to create and market Kyoto's hybrid commodity and toward the 'successes' of Kyoto accounting methods and other technical institutions in creating new cultural and political tools for marginalizing certain types of futures and actors. First, as argued above, the institutions surrounding the new carbon market succeed in diverting financial and intellectual resources away from political actions and technological innovations that could stem the flow of fossil carbon from below- to above-ground. Instead they add what one former World Bank specialist acknowledges to be 'epicycles' (such as the CDM) to an anachronistic, overwhelmingly fossil-centred system. World Bank loans exacerbating climate change, for example, exceed grants that claim to 'ameliorate' it by a ratio of at least 17:1 (Vallette et al., 2004). Second, the theory and practice of 'national allowances' succeed in reducing the space available for popular movements to discuss alternatives to the way that property in the global carbon dump is being created and inequitably distributed. Third, baseline-and-credit accounting carried out by a narrow professional class succeeds in sidelining the contributions of non-corporate actors as well as discussion and other actions directed toward alternative futures.



## Impact Extensions

### **( ) Income And Race Factors Increase Risks Of Disasters**

Michael Pastor, co-Director, Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community,  
University of California, Santa Cruz, RACE, POVERTY & the ENVIRONMENT,  
Summer 2006 <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/501>

The social dynamics that underlie the disproportionate environmental hazards faced by low-income communities and minorities also play out in the arena of disaster prevention, mitigation, and recovery. In a sense, environmental justice is about slow-motion disasters—and disasters reveal environmental injustice in a fast-forward mode. Both revolve around the axes of disparities of wealth and power. Lack of wealth heightens the risks that individuals and communities face, for three reasons. First, it translates into a lack of purchasing power to secure private alternatives to public provision of a clean and safe environment for all. Second, it translates into less ability to withstand shocks (such as health bills and property damage) that wealth would cushion. Third, it translates through the “shadow prices” of cost-benefit analysis into public policies that place a lower priority on protecting “less valuable” people and their assets. In the aftermath of Katrina, there is an added risk that transfers could turn New Orleans into little more than a theme park for affluent tourists. In the vicious circle of disaster vulnerability, those with less wealth face greater risks, and when disaster strikes, their wealth is further sapped. But risk is not just about money; even middle-class African Americans, Latinos, and Asians face elevated environmental risks. This reflects systematic differences in power and the legacy of racial discrimination. Power also shows up in private decisions by firms choosing where to site hazards and how much to invest in environmental protection; their choices are constrained not only by government regulations, but also by informal governance exercised by mobilized communities, civil society, and the press (see Pargal, et al. 1997; Boyce 2004). In both public and private arenas, then, power disparities drive outcome disparities—and the resulting patterns reflect race and ethnicity, as well as wealth.

## Impact Extensions

### **( ) The Existence Of Race-Based Risk Has Spurred The Environmental Justice Movement**

Michael Pastor, co-Director, Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community,  
University of California, Santa Cruz, RACE, POVERTY & the ENVIRONMENT,  
Summer 2006 <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/501>

The most important of these variables is race. Disparate patterns by race, particularly when one has controlled for income and other variables involved in the land use and market dynamics explanations, most clearly point to the role of unequal influence and racial discrimination. Racially disparate outcomes are also important in their own right. They can result from processes that are not so much a direct exercise of power as essentially embedded in the nature of our urban form, including housing segregation and real estate steering, informal methods that exclude communities from decision-making processes (including less provision of information regarding health risks), the past placement of hazards (which justifies new hazards as rational land use), and other forms of less direct "institutionalized" or "structural" racism (see Feagin and Feagin 1986; Institute on Race and Poverty 2002). And it is precisely racialized risk that has galvanized a movement for environmental equity rooted in civil rights law and activism. Race and racism therefore are at the heart of the evidentiary debate.

## Impact Extensions

### **( ) Environmental Justice Movement Is Solving Problems**

Robert Bullard, Environmental Justice Resource Center, TOXIC WASTES AND RACE AT TWENTY 1987-2007, p.5

Over the past two decades, grassroots community resistance emerged in response to practices, policies and conditions that residents judged to be unjust, unfair and illegal. For many communities of color, the environmental protection apparatus was judged to be broken and in need of fixing. Similarly, federal and state environmental protection agencies were seen as managing, regulating and distributing risks— instead of protecting public health and the environment in low income and people of color communities. Environmental justice networks and grassroots community groups are making their voices heard loud and clear. Grassroots groups also are winning on the ground and in some of the courts. They are making a difference in the lives of people from West Harlem to East Los Angeles. Working together, environmental justice leaders, activists and academicians have assisted public officials in identifying "at risk" populations, toxic "hot spots" and research gaps. They also have worked with decision makers to correct these imbalances. If this nation is to achieve environmental and economic justice, the environment in urban ghettos, barrios, reservations and rural "poverty pockets" must be given the same protection as that provided to the suburbs. All communities, black, brown, red, yellow or white, deserve to be protected from the ravages of pollution and environmental degradation. No community should become the dumping grounds for other people's toxic waste.

## Impact Extensions

### **( ) The Environmental Justice Movement Is A Bottom-Up, Grassroots Strategy**

Robert Bullard, Environmental Justice Resource Center, TOXIC WASTES AND RACE AT TWENTY 1987-2007, p.9

The environmental justice movement has changed the way scientists, researchers, policymakers, educators and government officials go about their daily work. This "bottomup" movement has redefined environment to include where people live, work, play and go to school, and it has renewed calls for aligning industrial production with the goal of maintaining the integrity of ecological life support systems. The impetus for changing the dominant environmental protection paradigm did not come from within regulatory agencies, the polluting industry, academia or the "industry" that has been built around risk management. The environmental justice movement is led by a loose alliance of grassroots and national environmental and civil rights leaders who question the foundation of the current environmental protection paradigm. They view environmental justice as a basic civil right and human right.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Impact Extensions

### **( ) Impact – Environmental Justice Framework Necessary For Human Survival**

Tom Stephens, Lawyer, Detroit, COUNTERPUNCH, March 28, 2005  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/stephens03282005.html>

On all these levels, dominance systematically threatens human and ecological survival today. Therefore we have to implement alternatives to dominance. Both to preserve material survival of the environment, and to establish justice among humans, we urgently have to implement alternatives. To continue with unfettered exploitation, with the illusion of the separate environmental "box" and the potential for infinite "growth," is a death sentence for both humans and our cultures. We urgently have to remember the sacred wisdom of our childhood, that (in Kate Kempton's words) what we "need" is not the same thing as what we "want." And what we think we want, in the world of lines, is not what we really need – for identity, survival, and happiness. We need to say "wait," to "pull back," and "we need to take this whole assembly of lines apart" in order to provide both a human future for our children and a natural future for our world. The long-overdue recognition that environmental justice must become an integral part of the public policy of democratic governments around the world, and that environmental racism and disproportionate exposure to environmental contamination and risk must be opposed and eliminated, is just one necessary step on this sacred road.

## Environmental Justice Critique – Impact Extensions

### **( ) Separation Of Environmental Concerns From Cultural And Economic Impacts Will Doom Our Civilization**

Tom Stephens, Lawyer, Detroit, COUNTERPUNCH, March 28, 2005  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/stephens03282005.html>

One characteristic of the dominant, linear world-view that distorts our perceptions and our decisions regarding our relationship to nature involves putting the environment in a box, separated from issues of cultural and economic survival. Under this view, "more" is "better," including more exploitation of the environment by dominant economic and cultural forces. The false ideological and psychological "box," separating the environmental from the socio-economic and from self-identity, blinds us to the permanent and irreversibly damaging consequences that more exploitation of a rapidly diminishing resource base threaten for us all. In our time, the "line" that symbolizes this world-view depicts us, through the transnational corporate forces of dominance and hierarchy, patriarchy and white supremacy, driving ourselves to the end of the line (lines end in "dead ends"), and off the edge of the cliff of social, ecological, economic and civilizational survival.

## Environmental Justice Critique Affirmative Answers

2AC Frontline

520

## 2AC Frontline

**1. Turn – The Case Impacts Fall Disproportionately On People Of Color. This analysis proves we are an example of their alternative that they say will solve.**

Robert Bullard, Professor of Sociology, Director Environmental Justice Resource Center, Climate Change and African Americans, 2008  
<http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/ClimateBib1.htm>

Global climate change looms as a major environmental justice issue of the 21st century. Climate change poses special environmental justice challenges for communities that are already overburdened with pollution and environmentally-related illnesses. As seen in Hurricane Katrina that hit the Gulf Coast, the environmental effects of climate change are real. The adverse impacts fall heaviest on the poor. This deadly pattern occurs disproportionately among African Americans and other people of color across the U.S. who are concentrated in urban centers, coastal regions, and areas with substandard air quality—including ground level ozone.

**2. The alternative has a solvency deficit. Their alternative will not solve our case in time. They do not defend that any legislation will pass in time. Only legislation can solve our case.**

**3. Our case outweighs. The impacts are larger and more certain than the impact of the case.**

**4. The alternative does not solve the K impact. Just changing the way we think about environmental justice isn't enough to cause change. Millions of people have already been writing articles, books and giving speeches, and if that wasn't enough, then adding our voices won't make a difference.**



## 2AC Frontline

### **5. We have to be pragmatic. We can act through our plan while at the same time consider their arguments about a new worldview.**

Andrew Light, Director of Science Technology and Society Program at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, Environmental Pragmatism, 1996, p. 178

Fortunately, pragmatists in general and environmental pragmatists in particular also understand that inquiry into social problems need not come to an end in order for action to take place. As Rorty suggested some time ago, "reference to action...can take place at any step in the eternally incomplete series of interpretations." When we feel the urgency to act, in order to provide aid to nature, we will find temporary stopping places in our ongoing conversations on how best to act for nature and how best to interpret the needs of nature. For pragmatists as I conceive them there may be no other public solutions to some problems other than "pragmatic" ones as we have given up on the idea of a totalizing discourse for now about conceptions of nature. But pragmatic solutions are not something we settle on, they are things we strive for while privately pursuing, if we choose, our individual redescriptions of nature in positive, totalizing or hegemonic terms.

### **6. No threshold. Even if they win that we are ignoring environmental justice concerns (which we are not) they can't prove that one instance of that will be enough to derail the environmental justice movement. And if one instance of that is enough, then the impact is inevitable.**

### **7. Permutation – we can support the alternative in all instances plus adopt the affirmative plan using the rationale of the environmental justice paradigm.**

## 2AC Frontline

### **8. No Link – Siting Decisions Influence The Composition Of The Neighborhood, Not The Reverse**

Vicky Been, Professor of Law, New York University, Ecology Law Quarterly 1997 24:1

Instead, the research left open the possibility that the sites for the facilities originally were chosen in a manner that was neither intentionally discriminatory nor discriminatory in effect, but that market responses to the facilities led the host neighborhoods to become disproportionately populated by the poor, and by racial and ethnic minorities. I posited one theory about how that could happen: if the facility was perceived as a nuisance or undesirable neighbor, neigh- [\*7] boring property values would decrease n17 and cause those in the community who could afford to leave to do so. n18 The combination of the out-migration and the decrease in property values would then make the neighborhood's housing more affordable for lower-income households and for those whose housing choices were limited by racial discrimination in the residential housing market. n19 Thus, over time, the undesirability of the facility would cause the neighborhood to become poorer and populated by higher percentages of racial and ethnic minorities than it had been prior to the siting of the facility.

