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GoP Good – Economy

GoP win key to the economy – gridlock causes immediate growth

Business Week 7-22

The Midterms Could Spark a Stock Rally, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/10\_31/b4189048926083.htm

President Barack Obama has already presided over the biggest stock-market rally during the start of a Presidency since Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s. Now, if election year history is any guide, stocks are poised for further gains, though for reasons Obama probably wouldn't like. Should Democratics fare poorly in this fall's midterm elections and lose control of the House to Republicans, stock investors could view the resulting split government as a positive. "Markets love gridlock," says Ken Fisher, who oversees $35 billion in Woodside, Calif., as chief executive officer of Fisher Investments. "What the markets want to see is no change: less legislation that engages in changes in taxes, spending, regulation, or property rights." The billionaire Fisher expects the market to stage a rally even before the midterm elections. Bets made on Intrade, a Dublin-based prediction market, show a 54 percent chance Republicans will take the House. How big are the potential stock-market gains? The Standard & Poor's 500-stock index has advanced 15 percent on average in years when there was a Democratic President and Republican majority in Congress, the most of any combination, according to New York-based Strategas Research Partners. The S&P 500 gained 6.7 percent in the 12 months after the 2006 midterm election, when Republicans and President George W. Bush lost control of both houses. In the 1994 congressional elections under President Bill Clinton, Democrats gave up their majority in the House and Senate. That was followed by the S&P's 34 percent surge in 1995, the biggest in 37 years, data compiled by Bloomberg show. The chance that Democrats will lose their Senate majority this year is 18 percent, according to Intrade.

\*\*\*Health Care\*\*\*

Health Care Internal

Dems loss leads to health care repeal – one house blocks implementation

Wise 10

David Wise 6/22/2010 WisPolitics “Westlake, Johnson talk Gulf spill, Patriot Act at forum” Retrieved on 06/22/2010 from <http://www.wispolitics.com/index.iml?Article=200566>

Johnson said he would seek to repeal the recently passed federal health care reform law and called for malpractice reform, insurance portability and purchase of insurance across state lines. Although he acknowledged that it may not be able to happen for some time, he said if Republicans win at least one house of Congress they could at least block implementation of some of the provisions.

Dem loss of the House enables the GOP to repeal health care

Brownstein 9

Ronald Brownstein, National Journal, 11-14-2009, “GOP Faces Choice If Health Bill Passes,” http://www.nationaljournal.com/njmagazine/politicalconnections.php

The stakes in the elections of 2010 and 2012 have just increased exponentially. Although many obstacles remain, the House's narrow approval of health care reform last weekend bettered the odds that President Obama will sign legislation vastly expanding the number of insured Americans. But the near-unanimous opposition of House Republicans to the bill signaled that the GOP may resist and challenge the initiative for years. That means, if the overhaul becomes law, the coming elections could determine whether nearly universal health care joins Social Security and Medicare as a central branch of the American social-welfare system -- or whether Republicans acquire the leverage to repeal or severely prune the new program before it takes root. Since last Saturday's vote, much attention has focused on the formidable hurdles still confronting reform legislation in the Senate and on the House blueprint's imperfections, particularly its lack of key cost-containment measures, such as the independent Medicare commission proposed in the Senate Finance Committee's bill. But that focus, while understandable, has obscured the historic significance of the House's 220-215 vote approving the plan. Some senior House Republicans have already pledged to repeal any health care bill if they regain the majority. Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Richard Nixon, and Bill Clinton all pursued universal coverage, but none could advance such a bill as far as a floor vote in either chamber. "There is still a long way to go, but the House vote really was an historical marker," says political scientist James Morone of Brown University, the co-author of The Heart of Power, a new book analyzing how presidents since FDR have handled health care. "We have had brilliant, successful, charismatic leadership at various times in American history. And no one has gotten as far as this Congress and this president."

Health Care Good – Economy

Key to the economy

Jonathan Gruber, Prof of Economics @ MIT, 12-4-2008, “Medicine for the Job Market,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/opinion/04gruber.html?\_r=1&ref=opinion

Given the present need to address the economic crisis, many people say the government cannot afford a big investment in health care, that these plans are going nowhere fast. But this represents a false choice, because health care reform is good for our economy. As the country slips into what is possibly the worst downturn since the Depression, nearly all experts agree that Washington should stimulate demand with new spending. And one of the most effective ways to spend would be to give states money to enroll more people in Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Plan. This would free up state money for rebuilding roads and bridges and other public works projects — spending that could create jobs. Health care reform can be an engine of job growth in other ways, too. Most proposals call for investments in health information technology, including the computerization of patient medical records. During the campaign, for example, Mr. Obama proposed spending $50 billion on such technology. The hope is that computerized recordkeeping, and the improved sharing of information among doctors that it would enable, would improve the quality of patient care and perhaps also lower medical costs. More immediately, it would create jobs in the technology sector. After all, somebody would need to develop the computer systems and operate them for thousands of American health care providers. Expanded insurance coverage would also drive demand for high-paying, rewarding jobs in health services. Most reform proposals emphasize primary care, much of which can be provided by nurse practitioners, registered nurses and physician’s assistants. These jobs could provide a landing spot for workers who have lost jobs in other sectors of the economy. Fundamental health care reform would also stimulate more consumer spending, as previously uninsured families would no longer need to save every extra penny to cover a medical emergency. When the federal government expanded Medicaid in the 1990s, my own research has shown, the newly insured significantly increased their spending on consumer goods. Universal health insurance coverage would also address economic problems that existed before this downturn began — and that are likely to linger after growth resumes. In our current system, people who leave or lose their jobs often must go without insurance for months or years, and this discourages people from moving to positions where they could be more productive. Most reform proposals call for the creation of pools of insurance coverage that would guarantee access to high-quality, affordable care for people who are self-employed or out of work, increasing their mobility. If this coverage focuses on disease prevention and wellness, it could also improve the health, and thereby the productivity, of the workforce. In the long term, the greatest fiscal threat facing this nation is the growth in the costs of health care. These costs have more than tripled as a share of our economy since 1950, and show no signs of abating. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that the share of the economy devoted to healthcare will double by 2050.

Health Care Good – Disease

Reform is key to prevent epidemic breakouts

Vanessa Mason, Public Health Specialist and graduate of Yale, 8-16-2008, “Universal Health Care Series: The National Security Argument,” http://vanessamason.wordpress.com/2008/08/16/universal-health-care-series-the-national-security-argument/

The flu epidemic of 1918 killed one-fifth of the world’s population in about two years, resulting in more deaths from the epidemic than World War I. Our interconnected society makes epidemics more likely to occur with the ease of mobility within countries and in between them. A recent epidemic scare happened in 2007 when Andrew Speaker, after receiving a diagnosis of drug-resistant tuberculosis, proceeded to travel overseas and back on commercial flights for his wedding and honeymoon. Speaker was already out of the country when before authorities realized that he was infected with multi-drug resistant tuberculosis, which is the most difficult strain to treat. Fortunately, no one was infected; also fortunately, Speaker was diagnosed and authorities were informed that he was infected. Imagine what could have happened if Speaker could not have seen a doctor. MRSA and other “superbugs” are becoming increasingly frequent. Avian flu and pandemic flu are also looming biological dangers. Imagine a situation where a patient has a bacterial infection but never goes to see a doctor because they can not afford the visit. The patient would continue to pass through the general population, infecting others. Public health officials would have greater difficulty finding the source of the infection because there would be so many more cases. Imagine a situation where a patient actually sees a doctor, but in a crowded emergency room. The doctor, overwhelmed with cases, quickly diagnoses the bacterial infection and prescribes penicillin. The patient takes the medication, but the bacteria becomes resistant to penicillin. His condition worsens and he can spread a drug-resistant strain to others. Imagine a situation caused that as a byproduct of his socioeconomic status, the patient lives in conditions that are ripe for the spread of infections: close quarters and poor ventilation. Poverty also compromises the strength of one’s immune system, leaving the body open to infections and once infected, the body can not fight infections well. 1) Universal health care provides a greater likelihood of early detection to curb infections before they grow too quickly. Early detection is a key advantage in controlling epidemics and preventing deaths. Earlier detection also helps to reduce the likelihood that drug-resistant strains develop in the general population. 2) Increasing access to health care allows health care professionals to identify patients at risk and intervene to offer ways to reduce the risk of infection. 3) Universal health care enables consistent access to proper treatment. Treating infections with the wrong medication or with an insufficient dosage can cause the pathogen to mutate, creating drug-resistant strains. Preventing epidemics should be a priority of paramount concern if the government actually wants to ensure national security. Implementing universal health care is an important step in the right direction.

**Extinction**

**South China Morning Post,** 1-4-19**96** (Dr. Ben Abraham= “called "one of the 100 greatest minds in history" by super-IQ society Mensa” and owner of “Toronto-based biotechnology company, Structured Biologicals Inc” according to same article)

Despite the importance of the discovery of the "facilitating" cell, it is not what Dr Ben-Abraham wants to talk about. There is a much more pressing medical crisis at hand - one he believes the world must be alerted to: the possibility of a virus deadlier than HIV. If this makes Dr Ben-Abraham sound like a prophet of doom, then he makes no apology for it. AIDS, the Ebola outbreak which killed more than 100 people in Africa last year, the flu epidemic that has now affected 200,000 in the former Soviet Union - they are all, according to Dr Ben-Abraham, the "tip of the iceberg". Two decades of intensive study and research in the field of virology have convinced him of one thing: in place of natural and man-made disasters or nuclear warfare, humanity could face extinction because of a single virus, deadlier than HIV. "An airborne virus is a lively, complex and dangerous organism," he said. "It can come from a rare animal or from anywhere and can mutate constantly. If there is no cure, it affects one person and then there is a chain reaction and it is unstoppable. It is a tragedy waiting to happen." That may sound like a far-fetched plot for a Hollywood film, but Dr Ben -Abraham said history has already proven his theory. Fifteen years ago, few could have predicted the impact of AIDS on the world. Ebola has had sporadic outbreaks over the past 20 years and the only way the deadly virus - which turns internal organs into liquid - could be contained was because it was killed before it had a chance to spread. Imagine, he says, if it was closer to home: an outbreak of that scale in London, New York or Hong Kong. It could happen anytime in the next 20 years - theoretically, it could happen tomorrow. The shock of the AIDS epidemic has prompted virus experts to admit "that something new is indeed happening and that the threat of a deadly viral outbreak is imminent", said Joshua Lederberg of the Rockefeller University in New York, at a recent conference. He added that the problem was "very serious and is getting worse". Dr Ben-Abraham said: "Nature isn't benign. The survival of the human species is not a preordained evolutionary programme. Abundant sources of genetic variation exist for viruses to learn how to mutate and evade the immune system." He cites the 1968 Hong Kong flu outbreak as an example of how viruses have outsmarted human intelligence. And as new "mega-cities" are being developed in the Third World and rainforests are destroyed, disease-carrying animals and insects are forced into areas of human habitation. "This raises the very real possibility that lethal, mysterious viruses would, for the first time, infect humanity at a large scale and imperil the survival of the human race," he said.

Health Care Good – Space

Health care reform is key to prevent budgetary collapse from entitlement costs

Jason Rosenbaum, Deputy Director of Online Campaigns, Health Care for America Now, 2-23-2009,

http://healthcare.nationaljournal.com/2009/02/obamas-fiscal-responsibility-s.php "Obama’s Fiscal Summit and Healthcare”

As pointed out by others here and elsewhere, Medicare and Medicaid are in fact set to rise in cost dramatically, and this is indeed a problem. And it's not just Medicare and Medicaid. Our entire health care system is set to rise in cost, a cost that's projected to reach almost 20% of GDP by 2017 if current trends continue. So it's not just the federal government that has a problem. With one out of every five dollars in our economy writ large projected to be spent on health care, every person in this country has a problem. The cost of health care must be brought under control to claim fiscal responsibility, and not just the cost of Medicare and Medicaid but the cost of health care for everyone. So, how do we control costs? We control costs first and foremost by getting everyone in America affordable coverage with benefits that meet their needs. We do this by giving people a choice to keep their private health insurance plan or the option to buy into a public health insurance plan, filling in the gaps in private insurance so everyone can have coverage. When people are covered by insurance, they get the care they need, not just catastrophic care at the emergency room when their health problems become dire (which is much more expensive). This prevention lowers cost and improves health outcomes. As this chart from the Center for Economic and Policy Research shows, if we can get our health care costs in line with other countries (the "Low Health Care Costs line) as opposed to our projected exponential growth, our budget deficit will stabilize. Fiscal responsibility therefore means controlling all health care costs, not just Medicare and Medicaid. President Obama understands this problem, and though it may require an upfront federal investment, in the long run it's the only way to use taxpayer money wisely.

**Failure to fix entitlement costs kills funding for NASA, ending space exploration**

Charles Miller, President of Space Policy Consulting, Inc., and Jeff Foust, editor and publisher of The Space Review, April 14, 2008, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1106/1

Obviously, these long-term trends in Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are not sustainable, and our national leaders will be forced to do something about it. This is our point. A near-term fiscal crisis is emerging in the next decade, and solving it will be the responsibility of the next President of the United States and the US Congress. Recent history provides a taste of what NASA may be facing in the very near future. During the Bush Administration NASA has done reasonably well in terms of spending: its budget, in constant 2008 dollars, has increased from $16.3 billion in fiscal year 2001 (the last Clinton Administration budget) to $17.1 billion in fiscal year 2008. This 0.7% real increase per year, on average, is far short of the increases that many space advocates have been seeking, but it is better than what some other agencies have received during the same period. However, this small budget increase has taken place during a time when balancing the budget has not been a priority for either a Republican President or the U.S. Congress. By comparison, during the Clinton Administration, when both the Democratic White House and Republican Congress sought (and achieved) a balanced budget, NASA fared far worse: in constant 2008 dollars, its budget fell from $20 billion in fiscal year 1993 to $16.3 billion in 2001, a decline of nearly 20 percent. Considering the budgetary challenges created by the retirement of the baby boomers, the next graph may be a better guide to the austerity NASA will face in the years to come than its experience of the last few years. These fiscal pressures will force the next president—regardless of whoever is elected in November—to make some hard decisions in the years to come about discretionary spending. It is unrealistic to expect that NASA will somehow be immune to pressures to cut spending. A budget cut in the next Administration that is equivalent to last decade’s cut would result in reduction of NASA’s budget of over $3 billion per year. If that happens, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the current exploration architecture to continue in anything resembling its current form and schedule. It will be significantly delayed, radically altered, or even cancelled. Should that happen, is there a way to keep the Vision for Space Exploration alive?

Health Care Good – Space

Extinction

Paul Spudis, Principal Investigator in the Planetary Geology Program of the NASA Office of Space Science, Solar System Exploration Division and Senior Professional Staff, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, 8-4 2004, http://www.spudislunarresources.com/Opinion\_Editorial/The%20Space%20Program%20and%20the%20Meaning%20of%20Life.htm

The race to the Moon did more than prove American technical skill and the power of a free society. The real lesson and gift from Apollo was a wholly unexpected glimpse into our future. From both the chemical and physical evidence of impact (which we learned from the record of the lunar rocks) and the fossil record, we discovered that large body collisions had occurred in our past and will occur again in our future. Such catastrophes resulted in the widespread destruction of life, in some cases instantaneously eliminating more than 90% of all living species. In short, we discovered that ultimately, life on Earth is doomed. Our new understanding of impact as a fundamental geological force, leaves us only with the question of when, not if, the next large collision will occur. And ‘when’ is something we cannot predict. Human civilization is cumulative. Our culture provides positive and beautiful things through music, art and knowledge – it embodies the wisdom of all who have gone before us. With that wisdom, we have rejected the evil doctrines of slavery, Nazism and communism. People live longer, happier and more productive lives as time goes on. So one must ask, are we here for a reason and if so, to what purpose? Before passing the torch to their children, humans feel the need to create something of long-term value – something that will exist long after their time here on Earth. Be it a garden or a cure for cancer, we want to leave this world a little bit better than we found it. Will the prospect of our extinction harden our resolve to survive, or will it hasten the decay of our culture? Without an escape hatch, our children will lose focus - lose sight of goals and grand visions. The President’s Vision for Space directs us to extend human reach by developing new capabilities in space travel. Returning to the Moon will facilitate that goal. There we will gain technical ability and learn how to use the abundant energy and material resources waiting on other worlds. With the knowledge of how to “live off the land” in space, we can move out into the universe – populating one world after another. We must not die out here on Earth. Our values, culture and ability to leave this planet set us apart as a species. We have looked into the past and have seen the future of our world. Life here on Earth is destined for extinction. By venturing forth beyond Earth, we can ensure our survival. To extend and preserve humanity and human achievement, we must advance new capabilities in space travel. The President has asked for $1 Billion (about 0.0004 of the Federal budget) spread over the next four years, to begin this journey. As we acquire capability with resources derived from the Moon and elsewhere, we will create a spacefaring infrastructure.

A strong space program is key to heg

Marc Kaufman, science writer, Washington Post, December 4, 2006

In Griffin's big-picture view, the stakes in space are high -- which helps explain why he is so driven about return to manned lunar exploration and beyond. Not only are there major national security issues involved -- the country relies on space-based defense like no other nation -- but the NASA administrator said the United States can remain a preeminent civilization only if it continues to explore space aggressively. If the United States pulls back, Griffin said, others will speed ahead. Russia and China have sent astronauts into low-Earth orbit, and India, Japan and the Europeans all have the technical ability to do the same now -- and far more in the future. International cooperation has been ingrained into the government's thinking about space, but the United States and others remain committed to manufacturing their own rockets and space capsules and will be looking for international cooperation only once they are on the moon or Mars or some asteroids in between. "I absolutely believe that America became a great power in the world, leapfrogging other great powers of the time, because of its mastery of the air," Griffin said. "In the 21st century and beyond, our society and nation, if we wish to remain in the first rank, must add to our existing capacities . . . to remain preeminent in the arts and sciences of space flight.”

Health Care Bad – Recruitment

Health care reform hurts military recruitment

Norris 8

Floyd, comments on finance and economics, Health’s Gain May Be Army’s Loss, NYT, Proquest

Call it the law of unintended consequences. When you fix one thing, it messes up other things. If the Democrats win the election this year, and are able to enact a health care plan that extends adequate coverage to all Americans, the loser could be the Army. Getting enough people to enlist could become a major problem for the next president. Senator [John McCain](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/john_mccain/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the presumptive Republican candidate, has already pointed out that Senator [Barack Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the likely Democratic candidate, never served in the military. It remains to be seen how potent that will be as an issue, given the fact that the last four presidential elections have been won by the candidate with the less impressive military resume. But there is something else that distinguishes Mr. Obama from all recent candidates for the presidency. He would be the first presidential nominee to come of age after the draft was abolished in the administration of [Richard M. Nixon](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/n/richard_milhous_nixon/index.html?inline=nyt-per). He never had to decide how to deal with the draft, and legally was under no more pressure to enlist than he was to go to medical school or become a bus driver. Joining the military was a career option like any other. And that has made it harder to put the Army together. Government polls [show](http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/news/2008/04/marine_recruiting_041208w/) that the proportion of young people who think they might enlist is roughly half what it was in the late 1980s. The military has responded with more recruiters and higher cash enlistment bonuses, and has met its goals. A significant factor for many recruits, it turns out, is the military’s generous health benefits for dependants.

Ground force availability is vital to the perception of our military – A declining pool of recruits risks aggression by our enemies

Perry 6

William, Senior Fellow @ Hoover Institution, The US Military: Under Strain and at Risk, The National Security Advisory Group, January 2006, National\_Security\_Report\_01252006.pdf

In the meantime, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond to other contingencies. The absence of a credible strategic reserve in our ground forces increases the risk that potential adversaries will be tempted to challenge the United States. Since the end of World War II, a core element of U.S. strategy has been maintaining a military capable of deterring and, if necessary, defeating aggression in more than one theater at a time. As a global power with global interests, the United States must be able to deal with challenges to its interests in multiple regions of the world simultaneously. Today, however, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond outside the Afghan and Iraqi theaters of operations. If the Army were ordered to send significant forces to another crisis today, its only option would be to deploy units at readiness levels far below what operational plans would require – increasing the risk to the men and women being sent into harm’s way and to the success of the mission. As stated rather blandly in one DoD presentation, the Army “continues to accept risk” in its ability to respond to crises on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere. Although the United States can still deploy air, naval, and other more specialized assets to deter or respond to aggression, the visible overextension of our ground forces has the potential to significantly weaken our ability to deter and respond to some contingencies.

Health Care Bad – Recruitment

US primacy solves all major impacts

Ferguson 4

Niall, Prof of history @ Harvard, Hoover Digest

So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the Dark Age experiences that a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous—roughly 20 times more—meaning that friction between the world’s disparate “tribes” is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on fresh water and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too; it is now possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it. For more than two decades, globalization—the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital—has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. The reversal of globalization—which a new Dark Age would produce—would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression. As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile, as Europe’s Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists’ infiltration of the E.U. would become irreversible, increasing transatlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home were preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy—from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai—would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work. The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. If the United States retreats from global hegemony—its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier—its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity—a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.

Health Care Bad – Economy

Individual mandate will cause massive jobs loss

Robert **Book**, PhD 11-19-20**09** “The Senate Health Bill: How Mandates Kill Jobs and Punish Poor Workers”, Senior Research Fellow, Health Economics,

http://blog.heritage.org/2009/11/19/the-senate-health-bill-how-the-mandates-kill-jobs-and-punish-poor-workers/

Last night, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid released his giant version of the Senate health care bill, [H.R. 3590](http://democrats.senate.gov/reform/patient-protection-affordable-care-act.pdf). A first look at the bill – which is 2,074 pages long – shows yet another attempt to use taxes to punish uninsured Americans and punish companies that hire workers from low-income families, especially single parents. If you wanted to punish the poor and kill the job prospects of people who need jobs the most, this would be an effective way to do it. The Individual Mandate**.** First, there is the “individual responsibility” provision in Section 1501 (pages 320-340). This would require anyone who fails to obtain a qualifying health plan – with a benefit package to be defined later by bureaucrats – to pay an annual tax penalty of $750 per adult family member and $375 per child, with a maximum penalty of $2,250 per family. These penalties will be phased in from 2014 to 2016 and then indexed for inflation, which means they are likely to increase nearly every year. These taxes are fixed amounts based on family size, not income. The rich will not pay more, and the middle class will not pay less (although the poor may qualify for exemptions). This is even worse than the House bill, which imposed a tax equal to 2.5 percent of modified adjusted gross income above the minimum income necessary to file a tax return. A family of at least two adults and two children is actually worse off under the Senate bill if they make less than $99,350 a year, and worse off under the House bill if they make more. The only nod to affordability is a “hardship exemption” if the lowest available premium for a bare-bones plan is more than 8 percent of your income. But that saves you money only if your income is less than $28,125 a year. There are, however, a few exemptions. You won’t have to pay the tax if you are a member of a qualified religion, as described in [Section 1402(g)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code](http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode26/usc_sec_26_00001402----000-.html), or if you are a member of a “Health Sharing Ministry.” You also won’t have to pay the tax if you are an illegal alien (assuming you can prove your status) or if you are incarcerated, or if you reside outside the United States for most of the year. **The Employer Mandate.** Then there is the “employer responsibility” provision (Section 1511-1513, pages 346-357). Companies with more than 50 employees are required to offer qualified health plans – with a benefit package to be defined later by bureaucrats – to their full-time employees or pay a tax of $750 per full-time employee. That’s a lot cheaper than providing health insurance, and the $750 is just a tax – it doesn’t count towards the employee’s premium. However, an employer who does offer qualifying insurance isn’t entirely off the hook. Suppose an employer offers insurance, but has an employee from a low-income family who qualifies for a premium subsidy in the “health insurance exchange” and decides to accept it. In that case, the employer is stuck with a tax penalty of $3,000 for that employee, and every other employee who qualifies and makes that same choice – unless it’s more than a quarter of the employees, in which case the tax is capped at $750 times the total number of full-time employees. (Workers will be permitted to opt out of their employer’s plan only if they qualify for a subsidy, have insurance through another family member, or if the employer covers less than 60 percent of their premium.) **Hurting the Poor.** In other words, if a company has a lot of low-income workers, they can save money by dropping their health plan and just paying the $750 per-employee tax. (And they can make as many employees as possible part-time.) However, if they have mostly middle-income workers, they face a heavy penalty — $3,000 – every time they hire a worker from a low-income family. This goes by the employee’s family income, not the income the employee is paid by any particular company. So a company could save $3,000 by hiring, say, someone with a working spouse or a teenager with working parents, rather than a single mother with three children. Even worse, if at least a quarter of the employees qualify for a premium subsidy based on their income and family size, the company is going to end up paying the same $750 per-employee tax – whether they offer insurance or not! So companies with a lot of low-income employees will essentially be encouraged to drop their health plans entire, dumping the remaining higher-income employees into the federal exchange at their own expense. **Seriously Bad Policy.** In other words, employers will have a strong tax incentive to lay off the workers who need the jobs most – people without other sources of income. How will employers know who those workers are? The federal officials will tell them when they send the tax bill (Section 1412). Employer will be required (Section 1513) to inform the IRS of precisely who their employees are and during which months they carried insurance, to make sure the IRS knows who has to pay the “individual responsibility” penalty.

Health Care Bad – Economy

Economic collapse

Massimo **Calabresi** “Unemployment dips, but long-term joblessness remains a concern” 20**09**,

http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1915185,00.html

For all the relief over the jobless figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Friday morning — 247,000 jobs were lost in July, far fewer than economists had expected — a dark problem lurks in the numbers: dangerously high levels of long-term unemployment in America. Unlike recent recessions, the current economic crisis has been characterized by skyrocketing numbers of those out of work for three, six or more months at a time. Economists worry that the shock of the past year's financial crisis may have driven the U.S. into a period of permanently high unemployment similar to what Europe has suffered for decades. While overall unemployment dropped from 9.5% in June to 9.4% in July, the number of long-term unemployed (those jobless for 27 weeks or more) increased to 4.9 million, up from 4.4 million in June. Viewed another way, 32.5% of the total unemployed had been looking for work for longer than half a year, up from 28.9% in June. "This recession is taking people a very long time relative to past recessions to find another job," says John Irons, policy director at the Economic Policy Institute in Washington. Traditionally the U.S. has been able to maintain unemployment at 5% or less, while Europe has for the past few decades been stuck at 8%, even during periods of economic growth. [(See "What to Expect When the Recession Ends.")](http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1905240_1905239,00.html) There are several reasons to worry about the high long-term unemployment numbers. On the individual level, the longer you stay unemployed, the more unemployable you become. People lose job skills, social skills and the will to search for a job as they spend time out of work. Unemployment affects individuals' sense of well being, producing higher rates of depression and lower levels of life satisfaction. Studies have shown mixed results as to the effect of unemployment on health. On average all job losers tend to face a permanent reduction in their salary, and that is even more common for the long-term unemployed. Long-term unemployment is also dangerous for the economy as a whole. One quarter of the long-term unemployed permanently leave the workforce, a recent study by the Congressional Budget Office found, producing increased loss of output in the economy. Long-term unemployment burdens social services, diminishes spending levels in the economy and drains overall savings. It can also affect unemployment among young, first-time job-seekers. "Long-term unemployment is debilitating for people trying to find jobs in the first place," says Professor James K. Galbraith of the University of Texas at Austin. The more long term unemployed there are already competing for jobs with long résumés, the harder it is for first timers with no work experience to get the job, thereby tossing them into the pool and sustaining the high rate. [(See "Great Depression 2.0: Tracing the Meltdown.")](http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1846697_1846700,00.html)

Health Care Bad – AT: Key to Care

Very few people can’t afford care, they choose not to sign up – the public option won’t change that

IBD 9

Investor’s Business Daily, July, Health Care Claims Don’t Add Up, Lexis

Still, lawmakers and the White House press on, relying on GOP weakness in the House and a new veto-proof majority in the Senate. They're also relying on a lack of awareness that claims made on behalf of national health care may be mostly false. Among them: • America has a health care crisis. No, we don't. Forty-seven million people lack insurance. Of the remaining 85% of the population, or 258 million people, polls show high satisfaction with the current coverage. Indeed, a 2006 poll by ABC News, the Kaiser Family Foundation and USA Today found 89% of Americans were happy with their own health care. As for the estimated 47 million not covered by health insurance, 20 million can afford to buy it, according to a study by former CBO Director June O'Neill. Most of the other 27 million are single and under 35, with as many as a third illegal aliens. When it's all whittled down, as few as 12 million are unable to buy insurance — less than 4% of a population of 305 million. For this we need to nationalize 17% of our nation's $14 trillion economy and change the current care that 89% like? • Health care reform will save money. Few of the plans now coming out of Congress will save anything, says the CBO's current chief, Douglas Elmendorf. In fact, he says, they'll lead to substantially higher costs in the future — costs that will be "unsustainable." As it is, estimates for reforming health care range from $1 trillion to $3.6 trillion. Much will be spent on subsidies to make a so-called public option more attractive to consumers than private plans. To pay for it, the president has suggested about $600 billion in new taxes, meaning that $500 billion to $2.1 trillion in new health care spending over the next decade will be unfunded. This could push up the nation's already soaring deficit, expected to reach $10 trillion through 2019 without health care reform. Massive new tax hikes will probably be needed to close the gap. • Only the rich will pay for reform. The 5.4% surtax on millionaires the president is pushing gets all the attention, but everyone down to $280,000 in income will pay more. Doesn't that still leave out the middle class and poor? Sorry. Workers who decline to take part will pay a tax of up to 2% of earnings. And small-businesses must pony up 8% of their payrolls. The poor and middle class must pay in other ways, without knowing it. The biggest hit will be on small businesses, which, due to new payroll taxes, will be less likely to hire workers. Today's 9.5% jobless rate may become a permanent feature of our economy — just as it is in Europe, where nationalized health care is common. • Government-run health care produces better results. The biggest potential lie of all. America has the best health care in the world, and most Americans know it. Yet we hear that many "go without care" while in nationalized systems it is "guaranteed." U.S. life expectancy in 2006 was 78.1 years, ranking behind 30 other countries. So if our health care is so good, why don't we live as long as everyone else? Three reasons. One, our homicide rate is two to three times higher than other countries. Two, because we drive so much, we have a higher fatality rate on our roads — 14.24 fatalities per 100,000 people vs. 6.19 in Germany, 7.4 in France and 9.25 in Canada. Three, Americans eat far more than those in other nations, contributing to higher levels of heart disease, diabetes and some cancers. These are diseases of wealth, not the fault of the health care system. A study by Robert Ohsfeldt of Texas A&M and John Schneider of the University of Iowa found that if you subtract our higher death rates from accidents and homicide, Americans actually live longer than people in other countries. In countries with nationalized care, medical outcomes are often catastrophically worse. Take breast cancer. According to the Heritage Foundation, breast cancer mortality in Germany is 52% higher than in the U.S.; the U.K.'s rate is 88% higher. For prostate cancer, mortality is 604% higher in the U.K. and 457% higher in Norway. Colorectal cancer? Forty percent higher in the U.K.But what about the health care paradise to our north? Americans have almost uniformly better outcomes and lower mortality rates than Canada, where breast cancer mortality is 9% higher, prostate cancer 184% higher and colon cancer 10% higher. Then there are the waiting lists. With a population just under that of California, 830,000 Canadians are waiting to be admitted to a hospital or to get treatment. In England, the list is 1.8 million deep. Universal health care, wrote Sally Pipes, president of the Pacific Research Institute in her excellent book, "Top Ten Myths Of American Health Care," will inevitably result in "higher taxes, forced premium payments, one-size-fits-all policies, long waiting lists, rationed care and limited access to cutting-edge medicine." Before you sign up, you might want to check with people in countries that have the kind of system the White House and Congress have in mind. Recent polls show that more than 70% of Germans, Australians, Britons, Canadians and New Zealanders think their systems need "complete rebuilding" or "fundamental change." • The poor lack care. Many may lack insurance, but that doesn't mean they lack care. The law says anyone who walks into a hospital emergency room must be treated. America has 37 million people in poverty, but Medicaid covers 55 million — at a cost of $350 billion a year. Moreover, as many as 11 million of the uninsured qualify for programs for the indigent, including Medicaid and SCHIP. But for some reason, they don't sign up. Are they likely to sign up for the "public option" when it's made available?