Vicky Been, Professor of Law, New York University, Ecology Law Quarterly 1997 24:1

To address both issues, my research team conducted a nationwide study of the demographics of the 544 communities that in 1994 hosted active commercial hazardous waste treatment storage and disposal facilities. n28 We looked first at the demographics of the communities as of the census taken immediately before they became hosts, then examined how the demographics of the host communities changed in each subsequent decade. Finally, we examined the demographics of the host communities as of the 1990 census. As detailed below, we found no substantial evidence that the facilities that began operating between 1970 and 1990 were sited in areas that were disproportionately African American. Nor did we find any evidence that these facilities were sited in areas with high concentrations of the poor; indeed, the evidence indicates that poverty is negatively correlated with sitings.

## Social Ecology Critique

1NC Shell	524
Link – Market Reforms	527
Link- Competitiveness	529
Solvency Takeout	531
Impact – Extinction	532
Impact – Agency	533
Impact – Racism	534
Impact – Culture	535
Answers to Permutation	536
Answers to Alternative Cannot Solve	539
Answers to Naturalizes Hierarchy	541
Answers to Capitalism Not Root Cause	542
Answers to State Not Always Bad	543
Answers to Resource Management Important	544
Answers to Radicalism Bad	546

## 1NC Social Ecology Critique

### **A. Thesis – Social Ecology is a philosophy based around a non-market, ethical relationship with nature.**

Kevin Preister, Ph.D. Social Ecology Associates, 1997. ["Social Ecology: A New Pathway to Watershed Restoration" Watershed Restoration: Principles and Practices  
[http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister\\_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf](http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf)]

The term social ecology is most frequently associated with the writings of Murray Bookchin (1990). He cites the importance of geographic place, local control (through the concept of the municipality), empowerment of citizens, and the meshing of social and environmental goals. His conception can be considered an "eco-ideology," that is, underlying his work is a philosophy of anarchism that calls for the elimination of societal hierarchies (class, race, gender) as a means of creating ecologically-sound living.

### **B. Link – Attempts to "green" capitalism, or create sustainable development, are just methods to further capitalism**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology,  
<http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

Any approach which fails to offer this basic critique, even "alternative" models like "sustainable" development, "trade not aid", or "green" and "caring" capitalism, can only lead to further immiseration, poverty, exploitation, cultural devastation and ecological destruction. There is a growing literature touting such approaches and a substantial critique developing as well.<sup>3</sup> The criticism of these approaches offered by Survival International reveals their self-serving nature, as well as their underlying logic, which never questions the primacy of the market. The fact is that traditional models of development, far from being the solution to these ills, are in large part the problem. Unless the a prioris of statistic and corporate frameworks are rejected, capitalism will continue to colonize and subvert the cultural and ecological diversity necessary for a healthy planet.

## 1NC Social Ecology Critique

### **C. Impact – Adopting a social Ecological perspective is necessary to prevent annihilation of all life**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

An analysis from the perspective of social ecology suggests that current development models must be firmly rejected if we are ever to achieve an ecological society. In fact, a basic redefinition of "development" is a precondition for the survival of the planet. How then does social ecology define development? How does that definition differ in basic ways from the traditional approach? And what are the means that can bring a new definition to bear in the world? The following pages present a set of issues which must be addressed in order to redefine development. They are intended to be suggestive rather than schematic, and will need to be applied in different ways in various parts of the world. But they must be, according to Murray Bookchin, the seminal thinker in social ecology, unabashedly utopian in the most profound sense. Utopian thinking today requires no apology. Rarely in history has it been so crucial to draw on the imagination in order to create radical new alternatives to virtually every aspect of daily life.

## 1NC Social Ecology Critique

**D. Alternative – We offer an alternative to the current capitalist mentality. Using the Public Sphere, we can transform the current modes of thinking toward a communal way of living. This would break the grow-or-die mentality and result in a truly ethical relationship with nature.**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

If mindless and unceasing growth as an end in itself - forced by competition to accumulate and devour the organic world - creates problems that cut across material, ethnic, and cultural differences, the concept of "the People" and of a "public sphere" may become a living reality in history. The Green movement, or at least some kind of radical ecology movement, could thereby acquire a unique, cohering, and political significance that compares in every way with the traditional workers' movement. If the locus of proletarian radicalism was the factory, the locus of the ecology movement would be the community: the neighborhood, the town, and the municipality. A new alternative, a political one, would have to be developed that is neither parliamentary on the one hand nor confined exclusively to direct action and countercultural activities on the other. Indeed, direct action would mesh with this new politics in the form of community self-management based on a fully participatory democracy - in the highest form of direct action, the full empowerment of the people in determining the destiny of society.

## Link – Market Reforms

### **( ) Market reforms fail to challenge the underlying hierarchy of capitalism**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

Indeed, to separate ecological problems from social problems--or even to play down or give token recognition to this crucial relationship-- would be to grossly misconstrue the sources of the growing environmental crisis. The way human beings deal with each other as social beings is crucial to addressing the ecological crisis. Unless we clearly recognize this, we will surely fail to see that the hierarchical mentality and class relationships that so thoroughly permeate society give rise to the very idea of dominating the natural world. Unless we realize that the present market society, structured around the brutally competitive imperative of "grow or die," is a thoroughly impersonal, self-operating mechanism, we will falsely tend to blame technology as such or population growth as such for environmental problems. We will ignore their root causes, such as trade for profit, industrial expansion, and the identification of "progress" with corporate self-interest. In short, we will tend to focus on the symptoms of a grim social pathology rather than on the pathology itself, and our efforts will be directed toward limited goals whose attainment is more cosmetic than curative.

## Link – Market Reforms

### **( ) Softer technology is just a cover up for capitalism's grow or die mentality**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

Nor would "softer" technologies produced by a grow-or-die market fail to be used for destructive capitalistic ends. Two centuries ago, the forests of England were hacked into fuel for iron forges with axes that had not changed appreciably since the Bronze Age, and ordinary sails guided ships laden with commodities to all parts of the world well into the nineteenth century. Indeed, much of the United States was "cleared" of its forests, wildlife, soil, and aboriginal inhabitants with tools and weapons that would have been easily recognized, however much they were modified, by Renaissance people who had yet to encounter the Industrial Revolution. What modern technics did was to accelerate a process that was well under way at the close of the Middle Ages. It did not devastate the planet on its own; it abetted a phenomenon, the ever-expanding market system that had its roots in one of history's most fundamental social transformations: the elaboration of hierarchy and class into a system of distribution based on exchange rather than complementarity and mutual aid.



## Link – Competitiveness

### **( ) The hierarchy of international competitiveness buys into the culture of capitalism**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 [“What is Social Ecology?” Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

It is crucially important, in social ecology, to recognize that industrial growth does not result from a change in a cultural outlook alone”and least of all, from the impact of scientific rationality on society. It stems above all from harshly objective factors churned up by the expansion of the market itself, factors that are largely impervious to moral considerations and efforts at ethical persuasion. Indeed, despite the close association between capitalist development and technological innovation, the most driving imperative of the capitalist market, given the dehumanizing competition that defines it, is the need to grow, and to avoid dying at the hands of savage rivals. Important as greed or the power conferred by wealth may be, sheer survival requires that an entrepreneur must expand his or her productive apparatus to remain ahead of other entrepreneurs and try, in fact, to devour them. The key to this law of life-to survival-is expansion, and greater profit, to be invested in still further expansion. Indeed, the notion of progress, once identified by our ancestors as a faith in the evolution of greater human cooperation and care, is now identified with economic growth.

## Link – Competitiveness

### **( ) Nationalism distracts from challenging the worst aspects of capitalism due to national loyalty**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

Nationalism, like statism, has so deeply imprinted itself on modern thinking that the very idea of a municipalist politics as an option for societal organization has virtually been written off. For one thing, as I have already emphasized, politics these days has been identified completely with statecraft, the professionalization of power. That the political realm and the state have often been in sharp conflict with each other - indeed, in conflicts that exploded in bloody civil wars - has been almost completely overlooked. The great revolutionary movements of the past, from the English Revolution of the 1640s to those in our own century, have always been marked by strong community upsurges and depended for their success on strong community ties. That fears of municipal autonomy still haunt the nation-state can be seen in the endless arguments that are brought against it. Phenomena as "dead" as the free community and participatory democracy should presumably arouse far fewer counterarguments than we continue to encounter.

## Aff Doesn't Solve

### **( ) Ethics is a better way to deal with environmental problems**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

The step-by-step reorganization of municipalities, their confederation into ever-larger networks that form a dual power in opposition to the nation-state, the remaking of the constituents of republican representatives into citizens who participate in a direct democracy-all may take a considerable period of time to achieve. But in the end, they alone can potentially eliminate the domination of human by human and thereby deal with those ecological problems whose growing magnitude threatens the existence of a biosphere than can support advanced forms of life. To ignore the need for these sweeping but eminently practical changes would be to let our ecological problems fester and spread to a point where there would no longer be any opportunity to resolve them. Any attempt to ignore their impact on the biosphere or deal with them singly would be recipe for disaster, a guarantee that the anti-ecological society that prevails in most of the world today would blindly hurtle the biosphere as we know it to certain destruction.

## Impact – Extinction

**( ) Capitalism's worst excesses will result in massive environmental harm and an uninhabitable planet.**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, Spring 2003. ["The Communalist Project", Harbinger, Vol 3, no 1.]

Whether the twenty-first century will be the most radical of times or the most reactionary—or will simply lapse into a gray era of dismal mediocrity—will depend overwhelmingly upon the kind of social movement and program that social radicals create out of the theoretical, organizational, and political wealth that has accumulated during the past two centuries of the revolutionary era. The direction we select, from among several intersecting roads of human development, may well determine the future of our species for centuries to come. As long as this irrational society endangers us with nuclear and biological weapons, we cannot ignore the possibility that the entire human enterprise may come to a devastating end. Given the exquisitely elaborate technical plans that the military-industrial complex has devised, the self-extermination of the human species must be included in the futuristic scenarios that, at the turn of the millennium, the mass media are projecting—the end of a human future as such.

Lest these remarks seem too apocalyptic, I should emphasize that we also live in an era when human creativity, technology, and imagination have the capability to produce extraordinary material achievements and to endow us with societies that allow for a degree of freedom that far and away exceeds the most dramatic and emancipatory visions projected by social theorists such as Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Karl Marx, and Peter Kropotkin.<sup>1</sup> Many thinkers of the postmodern age have obtusely singled out science and technology as the principal threats to human well-being, yet few disciplines have imparted to humanity such a stupendous knowledge of the innermost secrets of matter and life, or provided our species better with the ability to alter every important feature of reality and to improve the well-being of human and nonhuman life-forms.