Recruitment Link Extension

Recruitment stabilizing now – health care hurts military effectiveness and directly effects Iraq and Afghanistan

Business Pundit 8

National Healthcare will Hurt War Effort, http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/

The New York Times wrote a [poignant article](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/30/business/30norris.html?_r=2&scp=1&sq=health's%20gain%20may%20be%20army's%20loss&st=cse&oref=slogin&oref=slogin) on how improving [healthcare](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/) will probably diminish the US military. Until the Nixon era, the US military had a mandatory enlistment program. When Nixon abolished the draft, enlistment decreased by roughly 50%. Recruiters had to find new ways of luring in potential soldiers. They added cash bonuses, increased the number of recruiters, and, offered a sweet healthcare package. NYT research shows that healthcare has been a significant factor in deciding to enlist. Michael Massing, (The New York Review of Books, April 3) tells the story of one part-time college student from Brooklyn, who was holding down two jobs but still going into [debt](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/). “Meanwhile, he got married, his wife got pregnant, and he had no health care. From a brother in the military, he had learned of the Army’s many benefits, and, visiting a recruiter, he heard about [Tricare](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/), the military’s generous health plan.” He enlisted. It seems a bit perverse that the incentives for a young person with children to join are greater than the incentives for his childless friend. But that is the way it is. So what happens when a national healthcare policy is put into place? Enlistment drops. Iraq is understaffed (presumably, this even applies to an exit policy). And the Army is out of an incentive to bring more people in. The challenge, then, is finding new people to fight the war. The [recession](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/) may help: chronically unemployed people with a grim economic outlook are more likely to enlist than those expecting a job down the line. In the longer term, the military may rely on education benefits. Congress passed a bill approving full public-university tuition and $1,000/month living expenses for veterans who served at least three years in the military after 9/11. Candidate McCain says this bill will only help if people stay in the [army](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/) longer–most people these days choose not to re-enlist. In sum, it’s a grim trade-off: Iraq and Afghanistan for national health. I definitely stand on the side of healthcare, which is so desperately needed in our country…but the [government](http://www.businesspundit.com/national-healthcare-will-hurt-war-effort/) can’t ditch an entire national security campaign without some kind of repercussion. What do you think?

Recruitment Impact – Deterrence

Army recruitment key to hegemony

Batschelet 94

Allan, Master of Military Art and Science Candidate at US Army Command and General Staff College. NATIONAL SERVICE AND ITS EFFECT ON THE ARMY'S ABILITY TO RECRUIT QUALITY SOLDIERS,” June 3, STINET

The United States is arguably the only superpower in the world today. The vision of the world the United States aspires to is one of freedom, respect for human rights, free markets, and the rule of law.3 To achieve its national interests the United States must retain a credible, quality army as the decisive instrument of national power. As the Army becomes smaller it is imperative to realize that near-term reductions in manpower quality have long-term effects. According to Trevor N. Dupuy, (General, USA, RET.) a respected defense analyst: Facts indicate that while a country may expect to coast for some time on the intangibles of troop quality, leadership, discipline, training, and tactics, a high level of combat effectiveness, once lost, may be hard to restore.4 Without the ability to successfully conduct and win a sustained land conflict, the United States will forfeit its role as world leader and jeopardize its national interests. This problem has implications for the future security of the United States. The United States Army has rebuilt itself from the demoralized hollow service of the Vietnam and post-Vietnam eras into a credible deterrent of armed aggression and a first-class fighting force. This metamorphosis is evidenced by the Army's success in Operations Desert Shield/Storm, Just Cause, and Provide Comfort. Today the Army is capable of providing the land component of a joint task force that can deploy to any location in the world and achieve decisive victory. The United States must ensure the continuation of this capability. It can do so only by ensuring that the Army continues to acquire the quantity and quality of soldiers necessary to operate its sophisticated weapon systems. To obtain quality recruits the Army must compete with industry, universities, and the other military services. Not only must the Army today struggle in the traditional manpower market place, but it now faces a new form of competition by the National and Community Service Act of 1993.s Competition for high-quality individuals in the form of the National and Community Service Act of 1993 will reduce the number of high-quality recruits the Army is able to attract to its ranks. As budget pressure from Congress increases to reduce the size of the Army, and the Army continues to field technically complex weapon systems, quality of the force becomes paramount. The effects of technology permeate society from industry to homes and throughout the military. Use of the microprocessor, robotics in manufacturing, and *instantaneous* communication systems requires that both blue and white collar workers possess highly technical skills to be productive. Fielding increasingly sophisticated weapon systems demands the Army, like industry, acquire high-quality individuals to operate and maintain its equipment. Martin Binkin, a defense analyst at the Brookings Institute, warns that a greater premium will be placed on technical skills in the future: The weight of the evidence is that both new and replacement weapon systems will demand ever-more- skillful operators and maintainers, especially if the capabilities of new systems are to be fully exploited. Thus prudent planners should anticipate that the services' requirements for bright, technologically literate individuals are unlikely to diminish in the years ahead, and it is more likely, given the present course, that the need for such people will grow commensurate with the complexity of the systems being fielded.° While Congress is reducing the size of the Army, it is also expanding the Army's roles and missions, expecting technology to substitute for quantity. The Army currently has 25,000 soldiers deployed in sixty foreign nations including, Macedonia, Egypt, Europe, and Honduras, engaged in "Operations Other than War," (OOTW) compared to 1992 when 12,000 were deployed in thirty-five countries.? These missions include humanitarian assistance, security assistance, peacekeeping operations, and counterdrug operations. High-quality soldiers are not only a prerequisite for conducting these missions successfully, but remain an indispensable factor in the Army's, ability to train for and execute combat operations. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services committee on May 19, 1993, General Gordon Sullivan, Chief of Staff of the Army said: The paradox of the Cold War is that although technology may assist us in overcoming a quantitative loss, the. fact of the matter is, what we are being' asked to do requires highly trained, competent men and women who are soldiers.8 Successful recruiting of high-quality individuals depends on several important factors: the civilian labor market, the number of new recruits required, propensity to serve (propensity is the inclination or preference to choose one option over another), recruiting resources, and competition from colleges and civilian employers. As the Army recruiting budget and propensity to serve declines and the size and quality of the youth cohort falls, competition for high-quality youth will intensify.

Recruitment Impact – Deterrence

Vitiation of the military causes entanglement and global conflict

Feaver 3

Professor of Political Science at Duke, Peter D., Armed Services: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations, p.213

The civil-military problematique is so vexing because it involves balancing two vital and potentially conflicting societal desiderata. On the one hand, the military must be strong enough to prevail in war. One purpose behind establishing the military in the first place is the need, or perceived need, for military force, either to attack other groups or to ward off attacks by others. Like an automobiles airbag, the military primarily exists as a guard against disaster. It should be always ready even if it is never used. Moreover, military strength should be sized appropriately to meet the threats confronting the polity. It serves no purpose to establish a protection force and then to vitiate it to the point where it can no longer protect. Indeed, an inadequate military institution may be worse than none at all. It could be a paper tiger inviting outside aggression strong enough in appearance to threaten powerful enemies but not strong enough in fact to defend against their predations. Alternatively, it could lull leaders into a false confidence, leading them to rash behavior and then failing in the ultimate military contest.

Recruitment Impact – Deterrence / Readiness

Army recruitment is key to overall force structure – implicates deterrence, readiness and hegemony

CSBA 6

The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, http://www.csbaonline.org/2006-1/2.DefenseBudget/Personnel\_and\_Readiness.shtml

Perhaps no other factor is as important to the effectiveness of the US military as the quality of its personnel. Likewise, the "readiness" of the US military to fight effectively on relatively short notice depends critically on keeping US forces well trained, and armed with well maintained equipment. As a result, trends in military recruitment and retention, training rates, and equipment maintenance and repair, are monitored closely by the administration and Congress, and have frequently sparked intense and often highly politicized debates.

Readiness levels are vital to the perception of US hegemony

Spencer 2k

Jack, Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security at Heritage, <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.

Reaches the Court

Best option for repeal of Health Care is through the courts

Jonathan Chait senior editor at The New Republic. He writes the magazine’s TRB column. author of The Big Con: Crackpot Economics and the Fleecing of America. Graduated from University of Michigan March 19, 2010 [“Could Republicans Repeal Health Care Reform?” Available online at <http://www.tnr.com/blog/jonathan-chait/could-republicans-repeal-health-care-reform> Accessed July 20, 2010]

Mitt Romney lays out his plan to repeal Romneycare... I mean, Obamacare: The key, he said, is having Republicans reclaim the White House and take majorities in the Senate and the House. Then, "we can clamp down on this bill ... by not funding it," Romney said during a speech Thursday I think Romney is just trying to cover his tracks and protect himself from the inevitable, true Republican primary attacks that he enacted a health care plan similar to Obama's, except more left-wing in the sense that it lacked the long-term cost controls. But he's still laying out the closest thing to a plausible Republican legislative plan to repeal health care reform should it be enacted into law. The problem with repealing health care reform is the filibuster -- Republicans would need 60 votes to undo the exchanges, regulations on things like preexisting conditions, and the individual mandate. But they could use budget reconciliation, which just needs a majority, to undo the tax credits and Medicaid expansion that make coverage affordable. (Even though using reconciliation to undo a major reform would be unprecedented!) The question is, could they really pull that off? First, you're doing a lot of pretty unpopular things -- yanking coverage away from people, raising taxes on the middle class. You'll have news stories about people whose lives are about to be ruined by the GOP. Second, if you do pass that, then you've started to unravel the system. You'll have a Republican administration and Congress presiding over a policy meltdown that, among other things, will raise enormous ire among insurers, doctors, hospitals, and others who will take a huge hit because they'll be flooded with patients who they have to treat or but can't pay the cost. So you're just setting things up for the Democrats to reinstate the subsidies when they take back power, which would become more likely if the GOP has deliberately caused a health care disaster. I think the most plausible strategy for the Republicans is to challenge the law in the Supreme Court. You only need a simple majority of 5 votes, the branch has no democratic accountability, and it's shown a willingness to ignore precedent exercise extreme judicial activism on behalf of high-stakes Republican priorities.

The Health Care Bill is Unconstitutional

Randy Barnett, legal expert for the Heritage Foundation, Nathaniel Stewart, legal expert for the Heritage Foundation And Todd Gaziano, Director Center for Legal & Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation, 12/9/10 [“Why the Personal Mandate to Buy Health Insurance Is Unprecedented and Unconstitutional” Available online at http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/12/why-the-personal-mandate-to-buy-health-insurance-is-unprecedented-and-unconstitutional Accessed July 22, 2010]

The Constitution is ultimately a political docu­ment, and the health care debate is ultimately a philosophical debate on the scope of political authority. If one’s health care and medical treatment is a personal matter and an exercise of personal responsibility, then the new law is quintessentially un-republican; for all practical purposes, it renders these intensely personal affairs a public concern. The imposition of an individual mandate to pur­chase health insurance is likewise an unconstitu­tional restriction on personal liberty, pregnant with potential abuses far beyond a mandate for health insurance.[7] Under the new law, states are compelled to expand Medicaid.[8] Equally troublesome is the con­gressional mandate on the states to establish feder­ally supervised health insurance exchanges within their borders where government-sponsored plans and co-ops will compete against private insurance. Under Section 1311(b)(1), “Each state shall, not later than January 1, 2014, establish an American Health Benefit Exchange [emphasis added].” The exchange is either to be a governmental agency or a nonprofit entity. Under Section 1321(c), if a state does not establish such an exchange, the Secretary of Health and Human Services will establish and oper­ate an exchange within the state. In the “state-based” exchanges, of course, only federally approved heath plans would be allowed to compete. The states, in other words, would be vehicles of federal health policy. This is underscored by the highly prescriptive requirements imposed on the states, governing everything from the simple pre­sentation of health plan information down to the formatting of state Web sites. The statute authorizes over a dozen regulatory interventions by the Secre­tary of HHS and other federal officials. At the very least, this is a profoundly undesirable alteration in the relationship between the federal government and the officers and citizens of the states—precisely the concentration of power that the Founders feared—and it is also constitutionally suspect. It is one thing to require state officials to obey federal law; it is quite another to compel them to administer it and force their citizens to bear the expense of that administration.[9] Our constitutional tradition limits federal power and does not sanction national intrusion into citizens’ personal, private, or domestic relations. As Madison affirmed, law in these areas of domestic life is properly within the jurisdiction of the states; this latest act of Congress is a bold challenge to that jurisdiction.

Even if it is a tax the Court can still repeal Health Care

Conn Carroll the Assistant Director for The Heritage Foundation's Strategic Communications and he serves as editor of The Foundry 7/20/2010 [“Morning Bell: White House Admits Obamacare’s Individual Mandate is a Tax” Available online at <http://blog.heritage.org/2010/07/20/morning-bell-white-house-admits-obamacares-individual-mandate-is-a-tax/> Accessed July 25, 2010]

The fact that the Obama administration and their allies are now admitting the individual mandate is a tax betrays their very real fear that the Supreme Court could find Obamacare’s individual mandate unconstitutional. In the bill itself, Congress identified the Commerce Clause as the source of their authority to force all Americans to buy health insurance. But as our legal team has made eminently clear, the mandate does not purport to regulate or prohibit commerce of any kind. To the contrary, it purports to “regulate”—and penalize—inactivity. If the Supreme Court allows the Obamacare individual mandate to stand, then Congress could do anything it wanted. They could: require us to buy a new Chevy Impala each year to support the government-supported auto industry; require us to buy war bonds to pay for the Iraq and Afghan wars; or force us to eat our vegetables.

But even if the Obama administration is now admitting the individual mandate is a tax, that still does not make the law constitutional. Rather than operating as a tax on income, the mandate is a tax on the person and is, therefore, a capitation tax. Therefore the 16th Amendment’s grant of power to Congress to assess an income tax does not apply. The Constitution does allow Congress to assess a capitation tax, but that requires the tax be assessed evenly based op population. That is not how the Obamacare mandate works. It exempts and carves out far too many exceptions to past muster as a capitation tax. The Obamacare mandate is still unprecedented and unconstitutional.

AT: Reaches the Court

It is highly unlikely that the Supreme Court would break new constitutional ground to save Health Care- 3 reasons

Randy Barnett, legal expert for the Heritage Foundation, Nathaniel Stewart, legal expert for the Heritage Foundation And Todd Gaziano, Director Center for Legal & Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation, 12/9/10 [“Why the Personal Mandate to Buy Health Insurance Is Unprecedented and Unconstitutional” Available online at http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/12/why-the-personal-mandate-to-buy-health-insurance-is-unprecedented-and-unconstitutional Accessed July 22, 2010]

Mandating that all private citizens enter into a contract with a private company to purchase a good or service, or be punished by a fine labeled a "tax," is unprecedented in American history. For this reason, there are no Supreme Court decisions authorizing this exercise of federal power. There are strong grounds to predict that the current Court will not devise any new doctrines by which to uphold an individual health insurance mandate. First and foremost, as already mentioned, to uphold this exercise of power, the Supreme Court would have to affirm for the first time in its history that Congress has a general or plenary police power--a position the Court has repeatedly refused to take. While the Raich decision affirmed the continuing vitality of the Wickard line of Commerce Clause cases, it neither overruled nor limited Lopez and Morrison. Instead it adhered to those decisions by finding that the cultivation of marijuana was an economic activity. Unlike Raich, both Lopez and Morrison were facial challenges to an act of Congress. In evaluating an as-applied Commerce Clause challenge, the Raich Court adopted the "class of activities" defined by Congress in the Controlled Substances Act, and refused to consider the narrower class of activity proposed by the parties challenging the application of the Controlled Substances Act to them, because reaching this subset of economic activities was essential to the broader regulatory scheme. Although this made "as-applied" Commerce Clause challenges more difficult, it did nothing to undermine a "facial" challenge to a statutorily defined class of activities that are largely or entirely outside the scope of the Commerce Clause. Any more expansive reading of Raich is unfaithful to the actual reasoning of the Court and is an exercise in wishful thinking by those who support unlimited federal power. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that five Justices of the Supreme Court will be open, and perhaps even eager, to reaffirm the principles of Lopez and Morrison in a case involving neither an as-applied challenge nor marijuana, and to dispel any impression that these cases were permanently eclipsed by Raich. There is no reason to believe, and much reason to doubt, that a majority of the current Justices will be interested in expanding federal power even farther than they did in Raich. And it is quite unlikely that a majority of Justices is open to any constitutional theory that would officially and effectively abolish the enumerated powers scheme embodied in Article I and the Tenth Amendment, as would be necessary to uphold a personal health insurance mandate. Furthermore, the 2008 case of District of Columbia v. Heller shows that a majority of the current Court takes the text and original public meaning of the Constitution quite seriously, especially when considering issues not controlled by existing precedent. A constitutional challenge to an individual health care mandate would be considered an opportunity by the Justices who made up the Heller majority to further vindicate their commitment to text and history in evaluating claims of federal power. This majority of Justices would know that a refusal to extend the Commerce Clause to reach the individual health insurance mandate will not invalidate any other law. These Justices will also know that Congress has other constitutional, and more politically accountable, means of accomplishing the same ends. Further, the majority will be aware that the health care mandate is not necessary to win a war or respond to a serious economic depression, areas where the Court has sometimes deferred to the political branches. To the contrary, the majority will likely understand that the individual mandate may even cut against health care cost containment. Although it is always difficult for the Supreme Court to thwart what is perceived to be the popular will, polling consistently shows that this legislation, if enacted, will fly in the face of popular opposition. If that remains true after enactment, the majority of the Justices who are inclined to preserve the enumerated powers scheme and adhere to the original meaning of the text will have little inclination or incentive to stretch the Constitution to reach so decidedly unpopular and far-reaching a power as this one.

\*\*\*Card Check\*\*\*

Card Check Internal

Significant GoP gains tank card-check

Leonard 9

Andrew, Obama's secret plan for a successful presidency, http://www.salon.com/tech/htww/2009/10/16/obamas\_secret\_plan\_for\_a\_successful\_presidency/index.html

Mickey Kaus says [everything is falling into place](http://www.slate.com/blogs/blogs/kausfiles/archive/2009/10/16/it-s-all-going-according-to-plan.aspx) for a successful Obama presidency. Except that, in the best Mickey Kaus tradition, his thesis is so drenched with contrarian posing that the definition of a "successful" Obama presidency means the abandonment of most of the policy goals Democrats have for his term. The Kaus thesis is predicated on Obama getting healthcare reform passed, after which the Democrats get clobbered by a still-crippled economy in the 2010 midterm elections. That, in turn, will mean that the rest of the "controversial big Dem bills that got backed up in 2010" -- climate change, card-check, immigration reform -- will die stillborn.

Democrats losing seats in Midterms makes EFCA passage impossible

Mark Schoeff Jr staff writer “Employee Free Choice Act Supporters Press On Despite Longer Senate Odds” Jan. 20, 2010 Accessed July 20 2010 http://www.workforce.com/section/00/article/26/95/42.php//Donnie

With midterm elections looming, the challenge to pass EFCA will only get tougher after this year. Democrats might lose more Senate seats in November. In a January 11 speech at the National Press Club in Washington, Trumka said that the measure would gain congressional approval by April. “It’s kind of now or never for them,” said Brett McMahon, vice president of Miller & Long, a concrete subcontractor and a member of Associated Builders and Contractors. “If the chances are [lower] now to get something done, they may become truly impossible in the next Congress.”

Card Check Good – Democracy

EFCA is crucial to maintaining democracy—the coercion and fear that is preventing unions now is anti-democratic because it shuns workers from fundamental rights

Harley Shaiken is a professor of social and cultural studies at the Graduate School of Education, director of the Center for Latin American Studies and a member of the Department of Geography at UC Berkeley, where he specializes on issues of work, technology and global production Union expert February 22, 2007accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.sharedprosperity.org/bp181.html//Donnie

Like the temperatures in a severe winter freeze, union membership continues to sink to record lows. The latest numbers indicate that 7.4% of working Americans in the private sector were union members in 2006 (BLS 2007), compared to over 30% in 1960 (Greenhouse 2007). If you include government workers, then the numbers inch up to a still-meager 12%, which is down from 12.5% in 2005 (BLS 2007). Does this mean that Americans no longer want to join unions? Not according to the most recent polls. A Peter Hart poll conducted in December 2006 reports that 58% of non-managerial working Americans indicated they would join a union if they could, a record number (Peter D. Hart Research Associates 2007).1 The yawning gap between the robust demand to join unions and the anemic membership numbers reflects the fact that, for many Americans, joining a union has become a risk rather than a right. In 2005, over 31,000 people—one worker every 17 minutes—were disciplined or even fired for union activity, according to the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) annual report, resulting in a big chill on labor's numbers and a "democracy deficit" for the entire society. 2 Shrinking union membership affects all Americans. Unions paved the way to the middle class for millions, pioneering benefits along the way such as paid pensions and health care. Now, labor's decline squeezes the middle class, raises inequality, and undermines democratic values. An effective way to address this "democracy deficit" is through the Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA). What the Act does is straightforward: it allows workers to form a union if a majority of people in a workplace sign up for one, short circuiting employer-dominated representation campaigns. In addition, it provides meaningful penalties for those who would violate workers' rights and ensures that, if workers choose a union, then collective bargaining actually results. The Act restores free choice and balance to a system that currently is driven by aggressive employers, anti-union consultants, coercion, and fear. As Studs Terkel put it, "Respect on the job and a voice at the workplace shouldn't be something Americans have to work overtime to achieve" (2006). Today, if workers seek to organize, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) sets a secret-ballot election generally a month or two following the formal request.3 This period winds up being an "interval of intimidation." The employer has the right of free speech, the right to hold unlimited mandatory meetings with employees, the right to "predict" calamities if the union wins, and the right to bar union organizers from the premises. With these rules the playing field is not simply tilted against organizing, unions are shut out of the stadium. What's more, penalties are nearly nonexistent for violating the diminished rights workers do retain. Americans rightly hold secret-ballot elections sacred, but elections are only as democratic as the context in which they take place. These NLRB-supervised elections are often so unfair that they approximate plebiscites in a dictatorship rather than a functioning democracy. The ballots may be counted honestly but the outcome ratifies the coercive, even threatening atmosphere in which the vote occurs. This dismal state of affairs was not always the case. Congress affirmed in ringing terms the rights of American workers to organize and bargain collectively in 1935 with the passage of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), or Wagner Act, hailed at the time as labor's Magna Carta. Seventy-two years later, amendments, court decisions, and administrative precedents have corroded the Act's original intent. Today, "trying to exercise those right[s] is another matter entirely," notes Fortune magazine, elaborating that "workers are routinely fired or discriminated against for supporting unions, most employers hire anti-union consultants to block organizing drives, and some go so far as to close down work sites when employees vote for a union" (Gunther 2006). Kenneth Roth, the executive director of Human Rights Watch, was even more direct. "Legal obstacles tilt the playing field so steeply against Freedom of Association," he stated, "that the United States is in violation of international human rights standards for workers" (Roth 2001, 19-20). Diminishing the right to organize damages democracy. "Free societies and free trade unions go together," George P. Schultz commented, reflecting his experience as both a labor-management mediator and Secretary of State (Silk 1991). President Ronald Reagan spoke eloquently about the role of unions in a democratic society in the early 1980s. He spoke of their struggle to "sustain the fundamental human and economic rights" such as "the right to work and reap the fruit's of one's labor, the right to assemble, the right to strike, and the right to freedom of expression" (Woolsey and Gerhard). At the time, he was speaking about communist Poland, but the sentiments are just as important in the United States today. Beyond their bedrock role in a democracy, unions are the principal voice of working families in the political arena, pushing for issues such as the minimum wage, unemployment insurance, Medicare and Medicaid, and a host of other measures. As union numbers fade, this voice becomes more muted and progressive politics become weaker (Radcliff and Davis 2000).

Card Check Good – Democracy

Democracy solves proliferation, environmental destruction and war

Larry Diamond is a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives December 1995 accessed July 20, 2010 http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/Promoting%20Democracy%20in%20the%201990s%20Actors%20and%20Instruments,%20Issues%20and%20Imperatives.pdf//Donnie

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness.

Card Check Good – Democracy

Card check is key to democracy for 2 reasons choice over employment and stopping companies from getting away with punishing workers illegally

Joel Wendland staff writer “Employee Free Choice Act Promotes Democracy” 3/11/09 accessed 7/20/10 http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/articleview/8237///Donnie

Let's look closely at each reform. Many in the right-wing media have misleadingly claimed and in many cases outright lied about the first provision. From CNN's Lou Dobbs to Fox News' Glenn Beck, commentators have insisted that EFCA would eliminate the secret ballot process in certifying a union, a process that is a "sacred institution" some have sanctimoniously added. This point has caught on. Many congressional Republicans have picked it up and used it as their excuse in opposing EFCA. That argument is flat out wrong. Labor law currently allows two methods of certifying unions: majority sign-up (also known as card check) and the secret ballot. The key difference is that now employers, not workers get to choose which method is adopted. This must be what Wal-Mart CEO Scott means by who gets to "drive the car." EFCA would give the choice of how to certify their union to workers – after all it is their organization, not the employer's. Media pundits and members of Congress who are confused on this issue can read the actual bill by clicking here. Wal-Mart boss Lee Scott would likely get angry if someone else got to determine how he joined any organization. So why does he and other CEOs have so much power to determine which organizations workers are members of? Choice about how and which organizations workers join is a fundamental right in a democratic society. State of war The second reform in EFCA would impose real penalties on employers who violate the law. Right now, something like 30 percent of workers who advocate for a union in their workplace are fired – illegally. More than 90 percent of workers are forced to attend mandatory "captive audience" meetings created by anti-union consultants and lawyers to discourage unionization and to level threats about what will happen if workers vote to join a union. According to a former anti-union consultant, employers view the unionization process as a "state of war" in which any tactic or maneuver – illegal or not – is justified. According to one lawyer familiar with labor law and the actual practice of unionization interviewed for this story, employers never face real penalties for their actions. At most the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), the federal agency that oversees union elections, might force the employer to post a statement alerting workers about their rights. Financial penalties are even more rare and can be delayed for many years and reduced in size that they are usually meaningless. This fact prompted Human Rights Watch (HRW) to report in January that "[s]anctions for illegal conduct are too feeble to adequately discourage employer law breaking" or "sufficiently disuasive to deter violations." HRW added that the "Employee Free Choice Act ... would remedy many of these deficiencies and create a more level playing field for US workers." Avoiding punishment for violating federal law might be up Wal-Mart CEO Scott's alley, but just imagine what would happen to any ordinary person who violated federal laws designed to protect an internationally recognized as a fundamental human right. Equally enforcing the law and punishing those who violate it is an essential ingredient of any democratic society.