We are thus in a position either to follow a path toward a grim "end of history," in which a banal succession of vacuous events replaces genuine progress, or to move on to a path toward the true making of history, in which humanity genuinely progresses toward a rational world. We are in a position to choose between an ignominious finale, possibly including the catastrophic nuclear oblivion of history itself, and history's rational fulfillment in a free, materially abundant society in an aesthetically crafted environment.

## Impact – Loss of Agency

**( ) Capitalism denies individuals an ethical life because all of life is defined by how much things cost - people just become a dollar sign**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

Much of what passes for development today has the opposite effect. Modernization undermines community and forces people into the market, where they lose their identity as unique individuals and are reduced to a faceless proletariat. The well-documented results of the "Green Revolution" in agriculture present a stunning example of this highly problematic process. A moral economy is perhaps the only alternative to this destructive dynamic. It is the preservation, creation or reinforcement of community and an active citizenry upon which development must focus. These in turn are the preconditions for resolving our ecological crises. Empowerment of people is the real goal of any authentic process of development. Social ecology calls for the primacy of these socio-cultural criteria over the economic. It is a revolutionary outlook which understands the elimination of all relationships based on hierarchy and domination as an integral part of the development process, and as the starting point for a reharmonization of people's relationship with the rest of nature. This perspective challenges in basic ways the institutions of the State and transnational corporations which are the primary vehicles for development under the current model.

## Impact – Racism

### **( ) Capitalism was constructed under western social Darwinist theory and can be used for racial discrimination**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

The problem of modernization is subsumed under a western, linear notion of progress which is rooted in a crude, Social Darwinist view of human history that first surfaced in the nineteenth-century cannon of cultural evolution. These ideas were first presented by Herbert Spencer and further elaborated by Maitland and Maine and, in the United States, by Lewis Henry Morgan. These schematic views proposed to rank all human cultures in a hierarchy, with Civilization (Western European) at the top and all other forms below. Typically, the hierarchy proceeds from Savagery to Barbarism to Civilization, to use Morgan's nomenclature. (Please note that Morgan's scheme, as developed in *Ancient Society*, was the basis for Marx and Engels' thinking on this issue, which is one reason that "Marxist" approaches to development have been as destructive as those of capitalism.)

The assumption underlying this thinking is that the rest of the world has failed to reach the same level of prosperity as the North because of inherent cultural flaws. They are beneath us because their cultures are inferior to our own. Thus it becomes "The white man's burden" to bring the poor savages and barbarians the benefits of civilization. In the nineteenth century, this line of thinking provided a moralistic rationale for the worst excesses of colonialism and imperialism, and in the present it is an a priori of traditional approaches to development.

## Impact - Culture

### **( ) Capitalism causes loss of indigenous culture due to the need for “modernization”**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. [“Redefining Development” Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

The assimilation of the diverse cultures of the planet is the human parallel to the loss of bio-diversity that our current development practice foreshadows. It is only through active resistance to the dominant model and the creation of real alternatives which exist outside of the framework of the global market that there is hope for the authentic development of the peoples of the planet, an unfolding of potentialities that could allow us to achieve the more profound ground of a humanity which is both rooted in the varied lives of the world's diverse peoples and cultures and truly universal in its ethical stance and practice.

## AT: Permutation

### **1. Capitalism will creep back in if we allow any exceptions**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

There is a sense in which any new forms of resistance - be they by Greens, libertarians, or radicals generally - must open alternative areas of life that can countervail and undo the embourgeoisement of society at all its levels. The issue of the relationship of "society," "politics," and "the state" becomes one of programmatic urgency. Can there be any room for a radical public sphere beyond the communes, cooperatives, and neighborhood service organizations fostered by the 1960s counterculture - structures that easily degenerated into boutique-type businesses when they did not disappear completely? Is there, perhaps, a public realm that can become an arena for the interplay of conflicting forces for change, education, empowerment, and ultimately, confrontation with the established way of life?

### **2. Calls for revolution fail if there are any exceptions because it undermines the legitimacy of social movements**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

The Green movement, in general, is remarkably well positioned to become the arena for working out such a perspective and putting it into action. Inadequacies, failures, and retreats like those of die Grunen do not absolve radical social theorists from the responsibility of trying to educate this movement and give it the theoretical sense of direction it needs. The Greens have not frozen into hopeless rigidity, even in West Germany and France, despite the enormous compromises that have already alienated the radicals in these countries from their respective Green parties. What is important is that the ecological crisis itself is not likely to permit a broad environmental movement to solidify to the point that it could exclude articulate radical tendencies. To foster such radical tendencies, to strengthen them theoretically, and to articulate a coherent radical ecology outlook is a major responsibility of authentic radicals. In an era of sweeping embourgeoisement, what ultimately destroys every movement is not only the commodification of everyday life but its own lack of the necessary consciousness to resist commodification and its vast powers of cooptation.



## AT: Permutation

### **3. seeking compromise is a capitalist illusion – it creates an excuse to never truly challenge existing injustices**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003 ["Theses on Social Ecology in a Period of Reaction" Social Ecology Institute, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031118110516621>]

Quite to the contrary: social ecology seeks to countervail attempts to denature the Enlightenment and revolutionary project by emphasizing the need for theoretical coherence, no less today than it did in the 1960s, when the "New Left" drifted from a healthy libertarian populism into a quagmire of Leninist, Maoist, and Trotskyist tendencies. Social ecology retains its filiations with the Enlightenment and the revolutionary tradition all the more emphatically in opposition to the quasi-mystical and expressly mystical trends that are thoroughly sweeping up the privileged petty bourgeoisie of North America and Europe, with their goulash of antirational, spiritualistic, and atavistic ideologies. Social ecology is only too mindful that capitalism today has a nearly infinite capacity to coopt, indeed commodify, self-styled "oppositional trends" that remain as the detritus of the "New Left" and the old counterculture. Even anarchism, once a formidable tradition, has been repackaged by Hakim Bey, Bob Black, David Watson, and Jason McQuinn into a merchandisable boutique ideology that panders to petty-bourgeois tastes for naughtiness and eccentricity.

## AT: Permutation

### **4. Capitalism will try to repackage the alternative if we seek compromise – preventing a real shift away from market economics**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003 ["Theses on Social Ecology in a Period of Reaction" Social Ecology Institute, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031118110516621>]

Except where its profits and "growth opportunities" are concerned, capitalism now delights in avowals of the need to "compromise," to seek a "common ground"--the language of its professoriat no less than its political establishment--which invariably turns out to be its own terrain in a mystified form. Hence the popularity of "market socialism" in self-styled "leftist" periodicals; or possibly "social deep ecology" in deep ecology periodicals like The Trumpeter; or more brazenly, accolades to Gramsci by the Nouvelle Droite in France, or to a "Green Adolf" in Germany. A Robyn Eckersley has no difficulty juggling the ideas of the Frankfurt School with deep ecology while comparing in truly biocentric fashion the "navigational skills" of birds with the workings of the human mind. The wisdom of making friends with everyone that underpins this academic "discourse" can only lead to a blurring of latent and serious differences--and ultimately to the compromise of all principles and the loss of political direction. The social and cultural decomposition produced by capitalism can be resisted only by taking the most principled stand against the corrosion of nearly all self-professed oppositional ideas. More than at any time in the past, social ecologists should abandon the illusion that a shared use of the word "social" renders all of us into socialists; or "anarchy," into anarchists; or "ecology," into radical ecologists. The measure of social ecology's relevance and theoretical integrity consists of its ability to be rational, ethical, coherent, and true to the ideal of the Enlightenment and the revolutionary tradition--not of any ability to earn plaudits from the Prince of Wales, Al Gore, or Gary Snyder, still less from academics, spiritualists, and mystics. In this darkening age when capitalism--the mystified social order par excellence--threatens to globalize the world with capital, commodities, and a facile spirit of "negotiation" and "compromise," it is necessary to keep alive the very idea of uncompromising critique.

## AT: Alternative Cannot Solve

**1. The alternative is seeking local communities to make environmental reforms – even if they win at some deep philosophical level there is inconsistency for social ecology, we can still advocate local action. We do not all need to understand the philosophical complexities to move away from seeing the environment as a dollar sign.**

**2. Local municipilism creates the necessary place for people to create an ethical relationship with nature**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

Although always mindful of the need for spiritual change, social ecology seeks to redress the ecological abuses that society has inflicted on the natural world by going to the structural as well as the subjective sources of notions like the "domination of nature." That is, it challenges the entire system of domination itself and seeks to eliminate the hierarchical and class edifice that has imposed itself on humanity and defined the relationship between nonhuman and human nature. It advances an ethics of complementarity in which human beings must play a supportive role in perpetuating the integrity of the biosphere, as potentially, at least, the most conscious products of natural evolution. Indeed humans are seen to have a moral responsibility to function creatively in the unfolding of that evolution. Social ecology thus stresses the need for embodying its ethics of complementarity in palpable social institutions that will give active meaning to its goal of wholeness, and of human involvement as conscious and moral agents in the interplay of species.

## Answers to Alternative Cannot Solve

### **3. Seeking the community as a whole would change people's ethical orientation toward nature**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

Property, in this ethical constellation, would be shared and, in the best of circumstances, belong to the community as a whole, not to producers ("workers") or owners ("capitalists"). In an ecological society composed of a "Commune of communes," property would belong, ultimately, neither to private producers nor to a nation-state. The Soviet Union gave rise to an overbearing bureaucracy; the anarcho-syndicalist vision to competing "worker-controlled" factories that ultimately had to be knitted together by a labor bureaucracy. From the standpoint of social ecology, property "interests" would become generalized, not reconstituted in different conflicting or unmanageable forms. They would be municipalized, rather than nationalized or privatized. Workers, farmers, professionals, and the like would thus deal with municipalized property as citizens, not as members of a vocational or social group. Leaving aside any discussion of such visions as the rotation of work, the citizen who engages in both industrial and agricultural activity, and the professional who also does manual labor, the communal ideas advanced by social ecology would give rise to individuals for whom the collective interest is inseparable from the personal, the public interest from the private, the political interest from the social.

## AT: Naturalizes Hierarchy

- 1. This is just untrue** – the alternative asks people to give up all hierarchy and not preserve any part of it.
- 2. This is nonunique** – Hierarchy exists in the status quo, the alternative would be a move away from these hegemonic practices.
- 3. It is possible to challenge the hegemonic structures of capitalism and hierarchy**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

The municipality is a potential time-bomb. To create local networks and try to transform municipal institutions that replicate the state is to pick up a historic challenge - a truly political one - that has existed for centuries. New social movements are foundering today for want of a political perspective that will bring them into the public arena, hence the ease with which they slip into parliamentarism. Historically, libertarian theory has always focused on the free municipality that was to provide the cellular tissue for a new society. To ignore the potential of this free municipality because it is not yet free is to bypass a slumbering domain of politics that could give lived meaning to the great libertarian demand: a commune of communes. For in these municipal institutions and the changes that we can make in their structure - turning them more and more into a new public sphere - lies the abiding institutional basis for a grassroots dual power, a grassroots concept of citizenship, and municipalized economic systems that can be counterposed to the growing power of the centralized nation-state and centralized economic corporations.