Card Check Good – Competitiveness

EFCA is key to unionization that leads to higher productivity—this solves US competitiveness

Harley Shaiken is a professor of social and cultural studies at the Graduate School of Education, director of the Center for Latin American Studies and a member of the Department of Geography at UC Berkeley, where he specializes on issues of work, technology and global production Union expert February 22, 2007accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.sharedprosperity.org/bp181.html//Donnie

A broad study of the economics literature found "a positive association [of unions on productivity] is established for the United States in general and for U.S. manufacturing" in particular (Doucouliagos and Laroche 2003, 1).7 Earlier research came to similar conclusions. Brown and Medoff (1978, 373) reported that for manufacturing "unionized establishments are about 22% more productive than those that are not." In much of the postwar period, this higher productivity underwrote the higher wages that unions achieved. Freeman and Medoff examined why unionized firms are more productive in What Do Unions Do? (1984). They found that about one-fifth of the union productivity effect came from reduced turnover. Unions improve communication channels, giving workers the ability to improve their conditions short of "exiting." Lower turnover means lower training costs, and the experience of more seasoned workers translates into higher productivity and quality. Moreover, higher compensation focuses the managerial mind: employers need to plan more effectively and focus on better methods. The real productivity story is best understood in the workplace where many complex issues converge and the proverbial rubber hits the road. An innovative employer working with a progressive union can achieve high levels of productivity and quality, pay high wages, and be competitive. Consider four examples from very different industries: retail, telecommunications, autos, and hotels. In retailing, a high-road partially unionized Costco outperforms a low-road Sam's Club (a Wal-Mart affiliate). Costco's labor costs are 40% higher than Wal-Mart, but nonetheless Costco produced $21,805 in operating profit per hourly employee in the United States in 2005, almost double the $11,615 generated at Sam's Club (Cascio 2006, 28, 35). And, Costco sells $866 per square foot compared to $525 at Sam's Club. How does Costco do it? "It absolutely makes good business sense," CEO James Sinegal maintains. "Most people agree that we're the lowest-cost provider. Yet we pay the highest wages. So it must mean we get better productivity." Echoing Henry Ford, he points out "that's not just altruism, it's good business" (Cascio 2006, 28). Costco, as Freeman and Medoff (1984) found in unionized firms, has lower turnover—6% annually compared to 21% for Sam's Club" (Holmes and Zellner 2004). In the telecommunications industry, Cingular, the largest wireless carrier in the nation, accepted a "neutrality agreement" with the Communications Workers of America (CWA). Both sides agreed not to attack each other, and the company agreed to majority sign up for its workers, a preview of how the Employee Free Choice Act might work. To date, 39,000 workers have joined the union, about 85% of Cingular customer service reps, technicians, and retail sales workers in 35 states. How have things worked out? Lew Walker, vice president for human resources, says that the union provides a competitive advantage for the company. "They very much recognize that we are in a competitive environment," he states. Disagreements occur, but a mechanism is in place to work them out cooperatively (Gunther 2006). The New United Motor Manufacturing (NUMMI) plant—a joint partnership of General Motors and Toyota organized by the United Auto Workers—achieved strong results in a unionized environment (Appelbaum et al. 2000, 7). The plant produces high-quality cars and trucks and pays among the highest wages in the domestic auto industry. NUMMI ranked third in 2005 for productivity among small truck assembly plants in North America, measured by hours per vehicle required for assembly (Harbour Consulting 2006). In fact, two of the top three assembly plants in North America were UAW plants in 2005 (they ranked one and two), and the union represented six of the top 10 plants (Harbour Consulting 2006). The Detroit Three have more than their share of problems right now, but labor productivity has made major strides. As for the hotel industry, in Las Vegas, Culinary Local 226 organizes 90% of the hotel workers on the Strip. As a result, unionized housekeepers earn 50% more than their nonunion counterparts in Reno and enjoy fully paid health care. The union and the hospitality industry jointly put a heavy emphasis on training and operate the Las Vegas Culinary Training Academy, one of the most comprehensive training centers of its kind in the country. "Our union's goal and the training center's goal is you can come in as a non-English-speaking worker, come in as a low-level kitchen worker, and if you have the desire, you can leave as a gourmet food server, sous-chef, or master sommelier," according to D. Taylor, the secretary-treasurer of the local (Greenhouse 2004, A22). The Las Vegas hospitality case is one of a growing number of regional industries in which labor has been the driving force behind the formation of multi-company labor-management high-road training partnerships.8 These cases hark back to the central role of craft unions in the building industry, in apprenticeship training, helping workers find new jobs, and administering portable benefit plans. In today's skill-based and post-industrial economy, a renewal of labor's capacity to give middle- and low-income workers access to training, career counseling, job placement, and portable benefits is essential to broadly shared prosperity. This renewal is equally pivotal to enabling more businesses to compete through skills, high productivity, and quality service. The high wages and extensive training are a successful combination in the service industry, according to management officials such as J. Terrence Lanni, chairman of MGM Mirage (Greenhouse 2004a, A22). The companies benefit and so do the union members, in this case, a group that is 70% female and 65% nonwhite. While short-sighted management can lead a unionized firm into the ground, and a recalcitrant union can put a

brake on productivity, the literature and case studies confirm that smart employers and progressive unions can foster higher productivity and competitive success.

Card Check Good – Competitiveness

Competitiveness is crucial to hegemony

Adam Segal is Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations “Is America Losing its Edge?” Nov/Dec. 2004 accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/60260/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

US heg is the only way to prevent nationalist power wars form intensifying

Robert Kagan is a Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace End of Dreams, Return of History July 19, 2007 accessed July 16, 2010 http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/end\_of\_dreams\_return\_of\_histor.htm

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying -- its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic.

Card Check Good – Human Rights

EFCA solves unionization—that is crucial to solving workers rights that are being violated in the status quo—this is key to overall human rights

Harley Shaiken is a professor of social and cultural studies at the Graduate School of Education, director of the Center for Latin American Studies and a member of the Department of Geography at UC Berkeley, where he specializes on issues of work, technology and global production Union expert February 22, 2007accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.sharedprosperity.org/bp181.html//Donnie

To ensure the exercise of free choice, EFCA provides both monetary penalties and the possibility of injunctions to limit coercion and restore fairness to the process. Currently, an employer who threatens to fire union supporters or to shut a plant if the union wins does not incur any monetary penalties. Those fines that can be levied against illegal firing are minimal and not much of a deterrent. EFCA allows meaningful fines—triple the amount of back pay in case of discharge—and the possibility of union injunctions in the face of significant violations of worker rights. Finally, EFCA seeks to deter Bad faith bargaining through mediation and arbitration. After 90 days of bargaining on a first agreement, either an employer or a newly certified union can request mediation by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. If an agreement is not reached after 30 days of mediation, either party can call for binding arbitration. This process eliminates the incentive of stalling at the bargaining table to provoke the decertification of a union down the road. EFCA restores balance to a process that has become increasingly dysfunctional. As we have seen, denying workers the right to form a union has damaging consequences for the economy and the political process. We have a dual disconnect. First, the disconnect between the high number of workers who indicate preference for joining a union and the low number who actually belong. As a result of weakening unions, we have the second gap, the Great Disconnect between rising productivity and stagnant or even declining real wages. Workers' freedom to form unions is, and should be, considered a fundamental human right. Seventy years ago, the LaFollette Senate Committee concluded that "The denial of this right [to organize] was the most important problem of civil liberties before the Nation." The committee emphasized that "denying workers the right to organize almost invariably meant denying them the fundamental civil rights which are the basis of our democratic system" (Swidorski 2003, 57). Strengthening free choice in the workplace lays the basis for ensuring a more prosperous economy, a healthier society, and a stronger democracy

**Human rights solve secessionist backlash against tyrants that escalates to nuclear war**

Human Rights Web an international organization committed to human rights 1994 accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.hrweb.org/intro.html

Many also realized that advances in technology and changes in social structures had rendered war a threat to the continued existence of the human race. Large numbers of people in many countries lived under the control of tyrants, having no recourse but war to relieve often intolerable living conditions. Unless some way was found to relieve the lot of these people, they could revolt and become the catalyst for another wide-scale and possibly nuclear war. For perhaps the first time, representatives from the majority of governments in the world came to the conclusion that basic human rights must be protected, not only for the sake of the individuals and countries involved, but to preserve the human race.

Card Check Bad – Competitiveness

Card Check kills competitiveness—it incentivizes outsourcing jobs to avoid regulation collapsing the economy

Gary Shapiro. President & CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association “Card Check Dilemma: How Can Well-Meaning Americans Be So Far Apart?” April 26, 2009. Accessed July 20, 2010. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gary-shapiro/card-check-dilemma-how-ca\_b\_184088.html//Donnie

I know (and lots of research shows) this proposal, if enacted, will cost millions of American jobs. The CEOs of my member companies also tell me this. From the biggest hi-tech CEOs to the guy in a garage with one employee, manufacturer, software company or service provider, they all agree that if this proposal becomes law, they will be incentivized to outsource. Most technology jobs are location neutral and can be performed anywhere in the world. Talking to big and small company CEOs, I believe they also view themselves as caring about their employees and agonize over any non-cause firing. They don't sleep well because they are always thinking about the people responsibilities of their job. Those that are familiar with unions have had varied experiences. Those that are not familiar do not want unions. The data does not support the union arguments. In 2007, almost 6,000 charges were filed against unions with some 85 percent alleging illegal restraint and coercion of employees. Of those, more than four out of five were filed by individuals with other unions filing many of the rest. The present law does not seem to disfavor unions. Union membership actually rose in 2008. What card check would do is guarantee big union membership rolls and provide a jump in mandatory union dues. In any case, even members of Congress are saying they have had enough. Democrat and Republican members agree that this has been among the most heavily lobbied issues in their career. Both parties report the issue is causing them a lot of time and angst. All agree that the sides of the debate are so far divided that a compromise seems inappropriate, if not impossible. Republicans and Democrats say they have never seen business so united. Legislators are concerned about the next election and how what they do on this issue will play out (no matter what their position) given the intensity of both sides. Increasingly, Democrats are saying this is the wrong time to have a "card check" debate given the challenges of Detroit and the economy. Some Republicans appreciate that this issue is one that clearly differentiates them from Democrats, but they are horrified that if the bill becomes law it will hurt our national competitiveness.

Card Check Bad – Competitiveness

Card check collapses competitiveness

Welch 7

Welch, Suzy received her BA from Harvard College in 1981 and then joined The Miami Herald as a reporter. She left daily journalism to attend Harvard Business School, where she graduated as a Baker Scholar in 1988. After Harvard Business School, Suzy worked as a management consultant, specializing in strategy and manufacturing. She joined the Harvard Business Review as a senior editor in 1995 and was named editor-in-chief in 20. "The Unemployment Act", <http://www.businessweek.com/perm/content/07_11/b4025117.htm>

Are you at all concerned about American competitiveness in the future? —Srikanth Raghunathan, Irwin, Pa. Yes. But not for the standard "the sky is falling" reasons, like the twin deficits, low-cost Chinese manufacturing, or intellectual property piracy. We believe those challenges will largely be ameliorated by market, political, and legal forces. No, we're as worried as can be that American competitiveness is about to be whacked by something no one seems to be talking about: the Employee Free Choice Act, which is currently weaving an insidious path through Congress toward becoming law. If it does, the long-thriving American economy will finally meet its match. You didn't read wrong. We know it must sound strange to oppose legislation that promises something as motherhood-y as "free choice." But the title of this bill is pure propaganda. It won't encourage liberty or self-determination in the workplace; more likely it will introduce intimidation and coercion by labor organizers, who, after a long slide into near-oblivion, finally see a glorious new route to millions of dues-paying members. Their campaign could trigger a surge in unionization across U.S. industry—and in time, a reversion to the bloated economy that brought America to its knees in the late 1970s and early '80s and that today cripples much of European business. If you want to be reminded of what that looks like, drive through Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, as we did last weekend, and take a look at all the shuttered factories. Steel—like coal, autos, and so many other industries in the global economy—paid the inevitable price of unionization run amok. MAKE NO MISTAKE. We don't unilaterally oppose unions. Indeed, if a company is habitually unfair or unreasonable, it deserves what it gets from organized labor. But the problem with unions is that they make a sport out of killing productivity even when companies are providing good wages, benefits, and working conditions. It is not uncommon in a union shop to shut down production rather than allow a nonunion worker to flip a switch. Only a union or millwright electrician can do that job! Come on. Companies today can't afford such petty bureaucracy or the other excesses unions so often lead to, such as two people for every job and a litigious approach to even the smallest matters. Yes, managers and employees will sometimes disagree. But in the global economy, they have to work through those differences not as adversaries but as partners. The Employee Free Choice Act undermines that. Here's how. Currently, when labor organizers want to launch a unionization effort, they ask each worker to sign a card as a show of support. If 30% or more employees do so, a federally supervised election can be called and conducted with one of the most revered mechanisms in democracy, the secret ballot. Thus, employees can vote their conscience, without fear of retribution from either union leaders or management. By contrast, under the Employee Free Choice Act, organizers could start a union if 50% of employees, plus one more worker, sign cards. That's right—no more secret ballot. Instead, employees would likely get a phone call with a pointed solicitation, or worse, a home visit from a small team of organizers. You can just imagine the scenario. The organizers sit around the kitchen table and make their case, likely with a lot of passion. Then they slide a card in front of the employee with a pen. Who would say no? Who could? Now, union supporters will tell you that they won't intimidate employees for votes, and regardless, management intimidates all the time by threatening to fire employees who vote union. But the system as it exists has safeguards, including heavy fines against companies that misbehave and automatic new elections. Still, the advance of the Employee Free Choice Act continues unabated. And so pretty soon, if enough business leaders and legislators don't stand up, it may well be: Hello again, unions. So long, American competitiveness. The change won't happen instantly. Companies will fight unions as if their lives depend on it, because they do. But given the logistics of the Employee Free Choice Act, any management campaign is hobbled. If you can't be at the kitchen table with the organizers and their hard stares, you probably can't win.

Card Check Bad – Competitiveness

Unionizations increase in wages trades off with companies ability to preserve the capital to compete—EFCA kills competiveness

Lee E. Ohanian Professor of Economics and Director, Robert Ettinger Family Program in Macroeconomic Research UCLA THE IMPACT OF THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT ON THE U.S. ECONOMY April 23, 2010 Accessed July 20 2010http://www.aei.org/docLib/OhanianEmployeeFreeChoiceAct.pdf//Donnie

A union is a form of monopoly or cartel. It is a single seller of labor services to a business. EFCA is intended to increase unionization. Economists typically favor as much competition as possible and thus tend to oppose policies that suppress competition. In markets for goods and services, competition is important because it means that only the most efficient organizations survive, and that these organizations produce at the lowest possible price. Competition is also important because it leads society to use its scarce resources most efficiently. When competition is significantly limited in the markets for goods and services, prices exceed the cost of production, and consumers pay more for goods and services than they otherwise would. Policymakers have long understood the importance of competition in these markets. The Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts were passed to prevent and correct the economic damages that occur when competition breaks down in these markets. The same economic reasoning about the social benefit of competition and the social cost of monopoly also applies to the labor market. Specifically, employers will hire workers as long as the cost of employment – compensation plus other costs of employing a worker – does not exceed the value of what the worker can produce. Thus, the maximum that an employer will pay for a worker is the value of that worker‘s production. Competition among employers in the labor market means that wages will tend to be pushed up to this maximum level. Competition among workers in the labor market means there is a strong incentive for workers to provide their labor services efficiently in their employment relationship. The long-run historical record indicates a high level of labor competition in the United States, with compensation closely tracking worker productivity. Figure 1 is a graph assembled by the Heritage Foundation that shows employee compensation and worker productivity between 1968 and 2008. The figure shows a very close relationship between productivity and compensation, which is consistent with a competitive and well-functioning labor market.[Graph Omitted] Many years ago, however, there was less competition in labor markets in some geographic locations in the U.S., and some economists have argued that unions played an important role during this period of limited labor market competition, including addressing workplace health and safety issues. But labor market conditions are much different today. Most workers now live in locations with many employers competing for their services, and workplace health and safety is largely covered by federal and state laws. The key message to policymakers is that policy that suppresses competition is sharply at variance with promoting economic efficiency. Evaluations of EFCA, or any policy that reduces competition in any market, should be judged on the basis of whether there are good economic reasons to suppress competition. I do not find any compelling arguments to suppress competition in today‘s U.S. labor market. However, promoting higher living standards for American workers can be addressed through different policies that achieve greater economic efficiency than increasing unionization rates. One of the primary arguments in support of EFCA is that it would reverse decades of declining unionization rates. Unionization has declined considerably among private employers, falling from a peak rate of more than 30 percent of nonagricultural employment in the late 1940s to around 7 percent today. In contrast, unionization rates have not declined over time for public sector employees. Economists cite a number of factors that have contributed to this decline in private sector unionization, and one of these factors is increased competition (see for example Farber, 1987 and Hirsch, 2008, and references therein). Unionization by its very nature is likely to be more successful in raising wages in industries that are less competitive, rather than in highly competitive industries. This is because competition limits how much unions can increase compensation. As described in the previous section, competition for workers pushes wages up to the value of a worker‘s production, and competition between producers drives down the return to capital to the minimum level consistent with employing capital in an industry. These competitive forces that raise wages and limit the return to capital leave relatively little room for unions to raise wages. In contrast, if there is limited competition within an industry, profits will exceed the normal rate of return to capital. Economists call these profits that exceed the normal return to capital economic rents. In this case of limited competition, a union, as a monopoly supplier of labor services, can raise wages by capturing some of the rents in the industry. Thus, the economic rents that result from too little competition are divided between labor and capital, and the relative division between these two parties depends on their respective bargaining positions.

Card Check Bad – Economy

EFCA kills the economy—expert studies prove it kills 4.46 million jobs and decreases real GDP by 500 billion

Lee E. Ohanian Professor of Economics and Director, Robert Ettinger Family Program in Macroeconomic Research UCLA THE IMPACT OF THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT ON THE U.S. ECONOMY April 23, 2010 Accessed July 20 2010http://www.aei.org/docLib/OhanianEmployeeFreeChoiceAct.pdf//Donnie

To address the issue of how much unionization would rise as a consequence of EFCA, I consider three possible unionization rates: 25 percent of the workforce, which would return unionization rates to their early 1970s level; 20 percent, which is the rate that prevailed in the early 1980s; and 15 percent, which is the rate that prevailed in the early-mid 1990s. These three levels of the wage premium, combined with three levels of increased unionization, yield nine different scenarios on how higher unionization could impact the economy. I summarize the economic impact from these scenarios in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 shows how aggregate employment would decline as a consequence of higher unionization. I find that employment loss would range from around 4.46 million jobs in the case that unionization rates returned to their 1970s levels and the wage premium remained at 15 percent, to about 540,000 jobs in the case that unionization returned only to its 1990s level and with just a small wage premium of 5 percent. Table 2 shows that higher unionization would generate significant declines in real GDP, ranging from output losses of more than $500 billion when 25 percent of the workforce is unionized and the union wage premium remains at 15 percent, to a loss of about $70 billion under the assumption that unionization rises only slightly and the newly unionized workers receive a 5 percent premium. Moreover, these employment and output losses would persist as long as unionization rates and wage premia persisted

Economic growth is key to avoid global conflict

Earl Tilford, PhD in history from George Washington University and served for thirty-two years as a military officer and analyst with the Air Force and Army, 2008, “Critical Mass: Economic Leadership or Dictatorship,” The Cedartown Standard, Lexis

Could it happen again? Bourgeois democracy requires a vibrant capitalist system. Without it, the role of the individual shrinks as government expands. At the very least, the dimensions of the U.S. government economic intervention will foster a growth in bureaucracy to administer the multi-faceted programs necessary for implementation. Bureaucracies, once established, inevitably become self-serving and self-perpetuating. Will this lead to “socialism” as some conservative economic prognosticators suggest? Perhaps. But so is the possibility of dictatorship. If the American economy collapses, especially in wartime, there remains that possibility. And if that happens the American democratic era may be over. If the world economies collapse, totalitarianism will almost certainly return to Russia, which already is well along that path in any event. Fragile democracies in South America and Eastern Europe could crumble. A global economic collapse will also increase the chance of global conflict. As economic systems shut down, so will the distribution systems for resources like petroleum and food. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that nations perceiving themselves in peril will, if they have the military capability, use force, just as Japan and Nazi Germany did in the mid-to-late 1930s. Every nation in the world needs access to food and water. Industrial nations—the world powers of North America, Europe, and Asia—need access to energy. When the world economy runs smoothly, reciprocal trade meets these needs. If the world economy collapses, the use of military force becomes a more likely alternative. And given the increasingly rapid rate at which world affairs move; the world could devolve to that point very quickly.

Card Check Bad – Economy

EFCA kills the economy—raises production costs, distorts resource allocation, causes unemployment and massively decreases GDP

Lee E. Ohanian Professor of Economics and Director, Robert Ettinger Family Program in Macroeconomic Research UCLA THE IMPACT OF THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT ON THE U.S. ECONOMY April 23, 2010 Accessed July 20 2010http://www.aei.org/docLib/OhanianEmployeeFreeChoiceAct.pdf//Donnie

EFCA is intended to raise unionization in the United States. Proponents of EFCA argue that increased unionization is necessary for restoring prosperity to lower and middle income workers. My analysis, however, indicates that increasing unionization would damage the U.S. economy by raising production costs, distorting resource allocation, and reducing our international competitiveness. Specifically, I estimate that if unionization were to return to levels of the 1970s and if that led to wage hikes on the order of those that unions typically have obtained, then employment would decline by about 4.5 million and GDP would decline by about $500 billion. I also find significant losses even if unionization did not rise much, and even if it did not generate wage increases on par with the historical union premium. I estimate that if unionization rates only returned to their 1990s levels, and the resulting wage hikes were only about five percent, then employment would decline by more than half a million jobs, and GDP would decline by about $70 billion. I also conclude that job loss from higher unionization would disproportionately fall on low-wage workers, as these workers are more substitutable with capital than are highly-skilled workers. This means that the workers which EFCA is primarily intended to help are those at most risk under EFCA. There are, however, alternative policies to promote wage growth, particularly for lower-skilled workers, that would be more efficient than increased unionization and that would not carry the employment loss risk associated with unionization. These policies include providing subsidies that reduce the cost to low-wage workers to acquire increased education, training, and job skills. For example, each year 10 million workers could receive about $5,000 for job training and education, which could cost as little as just one-tenth of increasing unionization back to 1970s levels. The central lesson we have learned from living in an increasingly globally competitive economy is that increasing wages and expanding the pool of high paying jobs requires increasing worker productivity, not suppressing competition through increased unionization.

Card check makes recovery impossible—it stifles business flexibility

Free Enterprise free market oriented magazine “Chambers: Card Check Would Impact Right-to-Work States” Fed. 2009. Accessed July 20, 2010 http://www.uschambermagazine.com/article/chambers-card-check-would-impact-right-to-work-states//Donnie

Passage of legislation that would make it easier for unions to organize workplaces would hamper America's economic recovery and growth, including in right-to-work states where employees can refuse to pay union dues, according to more than 180 state and local chambers of commerce in all 22 right-to-work states. In a February 11 letter to House and Senate members, 186 state and local chambers refute arguments that their states would not be impacted by the so called Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA). "While some have suggested that businesses in right-to-work states would not be significantly affected by EFCA, nothing could be further from the truth," according to the letter. "Workers in right-to-work states are just as likely as those in other states to find themselves suddenly unionized as the result of a secret card check campaign." If that happens, the letter continues, employees must give up their right to deal directly with their employer. The letter also argues that the card check bill would effectively eliminate private ballots in union organizing drives and subject employees to union intimidation, allow government-appointed arbitrators to set all the terms and conditions of an employee's contract, and impose new penalties for employer misconduct but not for union misconduct. "Given the growing economic recession, it is critical that businesses have the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of a challenging economy if we are to create an environment in which businesses can grow and create jobs. The Employee Free Choice Act is inconsistent with this critical goal," the letter says.

\*\*\*DADT\*\*\*

DADT Internal

Dems control key to DADT repeal

Keen 10

Lisa, DADT repeal teeters on the midterm elections, 3-11, http://www.ebar.com/news/article.php?sec=news&article=4621

Google "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," and you'll get more than 2 million links. Add the word "repeal" to the search, and you'll get about half a million. Add the words "this year," and you're down to 135,000. That's probably a good illustration of how the actual repeal process is going these days: Lots of people are talking about it, but the chances for success this year rely on a lot more things converging just so, and not too much. The plan on the table right now is two-pronged: first, some sort of intra-Pentagon relaxation of the enforcement of the current policy by, roughly, the end of this month. And then repeal of the policy at some point in the future. Representative Barney Frank (D-Massachusetts) said that future point likely will be on the Fiscal Year 2011 Defense Authorization bill which, last year, got its final vote in October. But Defense Secretary Robert Gates told a Senate Armed Services Committee last month that he sees Congress taking up the matter after the Pentagon does a study of the impact and how best to go about repealing the policy. He set December 1 as the report's due date and, in a memo to the study group March 2, suggested the group might consider recommending "further study." In other words, repeal of DADT this year is teetering on the midterm elections. While there is clearly more support for repeal of the policy this year than in the past 17 years of its implementation, DADT is still a contentious issue. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral Mike Mullen said it's the "right thing to do," his four joint chiefs say not now. The most recent national poll – by CNN February 12-15 of 1,023 adults – found 69 percent favor, 27 percent oppose, 4 percent were unsure. But that was a slip from 75 percent – in an ABC poll of 1,004 adults – the week before, just after Mullen's remark was widely publicized. And Congress has deteriorated into a partisan combat zone and some Republican members of the Senate Armed Services Committee made clear they oppose repeal. Repealing DADT will certainly have more opposition than did the hate crimes bill last year. The Senate needed 60 votes last summer to force the chamber to approve adding the hate crimes law to the defense authorization bill through unanimous consent; it got 63. Can the DADT repeal get 60? Some things have changed. For one thing, Senate Democrats lost one vote when Republican Scott Brown from Massachusetts won election in January to replace the late Edward Kennedy. Brown has not publicly stated his position, and he told Barbara Walters he hasn't made up his mind. But he described the issue as one of "social change," not discrimination, and two Massachusetts groups – the anti-gay Massachusetts Family Institute and the pro-gay MassEquality – say he supports keeping DADT. Last year, the key Senate vote on hate crimes took place in July. But conventional wisdom in Washington is that legislators start running for re-election by the end of March and they often run to the political middle to ensure the widest base of support in the general election. That is not the direction that helps secure votes for DADT repeal in a Democratic majority Congress. Democrats have a 77-seat advantage over Republicans in the House, and – if independents usually vote with Democrats – an 18-seat advantage in the Senate. Trouble is, the Senate has become increasingly vulnerable to Republican filibuster. And since it takes 60 votes to break a filibuster, Democrats are feeling impotent with 59. And that's if the vote on repeal takes place before the midterms. If it takes place after the midterms, it's unclear what the political climate will be. Eighteen Democratic seats and 18 Republican seats are up for election in November.

DADT Internal

It’s after the midterms

The Washington Post, 5-25-2010, “Obama backs 'don't ask, don't tell' compromise that could pave way for repeal,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/24/AR2010052403681\_pf.html

[President Obama](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Barack_Obama) has endorsed a ["don't ask, don't tell" compromise](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/23/AR2010052303880.html) between lawmakers and the Defense Department, the White House announced Monday, an agreement that may sidestep a key obstacle to repealing the military's policy banning gay men and lesbians from serving openly in the armed forces. The compromise was finalized in meetings Monday at the White House and on Capitol Hill. Lawmakers will now, within days, vote on amendments that would repeal the Clinton-era policy, with a provision ensuring that any change would not take effect until after the Pentagon completes a study about its impact on troops. That study is due to Congress by Dec. 1. In a [letter to lawmakers](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/federal-eye/2010/05/obamas_letters_supporting_dont.html) pushing for a legislative repeal, White House budget director [Peter Orszag](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Peter_Orszag) wrote Monday that the administration "supports the proposed amendment."

DADT Good – Hegemony

Repeal collapses hegemony

Gaffney 10

Frank, 6-14, president of the Center for Security Policy, Repealing 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Could Have Drastic Consequences, http://www.newsmax.com/FrankGaffney/barack-obama-dont-ask/2010/06/14/id/361932

Unfortunately, thanks to an amendment added in the Senate Armed Services Committee that would impose the homosexual agenda on the U.S. military, a more appropriate title for this bill would be "the-bring-back-the-draft act." Mind you, none of the bill's sponsors would want it given such a descriptor. Nor are they likely to own up to the reality that their effort to repeal the present statutory prohibition on avowed homosexuals serving in uniform (popularly, though incorrectly, known as "don't ask, don't tell") will have the effect of destroying the highly successful all volunteer force. Yet, that is, nonetheless, the professional judgment of over 1,160 retired senior military officers who joined together earlier this year to warn President Obama and the Congress of this danger. Specifically, these distinguished officers who included among their ranks two former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, several service chiefs, a number of combatant command, theater, and other major U.S. and allied force commanders and two Medal of Honor recipients wrote: Our past experience as military leaders leads us to be greatly concerned about the impact of repeal [of the law] on morale, discipline, unit cohesion and overall military readiness.  We believe that imposing this burden on our men and women in uniform would undermine recruiting and retention, impact leadership at all levels, have adverse effects on the willingness of parents who lend their sons and daughters to military service, and eventually break the All-Volunteer Force. Such a grim assessment has been informed by, among other data, the results of a poll of serving military personnel (as opposed to civilians) conducted by the Military Times. It found that roughly 10 percent of those currently in uniform would leave the armed forces if the proponents of the amendment to the NDAA succeed in repealing the current law. The pollsters reported that another 15 percent would actively consider doing so.  Interestingly, a front-page article in Sunday's Washington Post provides a flavor of how problematic such arrangements would be in practice. Entitled "In Limbo Over ‘Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'" the news item was transparently designed to promote the inevitability of repeal, and to tout the accommodations already being made by the armed forces to the anticipated post-repeal order of things. Still, the article could not avoid the reality that there will be serious issues involving conduct, discipline, spousal benefits, housing arrangements and the ability of military chaplains to practice and minister their respective faiths.  These are precisely the sorts of problems an internal Pentagon review has been given until December to assess.  But legislators more interested in appeasing homosexual activists than understanding the damage to the armed forces are insisting that the current prohibition be repealed now.  In order to secure sufficient votes for passage, they adopted a cynical gambit: The repeal would only go into effect after the Pentagon's study is done and three officials (all of whom have already made up their mind, namely, President Obama, Defense Secretary Robert Gates and JCS Chairman Mike Mullen) give the go-ahead.  The House of Representatives has already approved such a rigged game, voting recently to strike the existing law over the bipartisan objections of its Armed Services Committee and the four serving chiefs of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. As a practical matter, the result will likely be a hemorrhage of talent from the military. The only alternative would be to reinstitute conscription, better known and reviled as "the draft."  We will all pay the price of such irresponsible breakage of the all-volunteer force.

DADT Good- Increases Readiness (1/2)

DADT Ensures Military Readiness- Key to Lower Misconduct and Tension

Government Executive 10(Dawn Lim is a staff writer for Government Executive. “Groups Claim Repealing Gay Ban Could Hinder Military Readiness.” Feb. 19, 2010. <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0210/021910d1.htm>. July 20, 2010.)

Repealing the nearly 20-year-old policy banning openly gay men and women from serving in the armed forces would adversely affect the military's performance during wartime, according to some interest groups at this year's Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington. Earlier this month, the Pentagon's top brass voiced support for a repeal of "don't ask, don't tell," and President Obama also has said publicly that he supports overturning the Clinton-era policy. But u According to the center's policy review, putting uniformed personnel in military conditions of close quarters and "forced intimacy" with homosexuals would create misconduct and tension. Citing the threat that "zero tolerance of dissent" would lead to promotions based on "political-correctness" rather than merit, the report asserted that a policy change would hurt retention rates and unit cohesion. Elaine Donnelly, the center's president, criticized the open inclusion of gays and lesbians in the military as "social engineering," echoing the words used by prominent veterans' groups, including the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, earlier this month when they voiced opposition to Obama's proposal to repeal "don't ask, don't tell." Defense Secretary Robert Gates has appointed a task force to study how the military would implement a repeal of "don't ask, don't tell" policy that bars gays from serving in the military. And during congressional testimony in early February, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Adm. Mike Mullen said allowing gays to serve openly in the military was the "right thing to do." The Government Accountability Office has reported that the cost of discharging and replacing service members who were discharged because of their sexual orientation during the policy's first 10 years was at least $190 million, though an independent University of California Blue Ribbon Commission estimated that figure was much higher. Veterans are divided over the issue. Shortly after Obama was elected, more than 100 retired military leaders signed a statement supporting a change in the law. A new poll released on Thursday by the left-leaning think tank Center for American Progress shows that a majority of American voters are in favor of allowing gays to serve openly in the military: 54 percent of those surveyed support repealing "don't ask, don't tell," while 35 percent are opposed to overturning the ban. Tony Perkins, president of the Christian organization Family Research Council, said at the conference that the poll reflected the public's lack of understanding on the realities of military life. Also on Thursday during CPAC, Liz Cheney, daughter of former Vice President Dick Cheney, said she supports a repeal of "don't ask, don't tell" as does her father. Cheney's sister, Mary, is a lesbian.

DADT Good- Increases Readiness (2/2)

Military Readiness Key to North Korea

Vancouverite 10(“U.S. orders military readiness over North Korea aggression.” May 24, 2010

<http://www.vancouverite.com/2010/05/24/u-s-orders-military-readiness-over-north-korea-aggression/> July 22, 2010.)

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has reiterated strong support for South Korea’s defense as President Obama ordered the U.S. military to be in a state of readiness. “The Republic of Korea can continue to count on the full support of the United States, as President Obama made clear when he spoke to President Lee last week,” said Clinton during a press briefing. “First, we endorse President Lee’s call on North Korea to come forward with the facts regarding this act of aggression and, above all, stop its belligerence and threatening behavior,” she said as tension continued to mount over the sinking of a South Korean naval vessel with the loss of 46 lives. “Second, our support for South Korea’s defense is unequivocal, and President Obama has directed his military commanders to coordinate closely with their Korean counterparts to ensure readiness and to deter future aggression,” she said, reinforcing a statement made by Obama. ” As part of our ongoing dialogue, we will explore further enhancements to our joint posture on the Peninsula. Third, we support President Lee’s call to bring this issue to the United Nations Security Council,” she said. ” I will be working with Ambassador Rice and our Korean counterparts, as well as Japan, China, and other UN Security Council member states to reach agreement on a way forward in the Council.” “I have also had in-depth conversations with the Japanese leadership, and I am in the midst of intensive consultations with the Chinese Government on this issue. My colleagues in the United States Government, including Secretary Gates and others, are also actively engaging countries in the region. “Fourth, President Obama has directed U.S. Government agencies to review their existing authorities and policies related to North Korea, to ensure that we have adequate measures in place, and to identify areas where adjustments would be appropriate,” she added. Clinton will be in Seoul on Wednesday for further discussions about the sinking of the Cheonan and the allied response to it.

North Korean war leads to extinction

Africa News 99

October 25, LN.

If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

DADT Good- Order/Discipline

DADT Key to Keep Order, Morale, Discipline, and Unit Cohesion

The Washington Times 10( Peter Sprigg writer for FRC, , March 8, 2010.” Sex matters in the military; public opinion changes, but human nature does not” pg. 3. July 20, 2010.)

In some ways, the debate over homosexuals in the military is a battle of contradictions, being waged on many fronts and by many who hold highly disparate opinions. In his Senate testimony recently, Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed his personal support for liberalization of "don't ask don't tell" (DADT) because of the contradiction between allowing homosexuals to serve and requiring them to keep quiet about their sexuality. His comrades in arms disagreed. Last week, the other service chiefs (Army Gen. George Casey; Air Force Gen. Norton Schwartz; the Marine Corps commandant, Gen. James T. Conway; and the chief of naval operations, Adm. Gary Roughead) essentially contradicted Adm. Mullen by expressing serious concern over any change in current policy, especially with the nation fighting two wars. On another front, conservatives who held a press conference at the Conservative Political Action Conference sought to explain that former President Bill Clinton's DADT compromise actually contradicts the 1993 law passed by Congress, which says homosexuality is a threat to good order, morale, discipline and unit cohesion. Sen. Joe Lieberman, Connecticut independent, announced that he will soon introduce a bill to repeal the current law, contradicting the man who almost chose him as his running mate, Sen. John McCain, Arizona Republican. There will be another hearing on the topic this month before the House Armed Services Committee, chaired by Rep. Ike Skelton, Missouri Democrat, whose position against repeal contradicts that of the Democratic ‘ president, [Barack Obama.](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9776684216&returnToId=20_T9776692526&csi=8176&A=0.16819296946536777&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Barack%20Obama.&indexType=P)

AT: DADT Is Racist

DADT Is Not Bigoted- Exclusion Key to Effectiveness

The Washington Times 10(Peter Sprigg writer for FRC, March 8, 2010, Sex matters in the military; public opinion changes, but human nature does not pg. 3. July 20, 2010)

However, there is another contradiction that has gotten too little attention - a contradiction in the logic of those who favor opening the military to homosexuals. In one sense, they argue that sex matters more than anything; yet in another sense, they argue that sex matters not at all. In arguing that "gays and lesbians" are being excluded from the military just for "who they are," as [President Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9776684216&returnToId=20_T9776692526&csi=8176&A=0.16819296946536777&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama%20&indexType=P)and many others have done, they imply that for those individuals, their sexuality is the essential core of their identity. If you think about it, this is odd. No other group in the population identifies themselves, first and foremost, on the basis of their sexual desires and behaviors. The monogamous and the adulterous, the promiscuous and the celibate - none of these groups identify themselves to the world primarily on the basis of their sexuality. Only homosexuals do that. When it comes to their self-identification, sex means everything. But when we seek to examine the implications of allowing such individuals to serve in the military, we are told that sex means nothing. We are assured that putting people with sexual attractions to one another in positions of forced intimacy, sharing showers and sleeping quarters, will have no impact on people's behavior, let alone on their "good order, morale, discipline and unit cohesion." Such claims simply strain credulity. Several years ago (on Dec. 8, 2004) the liberal Washington Post carried a fascinating juxtaposition of stories. First, an Army court had overturned the criminal conviction of a male soldier for engaging in a sex act with a female civilian "in a military barracks" - and some activists were rejoicing that the decision might be a sign the military would overturn its ban on homosexual conduct. Another story indicated that a high-ranking male Air Force officer might be fired for engaging in serial "fraternization" (most of it consensual) with various women. Just below that was a story about sexual harassment and assaults at the Air Force Academy. Those are just one day's examples that illustrate the problems sex already is causing, even under current law and policies, among heterosexuals in the military. And those are under circumstances in which men and women who serve together remain segregated in the most intimate aspects of their lives. Because segregation of "gay" and "straight" soldiers likely would be considered intolerable, forced cohabitation between those who are sexually attracted could only make these problems worse. When conservatives argue that the troops will not accept homosexuality in the ranks, our opponents often misinterpret this claim. They think we are saying that American soldiers are too bigoted and unprofessional to adapt to diversity. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are saying that these troops have legitimate and well-founded concerns about the consequences of injecting additional sexual tension into the already demanding lifestyle of America's warriors. The reality is that sex does matter - but not in the way "gay" activists say. Homosexuals are not excluded from the military because of ""who they are. The distinction is on the basis of conduct and the propensity to engage in that conduct - not on the basis of personal identity. But maintaining discipline in the unique, all-consuming, 24/7 lifestyle of the military has always required placing restrictions on people's personal relationships and conduct that would not be accepted in the civilian world. That is why there are rules against "fraternization" and even laws (in the Uniform Code of Military Justice) against adultery and sodomy. In 1993, Congress reaffirmed what has been this country's policy since its founding - that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. Society and public opinion may have changed since then - but human nature and the unique demands of the military have not. The 1993 law should be retained for one simple reason - because sex matters in the military. Peter Sprigg is a senior fellow for policy studies at the Family Research Council.
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DADT Is Not Bigoted- Exclusion Key to Effectiveness

The Washington Times 10(Peter Sprigg writer for FRC, March 8, 2010, Sex matters in the military; public opinion changes, but human nature does not pg. 3. July 20, 2010)

However, there is another contradiction that has gotten too little attention - a contradiction in the logic of those who favor opening the military to homosexuals. In one sense, they argue that sex matters more than anything; yet in another sense, they argue that sex matters not at all. In arguing that "gays and lesbians" are being excluded from the military just for "who they are," as [President Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9776684216&returnToId=20_T9776692526&csi=8176&A=0.16819296946536777&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama%20&indexType=P)and many others have done, they imply that for those individuals, their sexuality is the essential core of their identity. If you think about it, this is odd. No other group in the population identifies themselves, first and foremost, on the basis of their sexual desires and behaviors. The monogamous and the adulterous, the promiscuous and the celibate - none of these groups identify themselves to the world primarily on the basis of their sexuality. Only homosexuals do that. When it comes to their self-identification, sex means everything. But when we seek to examine the implications of allowing such individuals to serve in the military, we are told that sex means nothing. We are assured that putting people with sexual attractions to one another in positions of forced intimacy, sharing showers and sleeping quarters, will have no impact on people's behavior, let alone on their "good order, morale, discipline and unit cohesion." Such claims simply strain credulity. Several years ago (on Dec. 8, 2004) the liberal Washington Post carried a fascinating juxtaposition of stories. First, an Army court had overturned the criminal conviction of a male soldier for engaging in a sex act with a female civilian "in a military barracks" - and some activists were rejoicing that the decision might be a sign the military would overturn its ban on homosexual conduct. Another story indicated that a high-ranking male Air Force officer might be fired for engaging in serial "fraternization" (most of it consensual) with various women. Just below that was a story about sexual harassment and assaults at the Air Force Academy. Those are just one day's examples that illustrate the problems sex already is causing, even under current law and policies, among heterosexuals in the military. And those are under circumstances in which men and women who serve together remain segregated in the most intimate aspects of their lives. Because segregation of "gay" and "straight" soldiers likely would be considered intolerable, forced cohabitation between those who are sexually attracted could only make these problems worse. When conservatives argue that the troops will not accept homosexuality in the ranks, our opponents often misinterpret this claim. They think we are saying that American soldiers are too bigoted and unprofessional to adapt to diversity. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are saying that these troops have legitimate and well-founded concerns about the consequences of injecting additional sexual tension into the already demanding lifestyle of America's warriors. The reality is that sex does matter - but not in the way "gay" activists say. Homosexuals are not excluded from the military because of ""who they are. The distinction is on the basis of conduct and the propensity to engage in that conduct - not on the basis of personal identity. But maintaining discipline in the unique, all-consuming, 24/7 lifestyle of the military has always required placing restrictions on people's personal relationships and conduct that would not be accepted in the civilian world. That is why there are rules against "fraternization" and even laws (in the Uniform Code of Military Justice) against adultery and sodomy. In 1993, Congress reaffirmed what has been this country's policy since its founding - that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. Society and public opinion may have changed since then - but human nature and the unique demands of the military have not. The 1993 law should be retained for one simple reason - because sex matters in the military. Peter Sprigg is a senior fellow for policy studies at the Family Research Council.

AT: DADT Is Racist

DADT Is Not Bigoted- Exclusion Key to Effectiveness

The Washington Times 10(Peter Sprigg writer for FRC, March 8, 2010, Sex matters in the military; public opinion changes, but human nature does not pg. 3. July 20, 2010)

However, there is another contradiction that has gotten too little attention - a contradiction in the logic of those who favor opening the military to homosexuals. In one sense, they argue that sex matters more than anything; yet in another sense, they argue that sex matters not at all. In arguing that "gays and lesbians" are being excluded from the military just for "who they are," as [President Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9776684216&returnToId=20_T9776692526&csi=8176&A=0.16819296946536777&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama%20&indexType=P)and many others have done, they imply that for those individuals, their sexuality is the essential core of their identity. If you think about it, this is odd. No other group in the population identifies themselves, first and foremost, on the basis of their sexual desires and behaviors. The monogamous and the adulterous, the promiscuous and the celibate - none of these groups identify themselves to the world primarily on the basis of their sexuality. Only homosexuals do that. When it comes to their self-identification, sex means everything. But when we seek to examine the implications of allowing such individuals to serve in the military, we are told that sex means nothing. We are assured that putting people with sexual attractions to one another in positions of forced intimacy, sharing showers and sleeping quarters, will have no impact on people's behavior, let alone on their "good order, morale, discipline and unit cohesion." Such claims simply strain credulity. Several years ago (on Dec. 8, 2004) the liberal Washington Post carried a fascinating juxtaposition of stories. First, an Army court had overturned the criminal conviction of a male soldier for engaging in a sex act with a female civilian "in a military barracks" - and some activists were rejoicing that the decision might be a sign the military would overturn its ban on homosexual conduct. Another story indicated that a high-ranking male Air Force officer might be fired for engaging in serial "fraternization" (most of it consensual) with various women. Just below that was a story about sexual harassment and assaults at the Air Force Academy. Those are just one day's examples that illustrate the problems sex already is causing, even under current law and policies, among heterosexuals in the military. And those are under circumstances in which men and women who serve together remain segregated in the most intimate aspects of their lives. Because segregation of "gay" and "straight" soldiers likely would be considered intolerable, forced cohabitation between those who are sexually attracted could only make these problems worse. When conservatives argue that the troops will not accept homosexuality in the ranks, our opponents often misinterpret this claim. They think we are saying that American soldiers are too bigoted and unprofessional to adapt to diversity. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are saying that these troops have legitimate and well-founded concerns about the consequences of injecting additional sexual tension into the already demanding lifestyle of America's warriors. The reality is that sex does matter - but not in the way "gay" activists say. Homosexuals are not excluded from the military because of ""who they are. The distinction is on the basis of conduct and the propensity to engage in that conduct - not on the basis of personal identity. But maintaining discipline in the unique, all-consuming, 24/7 lifestyle of the military has always required placing restrictions on people's personal relationships and conduct that would not be accepted in the civilian world. That is why there are rules against "fraternization" and even laws (in the Uniform Code of Military Justice) against adultery and sodomy. In 1993, Congress reaffirmed what has been this country's policy since its founding - that homosexuality is incompatible with military service. Society and public opinion may have changed since then - but human nature and the unique demands of the military have not. The 1993 law should be retained for one simple reason - because sex matters in the military. Peter Sprigg is a senior fellow for policy studies at the Family Research Council.

DADT BAD- Repeal Solves War and Economy

Repeal DADT Key to Increase US Troop Levels—Key to Solve Escalating War and the Economy

Korb et al 9 (Lawrence Korb, Sean E. Duggan and Laura Conley. Lawrence J. Korb is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, served as assistant secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration. Sean E. Duggan and Laura Conley are researchers at the center. “How to End Don’t Ask Don’t Tell.”Christian Science Monitor. July 7, 2009. Lexis. July 20, 2010.)

Last year, as a presidential candidate, Barack Obama pledged he would work with military leaders and Congress to repeal the law that bans openly gay men and women from serving in the military. Last week, as the nation's commander in chief, he renewed his stance, declaring that "preventing patriotic Americans from serving our country weakens our national security." Yet the law commonly known as "Don't ask, don't tell," or DADT, still remains in effect. As a consequence, more than 275 service members have been discharged on the basis of this discriminatory, outmoded, and counterproductive policy since President Obama took office and an estimated 2,000 have left the service voluntarily this year because of the policy. In addition, DADT has deterred untold others who want to defend their country from serving. Since its enactment more than 16 years ago, DADT has resulted in the discharge of more than 13,000 patriotic and highly qualified men and women. This not only undermines *military readiness,* but *costs the taxpayers* hundreds of millions of dollars spent on training and replacing these people. At least 1,000 of these 13,000 have held "critical occupations," such as interpreters and engineers. For example, by the end of fiscal year 2003, a few months after the fall of Baghdad, the military had forced out more than 320 service members with vital language skills such as Arabic and Farsi. Meanwhile, the Army and Marine Corps have been forced to significantly lower their moral and aptitude standards to fill their ranks, including taking in people with felony convictions. Nevertheless, there is no sense of urgency within the Obama administration to repeal DADT. The president himself said on June 29 that he believes the best approach is to work with Congress and the Defense Department to change the law. But the Pentagon's leader, Secretary Robert Gates said, "The president and I feel like we've got a lot on our plates right now and let's push that one down the road a little bit." Yet as President Clinton's experience in 1993 demonstrates, any delay can allow those who oppose repealing DADT to seize the momentum. As President Truman found out when he tried to integrate the armed forces, or President Nixon when he tried to end the draft, the Pentagon and their supporters on the Hill will resist these changes. Unlike 16 years ago, the US is waging two wars and "Don't ask, don't tell" is no longer supported by the majority of the American people. The percentage of Americans that support allowing gay people to serve openly has risen from 44 percent in 1993 to 75 percent last year, according to Washington Post-ABC News polls.. While a 2006 Zogby International poll of returning Iraq and Afghanistan service members found that only 26 percent agreed that gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve in the military, 73 percent were personally comfortable around gays and lesbians. There is also no credible evidence supporting the underlying arguments for retaining the law - namely that it would undermine unit cohesion and military effectiveness. In fact, government studies over the past 50 years demonstrate just the opposite. Moreover, 24 other countries, including our closest allies, such as Britain, Israel, and Canada, allow openly gay people to serve. In fact, the British, whose military is most similar in design and function to our own, found that six months after they were forced to change their policy by the European Court of Human Rights, sexual orientation became a nonissue. In other words, allowing openly gay men and women to serve proved more difficult in theory than in practice. Even an architect of "Don't ask, don't tell," Rear Adm. John Hutson, has acknowledged that the policy was "based on nothing" but "our own prejudices and our own fears."

DADT BAD- No Effect on Readiness

Repealing DADT Doesn’t Affect Readiness-Only a Question of Conservative Morality

The Washington Times 10 (Rowan Scarborough, staff writer, Some on right not opposed, Pg. 1. Lexis. March 1, 2010, accessed 7/20)

Conservative groups have begun to mobilize to stop [President Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9777079963&returnToId=20_T9777092934&csi=8176&A=0.06878782213874057&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama%20&indexType=P) plan's to open the **military** to acknowledged **gays,** as some prominent right-leaning Washington figures are breaking with the movement and siding with the White House. The Military Culture Coalition made its debut as an alliance Feb. 18 in a joint Washington news conference to announce a campaign to retain a 1993 law that bans open homosexuals in the ranks based on combat-readiness concerns. "The 15 findings of fact in the 1993 law, emphasizing morale, unit cohesion and **readiness** remain valid today," said Elaine Donnelly, who runs the Livonia, Mich.-based Center for **Military Readiness**. "Repeal and replacement with the proposed 'LGBT Law' for the military, implementing the agenda of lesbian, gay,bisexual and transgendered groups who endorsed [President Obama's](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9777079963&returnToId=20_T9777092934&csi=8176&A=0.06878782213874057&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama's%20&indexType=P)campaign, would make military life even more difficult and dangerous." The coalition includes conservative grass-roots organizations, such as Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council, the American Conservative Union and Concerned Women for America. Aaron Belkin, director of the Palm Center, said these groups have no interest in the **military** and are involved in this debate merely because they don't like homosexuals. "I don't think they're really motivated by concern for unit cohesion and military readiness," said Mr. Belkin, whose organization at the University of California at Santa Barbara has conducted studies promoting open **gays** in the **military.** "I think they're motivated by moral concerns and a distaste for homosexuality. Most of those groups don't make any bones about that." He also noted the coalition's press release, saying it put the group at odds with Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and several of his predecessors who have made statements varyingly critical of the current policy. "It was a little funny for me to see them put a rainbow-colored question mark over the Pentagon because it's not our side that is questioning Chairman Mullen, Chairman [Colin L.] Powell, Chairman [John] Shalikashvili and Chairman [William] Crowe. So I really don't think it's about **military readiness** for these groups," he said. Adm. Mullen, the late Adm. Crowe, and Gen. Shalikashvili have voiced support for overturning the ban, while Gen. Powell has said he wants the law reviewed. Conservatives have largely been silent on the issue of gays in the military since winning the battle in 1993, when they joined like-minded Democrats and Republicans to block President Clinton's bid to remove outright the services' ban on homosexuality. They took it one step further, writing into law a prohibition that merely had been a regulation; "don't ask, don't tell" was a compromise regulation on how to implement the ban. This time around, conservatives do not seem as unified or enthused. Groups against the ban, such as the Human Rights Campaign and Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, have kept a drumbeat of publicity casting the prohibition as unfair discrimination. The mainstream media generally support their goals. And public opinion polls have shown a growing majority supporting gays in the military**.** The prospect of major social change for the all-volunteer force has not captured conservative talk radio, which is focused on Mr. Obama's economic and health care agenda. For example, Bill O'Reilly, host of the Fox News Channel's most-watched prime-time show, said Mr. Obama's call for ending the ban this year is not an issue. Influential conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer sided with Mr. Obama on Fox's "Special Report" program in February. "I think it is a good idea, and I think the administration's approach, which is a gradual approach, is the right one, which is to study how to do it over a year and then to implement it over years," he said. "The mores in the country have changed, certainly in the last 16 years, and certainly among the young. I think it's a form of discrimination that's sort of outlived itself." Former Vice President Dick Cheney, a hero to conservatives for criticizing Mr. Obama's counterterrorism policies, all but endorsed ending the ban on ABC News last month. "I think society has moved on," said Mr. Cheney, who enforced the ban as President George H.W. Bush's defense secretary. "I think it's partly a generational question. I'm reluctant to second-guess the **military** in this regard, because they're the ones that got to make the judgment in how these policies affect the **military**capability of our units." Mr. Cheney said "that first requirement you have to look at all the time is whether or not they're capable of achieving their mission and does the policy change - i.e., putting **gays** in the force affect their ability to perform their mission. And when the chiefs come forward and say we can do it, it strikes me that it's time to reconsider the policy, and I think Admiral Mullen said that." Adm. Mullen told Congress last month that he supports repealing the ban, but the chiefs of the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps withheld support during congressional testimony last week. They said they want to await the results of a study ordered by Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates on how to integrate open **gays** and its impact on the force. The Marine Corps and Army chief expressed deep reservations about ending the ban. "I think the current policy works," Gen. James T. Conway, the Marine Corps commandant, told the Senate Armed Services Committee on Thursday. "My best **military** advice to this committee, to the secretary, to the president, would be to keep the law such as it is." Said Ms. Donnelly, "The other chiefs are coming forward and are not following the keynote testimony of Adm. Mullen. Our side now is only just starting to get visible. The other side has been out there all along. Now that the hearings are being held, there is a new dynamic." Some of the issues that social conservatives are raising: Will military chaplains be called on to perform ceremonies that violate their beliefs? Will there be mandatory sensitivity training? What will children be taught about homosexuality in the armed forces schools system? "If our military is now forced to affirm homosexual behavior, it will for the first time in history espouse amilitary policy that is completely at odds with the morality expressed by many of its chaplains," the Alliance Defense Fund, a conservative legal rights group, said in a Feb. 18 letter to Mr. Gates.

DADT BAD- No Effect on Readiness

Repealing DADT Wont Hurt Readiness-Tradition Causes Oppostion

The Washington Post 9, John, M. Shalikashvili, Pg. A25, June 19, 2009, accessed 7/20

The Supreme Court announced last week that it would [not review](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/08/AR2009060801366.html) a lawsuit challenging the**military's** "don't ask, don't tell" policy forbidding homosexuals from serving openly. The Obama administration had asked the court not to take the case as the president considers ending the ban. News that the president would change the policy had inspired a group of retired flag officers to [argue](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/14/AR2009041402704.html) on this page this spring that service by openly gay individuals would harm morale, discipline, cohesion, recruitment and retention in the U.S. military **["Gays and the Military:** A Bad Fit," op-ed, April 15]. They wrote as part of a larger effort by more than 1,000 retired officers to keep the ban in place. According to the generals and admirals, allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly would make parents less willing to allow their sons and daughters to enlist. The argument assumes that anti-gay sentiment is so fierce and widespread that moving to a policy of equal treatment would drive away thousands and could ultimately "break the All-Volunteer Force." Not only is there no evidence to support these conclusions, but research shows conclusively that openly gay service members would not undermine military readiness. Tradition is a critical military value, and the armed forces have a long-standing tradition of banning gay men and lesbians. Equally important military traditions, however, are learning and adapting -- and my colleagues made claims as if no new knowledge has been acquired over past decades, during which time Israel and Britain joined more than 20 other nations to allow openly**gay** individuals to serve without overall problems. In Britain and Canada, polls had indicated that thousands would resign if **gays** were allowed to serve, but when the bans were lifted, almost no one left. The British Defense Ministry conducted several assessments of the policy change and called it a "solid achievement." The flag officers neglected to acknowledge Britain's experience, instead dismissing the relevance of nations such as "Denmark, the Netherlands and Canada." While it is true that the U.S. armed forces are unique, it is important that we not marginalize the lessons learned in other countries -- particularly those that often conduct joint operations with us. But it is not just foreign militaries that show service by openly gay individuals works. The U.S.military itself has had successful experiences. Enforcement of the ban was suspended without problems during the Persian Gulf War, and there were no reports of angry departures. A majority of U.S. service members say they know or believe that someone in their unit is gay**,** according to a 2006 [Zogby International poll](http://www.palmcenter.org/files/active/1/ZogbyReport.pdf), and most of those who know of openly **gay** peers report no detriment to morale or cohesion. A recent study co-authored by Laura Miller of Rand Corp. found no correlation between a unit's readiness and whether known gays serve in it. And last year, four retired flag and general officers studied all available evidence and found that allowing gaysto serve posed no risk to force readiness. While the proper timing of repealing "don't ask, don't tell" remains uncertain, it is evident to me that a policy change is inevitable. More than three-quarters of the public favors the change. Polls show that even a majority of Republicans support allowing openly **gay** people to serve. Within the **military,** the climate has changed dramatically since 1993. Conversations I've held with service members make clear that, while the military remains a traditional culture, that tradition no longer requires banning open service by gays. There will undoubtedly be some teething pains, but I have no doubt our leadership can handle it.