## AT: Capitalism Not Root of Environmental Problems

**1. Extend our 1NC Link evidence** – Capitalism views the environment as a dollar sign. This relationship to nature makes it possible to plow down every tree and pollute the skies because capitalism does not have a way to accurately place a dollar sign on the environment. Due to this market failure, it makes environmental problems inevitable.

**2. Their Evidence Proves Our Argument** – Early societies ran into environmental problems because they did not take into account what happens when people ignore environmental derogation. The plan is the exact same mentality because they think the market will take care of everything.

**3. Economics is not sufficient to deal with environmental problems because the market does not adequately value the environment**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/soc ecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/soc ecol.html)]

What literally defines social ecology as "social" is its recognition of the often overlooked fact that nearly all our present ecological problems arise from deep-seated social problems. Conversely, present ecological problems cannot be clearly understood, much less resolved, without resolutely dealing with problems within society. To make this point more concrete: economic, ethnic, cultural, and gender conflicts, among many others, lie at the core of the most serious ecological dislocations we face today--apart, to be sure, from those that are produced by natural catastrophes. If this approach seems a bit too "sociological" for those environmentalists who identify ecological problems with the preservation of wildlife, wilderness, or more broadly, with "Gaia" and planetary "Oneness," it might be sobering to consider certain recent facts. The massive oil spill by an Exxon tanker at Prince William Sound, the extensive deforestation of redwood trees by the Maxxam Corporation, and the proposed James Bay hydroelectric project that would flood vast areas of northern Quebec's forests, to cite only a few problems, should remind us that the real battleground on which the ecological future of the planet will be decided is clearly a social one.

## AT: State Not Always Bad

**1. The government is a tool of capitalism** – Elections best demonstrate how politicians are just tools of corporations. Companies give millions of dollars to ensure their markets are preserved and interests protected. If we allow for the government in the alternative then those same prevailing interests would corrupt the alternative.

**2. Involving government will cause the alternative to fail due to elite corruption**

Murray Bookchin, Social Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003. ["Racial Politics in an Era of Advanced Capitalism", Institute for Social Ecology. <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=2003111810165099>]

This municipal life cannot be ignored in radical practice and must even be recreated where it has been undermined by the modern state. A new politics, rooted in towns, neighborhoods, cities, and regions, forms the only viable alternative to the anemic parliamentarism that is percolating through various Green parties and similar social movements - in short, their recourse to sheer and corruptive statecraft in which the larger bourgeois parties can always be expected to outmaneuver them and absorb them into coalitions. The duration of strictly single-issue movements, too, is limited to the problems they are opposing. Militant action around such issues should not be confused with the long-range radicalism that is needed to change consciousness and ultimately society itself. Such movements flare up and pass away, even when they are successful. They lack the institutional underpinnings that are so necessary to create lasting movements for social change and the arena in which they can be a permanent presence in political conflict.

## AT: Resource Management Is Important

**1. Resource Management is an important part of Social Ecology** – but the affirmative goes about resource management in a bad way. The Affirmative still relies on using economics and incentives to make progress, but we think this is wrong. You can do resource management, but it has to be justified on *ethical* grounds, not based on corporate profits.

## **2. Sustainable development is just a sustainable expansion of capitalism**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology,  
<http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

Vandana Shiva 4 notes that "development as capital accumulation and the commercialization of the economy for the generation of surplus and profits thus involved the reproduction not merely of the particular form of the creation of wealth, but also the associated creation of poverty and dispossession." We need to reorient our thinking about development and find real alternatives. Attempts to create a "caring capitalism" are oxymoronic. The very nature of the global market undermines what should be the goals of development: the promotion of unity in diversity through processes that ensure local communities' economic security, cultural survival and ecological health. Attempts to posit capitalism and the market as appropriate vehicles to bring about these conditions range from the extremely naive to the extraordinarily cynical; for example, the focus of "sustainable" development, as it emerges on the world stage, is finding a means to sustain the expansion of capitalism.



## AT: Resource Management Important

### **3. Sustainable development is just the universalization of the culture of capitalism**

Daniel Chodorkoff, Ph.D, anthropology, New School for Social Research, November 25, 2003. ["Redefining Development" Institute for Social Ecology, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031125143847456>]

When the Brundtland Commission of the United Nations, in its report Our Common Future discusses "sustainable development", it is exactly this process to which it refers. It is the economic realm which currently determines the conditions under which development occurs. Local and particular needs are subsumed under a "global" perspective which views the world as a series of interchangeable parts categorized under the rubric of raw materials, pools of labor, and potential markets. The homogenization of difference is posited as a progressive process. The universalization of the culture of capitalism (such as it is) is viewed as an inevitable and highly desirable outcome. Coca Cola Redux!

## AT: Radicalism Bad

- 1. If we win our link then they cannot win this argument – If we win that capitalism is the root cause of environmental destruction then it is try or die for the negative**
- 2. Their evidence does not talk about Social Ecology – their evidence is an attack on anti-technology kritik. We would still allow for technology, just not based on the idea of profits and losses.**
- 3. Capitalism's grow-or-die mentality is the root cause of environmental problems**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2001 ["What is Social Ecology?" Anarchy Online,  
[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/socecol.html)]

A society based on "grow or die" as its all-pervasive imperative must necessarily have a devastating ecological impact. Given the growth imperative generated by market competition, it would mean little or nothing if the present-day population were reduced to a fraction of what it is today. Insofar as entrepreneurs must always expand if they are to survive, the media that have fostered mindless consumption would be mobilized to increase the purchase of goods, irrespective of the need for them. Hence it would become "indispensable" in the public mind to own two or three of every appliance, motor vehicle, electronic gadget, or the like, where one would more than suffice. In addition, the military would continue to demand new, more lethal instruments of death, of which new models would be required annually.

## AT: Radicalism Bad

### **4. Our view of the environment allows for renewable energy to come about, but we think the affirmative's means of utilizing markets to initiate change is a flawed assumption**

Murray Bookchin, Activist and founder of Social Ecology, 2003 ["Theses on Social Ecology in a Period of Reaction" Social Ecology Institute, <http://www.social-ecology.org/article.php?story=20031118110516621>]

Social ecology, as developed in the United States in the early sixties (long after the expression had fallen into disuse as a variant of "human ecology"), tried to advance a coherent, developmental, and socially practical outlook to deal with the changes in radicalism and capitalism that were in the offing. Indeed, in great part, it actually anticipated them. Long before an ecology movement emerged, social ecology delineated the scope of the ecological crisis that capitalism must necessarily produce, tracing its roots back to hierarchical domination, and emphasizing that a competitive capitalist economy must unavoidably give rise to unprecedented contradictions with the nonhuman natural world. None of these perspectives, it should be noted, were in the air in the early 1960s--Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* with its emphasis on pesticides notwithstanding. Indeed, as early as 1962, social ecology projected the alternative of solar energy, wind power, and water power, among other new ecotechnologies, and alternatives to existing productive facilities that were to become axiomatic to a later generation of ecologists. It also advanced the vision of new ecocommunities based on direct democracy and nonhierarchical forms of human relations. These facts should be emphasized in view of deep ecology's attempt to rewrite the history of the ecology movement in terms of its own quasi-religious and scarcity-oriented outlook. Nor should we overlook the fact that social ecology's antihierarchical analyses laid the theoretical basis for early feminism, various community movements, the antinuclear movement, and in varying degrees, Green movements, before they turned from "nonparty parties" into conventional electoral machines.

## Social Ecology Critique Affirmative Answers

2AC Frontline

549

548

332 S. Michigan Ave, Suite. 500 ·  
Chicago, Illinois 60604



312-427-0175  
[www.urbandebate.org](http://www.urbandebate.org)

## 2AC Frontline

### **1. Permutation – Using the government can open up the possibility to interact with nature in a more ethical way**

Kelly A. Parker, Professor and Department Chair of Philosophy at Grand Valley State University, 1996 [Environmental Pragmatism, p.31]

Environmental ethics has also been associated with innovative public policy-making procedures, new applications of the legal system, and grass-roots activism. These ways of putting environmental awareness into action have come a long way in the past few decades, but of course there is a long way yet to go. The aim in all these areas, according to the pragmatic view, is to keep experimenting with ways to restructure our social institutions so that the public has a real voice in determining the kind of environments we inhabit. Pragmatism, as noted before, sees individuals as the source of genuine insight into what is needed, and accordingly tries to maximize participation in governing. Pragmatism is, in this respect as in others, closely allied with the ideals of the social ecology movement.<sup>20</sup>

### **2. The alternative cannot solve – there is no way to achieve local communities outlined in Bookchin's work.**

Damian Finbar White, Professor At Goldsmiths College, University Of London. 2003. [Hierarchy, Domination, Nature, Organization & Environment, Vol. 16 No. 1, March 2003]

Three weaknesses can be identified as central to Bookchin's critical social theory as presently formulated. First, although Bookchin provides a valuable critique of determinist versions of historical materialism, his own radical humanist reconstruction bends the stick too far in a voluntarist direction. Human beings make "his-tory" in Bookchin's historical social theory, and "history" is an all-embracing pro-cess. There is little sense, though, in his historical writings in that they do so not in conditions of their own choosing. In short, in social ecology there is too much agency, too little structure. Too little attention is paid in social ecology to the sedimented social-structural forms that merge around and embed human action, creating a complex series of constraints and enablements that resolve themselves in complex and discontinuous ways.

## 2AC Frontline

### **3. Historical examples indicate that capitalism is not the cause of environmental derogation. Even some early communal societies were harmful to the environment**

Damian Finbar White, Professor At Goldsmiths College, University Of London. 2003. [Hierarchy, Domination, Nature, Organization & Environment, Vol. 16 No. 1, March 2003]

Thus, Hughes and Thirgood(1983)made a powerful case for suggesting that environmental deterioration was at least one contributing factor in the decline of classical Greek and Roman civilisations. This was despite the fact that "their traditional religions taught them to stand in awe of nature and interfere as little as possible in natural processes"(p.206).Rather than stressing ideological factors producing this occurrence, though, stress is simply placed on their lack of ecological insight that" due to the advance of research in modern times, we take for granted" (p. 207). On similar lines, Bilsky(1980)and more recently Hoffman(2001)in a review of recent literature on social ecological relations in medieval Europe argued that" medieval Europeans did cause large scale ecological change and environmen-tal destruction, sometimes with intent, sometimes unaware"(Hoffman,2001,p.148). Elsewhere, David Harvey (1996) has noted of Chinese civilisation, The Chinese may have ecologically sensitive traditions of Tao, Buddhism, and Confucianism (traditions of thought which have played an important role in pro- Moting an "ecological consciousness" in the west) but the historical geography of deforestation, land degradation, river erosion, and flooding in China contains not a few environmental events which would be regarded as catastrophes by modernday standards. (p. 188; but also see Perdue, 1987).