DADT BAD- Flawed

DADT Flawed- No Impact On Military Readiness or Preparedness

St Petersburg Times 9( Must end dont ask, dont tell, Pg. 10A, October 14, 2009, accessed 7/20)

Since passage of the 1993 law establishing "don't ask, don't tell," about 12,500 **gay** men and lesbians have seen their **military** careers destroyed. Thankfully, there is growing recognition, even within military ranks, that the policy has handicapped the country's military readiness. Joining the call to repeal the outdated policy on Saturday was President [Barack Obama,](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9777079963&returnToId=20_T9777085870&csi=11063&A=0.7661380458189517&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Barack%20Obama,%20&indexType=P) who told an audience at a large gay rights gala: "We should not be punishing patriotic Americans who have stepped forward to serve this country." He's right. Americans have come a long way in their thinking about **gay** men and women in the **military.** According to national polls, support for getting rid of "don't ask, don't tell" now commands large majorities, including 60 percent of weekly churchgoers and 58 percent of Republicans. **Military** leaders who fought so hard to keep openly **gay** service members from their ranks during the Clinton administration are changing too. In the latest issue of Joint Force Quarterly, a **military** periodical, Air Force Col. Om Prakash writes that "don't ask, don't tell" has been "costly both in personnel and treasure." Prakash's well-researched essay says countries with militaries where gays serve openly - such as Britain, Australia, Canada and Israel - found that their decision to lift the ban on gays had "no impact on military performance, readiness, cohesion, or ability to recruit or retain." Alternatively, the ban has led the U.S. military to discharge soldiers with highly sought skills, such as foreign language speakers. And who knows how many **gay** American men and women have chosen to forgo **military** service because they would have to hide who they are. failed on Saturday to offer a time line for abolishing the policy, probably mindful of his already full plate. But pushing for the law's repeal is not politically treacherous anymore, and the longer [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9777079963&returnToId=20_T9777085870&csi=11063&A=0.7661380458189517&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P)and Congress wait, the more **gay** armed service members are put at risk of discovery and ouster. This continued discrimination does a dishonor to our nation. [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9777079963&returnToId=20_T9777085870&csi=11063&A=0.7661380458189517&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P)should demand that Congress end it now.

Other Countries Prove DADT Has No Impact On Military

The Guardian 10(Daniel Nasaw, staff writer, Us army chief to consult on ending anti-gay rules, pg. 20, February 24, 2010, accessed 7/20)

The US army chief of staff yesterday said he would consult generals from Britain and Canada about gay men and lesbians serving in the military, adding that armies ending discrimination had experienced no detriment to their battle readiness. But General George Casey and army secretary John McHugh said they opposed an effort to stop openly **gay** soldiers being discharged while the Pentagon takes a year to study the repeal of a policy barring them from serving. Their testimony in the Senate yesterday dashed the hopes of **gay** soldiers and others that Congress will pass a moratorium on discharges while **military** brass review personnel policies over the next year.Barack Obama and the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, oppose the Clinton-era policy that allows **gay** people to serve in the **military** so long as they keep their sexuality hidden. Since 1994 more than 13,500 **gay** people have been discharged under the policy, one of the last instances of official discrimination in the US. Opponents of the policy say it keeps patriotic men and women out of the military while the US is fighting two wars. In Afghanistan,

DADT Bad- Diminishes Troop Levels

DADT Repeal Key To Increase Troop Levels

Welsh 10 (Nick Welsh is a a staff writer for the Santa Barbara Independent. July 15, 2010. “Doing Away with ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ How UCSB’s Palm Center Is Winning the War Against Gay Discrimination in the Military” July 22, 2010.)

It’s only a matter of time before the controversial “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy governing gays in the military is buried once and for all. When that day comes, Aaron Belkin’s fingerprints will be all over the shovel. For the past 12 years, the political science professor has run the Palm Center at UCSB, a small think tank of scholars and lawyers focused on the fate of sexual minorities within the military. The situation, they soon found, was cruelly absurd and gratuitously self-defeating. At the same time the United States was waging two full-blown wars across the globe, the military was kicking out nearly 14,000 servicemen and -women for violating the dangerously nebulous terms of “don’t ask, don’t tell,” including more than 50 skilled translators — many fluent in Arabic — who had not securely locked themselves in the closet. In some cases, mere possession of a k.d. lang album or a Dinah Shore Golf Classic poster was sufficient cause to launch internal investigations. Meanwhile, the American military — strapped for qualified personnel and forced to relax admission qualifications — allowed more than 4,000 convicted felons to enlist. The “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy first arose in 1993 as a compromise between the Clinton White House and Republican leaders, the Christian Coalition, and key Southern Democrats, who were threatening a total ban on gays in the military. Back then, such high-profile players as General Colin Powell and Senator Sam Nunn argued that allowing out-of-the-closet homosexuals in the military would prove detrimental to the “unit cohesion” required by military discipline. Courtesy PalmCenter.org Over time, both Powell and Nunn would come to disavow that argument, but they didn’t have much of a choice. The research unearthed by Belkin and other scholars with the Palm Center exposed that there was no factual basis for the “unit cohesion” argument. More damningly, they found there never had been. If anything, they found that “don’t ask, don’t tell” was far more corrosive on military morale due to the capricious persecution that ensued. Even more startling, the Palm Center also revealed that 25 other modern militaries had allowed openly gay men and women to serve without suffering any loss of morale or cohesion.

Military Unity Key to Win Afghanistan- Act As One Team

RIECHMANN 10( Deb Riechmann is a Staff Writer for the AP. “Gen. Petraeus calls for unity in Afghanistan war.” July 2, 2010. <http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2010/07/03/general-as-afghanistan_7741376.html?boxes=Homepagebusinessnews>. July 22, 2010.) Gen. David Petraeus, the new commander of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan, called Saturday for unity in the civilian and military effort to turn back the Taliban, saying, "In this important endeavor, cooperation is not optional." In his first public comments since he arrived Friday night to assume command of the international military mission in Afghanistan, Petraeus said he would work to improve coordination between troops on the battlefield and civilians trying to bolster the Afghan government and improve the lives of the people. His predecessor, Gen. Stanley ( SXE - news - people ) McChrystal, was fired last month for intemperate remarks that he and his aides made to Rolling Stone magazine about Obama administration officials, mostly on the civilian side. "Civilian and military, Afghanistan and international, we are part of one team with one mission," Petraeus told about 1,700 invited guests, including Afghan government and military and police officials gathered at the U.S. Embassy for a pre-Fourth of July celebration marking American independence. His message to the Afghans in the audience: "Your success is our success." Petraeus, widely credited with turning around the U.S. war effort in Iraq, is taking over the 130,000-member NATO-led international force at a time of rising violence and growing doubts in Washington and other allied capitals about the effectiveness of the counterinsurgency strategy, which Petraeus pioneered. June was the deadliest month for the allied force since the war began in October 2001 with 102 deaths, more than half of them Americans.

DADT BAD- Discrimination

DADT Repeal Solves Military Discrimination

Brown 10(Laura Douglas-Brown is a staff writer for Southern Voice Newspaper and an Emory University graduate. “U.S. House, Senate committee vote to repeal DADT.”June 11, 2010. <http://www.thegavoice.com/index.php/news/national-news-menu/508-us-house-senate-committee-vote-to-repeal-dadt>. July 20, 2010.)

Efforts to repeal the military’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy gained significant momentum May 27 when both the U.S. House and the Senate Armed Services Committee passed amendments to repeal the ban. “Just like the military helped end segregation based on race, we should have put an end to ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ long ago. It is an affront to human dignity and to the dignity and the worth of every man and woman serving in our military,” U.S. Rep. John Lewis said during debate on the House floor. “We cannot wait. We cannot be patient,” Lewis said. “We must end discrimination in the military, and we must end it now. Discrimination is wrong, and we must end it now.” Both the House and Senate efforts would add “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” repeal to the massive Defense Department authorization bill. The Defense bill still has to pass the full Senate, where debate could begin as early as June 18, and some Republicans, including Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), have threatened filibuster. How Georgia’s U.S. House delegation voted YES on repeal DEMOCRATS District 4: Rep. Hank Johnson (D-Lithonia) District 5: Rep. John Lewis (D-Atlanta) District 12: Rep. John Barrow (D-Savannah) District 13: Rep. David Scott (D-Atlanta) REPUBLICANS none NO on repeal DEMOCRATS District 2: Rep. Sanford Bishop (D-Albany) District 8: Rep. Jim Marshall (D-Macon) REPUBLICANS District 1: Rep. Jack Kingston (R-Savannah) District 3: Rep. Lynn Westmoreland (R-Grantville) District 6: Rep. Tom Price (R-Roswell) District 7: Rep. John Linder (R-Duluth) District 10: Rep. Paul Broun (R-Athens) District 11: Rep. Phil Gingrey (R-Marietta) Note: District 9 seat is vacant After the Senate, the bill would then go through a conference committee to resolve any differences between the House and Senate versions, and then the House and Senate would have to vote to approve conference report, according to Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, before it would go to President Obama for signing. The full U.S. House voted 234-194 May 27 in favor of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” repeal amendment, which was sponsored by Rep. Patrick Murphy (D-Pa.) and needed 217 votes to pass. Only five Republicans voted in favor of repeal, while 26 Democrats voted against it. All of the Republicans in Georgia’s delegation voted against repeal. Two Democrats from Georgia, Reps. Sanford Bishop and Jim Marshall, were among the 26 Democrats who crossed party lines to oppose repeal. Kingston said he opposes repealing “ Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” because it would somehow lead to recognizing gay marriage. “With homosexuals serving openly in the military … there would be no option but to recognize a man’s husband or a woman’s wife and to provide spousal benefits thus contradicting the federal law,” he said in a press release. Kingston also suggested chucking DADT would “lead to further acts of censorship and a clamp down against religious freedom.” “What happens when clerics are told they can no longer preach against a practice their faith tells them is wrong,” Kingston asked. Bishop issued a statement explaining that he voted against repealing “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” through the Defense bill, even though he supports repeal, because he wanted Congress to wait until a Pentagon study is complete. “I agree with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the time has come to repeal the current ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ policy, which dishonors men and women who are willing to give their lives in service to our country and also prevents capable men and women with vital skills from serving in the armed forces. However, I believe a vote today is premature,” Bishop said.

DADT BAD-Racist

DADT System Flawed- Causes Racism Against Black Women

Jacksonville Free Press 10 (“Don't Ask, Don't Tell’ Disproportionately Affecting Black Women.” Jacksonville Free Press. Proquest. Pg 1. July 20, 2010.)

Besides Afghanistan and Iraq, there is no other military policy that raises as much controversy as "Dont Ask, Dont Tell" (DADT.) Robert M. Gates, the defense secretary, and Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a panel of Senators this week that they supported President Obama's proposal to repeal the 1993 Clinton era law forbidding gay men and women to be open about their sexuality while serving in uniform. This story has made headline news across the world. But what we haven't heard is, who's really being affected by this? From The Task Force study, Black same-sex households in the United States: A report from the 2000 Census: "Dont Ask, Don't Tell" has been used to kick Black women out of the military at a much higher rate than other groups. In fact, Black women are discharged under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" at three times the rate that they serve in the military. Although Black women make up less than one percent of servicemembers, they comprise 3.3% of those discharged under the policy. But wait, it gets better. The same report notes people can be discharged under DADT even if they are not gay or lesbian, apparently there are cases where men have accused women who refuse unwanted sexual advances of being lesbians, or because the women are successful and some men do not want to serve under them.

DADT Bad – AT: Cohesion

Repeal doesn’t undermine cohesion

CAP 10

Center for American Progress, March, Myth vs. Fact: Repealing “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/dadt\_myth\_fact.html

Myth: Allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly will undermine unit cohesion and military readiness. Fact: Permitting openly gay and lesbian service personnel will not undermine cohesion or readiness, and the experiences of our allies are a good guide. Commanding officers in the United Kingdom stated that the decision to allow open service had “no tangible impact on operational effectiveness, team cohesion or Service life generally.” Department of National Defence personnel noted “no diminution of cohesion” shortly after the Canadian ban was lifted in 1993. In Israel, researchers from the Palm Center at the University of California-Santa Barbara were not “able to find any data indicating that lifting the gay ban undermined Israeli military performance, cohesion, readiness or morale.” The militaries of all of these countries continue to perform admirably as do U.S. service members who work alongside these forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. Moreover, U.S. research indicates gay and lesbian service members do not undermine cohesion or readiness. A RAND Corporation study noted in 1993 that “sharing similar traits or values enhances social cohesion, but it is not necessary for task cohesion, so long as individuals share a commitment to the group’s mission.” In 2008, Laura Miller of the RAND Corporation and Bonnie Moradi of the University of Florida examined data from a 2006 Zogby poll sampling service members who had deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan and found “no associations between knowing a lesbian or gay unit member and ratings of perceived unit cohesion or readiness.”

DADT Bad – AT: Recruitment / Retention

Repeal doesn’t hurt recruitment or retention

CAP 10

Center for American Progress, March, Myth vs. Fact: Repealing “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/dadt\_myth\_fact.html

Myth: Allowing openly gay service will reduce recruitment and retention rates. Fact: Openly gay service has never been shown to reduce recruitment or retention significantly. After the United Kingdom lifted its ban in 2000, Palm Center researchers found later the same year that “no one has heard of any difficulties related to recruitment or training completion rates; recruitment levels are characterized as ‘quite buoyant.’” The RAND Corporation’s 1993 study found that the Canadian Forces had suffered “no resignations (despite previous threats to quit), no problems with recruitment.”

DADT Bad – International Examples Prove

International examples prove the effectiveness of DADT repeal – no risk of a nightmare scenario

CAP 10

Center for American Progress, March, Myth vs. Fact: Repealing “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/dadt\_myth\_fact.html

Myth: The experiences of foreign militaries are not good models for decisions by the U.S. military. Fact: There is much to learn from the experiences of our allies, especially the United Kingdom, Canada, and Israel. Like U.S. forces, these militaries deploy frequently, require their service members to share close living quarters such as on submarines, engage in combat regularly, and perform effectively under fire. Moreover, these countries and the service members who constitute their armed forces all share common social values with the United States. Canada and Israel began to permit unrestricted open service around the same time that the United States instituted “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” and the United Kingdom repealed its ban 10 years ago. None of the nightmare scenarios predicted by some opponents of open service occurred in these countries.

\*\*\*Global Warming Legislation\*\*\*

Warming Internal

GoP win tanks warming regulations

Page 10

Susan, USA Today, 4-28, "Six months to November, with dates to watch," http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/2010-04-28-six-months\_N.htm

Eighteen months after Barack Obama was elected president and Democratic margins in Congress widened, Republicans boast that they're poised to regain control of the House in November and be in a position to stymie the White House agenda. Democrats argue that they have enough time amid signs of a brightening economy to improve their prospects and minimize their losses in the midterm elections. With six months to go, there are road signs to watch for that will indicate which side is right. At stake is the future of the Bush administration tax cuts that expire this year, the ambitious cap-and-trade climate bill now stalled on Capitol Hill, even the efforts to reshape or repeal the health care law that was enacted just last month and is a signature of Obama's administration. A Republican takeover presumably would dispatch the president to a land of diminished expectations, where a GOP rout sent then-president Bill Clinton for a time after his disastrous 1994 midterms.

Poor showing tanks climate change legislation

Andrew Leonard, Political Analyst, 10/16/2009, “Obama's secret plan for a successful presidency,” http://www.salon.com/tech/htww/2009/10/16/obamas\_secret\_plan\_for\_a\_successful\_presidency/index.html

Mickey Kaus says [everything is falling into place](http://www.slate.com/blogs/blogs/kausfiles/archive/2009/10/16/it-s-all-going-according-to-plan.aspx) for a successful Obama presidency. Except that, in the best Mickey Kaus tradition, his thesis is so drenched with contrarian posing that the definition of a "successful" Obama presidency means the abandonment of most of the policy goals Democrats have for his term. The Kaus thesis is predicated on Obama getting healthcare reform passed, after which the Democrats get clobbered by a still-crippled economy in the 2010 midterm elections. That, in turn, will mean that the rest of the "controversial big Dem bills that got backed up in 2010" -- climate change, card-check, immigration reform -- will die stillborn.

GoP gains prevent carbon caps

Alan Abramowtiz, Professor of Political Science at Emory University, 9/3/2009, “Forecasting the Midterm Election; An Early Look at What to Expect in 2010,” Center For Politics, pg. np

Democrats are likely to lose at least 15 seats in the House of Representatives in 2010 and their losses could go as high as 30-40 seats. The Senate looks more promising for Democrats because there are as many Republican as Democratic seats up for election next year but a loss of 3-4 seats is entirely possible. Given the deep partisan divide in both chambers, diminished majorities will make it much more difficult for Democrats to pass any major legislation in the next Congress. If anything, Republican leaders emboldened by a successful election are likely to be even less interested in compromise with the White House and Democratic leaders than now. If Democrats can’t pass health care, carbon caps, and immigration reform in the current Congress, they probably won’t have another chance until at least 2013.

Healthy majority key

Guardian 10

March, “The Tea Party is a Dynamic Force, but it is Still Unruly and Incoherent,” Lexis

Obama's agenda, including legislation on healthcare reform, climate change and income redistribution, was predicated on the expectation of a healthy Congressional majority. That is now in peril. Democrats currently have a majority of 77 in the House of Representatives and 18 in the Senate. According to the respected election forecasts of the Cook Political Report, there are 59 competitive House seats in the mid-terms. Of those, Democrats are defending 53 and Republicans only six. The Democratic hold on the Senate is also precarious. In the upper house there are 12 competitive seats, of which Democrats are defending eight and Republicans four. Democrats have little to show for their majorities as it is. Given the lack of discipline in the Democratic caucus, Republicans need only prevail in half of these races to make meaningful progress almost impossible.

Warming Internal

It’s now or never

Washington Independent 10

“Does Grahams Backtrack Spell the End of Cap-and-Trade?” 1-27-10, Lexis

With Democrats 59-seat majority in the Senate likely to be reduced to 53 to 55 after the midterm elections, if cap-and-trade doesnt happen this year, it wont happen for a long time. The House leaderships impressive success in passing a landmark climate bill, the hope engendered by the tripartisan climate talks, President Obamas Copenhagen pledge to cut Americas emissions by around 17 percent by 2020 ” all that might have just gone down the drain with a Scott Brown-influenced change of heart by the senior senator from South Carolina.

Each vote is key

**The Times 12-28**

Democrats pose threat to President Obama’s cap-and-trade climate Bill, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us\_and\_americas/article6969108.ece

Less than ten days after claiming a breakthrough on climate change in Copenhagen President Obama is facing a mutiny from senior Democrats who are imploring him to postpone or even abandon his cap-and-trade Bill. Democratic Senators, fearful of a drubbing in the mid-term elections next year, are lining up to argue for alternatives to the scheme that is the centrepiece of the carbon reduction proposals that Mr Obama hopes to sign into law. With the Congressional battles over Mr Obama’s healthcare reforms fresh in their memory senior Democrats are asking the Administration to postpone the next big climate change push until at least 2011. Senators from Louisiana, Indiana, Nebraska and North Dakota, some with powerful energy companies among their constituents, are falling out of love with the idea of a large-scale cap-and-trade scheme — which seeks to allocate tradeable permits to major polluters — in favour of less ambitious proposals that put jobs and the economy first. Each of their Senate votes is vital for any climate change Bill to have a chance of being passed, and a firm American commitment to cap and trade is essential for similar carbon reduction mechanisms to be effective on a global scale. RELATED LINKS Barack the secret swinger drops basketball for golf Horse-trading over health scars Obama Asked if she has urged the White House to abandon cap and trade — at least until after the mid-terms — Senator Mary Landrieu of Louisiana told the Politico website yesterday: “I am communicating that in every way I know how.” At least five other high-ranking Democrats have lobbied the Administration in similar terms. Senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota said that winning passage of climate change legislation in an election year had “very poor prospects”, and Senator Ben Nelson of Nebraska said that he would “just as soon see [climate change] set aside until we work through the economy”

Democratic margins are key to climate legislation

AP 2/18/10 “Obama aims to boslter Senate Deomcrats out West”

President Barack Obama is intervening out West in a brutal election season for incumbents, trying to bolster two vulnerable senators – one of them Majority Leader Harry Reid – and the morale of his party. Obama ventures Thursday to Denver to raise money and speak up for Democratic Sen. Michael Bennet of Colorado, who was appointed and is now getting challenged within his party. Obama will end up in Las Vegas for another Democratic fundraiser and plenty of prominent time with Reid, the Nevada lawmaker who is a major target for Republicans in November. The trip has a public agenda, too – a Las Vegas town hall on the economy on Friday and an Obama speech to the business leaders of that city, who feel he keeps slamming their town. But the political element is a big driver of a visit that will mostly be at taxpayer expense. Obama’s direct involvement comes as the Democrats’ command of the Senate grows shakier, jeopardizing Obama’s agenda as he cannot count on any Republican support. Obama will try to help all year in targeted states he carried in 2008, like Colorado and Nevada, as the margins in Congress will shape his own fortunes on economic, health care and climate legislation

Warming Legislation Good – Global Modeling

**Climate bill key to Copenhagen treaty-failure to pass causes extinction via warming and continues oil dependence**

UPI 6-16

http://www.upi.com/Science\_News/Resource-Wars/2010/06/16/US-climate-bill-to-shape-UN-talks/UPI-31061276708247/

Worldwide hopes for a comprehensive climate protection treaty hinge on whether U.S. President Barack Obama can push through an ambitious U.S. climate bill. At least that's what observers to the U.N. climate negotiations say. EU Climate Commissioner Connie Hedegaard, a former Danish climate minister and chairwoman of the Copenhagen climate summit, last month said it was key that the United States legally commits itself to greenhouse gas emissions caps. "The United States needs to bring in the law," she said of the climate and clean energy bill currently stalling in the Senate. Quickly growing economies like India and China are waiting on Washington to live up to its rhetoric before they are willing to take their own steps, Hedegaard added. The U.N. climate negotiations are still deadlocked after a U.N. summit in Copenhagen last year ended in acrimony. Industrialized and developing nations are still at odds over how to limit the global temperature rise to no more than 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. A rise beyond that limit would result in potentially catastrophic consequences for humanity, with meteorological disasters increasing, scientists say. Developing nations have resisted a legally binding treaty because they claim rich nations that have benefited from emitting during the past decades should shoulder more of the burden. Industrialized countries argue the developing nations need to commit to concrete reduction targets to enable a global effort. The European Commission recently backtracked on a plan to unilaterally boost the bloc's greenhouse gas emissions reduction target from 20 percent to 30 percent -- likely also because other nations, including China and the United States, haven't committed to similarly ambitious targets. European officials hope that the U.S. Senate passes the U.S. climate bill before the next crucial U.N. summit in Cancun, Mexico in December. It's not that the United States has been completely inactive. Obama campaigned on plans for a green economic miracle and has unlocked millions of dollars to boost clean energy development and usage. However, just like his colleagues from Asia and Europe, he has failed to rally the world's nations behind a comprehensive climate protection treaty due to be passed at a U.N. summit in Copenhagen last year. At home, the House of Representatives passed sweeping climate protection and renewable energy legislation a year ago. A similar bill in the Senate, the American Power Act drafted by Sens. John Kerry, D-Mass., and Joe Lieberman, Ind-Conn., however, has been blocked by filibuster threats. The bill would need support from at least one Republican senator to have a chance and no one seems to be considering changing sides. Obama this week urged Americans to rally behind a "national mission" to promote clean energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions responsible for global warming. In the eighth week of the catastrophic BP oil spill, Obama urged his fellow Americans to battle their longstanding dependence on fossil fuels. "The tragedy unfolding on our coast is the most painful and powerful reminder yet that the time to embrace a clean energy future is now," Obama said. "Now is the moment for this generation to embark on a national mission to unleash America's innovation and seize control of our own destiny." Obama added: "Time and again, the path forward has been blocked -- not only by oil industry lobbyists but also by a lack of political courage and candor. The consequences of our inaction are now in plain sight." Officials supporting the Kerry-Lieberman bill have pointed to new figures by the Environmental Protection Agency to counter criticism that curbing emissions would hurt the U.S. economy. Lieberman said his bill would cost the average American family less than $150 a year. "Is the American household willing to pay less than $1 a day so we don't have to buy oil from foreign countries, so we can create millions of new jobs, so we can clean up our environment? I think the answer is going to be yes," Lieberman said. By the way: The millions of barrels of oil that have gushed into the gulf, killing fish, sea mammals and birds, damaging the ecosystem and threatening the regional economy for years to come -- know how long they would have fueled the U.S. economy? Less than four hours.

Warming Legislation Good – Global Modeling

Cap and Trade-Doesn’t Solve Warming

Waxman Markey Doesn’t Solve Warming: Models, Developing Nations Prove

Chip Knappenberger 2009, Knappenberger holds an M.S. degree in Environmental Sciences (1990) from the University of Virginia as well as a B.A. degree in Environmental Sciences (1986) from the same institution. His over 20 years of experience as a climate researcher have included 10 years with the Virginia State Climatology Office and 13 years with New Hope Environmental Services, Inc.. From this research, he has authored or co-authored over 20 papers appearing in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, and numerous others appearing in scientific conference proceedings, professional journals, and the popular press.

http://www.masterresource.org/2009/05/part-i-a-climate-analysis-of-the-waxman-markey-climate-bill%E2%80%94the-impacts-of-us-actions-alone/

The economics and the regulatory burdens of climate change bills are forever being analyzed, but the bills’ primary function—mitigating future climate change—is generally ignored. Perhaps that’s because it is simply assumed. After all, we are barraged daily with the horrors of what the climate will become if we don’t stop emitting greenhouse gases into the atmosphere (the primary focus being on emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels). So doing something as drastic as that proposed by Waxman-Markey—a more than 80% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from the United States by the year 2050—must surely lessen the chances of climate catastrophe. Mustn’t it? But if that were the case, why aren’t the climate impacts being touted**?** Why aren’t Representatives Waxman and Markey waving around the projected climate success of their bill? Why aren’t they saying: “Economics and regulations be damned. Look how our bill is going to save the earth from human-caused climate apocalypse”? That reason is that **it won’t**. And they know it. That is why they, and everyone else who supports such measures, are mum about the outcome. The one thing, above all others, that they don’t want you to know is this: No matter how the economic and regulatory issues shake out, the bill will have virtually no impact on the future course of the earth’s climate. And this is even in its current “pure” form, without the inevitable watering down to come. So discussion of the bill, instead of focusing on climate impacts, is shrouded in economics and climate alarm. Getting a good handle on the future climate impact of the proposed Waxman-Markey legislation is not that difficult. In fact, there are several ways to get at it. But perhaps the most versatile is the aptly named MAGICC: Model for the Assessment of Greenhouse-gas Induced Climate Change. MAGICC is sort of a climate model simulator that you can run from your desktop (available [**here**](http://www.cgd.ucar.edu:80/cas/wigley/magicc/index.html)). It was developed by scientist**s** at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (primarily by Dr. Tom Wigley) under funding by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other organizations. MAGICC is itself a collection of simple gas-cycle, climate, and ice-melt models that is designed to produce an output that emulates the output one gets from much more complex climate models. MAGICC can produce in seconds, on your own computer, results that complex climate models take weeks to produce running on the world’s fastest supercomputers. Of course, MAGICC doesn’t provide the same level of detail, but it does produce projections for the things that we most often hear about and care about—for instance, the global average temperature change. Moreover, MAGICC was developed to be used for exactly the purpose that we use it here—the purpose for which Representatives Waxman and Markey and everybody else who wants a say in this issue should be using it. That purpose is, according to MAGICC’s website, “to compare the global-mean temperature and sea level implications of two different emissions scenarios” —for example, scenarios both with and without the proposed legislative emissions reductions. So that is what we’ll do. We’ll first use MAGICC to produce a projection of global average temperature change through the 21st century under two of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s future emissions scenarios (which assume no explicit policy implementation). The two are: a mid-range emissions scenario (SRES A1B for those interested in the details) and a high-end emissions scenario (SRES A1FI). Then, we’ll modify these IPCC scenarios by entering in the emissions reductions that will occur if the provisions outlined in the Waxman-Markey Climate Bill are fully met (leaving aside whether or not that could be done). Basically, Waxman-Markey calls for U.S. emissions to be reduced to 20% below the 2005 emissions level by 2020, 42% below 2005 levels by 2030, and 83% below 2005 levels by 2050. We’ll assume that U.S. emissions remain constant at that reduced value for the rest of the century. We’ll then use MAGICC to produce temperature projections using these modified scenarios and compare them with the original projections.\* And here is what we get all rolled into one simple figure. The solid lines are the projections of the change in global average temperature across the 21st century from the original IPCC A1FI (red) and A1B (blue) high and mid-range emissions scenarios, respectively (assuming a climate sensitivity of 3ºC). The dotted lines (of the same color) indicate the projected change in global average surface temperature when the emissions reductions prescribed by Waxman-Markey are factored in**. By the year 2050, the Waxman-Markey Climate Bill would result in a global temperature “savings” of about 0.05ºC regardless of the IPCC scenario used—this is equivalent to about 2 years’ worth of warming**. By the year 2100, the emissions pathways become clearly distinguishable, and so to do the impacts of Waxman-Markey. Assuming the IPCC mid-range scenario (A1B) Waxman-Markey would result in a projected temperature rise of 2.847ºC, instead of 2.959ºC rise— a mere 0.112ºC temperature “savings.” Under the IPCC’s high-emissions scenario, instead of a projected rise of 4.414ºC, Waxman-Markey limits the rise to 4.219ºC—a “savings” of 0.195ºC. In either case, this works out to about 5 years’ worth of warming. In other words, a full implementation and adherence to the emissions restrictions provisions described by the Waxman-Markey Climate Bill would result only in setting back the projected rise in global temperatures by a few years—a scientifically meaningless prospect. (Note: I present the results to three significant digits, not that they are that precise when it comes to the real world, but just so that you can tell the results apart). Now, various aspects of the MAGICC model parameters can be tweaked, different climate models can be emulated, and different scenarios can by chosen. And different answers will be obtained. That is the whole purpose of MAGICC—to be able to examine the sensitivity of the output to these types of changes. But if you take the time to download MAGICC yourself and run your own experiments, one thing that you will soon find out is: No matter what you try, altering only U.S. emissions will produce unsatisfying results if you seek to save the world by altering its climate. We have calculated only the climate impact of the United States acting alone. There is no successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol to bind other countries to greenhouse gas emissions reductions. But, truth be told, the only countries of any real concern are China and India. The total increase in [China’s emissions](http://www.eia.doe.gov/environment.html) since the year 2000 is 50 percent greater than the total increase from rest of the world combined and is growing by leaps and bounds. And consider that India carbon dioxide emissions haven’t started to dramatically increase **yet.** But it is poised to do so, and an Indian official recently [**stated**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/12/AR2009041202452.html) that “It is morally wrong for us to agree to reduce [carbon dioxide emissions] when 40 percent of Indians do not have access to electricity.” Without a large reduction in the carbon dioxide emissions from both China and India—not just a commitment but an actual reduction—there will be nothing climatologically gained from any restrictions on U.S. emissions, regardless whether they come about from the Waxman-Markey bill (or other cap-and-trade proposals), from a direct carbon tax, or through some EPA regulation

AT: Cap and Trade Ineffective

Our emissions are irrelevant-

Industrialized nations are already meeting Kyoto Targets-getting India and China on board via Copenhagen is key

ZNews 7-02

http://www.zeenews.com/news638152.html

In a relief to the industrialised nations, a Dutch environment report has blamed high growth in China and India for the rise in carbon emissions, saying they have "completely nullified" the reductions achieved by rich nations.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The global CO2 emissions have remained constant in 2009 despite the economic crisis slowing down the growth trajectory of many countries, Netherlands Environment Assessment Agency (PBL) said in a report yesterday. The agency, which had identified that China's carbon emissions in 2006 had overshot that of the US, making it the world's largest polluter, attributed the 2009 trend to an offset effect by China and India. "... strong increases in CO2 emissions from fast-growing developing countries, such as China and India, have completely nullified CO2 emission reductions in the industrialised world," the report said. http://www.zeenews.com/image/spacer.gif The figures will come as a relief to the world's rich countries, which, apart from the US, are legally committed to reducing emissions by a collective 5.2 per cent on 1990 figures by 2012, the report said. This is for the first time since 1992 that the emissions of the main greenhouse gas have remained constant. The PBL's report "No growth in total global CO2 emissions in 2009" is based on calculations on recent data from sources including data on energy use from oil company British Petroleum (BP), on cement production from the US Geological Survey (USGS), and on the latest version of the Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR). The calculations show that emissions from fossil-fuel combustion in the industrial countries have decreased by seven per cent. But in China and India, they actually increased by nine and six per cent respectively. http://www.zeenews.com/image/spacer.gifThe report trashes earlier projections by the International Energy Agency (IEA) predicting an emission decrease for 2009 of 2.6 per cent ? the largest in 40 years. While the industrialised nations seem to be on course to achieve the Kyoto Protocol targets -- aided in part by the meltdown -- the fast growing economies have been unable to rein in emissions. However, "a large part of production capacity that has been suspended (due to the economic crisis), could be re-employed as soon as the economy improves," it says. Both China and India had pledged ambitious target cuts ahead of last year's Copenhagen climate change summit. http://www.zeenews.com/image/spacer.gifWhile Beijing promised to curb its emission intensity by 40 to 45 per cent by 2020, India announced a target reduction of 20-25 per cent by 2020 on the 2005 levels. The report also pointed out that although there have been strong increases in emissions in countries such as China and India, their average CO2 emissions per inhabitant, in 2009, were still below those in industrial countries.

AT: Cap and Trade Ineffective

**Attacks against the bill are false-they rely on flawed data and understanding**

Pew Center On Global Climate Change 2009

http://www.pewclimate.org/acesa/eight-myths/June2009

No bill is perfect.  Certainly not one that contains a thousand pages and seeks to overhaul the way our nation uses energy.  But many of the recent attacks on the American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES) proposed b**y** Representatives Waxman and Markey go beyond fact-based policy disagreements and venture more into the realm of mythology.  Below is a list of a few of these myths, along with an attempt to set the record straight. Myth #1.  **By** giving away emission allowances, the bill is less effective at protecting the environment. Reality:  The cap in a “cap-and-trade” system determines its environmental stringency by setting the number of emission allowances that are available.  These allowances are equal to the amount of emissions that are permitted under the cap and their number declines over time as the cap is tightened.  From an environmental perspective, it doesn’t matter how the emission allowances are distributed.  They could be auctioned or freely distributed or any combination of the two.   All that matters is the total number of emission allowances that are distributed -- the environmental goal is determined by the cap itself and is not in any way impacted by whether the allowances are auctioned or distributed freely.

Cap and Trade Key To Copenhagen

Cap and Trade signals U.S. Leadership on Copenhagen-it’s the linchpin of a global climate deal

Huffington Post 10/18/09

("William S. Becker: Dressing for Copenhagen",)

In the Danish fairy tale by Hans Christian Andersen, an Emperor goes out among his subjects in his underwear. Two swindlers posing as tailors have convinced him he's wearing a suit made from cloth that's invisible to anyone who is stupid. Not wanting to accept that he's stupid, the Emperor parades through his empire believing he's fully dressed. It now is up to the U.S. Senate to make sure Uncle Sam is not only fully dressed, but dressed for success when he shows up in Copenhagen Dec. 7 to work on a global climate deal. As far as wardrobes go, President Barack Obama and his team have done a pretty good job packing their suitcases with climate initiatives they've launched under their own authority this year. As The Economist puts it, "America will now not have to go naked into the conference chamber" at Copenhagen. Even so, without an affirmative vote by the Senate on a respectable climate bill, Uncle Sam will be only half-dressed in the eyes of the global community. That's my reading after a three-country tour of Europe where I spent nine days in meetings with people from 19 nations ranging from Bangladesh to Belgium and Russia to Rwanda. They included a former head of state, former top military leaders, current government officials, scientists, entrepreneurs, academics and other thought leaders in their respective countries. In my informal sampling of their opinions, I found that **a) U.S. leadership remains the linchpin of a global climate deal, and b) the world needs to know that Congress, as well as** President **Obama, is serious about capping America's greenhouse gas emissions**. Before speculating about why this is the case, let's review the accomplishments the Administration already can take to Copenhagen: o Earlier this year, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson ruled that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and welfare. That triggered EPA's authority to regulate those emissions under the Clean Air Act. EPA now is moving forward on regulations that would limit emissions from large polluters starting in 2011, signaling that if Congress and the marketplace don't force a cut in U.S. carbon, EPA will. o The economic stimulus bill contained tens of billions of dollars for clean energy technologies ranging from high-speed rail to home weatherization, and from solar power to battery storage. It was the biggest energy bill ever passed by Congress. Most of those funds are only now beginning to move into the economy. The U.S. Department of Energy predicts "the next three months will be the most exciting time for the clean-technology industry in the last decade" with new grants issued every 10 days to two weeks. o In September, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar created a Climate Change Response Council to coordinate the department's actions on global warming. That's important because Interior has jurisdiction over one-fifth of our nation's landmass, 1.7 billion acres on the Outer Continental Shelf, drinking water supplies for 31 million Americans and irrigation water for 140,000 farmers. The announcement followed Salazar's decision last March to move toward substantial renewable energy production on public lands. o EPA and the Department of Transportation have proposed standards to increase the fuel efficiency of cars and light trucks in the U.S. by 40 percent between 2012 and 2016. The new standards will cut carbon emissions by nearly a billion tons and reduce oil consumption by nearly 2 billion barrels. Dan Becker of the Safe Climate Campaign called this action "the single biggest step the American government has ever taken to cut greenhouse-gas emissions." o In Pittsburg earlier this month, the G-20 endorsed Obama's proposal to eliminate fossil energy subsidies totaling about $300 billion annually. That huge step, as important symbolically as it is substantively, would cut greenhouse gas emissions an estimated 10 percent by mid-century and phase out the idiotic practice of supporting the fuels most responsible for anthropogenic climate change. The G-20's staff is developing the details. o The Administration has asked Congress to repeal a number of domestic tax breaks for fossil energy industries on grounds that energy prices should reflect true costs and that economic policy should support Obama's goal to create a clean energy economy. According to the Environmental Law Institute, the federal government provided more than $70 billion in subsidies to fossil energy industries from 2002 to 2008, more than twice the subsidies provided to renewable energy. o In one of his first acts as president, Obama issued an order that removed the gag and shackles from federal climate scientists, who then issued a long-suppressed report on the harsh and disruptive impacts climate change will have on every region of the United States. o Earlier this month, the President issued a comprehensive executive order that directs federal agencies, which collectively are America's biggest energy consumer, to establish absolute goals for carbon-cuts, to reduce petroleum use in the federal vehicle fleet by 30 percent, to implement a net-zero-energy requirement for federal buildings and to add sustainability requirements to federal contracts. o The **Administration is seeking bilateral climate agreements with other key nations, believing they are the "building blocks to an agreement at Copenhagen**." In July, the Administration signed a memorandum of understanding with China on energy, climate and environmental cooperation. **The President reportedly will seek further collaborations next month when he goes to China, followed by a meeting with the prime minister of India** in Washington. Given this list (and these are just the highlights), **why do we need the Senate to pass a bill in November**? First, executive orders are no substitute for laws. Presidential orders are impermanent. They are created with the stroke of a pen, and they can be reversed with the stroke of the pen by future presidents. Laws also can be reversed, of course, but not nearly so easily. Many of the nation's landmark environmental laws, such as the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, were passed by Congress decades ago and remain in force today. Second, **Senate action would affirm that the United States may finally be ready to move beyond its intransigence over the Kyoto Protocol to help ratify an international climate deal**. The **Senate sent a positive signal in 2005 whe**n, by a vote of 54-43, **it approved a resolution stating that: Congress should enact a comprehensive and effective program of**

**mandatory, market based limits and incentives on emissions** of greenhouse gases that slow, stop and reverse the growth of such emissions at a rate and in a manner that will not significantly harm the United States economy and will encourage comparable action by other nations that are major trading partners and key contributors to global emissions. **But it was the Senate's vote in 1997 - 95-0 for the Byrd-Hagel resolution - that sticks in the minds of the international community**. **It made clear the upper house would not consent to ratification of any agreement that did not include "specific scheduled commitments** (by developing countries) t**o limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions".** That remains the position of many political leaders in the United States today, including some who speak for the Administration. In addition, **the Senate's overall record on international environmental agreements leaves room for uncertainty over its reaction to a climate deal**. **The Senate has voted in favor of ratification for 69 percent of the environmental treaties it has considere**d over the past 20 years, **but several have been languishing for a long time**. As of last March, agreements in legislative limbo included the Law of the Sea Treaty submitted to the Senate in 1994; the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species submitted to the Senate in 1983; the Convention on Biological Diversity submitted to the Senate in 1993; the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants submitted to the Senate in 2002; and the 1996 Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes, submitted to the Senate in 2007. At the moment, **our political leaders are sending very mixed signals on whether the Senate will pass a climate bill before Copenhagen.** After Carol Browner was quoted predicting no bill this year, Sen. Barbara **Boxer rushed to declare that passage is still possible.** Democrat Sen. John Kerry and Republican Sen. Lindsey Graham expressed joint optimism in an op-ed for the New York Times: **We are confident that a legitimate bipartisan effort can put America back in the lead again and can empower our negotiators to sit down at the table in Copenhagen in December a**nd insist that the rest of the world join us in producing a new international agreement on global warming. That way, we will pass on to future generations a strong economy, a clean environment and an energy-independent nation. Let's hope the optimists are correct. **Big hurdles remain in the way of an international climate deal; getting over them will require all the momentum we can muster. It would be sweet indeed if the Obama** Administration **struck substantive bilateral agreements with China and India** next month. **But nothing would be sweeter than a November Miracle from the U.S. Senate.**

Warming Legislation Good

New carbon legislation solves runaway warming

**Pooley, 9**

Eric, Kalb Fellow, Shorenstein Center, Harvard U, ‘How Much Would You Pay to Save the Planet? ,’ January, http://www.hks.harvard.edu/presspol/publications/papers/discussion\_papers/d49\_pooley.pdf

When it comes to global climate change, it is sometimes said that we are the meteor.The analogy is imperfect, of course. Cli-mate change is slow and gradual, at least for now, unfolding on a time scale that confounds the capacities of our politics, our economics, and our journalism. **Abrupt, rapid disruptions are likely, but no one can say when they may come**. De-spite the uncertainties, **climate scientists have no doubt that the impact is already being felt and little doubt that future con-sequences will be severe to catastrophic**. **It is too late to “prevent” global warming, but it may yet be possible to avoid cata-clysm**. **Doing so**, environmental experts overwhelmingly agree, **requires decarbon-izing our economy**—not with a meteor-smashing space shot but with a broad, urgent World War II–style mobilization. Intense opposition to that sort of action remains, in part due to fears of rising en-ergy costs in a carbon-constrained world. **Well-designed policies are the key to re-ducing emissions while avoiding price spikes, and public support is the key to passing those policies into law.** A vigorous press ought to be central to both climate policy and climate politics, but this is not a time of media vigor. The American press has been hit by a meteor of its own, a secular revenue decline that is driving huge reductions in newsroom staff and making disciplined climate coverage less likely just as it becomes most crucial. So it is well worth asking: How is the press do-ing on the climate solutions story? This paper attempts to answer that ques-tion by examining coverage of the eco-nomic debate over Senate Bill 2191, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act of 2008. The economics of climate pol-icy—not the science of climate change—is at the heart of our story because the **most important step toward national mo-bilization is putting a price on carbon emissions,** either **through** a carbon tax or, in Lieberman-Warner’s case, **a mandatory declining cap**. This is the great political test, and the great story, of our time. But news organizations have not been treating it that way.

Warming Legislation Good

Key to global action

**Bales 9**

Carter, managing partner emeritus of the Wicks Group, a private equity firm, ‘Avoiding climate disaster,’ Feb 22, http://whatmatters.mckinseydigital.com/climate\_change/avoiding-climate-disaster

The primary benefit of imposing a carbon cap in the United States is the prospect of containing the adverse impact of global warming. Assessments by prominent researchers such as Lord Nicholas Stern, former chief economist of the World Bank, suggest that the quantifiable negative GDP impact would range anywhere from 5 percent or less up to 20 percent from unchecked climate change. Moreover, while the basic physics of global warming are well established, profound uncertainties remain regarding the potentially catastrophic effects of climate change. If the United States decides to cap domestic emissions, the hope is that this action would provide the credibility needed to negotiate an international accord, which would help address the problem on a global scale. Even if such an accord proves elusive, by moving early the United States would still reduce the risk of extreme global-warming outcomes while developing the technological edge to roll out solutions quickly to global markets once a serious global emissions containment regime is negotiated.

Warming Leads to War – Nuclear

Global warming leads to nuclear war

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

THIS BOOK IS AN ATTEMPT, peering through a glass darkly, to understand the politics and the strategies of the potentially apocalyptic crisis that looks set to occupy most of the twenty­first century. There are now many books available that deal with the science of climate change and some that suggest pos­sible approaches to getting the problem under control, but there are few that venture very far into the grim detail of how real countries experiencing very different and, in some cases, overwhelming pressures as global warming proceeds, are likely to respond to the changes. Yet we all know that it's mostly politics, national and international, that will decide the outcomes. Two things in particular persuaded me that it was time to write this book. One was the realization that the first and most important impact of climate change on human civiliza­tion will bean acute and permanent crisis of food supply. Eating regularly is a non-negotiable activity, and countries that cannot feed their people are unlikely to be "reasonable" about it. Not all of them will be in what we used to call the "Third World" -the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The other thing that finally got the donkey's attention was a dawning awareness that, in a number of the great pow­ers, climate change scenarios are already playing a large and increasing role in the military planning process. Rationally, you would expect this to be the case, because each country pays its professional military establishment to identify and counter "threats" to its security, but the implications of their scenarios are still alarming. There is a probability of wars, including even nuclear wars, if temperatures rise two to three degrees Celsius. Once that happens, all hope of international cooperation to curb emissions and stop the warming goes out the window.

Warming Leads to War – Resources

Warming leads to resource wars

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

The military profession, especially in the long-established great powers, is deeply pessimistic about the likelihood that people and countries will behave well under stress. Professional officers are trained to think in terms of emergent threats, and this is as big a threat as you are going to find. Never mind what the pundits are telling the public about the perils of climate change; what are the military strategists telling their governments? That will tell us a great deal about the probable shape of the future, although it may not tell us anything that we want to hear. In Britain, climate change has been taken seriously at the official level for a long time, and the British Armed Forces are free to discuss any scenarios they want. The DC DC Global Strategic Trends Programme 2007-2036, third edition, 2006, a ninety-one-page document produced by the Development, Concepts and Doctrine Centre within the British Ministry of Defence and regularly updated online, is "a source document for the development of UK Defence Policy." In many ways, it is a remarkably sophisticated document. At one point, for example, it observes that "by the end of the period [2°36] it is likely that the majority of the global popula­tion ~ill find it difficult to 'turn the outside world off.' lCT [information and communication technology] is likely to be so pervasive that people are permanently connected to a network or two-way data stream with inherent challenges to civil liber­ties; being disconnected could be considered suspicious." But on the political and strategic impacts of climate change, it is surprisingly terse. Here is all it has to say on the matter: The future effects of climate change will stem from a more unstable process, involving sudden and possibly in some cases catastrophic changes. It is possible that the effects will be felt more rapidly and widely than antici­pated, leading, for example, to an unexpected increase in extreme weather events, challenging the individual and collective capacity to respond ... Increasing demand and climate change are likely to place pressure on the supply of key staples, for exam­ple, a drastic depletion of fish stocks ora significantly reduced capacity to grow rice in SE Asia or wheat on the US plains. A succession of poor harvests may cause a major price spike, resulting in significant economic and political turbulence, as well as humanitarian crises of significant proportions and frequency ... Water stress will increase, with the risk that disputes over water will contribute significantly to tensions in already volatile regions, possibly triggering military action and population movements ... Areas most at risk are in North Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia, includ­ing China whose growing problems of water scarcity and contamination may lead it to attempt to re-route the waters of rivers flowing into neighbouring India, such as the Brahmaputra ... A combination of resource pressure, climate change and the pursuit of economic advantage may stimulate rapid large-scale shifts in population. In par­ticular, sub-Saharan populations will be drawn towards the Mediterranean, Europe and the Middle East, while in Southern Asia coastal inundation, environmental pressure on land and acute economic competition will affect large populations in Bangladesh and on the East coast of India. Similar effects may be felt in the major East Asian archipelagos, while low-lying islands may become uninhabitable.

Warming Leads to War – US-China

Warming leads to US-China war

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

China's shrinking rivers will affect not only food produc­tion across southern China but also the country's ambitious hydroelectric schemes, like the Three Gorges Dam. The weak­ening of the northeast monsoon will cut grain production on the north Chinese plain, and China's industrialized coastal regions will take a severe battering from rising sea levels and stronger storm systems. The autocratic Chinese regime may seek to fortify its domestic position, rendered shaky by these blows, by directing popular anger outwards, at Taiwan, Japan or even the United States.

Warming Leads to War – Russia- China

Warming leads to Russia-China war

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

Both of the world's greatest powers are also in the north­ern mid-latitudes, but their sheer size makes matters more com­plicated, for they straddle several of the zones mentioned above. For a variety of unrelated reasons, China is the big loser. While its most northerly region, Manchuria, comparable in latitude to the New England states in the United States, should continue to receive adequate rainfall at plus-two degrees Celsius, the north Chinese plain, where the country grows most of its wheat, will not: the monsoon that delivers the summer rainfall over most of that region is already beginning to fail, and in the longer run, the volume of flow in the Huang He (Yellow River) will be affected as well. To make matters worse, the shallow aquifer that underlies much of that region has already been pumped dry, and the deep aquifer is going fast. Farther south, where the main grain crop is rice, the glaciers and snowpack in the high Tibetan Plateau that feed the Yangtze and other major rivers are melting. When they are gone, the rivers will become more seasonal, and will contain less water in the summer months, when it is most needed. Northern Eurasian stability could ... be substantially affected by China's need to resettle many tens, even hun­dreds of millions from its flooding southern coasts. China has never recognized many of the Czarist appropriations of Chinese territory, and Siberia may be more agricultur­ally productive after a 5 to 6 degree C rise in temperature, adding another attractive feature to a region rich in oil, gas and minerals. A small Russian population might have substantial difficulty preventing China from asserting control over much of Siberia and the Russian Far East. The probability of conflict between two destabilized nuclear powers would seem high**.**

Warming Leads to War – Resources

Resource shortage leads to war

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

The United States is a harder case to call. It will probably suffer huge losses to its food production on the high plains west of the Mississippi River, where the rainfall will be diminishing at the same time as the giant Ogallala aquifer that provides irri­gation water for the entire region is finally pumped dry. The Central Valley of California, which accounts for one-quarter of the food grown for human consumption in the United States, will face grave difficulties if the rivers that are fed by the snow­pack on the mountains become seasonal (winter only): at two degrees Celsius hotter, much of the snow that now falls on the mountains in winter will fall as rain instead and run off imme­diately, leaving the rivers largely dry in summer. Nevertheless, the United States may still have enough good agricultural land in the "Old Northwest" and within a few hundred kilometres of the sea along the eastern seaboard, the Gulf coast, and in the Pacific Northwest to feed its own population, which is forecast to be four hundred million by 2050. It is unlikely, however, that even the U.S. will still be in the food-exporting business once global heating reaches two degrees Celsius. Except for quite limited surpluses in Russia and Canada, nobody will be exporting food. If you cannot pro­duce enough at home, then your people will just have to starve. This is not just a formula for famine; it is also a formula for war. All around the world, countries facing mass starvation will be just a bit closer to the equator than countries that can still feed their people, and some of the countries on the losing side will be sufficiently developed to make their unhappiness with this outcome felt. (People always raid before they starve.) To make matters worse, it will not escape notice that the countries that suffer least from the changing climate are, in most cases, the ones that industrialized first, and that are responsible for most of the emissions that have set this lethal process in motion.

AT: Warming Inevitable

Warming is not inevitable

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

There is no need to despair. The slow-feedback effects take a long time to work their way through the climate system, and if we could manage to get the carbon dioxide concentration back down to a safe level before they have run their course, they might be stopped in their tracks. As Hansen et al. put it in their paper: A point of no return can be avoided, even if the tipping level [which puts us on course for an ice-free world] is temporarily exceeded. Ocean and ice-sheet inertia permit overshoot, provided the [concentration of carbon dioxide] is returned below the tipping level before initiating irre­versible dynamic change .... However, if overshoot is in place for centuries, the thermal perturbation will so pen­etrate the ocean that recovery without dramatic effects, such as ice-sheet disintegration, becomes unlikely. The real, long-term target is 350 parts per million or lower, if we want the Holocene to last into the indefinite future, but for the remainder of this book I am going to revert to the 450 parts per million ceiling that has become common currency among most of those who are involved in climate change issues. If we manage to stop the rise in the carbon dioxide concentration at or not far beyond that figure, then we must immediately begin the equally urgent and arduous task of getting it back down to a much lower level that is safe for the long term, but one step at a time will have to suffice. I suspect that few now alive will see the day when we seriously start work on bringing the concen­tration back down to 350, so let us focus here on how to stop it rising past 450.

Warming is not inevitable, but the margin for error is small

Dyer 9

Gwynne, MA in Military History and PhD in Middle Eastern History former @ [Senior Lecturer](file:///C:\wiki\Senior_Lecturer) in War Studies at the [Royal Military Academy Sandhurst](file:///C:\wiki\Royal_Military_Academy_Sandhurst), Climate Wars

Clearly, we have very little margin left to play with, and if global emissions are not radically reduced within about twenty years, then we will have little chance of stopping short of 550 parts per million carbon dioxide equivalent. Fifty or sixty or even eighty percent cuts in emissions by 2050, which is the target that has won the hearts of most contemporary politicians who take climate change seriously, gets us to 550 parts per million at about the same time. Average global temperature might still only rise to two degrees Celsius warmer by 2030, or even less if the feedbacks are slow to kick in, because there is a very long lag between the arrival of a given amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the consequent change in the planet's average surface temperature. But once the carbon dioxide is in the air, it stays there on average for about two centuries, so the final out­come has become almost inevitable. A concentration of 550 parts per million carbon dioxide equivalent in the atmosphere takes us to a world that is between three and four degrees Celsius hotter by the end of the century, not counting any feed­back effects. But, by three degrees Celsius hotter, the major feedbacks surely will have begun to operate, and our goose will be well and truly cooked.

AT: Copenhagen Dead

Copenhagen is alive-the complex details have been put off and will be sorted out in 2010-Obama’s commitment is key

EurActiv 2009, December “Climate change: The road to Copenhagen” EurActiv.com is the independent media portal fully dedicated to EU affairs. EurActiv has an original business model, based on five elements (corporate sponsoring, EurActor membership, advertising, EU projects, and content syndication). It is well funded and the content usage is free

http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/climate-change-road-copenhagen/article-180706

**Beyond Copenhagen: Towards a comprehensive deal in 2010 After two years of preparatory work, only one thing seems certain: Copenhagen will not mark the end of the process, but is rather expected to set out a legal framework for more detailed negotiations to continue during the course of 2010** ([**EurActiv 18/11/09**](http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/ministers-resigned-political-climate-deal-copenhagen/article-187412)). Optimists say such **delays are nothing new in international negotiations and are not necessarily a recipe for failure.** Indeed, **it was not until four years after an agreement had been reached on the Kyoto Protocol that details were finalised to allow ratification, they point out**. Negotiators are hoping to work more quickly this time, leaving the legal details to 2010. Crucially, **Copenhagen should set out a clear action plan and a timetable for moving to a legally-binding agreement,** EU leaders have stated ([**EurActiv 30/10/09**](http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/eu-leaders-fail-hammer-climate-funding-details/article-186932)). UN climate chief Yvo de Boer has outlined the elements required to make Copenhagen a success in terms of concrete figures and measures on mitigation and funding.  Specifically, developed countries must agree binding targets for significant emission cuts by 2020, while developing countries must outline measures to halt their emissions growth below a business-as-usual scenario, de Boer said.  In addition, **rich countries will have to provide long-term financial assistance to poorer ones and set up a €10 billion climate fund to help them adapt to the immediate impacts of climate change**, he added. Finally, the negotiators must agree to establish a governance structure that will deliver these goals, de Boer said. **Delegates so far have made progress on technical details, including how to measure deforestation and the principles of putting up an international fund to help poor and vulnerable countries to cope with the impacts of global warming** (rising seas, floods, droughts, storms and wildfires).  However, key issues such as long-term goals for slashing emissions and avoiding dangerous climate change impacts, as well as the introduction of a technology-transfer mechanism to allow developing countries to move towards low-carbon economies, need to be hammered out. **President Obama in balancing act**  **The US administration has a decisive role to play in global negotiations. President** Barack Obama has promised to set ambitious targets. However, trapped between international pressure to curb greenhouse gas emissions and a US Senate that is not prepared to act, the White House is coy about President Obama's plans.  **Last month, the White House pledged to cut emissions by 17% below 2005 levels by 2020, a drop of about 3% below 1990 level**s. This pledge relied on the adoption of a meaure by a Senate committee calling for 20% cuts by 2020, but that is expected to be weakened as the legislation moves through other Senate committees.  In June 2009, the House passed a bill aimed at CO2 emission reductions of 17% below 2005 levels by 2020 and sharper cuts in the following decades, using a cap-and-trade system. But Obama has another ace up his sleeve. At the end of March 2009, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gave the White House a report alleging that pollution tied to climate change could endanger human life. This discovery could give the government the authority to regulate CO2 emissions under the Clean Air Act, according to a US Supreme Court ruling dating from 2007.  In the short term, the report's findings set the EPA on a collision course with US carmakers, coal-fired power plants and other businesses that rely on fossil fuels, which fear complex and costly rules**.  Obama is under political pressure from both parties to scale back his priorities, despite his insistence that the country had no alternative if it wanted to succeed**.  "Sometimes you have to fail before you can succeed," Obama has repeatedly said. "**And often it takes not just the commitment of an innovator, but the commitment of a country to innovate,"** he added.