## 2AC Frontline

### **4. Turn. Social ecology supports hierarchy by naturalizing human domination over nature**

Damian Finbar White, Professor At Goldsmiths College, University Of London. 2003. [Hierarchy, Domination, Nature, Organization & Environment, March 2003]

Moreover, although Bookchin complains about determinist features of historical materialism, we can also find elements of his own position that come close to "naturalising" hierarchy. For example, at certain points hierarchy is seen as worked out of "basic biological facts." Such a claim clearly sails close to determinism if interpreted crudely. To give Bookchin his due, his narrative here is usually more subtle and complex, stressing openness, change, and contingency. At other times, though, it appears that hierarchy is almost postulated as a part of the human condition. Thus, we are told, "The violation of organic society is latent within organic society itself. The primal unity of the early community, both internally and with nature, is weakened merely by the elaboration of the community's social life—its ecological differentiation" (Bookchin, 1982, p. 80). And here it would appear that the rise of social hierarchy is almost a product of the natural development of social life.

### **5. Government reforms can further the goals of social ecology**

Kevin Preister, Ph.D. Social Ecology Associates, 1997. ["Social Ecology: A New Pathway to Watershed Restoration" Watershed Restoration, [http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister\\_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf](http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf)]

The concept of productive harmony can be used to describe the related concepts of physical and social environmental health as related to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (Figure 1; Kent et al. 1994). The productive harmony model is based on Section 101(a) of NEPA, which states that environmental decisions and actions shall be made in ways that "create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans." Section 102 is the procedural requirements for carrying out an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and has received the most attention over the years, but Section 101 has offered the most guidance in defining the social ecosystem process.

## 2AC Frontline

### **6. No Link - the affirmative furthers an important goal of social ecology – resource management**

Kevin Preister, Ph.D. Social Ecology Associates, 1997. ["Social Ecology: A New Pathway to Watershed Restoration" Watershed Restoration: Principles and Practices  
[http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister\\_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf](http://naturalborders.com/Docs/KPreister_PathwayToWatershedRestoration.pdf)]

In this paper we have stressed the importance of working within a cultural context, as a prerequisite for successful watershed restoration. Our stories illustrate the need for an awareness of informal networks, word of mouth communication, gathering places, local knowledge, respect for each other, emerging issues and their significance, and the human-geographic boundaries within which people identify with the land and their community. These features are the basis of a social ecological understanding of human habitat and its relationship with the physical environment. We maintain that social ecology must be conceptually and operationally integrated with physical resource management in order for watershed restoration to be successful. Cultural restoration is often the key to ecological restoration, and is embodied in the concept of productive harmony as set forth in Section 101 of NEPA.



## 2AC Frontline

### **7. Turn: Radical environmental theory causes over-use of resources and environmental destruction**

J Bladwin, industrial designer and writer, Spring 1993. [Whole Earth Review, "Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism. - book reviews" [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1510/is\\_n78/ai\\_13528243](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1510/is_n78/ai_13528243)]

Advanced techniques in food science, especially those concerned with enzyme production and protein synthesis, may also offer substantial environmental benefits. Especially desirable is the development of palatable, vegetable-based meat substitutes. If soy burgers become indistinguishable from, and less expensive than, the genuine product, we could expect widespread cutbacks in meat consumption, allowing us to liberate vast tracts of land from agricultural production. Such environmental benefits would, however, be impossible to realize if consumers were to take at face value the eco-radical tenet that artificial products are to be avoided in all instances. Practical environmentalists will likely respond to the proposals sketched above with disgust if not revulsion. In their view, tampering with DNA is blasphemy, and even the consumption of artificial foods is something of a venal sin. But by sanctifying the human place within the natural world, radical greens only ensure the destruction of nature. The more we feel compelled to consume natural products, the more we monopolize the earth for ourselves.

### **8. Saving the environment is only possible though sustainable development**

J Bladwin, industrial designer and writer, Spring 1993. [Whole Earth Review, "Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism. - book reviews" [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1510/is\\_n78/ai\\_13528243](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1510/is_n78/ai_13528243)]

Brazil and other stalled-out Latin American industrializers have pursued a policy of "showcase modernity" based on the emulation of U.S. consumption patterns among members of the elite class. Such elitist policies invariably fail. The genuinely developing nations of Asia have, in contrast, adhered to a Japanese model that stresses relative egalitarianism, constrained consumption, heightened investment, and broad-based education. In the end, such a recipe will prove essential not just for economic development, but for achieving environmental sustainability as well.

## Incentives Topicality – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	555
+ 553	
RPS Violation Insert	557
Cap and Trade Violation Insert	558
Nuclear Energy Violation Insert	559
Biofuels Violation Insert	560
Extensions to RPS Violation	564
Extensions to Cap and Trade Violation	565

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives

**A. Interpretation – The resolution says “Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase alternative energy *incentives* in the United States.”**

**“Incentives” are policies that provide market compensation like tax credits, rebates, or subsidy payments for production of energy. They put the decision to produce alternative energy entirely in the hands of suppliers.**

Janet Swain, Director Energy and Climate Change Program, Worldwatch Institute, National Policy Instruments, Thematic Background Paper, International Conference for Renewable Energies, Bonn, January 2004 p.18

Financial incentives reduce the costs of renewable energy by lowering the price paid for renewable technologies or energy, increasing the payment received, or reducing the cost of production. They include market compensation in the form of tax credits, rebates, and payments, which subsidize investment in a technology or the production of power. Such incentives have been used extensively in Europe, Japan, the United States, and India—the only developing country that has enacted tax credits to date. Long-term, low-interest loans and loan guarantees work to reduce the cost of capital.

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives

### **B. Violation.**

**1. Plan is a mandate to increase alternative energy, which is distinguished from an incentive. Mandates require increases in alternative energy, incentives leave the decision completely up to the market.**

Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, 2008  
<http://www.ren21.net/REPolicies/policy/instruments.asp>

The relatively short history of renewable energy policy has already produced a vast variety of political measures intended to promote renewables. The International Energy Agency (IEA), with support from the European Commission, offers a Link to an external resource Global Renewable Energy Policies and Measures Database. This database currently covers more than 100 countries and categorises the measures according to 14 different technologies and 24 policy types.

Various categories of instruments can be distinguished:

\* Most forceful are mandated market policies, which set mandatory quantities in the form of quotas (renewable portfolio standards (RPS), blending,...) or mandatory prices such as feed-in tariffs. They are applied in order to give renewable energy a considerable role in the electricity generation and transport fuel markets, and create a critical mass for the development of the industry. In segregated partial-markets, competitive bidding for renewable energy concessions and renewable energy or green energy tradable certificates also constitute mandated market policies. In some cases (e.g. off-grid areas where previously no market exist) policy must actually organise markets and the necessary institutional development.

\* Financial incentives constitute another category of policies, which is focussed more on cost reductions and improving the relative competitiveness of renewable energy technologies (RET) in given markets: capital grants, third-party finance, investment tax credits, property tax exemptions, production tax credits, sales tax rebates, excise tax exemptions, etc. Some of these measures can be well applied to RET invested by the users themselves. Taxes on fossil fuels also improve the competitive position of renewable energy and are particularly appropriate to internalise negative external effects on environmental or energy security.

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives (RPS)

**2. Renewable Portfolio Standards are a mandate to increase renewable energy, not an incentive. If RPS is an incentive, then every energy policy is an incentive, so that word would have no meaning in the resolution.**

Monthly Energy Review March 2001

[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2744/is\\_2001\\_March/ai\\_73236769](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2744/is_2001_March/ai_73236769)

Financial incentives as defined here may reduce production costs, boost markets, or transfer economic resources so as to lower buyers' prices or increase sellers' receipts. Federal financial incentives generally take the form of tax credits and production incentives, such as a 1.5 cents-per-kilowatt hour payment to investors and investor-owned utilities for electricity from wind and closed-loop biomass plants, and a 1.5 cents-per-kilowatt-hour incentive to certain generators for electricity from biomass, geothermal, wind, and solar sources. There are also a number of Federal tax subsidies for alcohol fuels.

Federal mandates include the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, which boosted renewable energy by requiring electric utilities to buy electricity from certain small power plants using renewable fuels. The utilities were required to buy the electricity at their avoided costs, which have sometimes been very favorable to non-utility generators.

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives (Cap-and-Trade)

### **2. Cap and Trade policies are not incentives,**

**The "cap" is a mandatory limit on the amount of non-alternative energy that can be produced, the "trade" is just a mechanism set up to enforce the mandatory cap. It is functionally the same as a pure command-and-control mandate, just with a different enforcement strategy.**

David Driesen, Washington and Lee Law Review Spring 1998  
[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_qa3655/is\\_199804/ai\\_n8791954](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3655/is_199804/ai_n8791954)

Emissions trading does not provide a meaningful alternative to traditional programs, because it relies upon government decisions about the scale of reductions instead of decentralized responses to continuous incentives to reduce pollution. Hence, it makes sense to distinguish true economic incentive programs, programs that rely solely on positive and negative economic inducements to secure reductions, from mixed programs like emissions trading and traditional regulation, that rely on a combination of negative economic inducements, in the form of monetary penalties for noncompliance, and government commands.'

**Imagine if there were no "cap" in the plan. The "trade" mechanism would not increase alternative energy – there would be no limit to the number of permits, so they would have no value.**

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives (Nuclear Energy)

### **2. The Nuclear Energy Plan Does Not Net Increase Alternative Energy Incentives.**

**All the plan does is to have the federal government create a nuclear waste disposal system. This does not provide an economic incentive for the production of nuclear energy it provides an incentive for the disposal of nuclear waste.**

**The plan does not require that nuclear energy replace fossil fuels or increase the total amount of alternative energy.**

**The plan equally provides a disincentive to other forms of alternative energy, such as solar and wind, by making investment in nuclear energy more attractive. If the result of the plan was that solar and wind energy producers switched to nuclear energy there would be no net increase in alternative energy, and therefore no increase in alternative energy incentives.**

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives (Cap-and-Biofuels)

### **2. The Biofuels Plan Goes Way Beyond Alternative Energy Incentives.**

**a. Price Floors. Setting a price floor of \$50 per barrel for oil does not increase incentives now that oil is \$140 per barrel. The affirmative would only be topical if the price of oil ever fell that low again.**

**The price of oil will not go down, certainly never below \$50.**

Daniel Yergin, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, June 25, 2008  
<http://www.cera.com/aspx/cda/public1/news/articles/newsArticleDetails.aspx?CID=9587>

And some anticipate a permanent shortage – in its strongest form, the world's "running out" of oil. A "shortage psychology" certainly seems to have become widespread in financial markets as prices have gone up. This psychology is based partly on current market conditions and partly on expectations of tight markets for many years to come.



## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives (Biofuels)

**b. Market guarantees are mandates, not incentives. Here is an example from Oregon of the difference between biofuel mandates and incentives. The plan only has blending requirements, not tax credits.**

Stoel Rives, LLP, June 28, 2007

<http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/partner/story?id=49182>

The legislation guarantees a market for biofuels in Oregon by requiring Oregon petroleum dealers to add biofuels into diesel and unleaded gasoline as state biofuel producers reach certain critical levels of production. After Oregon production of biodiesel from sources in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana reaches 5 million gallons per year, the Oregon Department of Agriculture (the "Department") will mandate that state petroleum dealers blend at least 2 percent biodiesel into market petroleum diesel. Once Oregon biodiesel production from regional sources reaches 15 million gallons per year, the percentage increases to 5 percent. Biodiesel produced from palm oil does not apply toward these percentages. For the ethanol industry, after state ethanol production reaches 40 million gallons per year, the Department will mandate that state petroleum dealers blend 10 percent ethanol into their unleaded gasoline. Oregon's biofuels legislation goes beyond just setting mandates; it also provides state income tax credits for producing or collecting biomass to produce biofuels, property tax exemptions in designated rural renewable energy development zones and income tax credits for consumers using biofuel blends or solid biofuels.

**The money for biofuel pumps is not a separate incentive because it is entirely driven by the mandated blending amounts. It is just a mechanism to achieve the mandate.**

**c. Research and Development is only an incentive by effect. Government subsidy of research doesn't make current production of alternative energy cheaper. It only affects the amount of energy if there is a discovery that would go beyond status quo discoveries.**

**If we win that any one part of the plan isn't topical you vote negative because of extra-topicality.**

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives

### **C. Standards.**

- 1. Limits – the resolution should be interpreted so that each word limits what the affirmative can do in the area of alternative energy.**
- 2. Ground – the resolution should be interpreted to provide a division of negative ground. The affirmative should be limited to the ground of economic incentives and the negative should have the ground of command and control mandates.**
- 3. Predictability – the resolution should be interpreted in a way so the negative can predict what the affirmative plan will do. This facilitates clash and encourages research.**

### **D. Voting Issue**

- 1. Fairness – the judge must uphold the fundamental fairness of the activity as a precondition for encouraging participation. Limits and ground concerns are essential for fairness.**
- 2. Education – the primary focus of debate is the education of its participants. Without predictability, clash, preparation and limits on the affirmative there would be much less education.**

## Answer to: Incentives can be Punishments

**1. "Incentives" are positive inducements.**

WordWebOnline.com/en/incentive

"incentive: A positive motivational influence"

**2. Defining "incentives" this way does not provide predictability for the negative because the affirmative can act in either direction, so there is no stable ground for the negative.**

**3. This interpretation makes the word "incentive" have no meaning, it might as well be the word "policy."**

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives – RPS Extensions

**( ) Contextually, RPS plans are mandates, not incentives.**

James Brosnan, Albuquerque Tribune, December 14, 2007  
<http://www.abqtrib.com/news/2007/dec/14/senate-passes-energy-bill-minus-renewable-energy-t/>

(Senator) Bingaman said he regretted they could not pass the renewable energy tax incentives, or a mandate to force utilities to get 15 percent of their energy from renewable resources by 2020.

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives – Cap and Trade Extensions

**( ) If cap and trade systems are "incentives" then any regulation with an enforcement provision would be an "incentive" so anything would be topical. Under that interpretation, the affirmative gives no limiting meaning to the word.**

David Driesen, Washington and Lee Law Review Spring 1998  
[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_qa3655/is\\_199804/ai\\_n8791954](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3655/is_199804/ai_n8791954)

This failure to define economic incentives leaves unsupported the suggestion that emissions trading realizes environmental goals through economic incentives, but that traditional regulations (rules that limit discharges of pollutants into the environment without allowing trading) do not. Both traditional regulation and emissions trading rely upon the threat of a monetary penalty to secure compliance with government commands setting emission limitations.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps neither traditional regulation nor emissions trading should be considered economic incentive programs, because both rely upon government commands.<sup>4</sup> Or perhaps both should be considered economic incentive programs, because monetary penalties provide a crucial economic incentive in both systems.

## Incentives Topicality Affirmative Answers – Table of Contents

2AC Shell	567
-----------	-----

## The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives – 2AC Frontline

### **1. There is no simple bright line between mandates and incentives.**

National Center for Environmental Economics, 1.2 Definitions, Environmental Protection Agency, June 29, 2008

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/incsave.nsf/437c451fb25915d5852564db00579f01/006f11fa1f3c74d585256636004f2ed6!OpenDocument>

It must be emphasized that although this report makes a careful distinction between command-and-control and economic incentive approaches, these distinctions are often difficult to apply in practice. Some analysts have even argued that prohibitions established by command-and-control regulations operate in part by creating economic incentives to comply (through the proper setting of fines and penalties), while pollution charges and other "market" incentives rely on governmental policing of the market or governmental definition of the goods (i.e, pollution units). In other words, there is a continuous distribution of pollution control measures ranging from the "pure" command-and-control to the "pure" market mechanism. Expressed still another way, the dividing line between command- and-control and economic incentives can be drawn at any number of places; although the definition used above is based on what is probably the most important economic distinction between the two approaches, a case can be made for a number of other definitions.

### **2. "Incentives" can be negative, like punishment – so punishing producers for not meeting standards or caps is still an incentive**

Answers.Com '08

"incentive: Something, such as the fear of punishment or the expectation of reward, that induces action or motivates effort."

### **3. "Incentives" don't have to guarantee action, they are inherently probabilistic.**

Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online '08

"incentive : something that incites or has a *tendency to incite* to determination or action"

### The Plan Does Not Increase Incentives – 2AC Frontline

- 4. No important ground loss for the negative. They still have strategies to say alternatives are bad, and state counterplans. Some of their positions might link even more to mandates than to incentives.**
- 5. There are still meaningful limits to the resolution, regardless of how broadly we interpret "incentives" We are still limited to increasing alternative energy.**
- 6. The negative interpretation overlimits us. Most real world policies have elements of mandates combined with other policies. Very few real world plans would be pure incentives by their interpretation.**
- 7. Our affirmative is predictable. Their interpretation would mean that RPS and Cap/Trade wouldn't be topical and those are the heart of the federal alternative energy debate.**



## Alternative Energy Topicality – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	570
Definitions	571
Answers to Nuclear Meets	572
Answers to Counter-Interpretation: Fossil Fuels	573
Answers to Contextual Literature	574
Answers to Bright Line	575

## Alternative = Renewable 1NC Shell

### **A. Interpretation. Alternative Energy Must Be Renewable – Nuclear Power Does Not Count**

Pearson Education '01 ["Glossary", accessed 7/21/08,  
[wps.pearsoned.co.uk/wps/media/objects/2768/2834452/glossary/glossary.html](http://wps.pearsoned.co.uk/wps/media/objects/2768/2834452/glossary/glossary.html)]

Energy obtained from sources other than fossil fuels or nuclear power. The sources generally have low pollution implications and use renewable resources; for example biogas, geothermal energy, hydroelectric power, solar energy, tidal power, and wind power.

### **B. Violation. The Plan Increases Nuclear Power, not Alternative Energy**

### **C. Standards. Prefer the Negative Interpretation for Three Reasons:**

- 1. Limits.** This interpretation provides dozens of options from wind to solar to biopower to ocean thermal energy. If any new or non-traditional energy source is allowed, then the Affirmative could advocate Clean Coal, Liquid Natural Gas, Coal-to-Liquid, Oil Shale, and many other sources of energy that are not really alternatives. This creates an unfair research burden and destroys the spirit and educational value of the topic.
- 2. Ground.** The arguments against nuclear power are completely different from the arguments against renewable energy sources, and forcing the Negative to research and prepare them creates an unfair burden.
- 3. Education.** Future leaders need to learn about long-term solutions to the world's energy needs. Thus, we should focus on renewable sources of energy, such as solar and wind power, rather than non-renewable sources like coal and nuclear power. Otherwise, in another 200 years the world will run low on uranium and once again face an energy crisis.

### **D. Topicality is a Voting Issue**

- 1. Fairness.** Topicality is a rule of debate that ensures the Negative a fair chance. Thus, it must be evaluated before any other issue.
- 2. Jurisdiction.** As a judge, you have no jurisdiction to vote for a non-topical plan. That means that even if you think it is a good idea, you must vote Negative since it does not affirm the resolution.

## Alternative = Renewable Definitions

### **( ) The Affirmative Must Offer an Alternative to Nonrenewable Sources of Energy Such as Uranium**

Nelson Education '08 ["Our Environment", accessed 7/21/08,  
<http://www.environment.nelson.com/0176169040/glossary.html>]

Alternative Energy- Renewable energy sources, such as wind, flowing water, solar energy and biomass, which create less environmental damage and pollution than fossil fuels, and offer an alternative to nonrenewable resources.

### **( ) Alternative Energy Does Not Use Up Natural Resources**

Princeton '08 [<http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=alternative%20energy>,  
accessed 7/21/08]

Alternative Energy- energy derived from sources that do not use up natural resources or harm the environment

## Answers to Nuclear Meets

### **1. Nuclear Power Does Not Meet Our Interpretation**

We don't even have to win that alternatives must be renewable. The Pearson Education definition clearly states that nuclear power is not alternative energy.

### **2. Nuclear Power Does Not Meet Any of Our Standards**

Allowing nuclear power cases forces the Negative to research an entirely different subject from renewable energy, destroys education about long-term energy solutions, and opens the door for other abusive cases. These are all reasons to vote Negative.

### **3. Nuclear Power is Not Alternative Energy**

Wiktionary '08 [[http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/alternative\\_energy](http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/alternative_energy), accessed 7/21/08]

Alternative Energy- Energy derived from any [renewable](#) source; i.e other than fossil fuels or [nuclear fission](#)

## Answers to Counter-Interpretation: Fossil Fuel Alternatives

### **1. Arbitrary Distinction**

Fossil fuels aren't bad because they come from fossils, they are bad because there is a limited supply and they damage the environment. This is also true of nuclear power. Alternative forms of energy should be limitless and harmless to the environment.

### **2. Does Not Meet 1NC Standards**

This interpretation forces the Negative to research an entirely different subject from renewable energy and destroys education about long-term energy solutions. Prefer the Negative interpretation.

## Answers to Contextual Literature

### **1. Negative Interpretation Meets**

We have provided multiple sources of literature, including the 1NC Pearson Education definition, that specifically state that nuclear power is not alternative energy.

### **2. Wrong Context**

All of the Negative standards are about how our interpretation makes for more fair and educational debates. The Affirmative's so-called contextual literature doesn't address the meaning of this year's debate resolution, which is the real context in which we are debating.