AT: Cap and Trade This Year

No Cap and Trade these year-Democratic insiders agree

CNN 4-23   
http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/04/23/climate-change-legislation-unlikely-this-year-say-sources/?fbid=BmfLEv81dXg

Despite a new bipartisan push on climate change, legislation on the issue is unlikely to make it to the Senate floor this year, two Senate Democratic sources tell CNN. That would be a blow to three senior senators set to unveil a much anticipated bipartisan measure dealing with climate change Monday morning. The main reason sources say the prospects for the legislation are dim is because Senate Democratic leaders have decided to try to put immigration reform first on the agenda, and after that there likely won't be an appetite for another politically divisive issue before November's election – especially with a Supreme Court nomination ahead and a desire to stay focused on the politically potent issue of jobs. The Democratic sources said the feeling in the Senate Democratic leadership is that immigration has more of a political upside for Democrats for several reasons. Democrats know that Latinos who voted for President Obama and other Democrats in 2008 are furious that Democrats have not yet kept the promise to advance comprehensive immigration reform. Immigration is especially critical politically for Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nevada, who is down in the polls for his re-election bid in a state where a quarter of the population is Hispanic. On Monday, Sen. John Kerry, D-Massachusetts, Sen. Joe Lieberman, I-Connecticut, and Senator Lindsey Graham, R-South Carolina, are slated to release legislation that would, among other things, set a goal of a 17 percent reduction in carbon emissions in the next 10 years. A Kerry spokeswoman downplayed any talk of not moving on the issue before November. "There are always people who think it's impossible to tackle big challenges in an election year, but Senators Kerry, Graham, and Lieberman have been working overtime to produce an approach that can succeed," said Kerry spokeswoman Whitney Smith. "The majority leader reiterated yesterday to them that he is committed to make this the year bi-partisan, comprehensive climate and energy reform passes the Senate and Senator Kerry knows the leader is tough and determined enough to make it happen."

Cap and Trade won’t hit the Senate floor-Dems scared of midterms backlash

Rob Port 4-23 “Democrats Decide That Passing Cap And Trade Before The Midterm Elections Maybe Wouldn’t Be A Good Idea”, Political Correspondent;

http://sayanythingblog.com/entry/democrats-decide-that-passing-cap-and-trade-before-the-midterm-elections-maybe-wouldnt-be-a-good-idea/

The “climate bill” won’t be [**hitting the Senate floor this year**](http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/04/23/climate-change-legislation-unlikely-this-year-say-sources/?fbid=fiYY8kd5S1w), say unnamed Democrat sources. The main reason sources say the prospects for the legislation are dim is because Senate Democratic leaders have decided to try to put immigration reform first on the agenda, and after that there likely won’t be an appetite for another politically divisive issue before November’s election – especially with a Supreme Court nomination ahead and a desire to stay focused on the politically potent issue of jobs. The idea that Democrats do have an appetite for an immigration bill, in lieu of cap and trade, seems pretty laughable to me. I think Obama is going to continue pushing to slam more of his agenda through while his party holds on to the majorities in Congress, and rank-and-file congressional Democrats are going to duck those efforts. Because they actually want to get re-elected in the fall.

Cap and Trade-Can Pass Next Year

Dems can do it next year-Feistein agrees

BusinessWeek 6-11

http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-06-11/u-s-democrats-split-in-senate-vote-on-agency-s-carbon-rules.html

“We need to pass a cap-and-trade bill,” Senator Dianne Feinstein, a California Democrat, said after the vote on Murkowski’s measure. “I think it can certainly get passed next year; it can’t this year.” Under cap-and-trade, the government issues a declining number of carbon dioxide allowances that power plants, factories and oil refineries buy and sell. Cap-and-trade legislation that narrowly passed the House last year stalled in the Senate. Senators John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, and Joseph Lieberman, a Connecticut independent, released a revamped cap- and-trade bill last month and are lobbying with Obama’s help to get the new carbon-pricing proposal included in energy legislation that may get a vote as early as July. ‘Much Different’ Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois, the Democrats’ chief vote-counter, said after yesterday’s vote “the Senate is likely to consider legislation much different than the House” cap-and- trade bill. The bill to be considered next month will “deal with energy and clean-energy jobs,” Durbin said. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid told reporters he’ll wait for a meeting with Democrats next week before deciding what should be in next month’s energy legislation, although it won’t be branded as “cap-and-trade.” “We don’t use the word cap-and-trade; that’s something that’s been deleted from my dictionary,” Reid said. “Carbon pricing is something we’re talking about.” Reid said this week he is weighing whether to add the carbon caps in Kerry and Lieberman’s legislation to a bill approved by the Senate energy committee last year that ramps up electricity generation from renewable sources such as wind farms and sets new energy-efficiency standards. Six Democrats It usually takes 60 out of 100 votes to pass major legislation through the Senate. Democrats hold 59 seats in the chamber, meaning the support of at least one Republican is needed for most bills to pass. Yesterday all 41 Republicans voted against the EPA’s proposed carbon regulations.

2NC Economy Impact

Cap and Trade Key to the Economy-jobs

Brad Johnson, 4-26-2010, “[Report: Smart Cap And Trade Will Boost Growth, Create 2.8 Million Jobs, And Cut Carbon Pollution”](http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2010/04/26/climate-strategies-jobs/), Masters Degree in Geosciences for MIT

http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2010/04/26/climate-strategies-jobs/

A new macroeconomic analysis of green economic policies finds that cutting global warming pollution will make the economy grow faster. The [**Center for Climate Strategies**](http://www.climatestrategies.us/template.cfm?FrontID=6032) (CCS), building upon analysis they did of state-level climate plans for the National Governors Association, analyzed the economic and environmental impact of legislation in line with the planned Kerry-Graham-Lieberman framework. As long as [**state-level policies are boosted instead of pre-empted**](http://solveclimate.com/blog/20100422/23-energy-policies-could-save-americans-5-billion-year), CCS found that previous [**economic analyses by federal agencies and industry groups are wrong**](http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2010/04/08/economics-hates-environment/). This CCS analysis finds that instead of slowing the economy, household wealth and jobs will grow faster in a green economy. Carbon limits and efficiency-focused policies would have a net positive employment impact of 2.8 million jobs and expand the economy by $154.7 billion by 2020, while US emissions are cut to 27 percent below 1990 levels — if strong standards are set: The modeled job creation is consistent with the findings of Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts, which used an input-output model to find that a green economy would [**create 1.7 million new jobs**](http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2009/06/18/clean-energy-jobs-report/). The center looked at three different policy scenarios, using the industry-standard REMI Policy Insight PI+ macroeconomic model: – Strong local, state and federal implementation of green economic policies like green building codes and smart growth – These strong policies combined with a federal cap-and-trade system and coupled fuel fee to guarantee emissions reductions of 27 percent below 1990 levels by 2010 – Scaled-back implementation of the policies and cap-and-trade system in line with President Obama’s goal of six percent below 1990 levels, similar to the Kerry-Graham-Lieberman bill soon to be considered The cap-and-trade system modeled uses full auction of permits and 75 percent of proceeds going directly back to consumers and 25 percent going to technology investments. No proceeds are dedicated to deficit reduction, as none is needed — a faster-growing economy will increase other tax receipts. In every single scenario, policies that cut waste and save money by eliminating market failures predominate, making the U.S. economy a more efficient free market and accelerating job growth and household wealth. The report finds that stronger environmental targets and standards deliver greater economic benefits — even if the tremendous benefits of reducing pollution have for health and environmental costs are ignored. The [**23 recommended climate strategies**](http://solveclimate.com/blog/20100422/23-energy-policies-could-save-americans-5-billion-year) range the gamut from agriculture, energy supply, electricity use, to transportation. These strategies — most of which save money — combined can achieve major carbon pollution reductions: This is what true all-of-the-above energy policy looks like. The [**suite of recommended policies**](http://www.climatestrategies.us/ewebeditpro/items/O25F23066.PDF) coming from the consultants to the Center for Climate Strategies report — the stakeholders in local and state governments, businesses, and energy users — must be taken as a top priority, even if they don’t have an army of lobbyists to promote this green economic agenda. The current level of ambition in Washington is not only insufficient to mitigate the damages of global warming, it is leaving hundreds of thousands of jobs on the table.

Economy Internal Link Ext

Cap and Trade helps the economy-auction system means it protects consumers and encourages job growth

Revesz and Livermore 3-10-2009 “Obama's Carbon Cap-and-Trade Plan Can Boost Growth”

Richard L. Revesz is the dean of New York University School of Law, and Michael A. Livermore is the executive director of the Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law. They are the authors of Retaking Rationality: How Cost-Benefit Analysis Can Better Protect the Environment and Our Health (Oxford University Press, 2008).

http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/mar2009/db20090310\_825431.htm

President Barack Obama hits three nails on the head with his plan to cap carbon emissions: weaning us off fossil fuels, spurring a wave of investment and job creation, and putting cash in the pockets of Americans who most need it. In his budget, Obama included a "cap-and-refund" proposal that puts a strict limit on pollution that causes global warming and uses a permit auction to make large companies pay for the right to pollute. The cap on emissions will increase the price of fossil-fuel-based energy to encourage efficiency and new technologies. To protect consumers from rising prices, Obama's plan refunds the revenue from the auctions directly to the American people through a tax credit. The point of a carbon cap is to make energy efficiency and renewable energy sources more competitive by removing hidden subsidies for dirty energy such as coal. Pollution from fossil-fuel-based energy is known to impose important external costs, from health impacts today to climate change risks tomorrow. By raising the price of carbon emissions, a cap will create incentives for clean energy, efficiency, and conservation. Sparing Consumer Electricity Costs Leveling the playing field by forcing fossil-fuel prices to reflect their true cost will spur a wave of clean-energy investment: research and development in new technologies, new factories to produce solar panels and wind turbines, and energy-efficiency retrofits of commercial and residential real estate. That means jobs, and lots of them. While some businesses that rely on dirty energy will be hurt, many others will thrive in the clean-energy economy. Most carbon cap plans are set up to fail because they reward energy companies with permit giveaways and fail to compensate consumers for increased electricity bills. One such proposal hit the Senate floor last year, only to collapse under the weight of too much spending and not enough protection for the middle class. Obama's cap-and-refund plan avoids these mistakes. As stated clearly by Peter Orszag, President Obama's budget director, giving away the permits would be nothing more than "the largest corporate welfare program that has ever been enacted in the history of the United States." A cap is going to increase the relative cost of dirty energy whether permits are given away or auctioned because companies will have to use permits they could otherwise have sold in the market. Either way, in deregulated markets, energy companies will pass those costs to consumers. Giving away permits doesn't help consumers; it just transfers wealth to utility companies. The exception is in regulated energy markets, where consumers would have to count on utility regulators to protect their interests. Add Nonworkers to the Refund Flow Just as important, almost all of the revenue from the permit auction is returned to the American public, recycling revenue directly into the U.S. economy and protecting consumers. Although prices for energy and energy-intensive goods are likely to rise, the refund can make up and even exceed the additional expenses for most Americans. As an added bonus, since lower-income Americans tend to spend new disposable income quickly—and they benefit the most under a tax-and-refund plan—we can actually expect a jump in consumer spending. The President's budget is only the very beginning of this process. There are ways to improve it and to involve more Americans. Under the President's plan, the refunds are distributed by extending the Making Work Pay tax credit, which applies to 95% of working Americans. If all, or nearly all, of the revenue from an auction is directly refunded, most Americans will receive more from the refund than they pay in increased energy prices. Unfortunately, this tax credit would not reach nonworkers, including retirees, people on disability, and the unemployed. Because these populations are among the most vulnerable, the refund should take them into account. As the cap declines, the auction revenue will actually increase, and a plan should be made to distribute the additional funds directly to the American public. A Cleaner, Healthier Economy These are important issues, but they deal with how to implement what is a genuinely transformative policy for this country. Right away, the President's proposal will create new investment incentives and get cash into the pockets of working Americans. In the future, as we adjust to a new green economy, the cap will be lowered, generating even greater revenue that will be distributed to the U.S. public. The results of America's fossil-fuel addiction are clear: We send billions overseas for foreign oil, muck up the environment with coal pollution, and stunt economic development. Breaking that addiction will cause withdrawal symptoms for some, but it is necessary to build a cleaner, healthier economy for all.

Economy Internal Link Ext

Cap and Trade is key to the economy-jobs

WRI 6-11 “Green Jobs and Competitive Industry: The Net Benefits of Climate Legislation”

World Resources Institute, Environmental Think Tank

http://www.wri.org/stories/2010/06/green-jobs-and-competitive-industry-net-benefits-climate-legislation

The Path to Clean Energy, Good Jobs, Economic Growth Any analysis of the economic impacts of climate and energy legislation must consider the opportunities for job and competitiveness gains for the economy overall. Under a climate bill, job growth would occur primarily in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors, but there are additional benefits that would touch almost all Americans. [**Analysis**](http://aceee.org/pubs/e098.pdf) (PDF) by the [**American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy**](http://www.aceee.org) of the House-passed Waxman-Markey bill found cost savings from economy-wide energy efficiency would lead to an average net energy spending reduction of $354 per household and an increase of nearly 425,000 jobs by 2030. Renewable energy technologies also have the potential to create good jobs in the U.S., but American industry currently lacks the incentives to invest in these areas. Recent WRI and Peterson Institute working papers found that both the [**wind**](http://www.wri.org/publication/it-should-be-a-breeze) and [**solar**](http://www.wri.org/publication/toward-a-sunny-future) industries have grown in recent years in countries where there is predictable, long-term policy support. A [**Center for American Progress**](http://www.americanprogress.org) [**report**](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/pdf/out_of_running.pdf) (PDF) also found that China, Germany and Spain have been able to take the lead in clean energy through a comprehensive policy approach. While government support is a main driver of renewable energy deployment, “Buy American” provisions for clean energy projects are not always beneficial for domestic job growth. For example, leading [**wind industry executives**](http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/85639-wind-execs-mount-offensive-against-schumers-buy-american-plan) have pointed out that requiring all locally manufactured components could lead to slower growth of local clean technology industries and fewer US jobs. According to [**recent research by WRI and PIIE**](http://www.wri.org/topics/trade), even without local content requirements, the majority of jobs in these industries are created locally and not easily moved overseas. This phenomenon is most prevalent in the [**wind industry**](http://www.wri.org/publication/it-should-be-a-breeze) because its infrastructure is difficult to transport, encouraging the creation of regional production hubs. For example, state policies that require electric utilities to develop renewable electricity sources have attracted international turbine manufacturers and other suppliers to locate facilities in [**Colorado**](http://www.investindk.com/visNyhed.asp?artikelID=22602) and [**Pennsylvania**](http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=35882) to serve the [**growing U.S. wind market**](http://www.wri.org/stories/2010/03/us-and-foreign-wind-companies-create-good-american-jobs). And while the [**solar industry**](http://www.wri.org/publication/toward-a-sunny-future) has a more globalized value chain, most jobs along this chain are in system design, planning, installation and operations – activities that inherently happen close to the installation site. The Waxman-Markey bill and pending Senate legislation include several provisions based on what states like Colorado and Pennsylvania have done to attract investment in the clean energy sector. American job growth in this area depends on a thriving clean technology industry. Climate legislation can achieve this by creating local market demand through setting national standards for new buildings and appliances, providing financing for R&D and strengthening the infrastructure necessary for a clean energy revolution. Most importantly, a cap-and-trade system for domestic emissions like that in Waxman-Markey and Kerry-Lieberman will put in place a long-term price signal on the cost of carbon pollution. This will give U.S. industry the incentive to heavily invest in clean energy, realize economies of scale and efficiency gains, and create thousands of new “green” jobs. Easing the Transition to a Low Carbon Economy The first step towards addressing concerns about the competitiveness of energy-intensive industries and the risk of emissions leakage question is understanding the scale of the problem. In 2008 WRI and PIIE published [**Leveling the Carbon Playing Field**](http://www.wri.org/publication/leveling-the-carbon-playing-field), a report that assessed which sectors of the economy would be at a significant international competitive disadvantage under a cap-and-trade system and how that could lead to declining market share, industry relocation and leakage. The report demonstrated that negative impacts are limited to a discrete set of energy intensive industries that are also heavily traded internationally (like producers of steel, glass, basic chemicals, pulp and paper), known as [**emissions-intensive, trade-exposed (EITE) industries**](http://www.wri.org/chart/us-industry-exposure-climate-costs-based-on-energy-intensity-and-imports). These industries account for 3 percent of the country’s economic output and less than 2 percent of nationwide employment. Because competitiveness and leakage concerns are limited to a small, specific set of sectors, targeted measures to ease the burden on these sectors can effectively address the problem. For example, these vulnerable EITE sectors could receive a rebate in the form of free emission allowances to offset the cost increase. This strategy to reduce the threat of leakage was included in the Waxman-Markey legislation that the House passed in June, 2009 and garnered support from several industrial manufacturers, organized labor and environmental NGOs. The Kerry-Lieberman proposal and the European Union’s cap-and-trade system take the same approach. The U.S. [**Interagency Report**](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/economics/pdfs/InteragencyReport_Competitiveness-EmissionLeakage.pdf) (PDF), released by the Obama Administration in December 2009, found that the House rebate provisions would effectively encourage industry to become more efficient while ensuring that eligible EITE industrial sectors would face no significant risk of emissions leakage. Furthermore, allowanÎ provisions would likely be sufficient to eliminate leakage risks for at least the first 10 years of the program, and potentially well past 2030. Kerry-Lieberman sets aside even more allowances to provide rebates for the same purpose.While supporters of a climate and energy bill argue that it would create American jobs and benefit the overall economy, detractors cite competitiveness and leakage concerns as a reason not to implement domestic legislation. In fact, government and independent studies indicate that well-crafted, targeted policy can address both the potential risks and gains from legislation. Both Waxman-Markey and Kerry-Lieberman contain provisions to mitigate the negative impacts to a discrete set of actors while fostering job creation, efficiency gains and long-term certainty. The sooner Congress passes comprehensive climate policy, the sooner U.S. industry and government can begin building the road to a cleaner environment and stronger economy.

2NC Oil Dependence Impact

Cap and Trade solves oil dependence

Courtney **Albon**, Times Gazette**, 2009**

http://www.times-gazette.com/news/article/4623915

Rep. John Boccieri, D-16th District, says **the cap and trade bill passed last week in the House is less about the environment and more about national security.** Boccieri said **the legislation has largely been framed as an environmental bill, an effort to push large manufacturers to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. However, he said the bill's most important role will be to reduce America's dependency on foreign oil by harnessing alternative forms of energy. "We've got to find a way to break that stronghold. It's one of the big threats our country faces," Boccieri said. The House passed the cap and trade bill** -- formally, The American Clean Air and Security Act -- June 26 and it awaits approval in the Senate. If passed, **it would place limits on manufacturers' emissions by requiring them to hold permits, or credits. The credits, which can be traded among companies, essentially give manufacturers the right to emit a certain amount of pollutant.** The goal is an 83-percent emissions reduction by 2050. Proponents such as Boccieri, say the cap on emissions will push manufacturers to be more innovative and seek out alternate fueling options. New energy sources means new jobs, which means a stronger, more secure economy, they say. However, manufacturers like the local American Augers, say the new rules will actually make them less competitive on a global scale and the cost of complying with the regulations will hit consumers through increased pricing on their products. "**It's gonna make us and everyone else less competitive in a global market place where others aren't subject to the tax,"** said Dave Hammond, vice president of operations at American Augers. Hammond said the bill is a "sneak attack" by the Obama administration to impose what he says amounts to a tax increase. However, Boccieri said, regional power authorities and language in the 1,400-page bill -- which he says he read cover to cover -- protect against hikes in utility costs. "I just want to make it clear that there are no taxes in this bill," Boccieri said. He said he was concerned when he read the initial bill that it would place too much of a burden on local businesses. But a 300-page amendment -- delivered at 3 a.m. the day of the vote -- eased some of his worries. The amendment includes the establishment of a $30 billion loan fund for small and medium-sized manufacturers who may need assistance in the transition to more energy efficient operations. He said he's excited about the possibilities the bill presents for businesses in Ohio and the Midwest. As demand grows for alternative energy sources, so will the need for producing mechanisms such as windmills to harness that energy. If Ohio becomes a player early in the game, the state could see new jobs and new industry, Boccieri said, which will support the "retooling" of existing manufacturing operations. "When technology catches up, we could actually be using more coal," Boccieri said. While Boccieri said he is satisfied with the bill passed in the House, it could look much different when (and if) it makes its way out of the Senate. The bill is still 15 votes short of majority and could include some concessions such as allowing more offshore oil drilling and the creation of nuclear power plants. "There's a lot of influence on Wall Street," Boccieri. "I hope they hold the line." He said he'd like to see the Senate remove a provision in the current bill, which calls for the creation of a national building code.

Oil dependency causes resource wars and conflict with China

New Statesman, 9/8/2003

In the 1990s, the faith of Spencer and Marx was repackaged and sold to governments. Given a spurious rigour by economists, it became the intellectual basis for the global free market. Yet its influence over policy has never extended to defence planning. Bien-pensants economists can babble on as much as they like about the pacifying effects of free markets, but military strategists continue to assume that secure access to energy sources is a strategic imperative. Advanced industrial societies would collapse if they were cut off from them for more than a few months. No new technology can prevent such a disaster. Talk of new sources of energy replacing oil in the long run is all very well, but history is one short run after another. The first Gulf war was waged to protect western oil supplies, and for no other reason. Iraq's vast oil reserves are not the only reason that country was invaded, but they are a vitally important factor. If - as some strategists believe is likely - military conflict breaks out between China and the United States over the next few decades, it will be partly because they are the chief competitors for the world's shrinking reserves of cheap oil. The rising demand for energy has become a cause of war. Contrary to the theories of progress bequeathed to us from the 19th century, worldwide industrialisation is not banishing scarcity in the necessities of existence and ushering in a new era of peace. It is creating new scarcities and triggering new conflicts. Without oil, the energy-intensive agriculture on which we rely so heavily could not exist. A steady supply of oil is as important in our lives as good weather was in the agrarian societies of the past.

2NC Chemical Industry Impact

The next year will redefine the chemical industry-its resurging but recovery is uncertain

REUTERS 2009 (Ernest Scheyder, “ANALYSIS - Chemical industry upbeat but cautious on 2010,” Dec 21, <http://in.reuters.com/article/idINIndia-44885420091221>)

**The next 12 months hold much opportunity for** investors in **the U.S. chemical industry as it**s members **hope to ride a wave of cautious economic optimism and** capitalize on **growing consumer confidence.** After two years of frenzied stock swings, debt downgrades, and slumping revenue and profit, some of the industry's biggest players are charily confident that a long-awaited economic uptick is coming next year. While in 2008 and 2009 consumers eschewed many of the products made from chemicals, including automobiles and electronics, **analysts expect 2010 to bring a resurgent economy and shopper**. "**History tells us that the best time to (become) a chemical investor is in the depth of a trough**," Alembic Global Advisors **analyst** Hassan **Ahmed said**. Indeed, despite jumping more than 50 percent so far in 2009, the Dow Jones U.S. Chemicals index is still about 30 percent off an all-time high touched in 2008. Commodity **chemical makers are** generally seen as **good investments as recessions** begin to **abate because demand begins to rise for plastics, clothing and other basic items that their products they go into**. As a full-blown recovery emerges, **specialty chemicals** -- which go into electronics, adhesives and other high-technology products -- **are** generally seen as **places for investors to shift their funds as discretionary income returns**. Huntsman, Solutia and Cabot are among the larger specialty chemical makers, while Air Products and Chemicals, Praxair and Eastman Chemical are some of the bigger commodity chemicals makers. Investors often prefer companies with a mix of both commodity and specialty chemicals, such as Dow Chemical and DuPont. Few chemical companies provide specific financial forecasts. But DuPont says it expects earnings to grow by at least 7.7 percent in 2010, and Dow bullishly told investors last month that its profit could start to jump next year and increase more than six times by 2012. CONSERVING CASH, BUILDING MARGINS **After coming through a tough recession, many chemical companies will spend carefully in 2010, and most have stated they will work to cut costs next year**. But fast-growing markets like the Middle East will probably still see a lot of capital expenditure dollars. Dow Chemical, for instance, is busy building the Ras Tanura refinery in Saudi Arabia, but the chemical giant is unlikely to spend more money in the United States in 2010, industry observers say. **Prices for chemicals probably will not rise in 2010 due in part to excess capacity and relatively low energy prices.** That is not the best news for an industry focused largely on cash generation and retention. But low prices also encourage consumers to buy more, and those companies with excess capacity would have the ability to take market share when the economy recovers. In the past 18 months, **chemical prices did not drop as much as energy costs, which helped the industry's margins hold steady or improve slightly in 2009**. Cost cuts should continue in 2010, but not at the same pace as 2008 and 2009. Many in the industry have laid off thousands of workers and are working to shed billions of dollars from their cost structure. "As long as we don't see a big spike in raw material (costs) ... I do think you're going to see margin expansion in 2010," Credit Suisse analyst John McNulty said. Margins may also benefit if chemical makers close some of their U.S. plants, whose average age is about 30 years, since it takes a lot of maintain those inefficient facilities. ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL **The chemical industry** is worried that it **could suffer from pending U.S. climate change legislation**, although many of its members support doing something about global warming. While the legislation has yet to be finalized, chemical makers are worried **they could be penalized just for using carbon, rather than emitting it.** For instance, **chemical companies use natural gas to make plastic, but the carbon in the natural gas is locked into the plastic, not emitted into the atmosphere. If the industry is charged merely for using the carbon, it would substantially boost costs.**

**Cap and Trade helps the chemical industry-increases demand for basic materials for green products**

InTech July 2009; Chemical makers get smart, use cap-and-trade;

http://www.isa.org/InTechTemplate.cfm?Section=Automation\_Update&template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=77992

Chemical companies gulp energy like a thirsty hound slops up cool water. See how the industry positions itself to emerge a winner in the pending greenhouse-gas clamp down. Dow Jones Newswires reported chemical makers are one of the biggest energy users among manufacturers, expelling about 5% of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions, according to government data. However, a so-called cap-and-trade system would also boost demand for some chemical companies’ products, from insulation to solar-panel components, because those products would help others cut back on the energy use. “This is really our sweet spot,” said Calvin Dooley, chief executive of the American Chemistry Council, an industry trade group. The chemical industry provides virtually all basic materials for other manufacturers, many of which would have to cut emissions or buy pollution permits under cap-and-trade. Success for a chemical company in a cap-and-trade system could boil down to the energy-saving value of the products it sells—not just how much energy it consumes. Chemical companies sell a variety of energy-saving materials, including industrial gases used as an insulator between glass panes in energy-efficient windows, foams used in the blades of electricity-generating windmills, and lightweight plastics used in car parts that help vehicles consume less energy. Some chemical companies report demand for their energy-saving products is strong already, even in the midst of the economic recession. DuPont Co. expects by 2015 its sales from renewable materials that displace fossil fuels will nearly double to $8 billion. German chemical maker BASF SE sees big business opportunities in the weatherproofing of residential homes, which typically contain an average $17,000 worth of chemical products, according to the chemistry council. There is room to raise that to up to $30,000 per house, said BASF. Other chemical companies are installing projects that will lower their own energy bill and potentially generate pollution credits to help offset their emissions. “Whether your inspiration is cap-and-trade or the prospect of $140-a-barrel oil, you need to be strategically involved in this space,” said Rich Wells, vice president of energy for Dow.

That’s the only scenario for surviving this century

Baum 99 – editor-in-chief of the American Chemical Society's Chemical and Engineering News [Rudy M. Baum, C&E News, “Millennium Special Report,” 12-6-99, http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html]

The pace of change in today's world is truly incomprehensible. Science is advancing on all fronts, particularly chemistry and biology working together as they never have before to understand life in general and human beings in particular at a breathtaking pace**.** Technology ranging from computers and the Internet to medical devices to genetic engineering to nanotechnology is transforming our world and our existence in it. It is, in fact, a fool's mission to predict where science and technology will take us in the coming decade, let alone the coming century. We can say with finality only this: We don't know.  We do know, however, that we face enormous challenges, we 6 billion humans who now inhabit Earth. In its 1998 revision of world population estimates and projections, the United Nations anticipates a world population in 2050 of 7.3 billion to 10.7 billion,with a "medium-fertility projection," considered the most likely, indicating a world population of 8.9 billion people in 2050. According to the UN, fertility now stands at 2.7 births per woman, down from 5 births per woman in the early 1950s. And fertility rates are declining in all regions of the world. That's good news.  But people are living a lot longer. That is certainly good news for the individuals who are living longer, but it also poses challenges for health care and social services the world over. The 1998 UN report estimates for the first time the number of octogenarians, nonagenarians, and centenarians living today and projected for 2050. The numbers are startling. In 1998, 66 million people were aged 80 or older, about one of every 100 persons. That number is expected to increase sixfold by 2050 to reach 370 million people, or one in every 24 persons. By 2050, more than 2.2 million people will be 100 years old or older!  **Here is the fundamental challenge we face: The world's growing and aging population must be fed and clothed and housed and transported in ways that do not perpetuate the environmental devastation wrought by the first waves of industrialization** of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we increase our output of goods and services, as we increase our consumption of energy, as we meet the imperative of raising the standard of living for the poorest among us, we must learn to carry out our economic activities sustainably.  There are optimists out there, C&EN readers among them, who believe that the history of civilization is a long string of technological triumphs of humans over the limits of nature. In this view, the idea of a "carrying capacity" for Earth—a limit to the number of humans Earth's resources can support—is a fiction because technological advances will continuously obviate previously perceived limits. This view has historical merit. Dire predictions made in the 1960s about the exhaustion of resources ranging from petroleum to chromium to fresh water by the end of the 1980s or 1990s have proven utterly wrong.  While I do not count myself as one of the technological pessimists who see technology as a mixed blessing at best and an unmitigated evil at worst, I do not count myself among the technological optimists either. **There are environmental challenges of transcendent complexity that I fear may overcome us and our Earth before technological progress can come to our rescue. Global climate change, the accelerating destruction of terrestrial and oceanic habitats, the catastrophic loss of species across the plant and animal kingdoms—these are problems that are not obviously amenable to straightforward technological solutions.**  But I know this, too: **Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium.**  Chemists, **chemistry, and the chemical industry**—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—**will play central roles in addressing these challenges**. The first section of this Special Report is a series called [**"Millennial Musings"**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749muse1.html) in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry.  The five essays that follow explore **the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century.** The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to humanity's future.  The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the [**chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production.**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749sustain.html) Although it is not well known to the general public, **the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero.** Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities.  This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va.  **Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences.** Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. **It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies**. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in [**feeding the world's population**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749food.html) in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food.