## Answers to Bright Line

### **1. Negative Interpretation Meets**

"Renewable" is a clear and objective bright line. Human beings will be extinct long before the sun explodes. But coal, oil, and uranium are all limited resources that will run out.

### **2. The Affirmative Must Offer an Alternative to Nonrenewable Sources of Energy Such as Uranium**

Nelson Education '08 ["Our Environment", accessed 7/21/08,  
<http://www.environment.nelson.com/0176169040/glossary.html>]

Alternative Energy- Renewable energy sources, such as wind, flowing water, solar energy and biomass, which create less environmental damage and pollution than fossil fuels, and offer an alternative to nonrenewable resources.

### **3. No Impact**

Judges can still decide the Topicality debate based on in-round arguments about the meaning of "renewable". There is no damage to fairness or education.

## Alternative Energy Topicality Affirmative Answers – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline	577
Definitions	578



## Alternative = Renewable 2AC Frontline

**1. We meet. The Negative's definition doesn't say that alternative energy *must* be renewable, only that it generally is. Nuclear is an alternative to fossil fuels.**

**2. Counter-Interpretation. Any Alternative to Fossil Fuels is Topical, It Does Not Have to be Renewable**

Torridge District Council '08

[<http://www.torridge.gov.uk/onlineplan/written/cpt28.htm>, accessed 7/21/08]

Alternative Energy- Energy generated from alternatives to fossil fuel. Need not be renewable.

**3. The counter-interpretation meets the Limits standard. It requires Affirmatives to defend alternatives to fossil fuels, so it still excludes abusive cases like Clean Coal and Oil Shale.**

**4. Contextual Literature Proves Nuclear Power is Alternative Energy**

Science Clarified '08 ["Alternative Energy Sources", accessed 7/21/08,  
<http://www.scienceclarified.com/Al-As/Alternative-Energy-Sources.html>]

Nuclear power is an alternative energy source that can be obtained from either the splitting of the nuclei of atoms (nuclear fission) or the combining of the nuclei of atoms (nuclear fusion). In either of these two reactions, great amounts of energy are released. Nuclear power plants use a device called a nuclear reactor in which uranium or plutonium atoms are split in controlled fission reactions. The heat energy released is captured and used to generate electricity. As of 2000, there were 110 operating nuclear power plants in the United States. France relies on nuclear power for more than 70 percent of its electricity production.

**5. Bright Line. The counter-interpretation provides a clear, objective test of Topicality. If a case promotes fossil fuels, it is non-topical. There is no bright line for "renewable". Even the sun will die out eventually, so arguably solar power is not truly renewable. Bright line tests minimize judge intervention, promoting fairness and education.**

**6. No Abuse. There is plenty of Negative literature against nuclear power and generic arguments against renewables, such as the Coal DA, still link.**

## Alternative = Renewable Definitions

### **( ) Nuclear Power is Alternative Energy**

Science Fiction Dictionary '08 [accessed 7/21/08,  
<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Labyrinth/2985/diction.html>]

Alternative Energy- sources of energy that do not depend of fossil fuels.  
alternative energy comes from nuclear reactors and renewable energy sources.

## Increase Topicality – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	580
Answers to We Meet	582
Answers to Counter-Interpretation	583
Answers to Grammar	584
Answers to Grammar Most Important	585
Answers to Ground	586

## Increase 1NC Shell

### **A. Interpretation. Increase Implies Previous Existence**

Princeton '08 [[wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn](http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn), accessed 7/22/08]

Increase- make bigger or more; "The boss finally increased her salary"; "The university increased the number of students it admitted"

**If something does not already exist, it cannot be made bigger. The Affirmative must make an existing incentive bigger. Creating a new incentive is not an increase and is not topical.**

### **B. Violation**

**[Biofuels: There is currently no federal price floor on oil. The plan creates this new incentive rather than increasing an existing incentive.]**

**[Cap and Trade: There is currently no federal cap on emissions. The plan creates this new incentive rather than increasing an existing incentive.]**

**[RPS: There is currently no federal RPS. The plan creates this new incentive rather than increasing an existing incentive.]**

**[Nuclear Power: There is currently no federal policy for disposal of nuclear waste. The plan creates this new incentive rather than increasing an existing incentive.]**

### **C. Standards. Prefer Our Interpretation for Three Reasons:**

**1. Limits. This interpretation is the only way to keep the size of the topic fair and manageable for the Negative team. There are a finite number of existing alternative energy incentives but an infinite number of new ones that could be created. Allowing the Affirmative to create new incentives places an impossible burden on the Negative.**

### Increase 1NC Shell

**2. Predictability.** Existing incentives are easy to identify and research, and there is plenty of literature for and against them. It is impossible to predict every new incentive that might be created, and there is no guarantee that Negative literature exists against obscure proposals. Predictable literature and Negative ground are key to fairness and education.

**3. Every Word Counts.** If the resolution intended the Affirmative to create new incentives, it would say "create" or "establish" instead of "increase".

#### **D. Topicality is a Voting Issue**

**1. Fairness.** Topicality is a rule of debate that ensures the Negative a fair chance. Thus, it must be evaluated before any other issue.

**2. Jurisdiction.** As a judge, you have no jurisdiction to vote for a non-topical plan. That means that even if you think it is a good idea, you must vote Negative since it does not affirm the resolution.

## Answers to We Meet

### **1. Non-Responsive.**

**This argument only explains why their plan is an alternative energy incentive. It does not address our violation which says they do not increase an existing incentive.**

### **2. No New Arguments.**

**The Affirmative's constructive speeches are over, and they have no chance of meeting our interpretation. If we win that ours is the better interpretation of the resolution, then we win the debate on Topicality.**

## Answers to Counter-Interpretation

### **1. Does Not Meet the Limits Standard.**

**Our interpretation restricting Affirmatives to increasing existing federal alternative energy incentives is the only way to avoid an infinitely large topic. There is no limit to the number of new incentives teams could propose. Limiting the topic in this way is the only way to ensure the Negative a fair debate.**

### **2. Does Not Meet the Predictability Standard.**

**The Negative can research and predict existing federal alternative energy incentives, but we cannot prepare for all of the new incentives that the Counter-Interpretation would allow. Without the ability to predict potential Affirmative cases, we cannot prepare a Negative strategy. This destroys fairness and education.**

### **3. This is a Voting Issue.**

**Remember, the plan has no chance of meeting the Negative interpretation. As long as we win that the interpretation better satisfies the standards presented in this round than the counter-interpretation does, then we win the debate on Topicality.**

## Answers to Grammar

### **1. We Meet.**

**There is nothing ungrammatical about the Negative interpretation. There was no need to include the phrase "one or more" because the word "increase" already implies that the Affirmative must expand existing incentives. And our interpretation is consistent with requiring plans to address more than one incentive, so the plural argument is irrelevant.**

### **2. Turn.**

**The resolution says "increase", not "create" or "establish". The wording of the resolution supports the Negative interpretation.**

### **3. Turn.**

**Extend our Princeton definition that "increase" means "make larger". You cannot make something larger if it does not exist. Grammar is a reason to prefer the Negative interpretation.**



## Answers to Grammar Most Important

### **1. Turn.**

**If we win that the Negative interpretation is more grammatical, then you automatically use that interpretation to determine Topicality. And since the Affirmative lacks any argument that they meet our interpretation, you would vote Negative immediately.**

### **2. Not Key to Predictability.**

**The Affirmative concedes that our interpretation is more limiting. The Counter-Interpretation allows all of the cases that ours does and many more. There is no way that a strictly larger interpretation could be more predictable, so the Negative automatically wins that standard.**

### **3. Limits are Most Important.**

**The Affirmative already has the huge advantage of getting to choose the case we debate. Strict limits on that choice are the only way to ensure fairness for the Negative. Allowing the Affirmative to do absolutely anything would make the topic area completely predictable but also completely impossible for the Negative to research, strategize, and prepare.**

## Answers to Ground

### **1. Turn.**

**The Negative doesn't need unique ground, we need predictable ground. The best arguments in the world won't do us any good if we don't know to research and prepare them before the debate.**

### **2. Limits Trump Ground.**

**Remember, the Affirmative's Counter-Interpretation allows all of the cases that our interpretation does plus infinitely many more. If the Affirmative has more strategic options, it cannot possibly be more fair to the Negative. As a judge, you must uphold fairness and education by selecting the most limiting interpretation of the resolution, which is the Negative's.**

## Increase Topicality Affirmative Answers – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline

588

587

332 S. Michigan Ave, Suite. 500 ·  
Chicago, Illinois 60604



312-427-0175  
[www.urbandebate.org](http://www.urbandebate.org)

## Increase 2AC Frontline

- 1. We Meet.** The federal government already provides some alternative energy incentives. A new incentive makes for a greater number of incentives than there are now, meaning that the plan does “increase alternative energy incentives in the United States” as required by the resolution.
- 2. Counter-Interpretation.** The Affirmative must increase the total amount of incentives for alternative energy in the United States, not necessarily the size of any particular existing incentive.
- 3. Grammar Proves.** The resolution says “increase alternative energy incentives” not “increase one or more alternative energy incentives.” This proves that it refers to incentives in general rather than to specific, existing incentives. If the Negative’s interpretation were correct, plans would have to provide more than one incentive, since incentives is plural in the resolution.
- 4. Grammar is the Most Important Standard.** A precise grammatical interpretation of the resolution is the only predictable and objective way to evaluate Topicality. A completely arbitrary interpretation might provide good Limits and Ground but would be wildly unfair to the Affirmative, who would never know before the start of the round what was expected of them. This turns the Predictability standard.
- 5. Ground.** If the Affirmative could only expand existing programs, it would be very difficult for the Negative to win unique turns and disadvantages. The Affirmative could always say that the existing program should have caused the impact already. Allowing new incentives makes for better Negative ground and more fair and educational debates.
- 6. Counter-Interpretation Turns the Every Word Standard.** As explained above, the resolution would have said “one or more incentives” if it meant to mandate an increase only to existing incentives. The Negative’s interpretation ignores the significance of the plural ‘incentives’.
- 7. No Abuse.** As long as the Negative has solid arguments against the case, they have a fair chance to win and there is no loss to education. Make them prove specific abuse caused by our plan before you consider Topicality.

## Extra-Topicality – Table of Contents

1NC Shell	590
Extensions to Violation	591
2NC Overview	594
Answers to We Meet – Incentives	595
Answers to Efficiency = Alternative Energy	596
Answers to Conservation Inevitable	597
Answers to Core of the Topic	598
Answers to Bi-Directionality	599
Answers to Reasonability	600

## Topicality – Conservation Extra Topical

### **A. Interpretation: “Alternative energy incentives” are incentives to generate more alternative energy.**

Mike Lobash, contributing author for facilities.net, August 2005. [“Alternative Energy: Green Incentives and Options Are On the Rise”, <http://www.facilitiesnet.com/bom/article.asp?id=3177>]

Alternative Energy Incentives State and local governments, as well as utilities, offer incentives to encourage the use of alternative energy sources. Here’s a look at where incentives are available and where regulations exists to encourage the use of on-site power systems and the purchase of green power.

### **B. Violation: The affirmative both encourages more alternative energy AND more efficient use of fossil fuels.**

Robert Greenstein, et al. founder and Executive Director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, June 3, 2008. [“HOW LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS FARE IN THE SENATE CLIMATE-CHANGE BILL” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, <http://www.cbpp.org/6-3-08climate.htm>]

“Cap-and-trade” legislation works by limiting the supply of fossil-fuel energy and thereby raising its price relative to other prices, in order to spur conservation and the development and use of cleaner energy sources.

### **C. Reasons to Prefer the Negative Interpretation:**

**1. Ground – the affirmative can run affirmatives that do not increase the total amount of renewable energy, but only increase energy efficiency. This would undermine negative link ground to the economy disadvantage.**

**2. Education – allowing energy efficiency dodges the alternative energy debate and supplants it with a debate about the effectiveness of energy efficiency – this is an unpredictable extrapolation of the resolution.**

**3. Extra Topicality is a voting issue. Extra topicality allows the affirmative to claim larger advantages, run unpredictable plans, and dodge negative arguments.**

### **D. Topicality is a necessary burden to ensure competitive equity between the negative and affirmative team.**

## Extensions to Violation

### **( ) Cap and Trade creates an incentive for conservation of fossil fuel energy**

Robert J. Samuelson, contributing editor of Newsweek, July 8, 2008 ["Let's just call it cap and tax" Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/139454/page/1>]

If we're going to use price to try to stimulate those new technologies, let's at least do it honestly. Most economists think that a straightforward tax on carbon would have the same incentive effects for alternative fuels and conservation as cap-and-trade without the rigidities and uncertainties of emission limits. A tax is more visible, understandable and democratic. If environmental groups still prefer an allowance system, let's call it by its proper name: "cap and tax."

### **( ) Cap and Trade results in greater energy conservation**

Washington post, May 30 2008. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/05/29/AR2008052903263.html>

The fundamental way a cap-and-trade system achieves emissions reductions is by increasing the price of emissions-intensive goods, thereby curtailing their use. Artificially depressing prices reduces the incentive to conserve, forcing the economy to make more-costly reductions (with concomitant price increases) elsewhere.

### Extensions to Violation

**( ) The revenues gained from a cap and trade increase the likelihood of energy conservation being part of the plan.**

Dallas Burtraw, et al, Senior fellow at Resources for the Future, June 2005.  
[“Allocation of CO2 allowances in the regional greenhouse gas cap-and-trade program” Resources for the Future, <http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-DP-05-25.pdf>.]

One of the most important and contentious features of an emissions trading program is how emissions allowances are initially distributed. Several distribution approaches have been considered in other regulatory contexts. One such approach is to distribute allowances on the basis of historic measures of electricity generation; this approach is often called grandfathering because it distributes allowances without charge to incumbents in the industry. Another approach is to regularly update the calculation underlying the allowance distribution based on current- or recent-year data. Like distribution based on historic data, an updating approach distributes allowances free of charge and also could distribute according to various measures, such as the share of electricity generation, emissions, or heat input (related to fuel use) at a facility. The primary alternative to these free distribution approaches is the sale of allowances through an auction, directly or indirectly (e.g., allowances may be distributed for free to third parties such as energy consumers or their trustees, which then sell allowances through an auction). A key feature distinguishing types of auction approaches is the dispensation of revenues raised under the auction. Revenues could be returned to industry or consumers, used to compensate communities, invested in energy conservation, or used to offset other needs for tax revenue by government.



### Extensions to Violation

#### **( ) There are multiple possible advantages the affirmative could claim off of energy efficiency**

Dallas Burtraw, et al, Senior fellow at Resources for the Future, June 2005.  
[“Allocation of CO2 allowances in the regional greenhouse gas cap-and-trade program” Resources for the Future, <http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-DP-05-25.pdf>.]

The benefits of auctioning include providing a source of revenue that could potentially address inequities brought about by a carbon policy (e.g., by compensating consumers for high prices or communities that are severely affected) or be used to make investments in energy conservation. Alternatively, the revenues from auctioning allowances may have economy-wide efficiency benefits if they are used to reduce taxes.

#### **( ) There is a clear distinction between incentives to increase energy efficiency and incentives to increase alternative energy**

Per-Olof Busch, political scientist, is a research fellow at the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Freie Universitat Berlin, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science March, 2005 P.LN

Energy taxes are market-based environmental policy instruments that tax energy consumption or production. Their overarching goal is to reduce CO2 emissions from the use of fossil fuel in energy production and thereby mitigate climate change. By increasing energy prices, they set market incentives for energy conservation or, if the tax base is calculated on the carbon content of energy sources, for the use of renewable energy sources.

## 2NC Overview

The affirmative has the burden of increasing alternative energy in the United States. A cap and trade policy goes beyond that burden and claims advantages off increasing energy efficiency. This is not as benign as it sounds. A cap and trade policy dodges our economy DA by claiming that it is more flexible than a restriction on carbon use.

This opens the door for the affirmative to write a new, and unpredictable list of possible plans. One topical plan would just increase the efficiency of current carbon consumption, which would sidestep the questions if alternative energy is good, if it works, or even if we should increase it.

Finally, extra topicality is a reason to reject the affirmative. If you allow extra topicality, the affirmative could claim to give money to solar energy and any of the following:

Lower gas prices by government funding  
Increase the efficiency of automobiles  
Or even withdraw from Iraq

Topicality is a voting issue to make sure debate is fair for both sides.

## AT: We Meet – Incentives

**1. This proves the affirmative is extra topical** – even if the affirmative increases incentives for alternative energy, it goes beyond this, and also makes energy more efficient.

### AT: Efficiency = Alternative Energy

**1. This view of the topic is bad for education** – the central debate this year is over the effectiveness, viability, and benefits of alternative energy. If conservation of fossil fuels is topical, the affirmative would never have to debate any of these issues.

**2. It is also bad for negative ground** – core affirmative ground is giving money to create new resources, the negative is supposed to be able to counter plan with command-and-control legislation. Under the aff view of the topic, it is fair ground for the affirmative to do both.

**3. There are virtually limitless ways to increase energy efficiency** – The affirmative can now put higher emissions standards on any form of transportation; they could change gas refineries or the gas usage of US military vehicles. Moreover, it is topical to change the efficiency standards in any manufacturing sector of the economy. This creates an almost impossible burden on the negative to be able to research all of these possible cases.

## AT: Conservation is Inevitable

**1. Our interpretation still provides negative ground** – as long as the affirmative is required to increase alternative energy, and not just get more energy out of existing energy – the negative is guaranteed the core ground of the topic.

**2. This is a different type of energy conservation** – our interpretation revolves around increasing existing efficiency. Even if there are fewer fossil fuels used post-plan, we would still be able to make the arguments like renewable energy doesn't work and it would harm the economy.

### AT: Core to the Topic

- 1. There are multiple ways to do a cap and trade program** – one topical way would be to allow “upstream” permits. These are permits that are only issued to energy companies. If the affirmative restricted the cap and trade policy to only these companies, it would not create an incentive for greater efficiency.
- 2. Cap and Trade is not core for “alternative energy”** – it is about a fossil fuel reduction, NOT about increasing energy production
- 3. It can still be made as a negative argument** – under our interpretation, the negative can counter plan to cap and trade and debate if regulation is more effective than incentives.

### AT: Bi-Directionality

**1. This would not make the resolution bi-directional** because the affirmative would not be claiming to decrease alternative energy. As long as the affirmative increases alternative energy, we have the core negative ground.

**2. Allowing efficiency creates a bidirectional resolution** – the affirmative could claim that less alternative energy would be required in a world of higher energy economy standards.

## AT: Extra T Reasonability

- 1. Reasonability is a vague standard** – what is reasonable to one judge might not be reasonable to another. This makes it difficult for debaters to pick in-round strategies.
- 2. It is unreasonable to allow all the cases the affirmative justifies**, extend our arguments on the counter interpretation.
- 3. We think debate should be viewed in terms of competing interpretations**, where you compare what debate looks like under the negative view and the affirmative view. If the affirmative cannot provide the best view of the topic – then you should not reward them for losing topicality. Instead, we should be trying to find the best topic to debate.



## Extra-Topicality Affirmative Answers – Table of Contents

2AC Frontline	602
---------------	-----

## 2AC: Conservation Topical

**1. We Meet** – the affirmative creates an incentive to switch away from fossil fuels – this is our only burden. Extend the UCS evidence from the 1AC.

### **2. Our Interpretation: Energy efficiency is a form of “alternative energy”**

Kamaal R. Zaidi, Albany Law Environmental Outlook Journal 2007 p.In

Aside from entailing fewer deleterious effects on the environment, the application of wind energy in the marketplace is generally meant to compete against rising costs of energy supplied by conventional fossil fuels like coal or natural gas. To foster more efficient energy pricing regimes, the Canadian government offers tax incentives to businesses and potential investors to create renewable forms of energy that supplement modern environmental policies of sustainable development. n92 In its 1996 federal budget, the Canadian government allowed investors to fully write-off intangible start-up costs by investing in renewable energy projects like wind turbines. n93 In 1998, the Canadian government reiterated how these tax incentives would continue to be applied for companies planning to invest in energy conservation as "green" renewable energy. n94

**3. Conservation is inevitable** – even if the affirmative is limited to only funding alternative energy, there would be fewer fossil fuels used. This would be a form of energy conservation.

### **4. Cap and Trade is predictable – it is central to the topic**

David M. Driesen, Associate Professor, Syracuse University College of Law, Buffalo Environmental Law Journal Fall, 2002 / Spring, 2003. p.In

This means that the question of how the government might encourage movement toward renewable energy and energy conservation as appropriate is more complex than the command and control/economic incentive dichotomy would suggest. The experience with both traditional regulation and emissions trading teaches that stringent emission limits play an essential role in providing incentives for environmental innovation. n145

## 2AC: Conservation Topical

### **5. We Meet – Cap and Trade Creates Incentives for cleaner energy.**

Sightline institute, No Date Given.

[http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res\\_pubs/cap-and-tradeFAQ](http://www.sightline.org/research/energy/res_pubs/cap-and-tradeFAQ)

A promising approach for accelerating the shift to a clean-energy economy is a market-based system called "cap and trade." A cap-and-trade system would put responsible limits on climate-warming pollution, while creating incentives for a cleaner, more efficient energy economy.

**6. Caps are necessary to prevent bi-directionality** – without a clear limitation of fossil fuels the affirmative could claim they increase energy use by decreasing the price. This would double the topic size for the negative.

**7. Extra Topicality should be evaluated in terms of reasonability** – at the very worst the affirmative has one extra link to the economy – given how hard it is to tell the difference between "new energy" and "energy conservation", the judge should view extra topicality from the view of reasonability.