2NC Agriculture Impact

Agricultural collapse inevitable due to warming-Cap and Trade boosts the industries competitiveness by opening new markets

Bruce A. McCarl, Distinguished Professor of Agricultural Economics Texas A&M University Testimony for the House Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy and Research December 3, 2009

**Agriculture**, broadly defined to include forests and fisheries, **is highly vulnerable to climate change related developments**. Specifically agriculture is vulnerable in three fundamental ways. Productivity effects of shifts in climate will impact the sector though changes in temperature, precipitation, and extreme climatic events along with other climate attributes. **Atmospheric carbon dioxide also will have implications**. Here is just a sampling of some findings: **work has shown crop yields worsened in the south and southwest but bettered in the north, pest populations and costs increased, yield variability increasing, range carrying capacity diminished, livestock appetite altered, subtropical developing agriculture negatively affected, tree growth altered and technical progress slowe**d (Reilly et al, Chen and McCarl, Paustian et al, McCarl et al, Irland et al). Need to adapt to an altered climate and a carbon dioxide enriched atmosphere will affect the sector. **Climate change adaptation will involve alterations in crop and livestock mixes along with land management practices. It will also require added investment capital for facilities,** altered production practices, research and extension (McCarl, 2007). Furthermore such actions today appear to be inevitable (Rose and McCarl). Diversion of resources to limit the extent of climate change plus effects of higher energy prices. Agriculture may face altered energy costs and face pressures/opportunities to limit emissions, produce substitute, lower emitting products (bioenergy) and enhance sequestration (Murray et al). Collectively these forces mean agriculture will be substantially affected. 2 2 Limiting Climate change Now let me turn to the topic of the day and that is agriculture's role in limiting the future magnitude of climate change by participating in an offsets market. *2.1 Opportunities* As argued by Dr. Murray there are a number of ways agriculture might participate in or be affected by a cap and trade market including agriculture generates about 6% of fossil fuel related emissions and would face increased fuel costs and needs to reduce usage (EPA) agriculture provides the bulk of the feedstocks for renewable and, in many cases, emissions reducing forms of energy (McCarl, 2008). Agriculture may be able to reduce a number of other emissions including those from livestock and manure, and fertilizer (McCarl and Schneider, 2001) Agriculture may be able to increase the rate of sequestration by changing tillage, afforesting, forest management, grassland conversion and others (Murray et al) Agriculture may be able to preserve existing carbon stocks by avoiding land use change and deforestation as discussed by Dr. Sohngen. *2.2 Attractive alternatives?* There are a number of reasons why the above opportunities may be attractive meriting current attention including The practices needed to implement the offsets, fossil fuel emissions reductions and renewable fuel feedstocks are generally known, existing technology (excepting cellulosic liquid fuels) not needing extended time until deployment (as is the case with for example carbon capture and storage) – Marland et al. Many of the technologies are currently implementable with low capital costs bridging us to a future with a decarbonized energy The use of agricultural activities has been shown in modeling studies to lead to substantial reductions in the domestic and international costs of limiting atmospheric greenhouse gas content (de la Chesnaye, and Weyant). The agricultural contribution can be large. For example, when we were analyzing possible Kyoto Protocol participation 10 years ago we found at higher prices that agriculture and forestry could offset the entire US obligation which was about 6% below 1990 levels plus 24% projected growth by 2012 or a total of 30% below today's levels. There are a number of large potential or readily exploitable alternatives including bioelectricity, liquid fuels from cellulose and wastes, feedstocks, afforestation, manure lagoon management, agricultural soils, forest management, and avoided deforestation (Murray et al). 3 *2.3 Implementation Complexity* As Dr. Murray argued there are a number of complex implementation issues including the points he highlighted and more (additionality, uncertainty, permanence, saturation, leakage, transactions costs, measurement/monitoring, climate change interactions and aggregation/brokerage – Smith et al, Morgan et al). Some alternatives will turn out to be impractical in the face of these considerations. Today it is difficult to pick winners and losers. I feel it is desirable in setting up cap and trade to allow broad participation and establish a careful way of setting the cap then let the private market evolve to handle the **complexity. 3 Cap and Trade Effects on Agriculture Now let me turn attention to the implications that a cap and trade program would have on agriculture addressing the case both with and without the approval of offsets. 3***.1 New markets* Fundamentally, **the cap and trade program would provide agriculture with new markets and opportunities. If offsets are not broadly approved the market would likely be restricted to an increased demand for biofuel and bioelectricity feedstocks. If offsets are approved then agriculture could enter the carbon (broadly defined to encompass multiple greenhouse gasses) market selling the results of sequestration and emission reduction activities**. *3.2 Competitive with existing markets* Producing offsets and bioenergy feedstocks on a large scale diverts agriculture from things it is now doing and ultimately is competitive with existing production. As such several things are expected. Market prices are likely to go up – with or without offsets (Schneider and McCarl, Murray et al, Baker et al). More with than without. Exports are likely to fall and world prices go up. *3.3 Producer Income and Consumer cost* **The higher prices and added markets inevitably lead to higher agricultural incomes along with higher consumer and international food costs**. This means reduced consumer and rest of world welfare with the losses therein being greater than the producer income gains. **This would naturally have to be balanced off with the environmental benefits of cap and trade plus the savings in the rest of the economy of meeting the cap**. Furthermore, the agricultural income effects (Baker et al) are not uniformly distributed with crop producers gaining the most and livestock and forest somewhat less (although one can alter this by allocating afforestation incomes in different ways). There is also substantial gain in rural America from enhanced land based incomes plus distributed energy production under biofeedstock transformation to energy. 4 *3.4 Environmentally complex* Collectively the use of offsets, fossil fuel use and bioenergy feedstock production generates a complex set of environmental impacts. Actions reducing tillage intensity, afforesting, converting grasslands etc lead to water quality and erosion benefits while higher market prices and increased land demand lead to more land development and intensification possibly increasing chemical use, erosion sequestration releases and water use. In addition, increases in agricultural participation in the cap allows less energy sector reduction and diminishes air quality gains that would occur with less fossil fuel usage (Elbakidze and McCarl). Finally, **the international market consequences would stimulate production increase** in other areas including the possibility of added deforestation. 4 Key role of technology It merits mention that the pressures of an agriculture contributing to expanding demands for energy, limiting greenhouse gasses and food/fiber can only happen if technological progress remains high. Certainly technology investment is a complementary policy and is in fact a substantial way of limiting future greenhouse gas emissions (Schneider et al). 5 Summary **Agriculture will be affected by climate change and will need to adjust. It may be a big player in cap and trade if offsets are approved but would benefit from just increased energy prices in the absence of off**sets. A complex market will need to evolve to handle agricultural offset characteristics and it appears desirable to allow wide participation.

Collapse of U.S. Ag makes extinction inevitable

Lugar, 4 – U.S. Senator (Richard, <http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html>)

**In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril.** **One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is** not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also **world peace and security.** History tells us that **states** may **go to war over access to resources**, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. **Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of** **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, **the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels.** People in rapidly **developing nations will** have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will **raise demand for feed grain** at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: **developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations.** As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe.   Productivity revolution  **To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years**, we in **the** **U**nited **S**tates **will have to grow** roughly **three times more food on the land we have.** That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course **there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more** in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. **The** **U**nited **S**tates **can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.**

Cap and Trade Helps Ag Ext

Your projections are inaccurate-negative affects on U.S. agriculture are offset by new biofuel markets

Brian C. Murray, Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, Duke UniversityBruce A. McCarl, Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M UniversityJustin Baker, Center on Global Change, Duke University, May 2009, “How Might Carbon Prices and Energy Costs Affect Returns to Agricultural Producers?

Recent **projections of cap-and-trade policy** in EPA’s **analysis of the Waxman-Markey bill show smaller energy sector impact**s. EPA just performed an analysis of the recently proposed Waxman-Markey draft bill. The new EPA report was released in April 2009 and therefore was not available to Doane at the time of their report. Waxman-Markey calls for similar long-term cuts to Lieberman-Warner, but changes in energy policies and baseline assumptions about technological change, economic activity, and energy efficiency lead to GHG allowance prices for 2020 that are 40% lower in the core scenario (2) than was the case in Lieberman-Warner ($22 rather than $37). This translates into energy price increases of 12.5% for natural gas and 4.7% for oil in 2020 (down from 35% and 27% for 2020, respectively, under Lieberman-Warner).1 Therefore any energy-related agricultural input cost effects would be much more muted with these estimates. Lack of a structural economic model to capture substitution and market linkages. The process linking cap-and-trade, allowance prices, energy prices, and commodity production costs is quite complex and is best dealt with using either (1) a partial equilibrium sector model that examines the complexities of the agricultural sector as we link together inputs, feed, consumption, process­ing, and market prices; (2) **a general equilibrium economic model that links together the carbon, energy, land, and agricultural commodity markets (both domestic and global**); or (3) some combina­tion of the two. Such an approach can trace the implications of cost shocks in one part of the market through the channels of supply, demand, substitution, trade, and prices. The Doane study does not use any such model. This, unfortunately, **can lead to an incomplete picture of net impacts on farmers,** as highlighted in the next several points below. One of the problems with using simple crop budget calculations rather than an economic model is the implied assumption of constant rate of input use in the production process. After establishing a baseline of average production costs by input (i.e., seed, fertilizer, chemicals, custom operations, fuel/electricity) and crop (corn, soybeans, wheat, cotton, rice, sorghum, oats, and barley), the Doane study forecasts changes in total per-acre expenditures by relating the effect of rising energy prices to the cost of each cost item. The use of each cost item (input) is held constant. There are two problems with assuming a constant rate of input use based on a historical series. First, it allows for no substitution among inputs in the short-term. Typically economists estimate substi­tutability among various inputs in the production process. **By focusing on rising energy prices for individual inputs in isolation**, the Doane study **ignores the possibility that farmers can trade off among inputs, substituting less costly inputs for more costly inputs.** Secondly, the assumption of constant input use ignores the possibility of technological growth or long-term shifts in management practices. While the Doane study authors note that biotechnology adoption and changing management regimes have greatly impacted farm cost structure, they do not discuss the manner in which long-term energy cost trends could lead to similar advances and shifts in production practices. For example, farmers might find it preferable to reduce fertilizer use or switch to no-tillage production in order to avoid the higher costs of fossil fuel–intensive inputs, thereby reducing the impact of higher energy input costs on the total cost of production. In an earlier study, McCarl et al. (1999) show that significant energy conservation was attained through the reduced tillage induced by a carbon price. No pass-through of higher costs to higher prices. One of the consequences of not using a market model is that the analysis does not capture the ef­fect that higher input costs have on market prices for the commodities in question. Quite simply, when all suppliers in the market face higher input prices—as will be the case when energy prices change—these costs will reduce supply and in turn raise the market price received by the farmers. The notion that higher input costs translate to higher output prices is straightforward, simple, and empirically robust. It is true that some of the U.S. commodities are traded in global markets, and some of those markets may have competi­tors that are not subject to climate policy (e.g., Brazilian soybeans), which can make it harder for U.S. producers to pass on carbon-related costs to consumers. But for the most part, U.S. producers will play a large enough role in the markets they face domestically and abroad that they will have the ability to pass along at least some of the costs in the form of higher prices. Consider what has happened in commodity markets over the last couple of years with higher energy prices. Therefore the Doane report’s practice of quantify­ing the cost-per-acre impact and implying that this fully captures the effect on farmers overstates the case. A model that captures domestic supply and demand conditions and global trade in commodities will capture these price effects and provide a better indication of the net impact on U.S. farmers. Indeed in the conclusions section, Nicholas Institute 3 the Doane report does acknowledge that energy costs can get passed through in the agricultural sector, but only in arguing that costs for transport­ing their products off the farm will pass through to farmers in the form of lower net output prices. By ignoring the ability of input costs to get passed on to consumers, yet emphasizing that downstream costs get passed forward in the form of lower prices, the report is selective in what it chooses to convey about the energy-related cost impacts. **The report ignores the role of biofuels in farm returns. A carbon price would provide a cost advantage and expand market demand for low–net carbon fuels such as biofuels for use in transportation and electric power. The primary feedstock for biofuels is supplied by agricultural producers, and they reap the benefits of expanded market demand. The most prevalent example today is with corn-based ethanol. Through a variety of government programs, based in part on climate policy objectives, and also in response to rising crude oil prices**, the demand for ethanol has expanded dramatically in the last two years. Correspondingly, the price of corn and other crops that compete for land with corn shot up markedly and net farm income hit record levels. And while prices have tapered off some in the last year due to the economic downturn (see Figure 1), they still remain well above historic trends. Various studies by USDA and academic institu­tions have attributed 40% or more of the crop price increase to ethanol demand for corn (e.g., World Bank 2009; Fortenberry and Park 2008). It may be that the Doane report authors omit biofuels from consideration because the recently promulgated Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS) essentially mandates a fivefold increase in the use of biofuels by 2022 independent of any separate carbon cap program. One could argue that these benefits will accrue to farmers regardless of the climate policy and that little if any additional biofuel demand will be driven by a cap. But such an omission should be based on a systematic modeling of the biofuels market, the mandate, and climate policy together to draw such a conclusion (see below), which this study does not do. No agricultural offsets. By all accounts, agriculture would remain outside of any cap that emerges in a federal climate policy, but would be eligible to supply offsets to the capped sectors. Offsets reduce emissions (or increase sequestration) of greenhouse gases produced by an entity outside of the compliance cap. The offsets are used by a capped entity to offset its own emissions. **The economic premise of an offset transaction** is that the uncapped reduction is less expensive than the capped reduction, which **leaves room for gains from trade.** **Farmers can participate by sequestering carbon through no-till agriculture, grassland conversion, or tree-planting, or by reducing field emissions of nitrous oxide (N**2**O) or methane, both GHGs. Farmers exercise these options in order to sell offset credits; presumably they will not take these actions unless they gain economically** the Doane report does acknowledge that energy costs can get passed through in the agricultural sector, but only in arguing that costs for transport­ing their products off the farm will pass through to farmers in the form of lower net output prices. By ignoring the ability of input costs to get passed on to consumers, yet emphasizing that downstream costs get passed forward in the form of lower prices, the report is selective in what it chooses to convey about the energy-related cost impacts. The report ignores the role of biofuels in farm returns. **A carbon price would provide a cost advantage and expand market demand for low–net carbon fuels such as biofuels for use in transportation and electric power. The primary feedstock for biofuels is supplied by agricultural producers, and they reap the benefits of expanded market demand.** The most prevalent example today is with corn-based ethanol. Through a variety of government programs, based in part on climate policy objectives, and also in response to rising crude oil prices, the demand for ethanol has expanded dramatically in the last two years. Correspondingly, the price of corn and other crops that compete for land with corn shot up markedly and net farm income hit record levels. And while prices have tapered off some in the last year due to the economic downturn (see Figure 1), they still remain well above historic trends. Various studies by USDA and academic institu­tions have attributed 40% or more of the crop price increase to ethanol demand for corn (e.g., World Bank 2009; Fortenberry and Park 2008). It may be that the Doane report authors omit biofuels from consideration because the recently promulgated Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS) essentially mandates a fivefold increase in the use of biofuels by 2022 independent of any separate carbon cap program. One could argue that these benefits will accrue to farmers regardless of the climate policy and that little if any additional biofuel demand will be driven by a cap. But such an omission should be based on a systematic modeling of the biofuels market, the mandate, and climate policy together to draw such a conclusion (see below), which this study does not do. No agricultural offsets. By all accounts, agriculture would remain outside of any cap that emerges in a federal climate policy, but would be eligible to supply offsets to the capped sectors. Offsets reduce emissions (or increase sequestration) of greenhouse gases produced by an entity outside of the compliance cap. The offsets are used by a capped entity to offset its own emissions. The economic premise of an offset transaction is that the uncapped reduction is less expensive than the capped reduction, which leaves room for gains from trade. Farmers can participate by sequestering carbon through no-till agriculture, grassland conversion, or tree-planting, or by reducing field emissions of nitrous oxide (N2O) or methane, both GHGs. Farmers exercise these options in order to sell offset credits; presumably they will not take these actions unless they gain economically the impact appears to be quite a bit smaller than the direct energy-cost-per-acre measures put forth in the Doane report. Moreover, taken together with an expansion of biofuel demands that are complementary to a carbon price policy, the net effect on agricultural producers ranges from small net effect to large positive returns (e.g., corn). There is more to the story, since the higher prices received by farmers are paid for by consumers and this is money out of their pocket. These factors also need to be considered in a full economic analysis of agricultural sector. But the story for crop growers and other primary producers, which is the focus of the Doane report and conclusions, appears quite a bit more favorable or less damag­ing than their estimates suggest.
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Cap and Trade helps U.S. farmers-prices and credit selling potential

Envirnoment and Energy Publishing, 2009, Environment & Energy Publishing (E&E) is the leading source for comprehensive, daily coverage of environmental and energy policy and markets.

http://www.eenews.net/public/EEDaily/2009/12/03/1

**Farmers have more to gain than lose from a cap-and-trade regime for greenhouse gases, despite estimates that they could see significantly higher production costs**, according to a new analysis from the Agriculture Department. **An expanded economic study,** which USDA released yesterday, **estimates that farmers with energy-intensive crops could see their cost of production per acre go up to nearly 10 percent** over the next 50 years. But agriculture officials insist that higher prices for fuel or feed would be offset by the gains of participating in an offset market. **"The bottom line is, we think this is a net benefit for farmers and ranchers," said** Agriculture Secretary Tom **Vilsack**. USDA released the report at a House Agriculture Committee hearing yesterday. A second hearing today will focus on the offset market that could establish a new cash flow to farmers. Companies with carbon emissions could pay farmers and ranchers to sequester carbon through planting trees, practicing no-till farming or developing better nutrient management. The new analysis of **the House-passed climate bill** ([**H.R. 2454**](http://www.eenews.net/features/bills/111/House/060709182643.pdf)) **estimates that commodity crop farmers would see minimal price increases in the first four years, when a rebate in the bill would keep fertilizer prices lower.** Over the longer term, farmers would see bigger price increases, according to the agency. Agriculture itself is not capped in the bill, but the price of energy and fertilizer is expected to go up because of caps on the industries that supply the inputs for fuel and fertilizer. Livestock producers would also be hit by higher commodity prices. For instance, corn, one of the most energy-intensive crops, would see cost increases of $1.19 per acre in the short-term but $25.19 in long term, or 9.6 percent. USDA projects fuel costs to rise between 2.6 percent to 5.3 percent from 2012 to 2018. Fertilizer would go up an extra 0.3 percent to 1.7 percent per year. **The cost estimates ignore potential benefits that farmers and ranchers might gain from selling carbon credits**. **Vilsack said in a teleconference with reporters yesterday that the offset market in the House bill could bring in $10 billion to $20 billion for the farm sector**. USDA chief economist Joseph **Glauber will expand on the benefits from offset markets in another round of testimony for the Agriculture Committee today**. Vilsack said **all sectors --** including livestock and crops, like rice, **that have less carbon-sequestration potential -- could have a chance to benefit under the system**. But he warned the transition would not be easy for all farm enterprises. "It is fair to recognize that different producers will be affected differently," Vilsack said. "But ... more farmers will benefit than not." Differing interpretations House Agriculture Committee members interpreted the economic results differently, depending on their stance on cap and trade. "The conclusions of all the studies remain the same, that cap and trade has the potential to devastate the agriculture community with higher energy prices," said Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.). If Congress does not pass a climate bill, EPA could move forward with their own regulations to curb emissions. Goodlatte recommended Congress block the effort by passing legislation that restricts the authority of EPA to take that action, an idea that failed during the EPA spending bill debate this year. But Rep. Tim Walz (D-Minn.) said that lawmakers, farm interests and economists are not paying enough attention to the potential harm to agriculture from a warming planet -- which could bring on more severe weather events, disease and pests. "The fact of the matter is, what the bill won't do, climate will do," Walz said. "**It behooves us all to look at the evidence on all sides, not just the short-term view, climate change is not going to allow us to yield the food and fuel we need."** Other economists who testified at the hearing yesterday agreed that unmitigated global warming could also have serious economic effects for farmers. "Studies have tended to underemphasize the costs of adaptation and of severe climate events," said John Antle, professor of economics at Montana State University. "We need to think more carefully about where we are headed in the future." "**The potential yield decreases of doing nothing are extreme,**" said Richard Pottorff, chief economist of Doane Advisory Services. "We need to take some action, but what we do is the question." Get on board Most farm groups have been hesitant to support U.S. cap-and-trade efforts because of concern about how such a plan could raise energy and fertilizer prices. The American Farm Bureau has launched a campaign against U.S. emission curbs and many commodity groups have either decried climate legislation or taken a neutral stance. The left-leaning National Farmers Union is one of the few large farm groups advocating for climate change legislation. Vilsack urged farm groups to change their stance, saying global warming could be devastating for agriculture. "It is important for us to recognize no action is not a good option," he said. Vilsack predicted farmers would embrace cap and trade as they see the advantages from a carbon sequestration market. "**Farmers were reluctant when fertilizer was first proposed ... or seed technology ... but they embraced the technology, and the result is agriculture production that is the envy of the world**," Vilsack said. "I understand the concern in farm country, but if this is done properly, it is going to ultimately, in the long term, the short term and the medium term, it is going to be a benefit to farmers."

2NC China Relations Impact

Copenhagen leads to U.S. Sino Cooperation

Ching, 2/26 2009[ Frank, “Clinton gets off to a good start in China” [http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20090226fc.html](https://webmail.greenhill.org/owa/redir.aspx?C=dac986bf3dac4053bba4019f7e06e97a&URL=http%3a%2f%2fsearch.japantimes.co.jp%2fcgi-bin%2feo20090226fc.html)]

**She and her Chinese counterpart, Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi, held a joint press conference where they announced that their principals** — Obama and Chinese President Hu Jintao — **would hold their first summit conference in April** when both men will be in London for a Group of 20 meeting that has been billed as one to create a new economic order. Clinton said that both she and Yang had a simple premise: **It is essential that the U.S. and China have a positive, cooperative relationship**. With the articulation of that premise, **other problems should be put in the proper perspective**. No doubt, **problems will arise in future but, for now, both countries appear to share a sense of global responsibility and are willing to work together on** the two main challenges facing the world today: the continuing international financial crisis as well as **climate change. T**he two sides also covered a wide range of other issues, including the North Korean nuclear weapons issue, Iran and cross-strait relations. These are all matters that require cooperation between Washington and Beijing if they are to be properly managed. While the London G20 summit will tackle economic and financial issues, climate change will be the topic of the Copenhagen conference in December. The Clinton trip should put to rest speculation that Sino-American relations may be strained by the Obama administration's putting pressure on China to revalue its currency or by adopting protectionist trade measures. Both countries clearly appreciate the overriding importance of maintaining a cooperative relationship. The bilateral dialogues initiated by the Bush administration may be tweaked but they will continue, possibly at an even higher level. Clinton had indicated that the Sino-American dialogue would no longer be dominated by Treasury and the discussion of economic issues. She said that she and the new Treasury secretary "will both be fully engaged in this dialogue," suggesting that she may want to lead the dialogue herself. As Yang said, the upcoming summit meeting between the leaders of China and the U.S. will be of great importance and careful preparations will have to be made to ensure its success. He will fly to Washington in March to pave the way for the London conference and the Obama-Hu summit. There is very little time left between now and April. There is a little more time, though not much more, between now and December. **The two countries have their work cut out for them if they are to reach joint positions to be adopted in London and Copenhagen. It is not only in their interests, but in the interests of the rest of the world, for these two countries to work together at these two crucial conferences.**

US – Sino cooperation prevents extinction - it solves every impact

Wenzhong, PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-7**-**2K4 (Zhou, “Vigorously Pushing Forward the Constructive and Cooperative Relationship Between China and the United States,” http://china-japan21.org/eng/zxxx/t64286.htm)

China's development needs a peaceful international environment, particularly in its periphery. We will continue to play a constructive role in global and regional affairs and sincerely look forward to amicable coexistence and friendly cooperation with all other countries, the United States included. We will continue to push for good-neighborliness, friendship and partnership and dedicate ourselves to peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Thus China's development will also mean stronger prospect of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. **China and the US should**, and can, **work together for peace, stability and prosperity** in the region. Given the highly complementary nature of the two economies, China's reform, opening up and rising economic size have opened broad horizon for sustained China-US trade and economic cooperation. **By deepening our** commercial **partnership**, which has already delivered tangible benefits to the two peoples, **we can** do still more and also **make greater contribution to global economic stability** and prosperity. **Terrorism, cross-boundary crime,** proliferation of advanced weapons, **and spread of deadly diseases pose a common threat** to mankind. **China and the US have** extensive shared stake and **common responsibility for meeting these challenges, maintaining world peace** and security **and** addressing **other** major **issues bearing on human survival** and development. **China is ready to keep up its coordination and cooperation in these areas with the US** and the rest of the international community. During his visit to the US nearly 25 years ago, Deng Xiaoping said, "The interests of our two peoples and those of world peace require that we view our relations from the overall international situation and a long-term strategic perspective." Thirteen years ago when China-US relations were at their lowest ebb, Mr. Deng said, "In the final analysis, China-US relations have got to get better." We are optimistic about the tomorrow of China-US relations. We have every reason to believe that so long as the two countries view and handle the relationship with a strategic perspective, adhere to the guiding principles of the three joint communiqués and firmly grasp the common interests of the two countries, we will see even greater accomplishments in China-US relations.

2NC African Economy Impact

Copenhagen key to African economy-counters ecological shock and creates a green economy

Mohamed Shamun Omar December 06, 2009, “Road to Copenhagen Climate Conference Must Pass through Africa: Policy Options for African Leaders and Negotiators”, Staff Writer,

http://wardheernews.com/Articles\_09/Decemebr/Mohamed\_Omar/06\_Policy\_options\_for\_African\_leaders\_&\_negotiators.html

**As African leaders shepherd to Copenhagen** to attend the 15th Conference of the Parties (COP 15) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, **they will be facing an international climate negotiations that have been largely framed along the lines of emissions cap and growth of the industrialized North versus Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC),** a new economic block that Goldman Sachs research paper reported to have the economic potential to be larger than the former G6 in US dollar terms by 2050. This raises two challenges for African negotiators. First, what would be an effective approach to reframe the climate debate with Africa in the mix? Secondly, what policy options and instruments are available to African negotiators in Copenhagen? Answering both these questions will strengthen Africa’s position in Copenhagen, and its capacity to adapt to climate change and potentially develop green economy.  Some African leaders have been sounding bold lately in reshaping the debate, while others are more conciliatory. The Prime Minister of Ethiopia, Mr. Meles Zenawi, who is leading group of African nations to the COP 15 in a keynote address to the special session of the African Partnership Forum (APF), hosted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) this past September in Addis Ababa said, “*We will use our numbers to delegitimize any agreement that is not consistent with our minimal position,” further adding: “If need be, we are prepared to walk out of any negotiation that threatens to be another rape of our continent*.” Kenya's Prime Minister, Raila Odinga sounded more conciliatory in an interview with AFP by saying "*we really should not go to Copenhagen and play the hard ball and the blame game.  This issue is so crucial that it requires full cooperation because if the North does not cooperate with the South it means all of us are going to be victims. All of us are going to be losers*." African leaders need to refrain from rhetoric impulses and subjection, and reframe the climate debate with solid arguments informed by science and economic rationale coupled with forming political alliances. African negotiators in Copenhagen should use widely available and accepted scientific evidences that show clear correlation between African climate change and grave human and environmental consequences. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment in London reported this past October that Africa is very likely to get warmer and drier with the probability of more intense tropical cyclones, higher sea levels, more storm surges, and in general, more **climatic variation and extreme weather events. These predicted ecological shocks will have major devastation in Africa, both in terms of human capital and the environment. O**ne does not need to look further back into history to see the impact of climate variation in Africa. The Maasai history at the end f 19th century, a period termed as “Emutai” meaning the wipe out is a case in point. Researchers at Tsavo National Park in Kenya including Dr. Lindsey Gillson uncovered evidence of large scale, but infrequent ecological disturbances that coincide with the “Emutai.” The plight of this period has been documented in part by Oscar Baumann, the Austrian explorer and cartographer who traveled widely in Africa, and was later appointedConsular General to Zanzibar by the Austro-Hungarian Government in 1896. Baumann painted a chilling picture of the destructions caused by the environmental disaster. He wrote in his book, Durch Massailand zur Nilquelle (Through the lands of the Maasai to the source of the Nile), “*There were women wasted to skeletons from whose eyes the madness of starvation glared ... warriors scarcely able to crawl on all fours, and apathetic, languishing elders. Swarms of vultures followed them from high, awaiting their certain victims*." Political alliances and true understanding of climate change response policy options will be the strategy in Copenhagen, and unless African negotiators are savvy in this art, it might be a missed opportunity for Africa. Jockeying positions and forming alliance is already in high gear, small band of islands led by President Mohamed Nasheed of Maldives (one of the lowest laying countries in the world) are bonding together en-route to Copenhagen advocating a common climate mitigation response. African negotiators need to define their issues, desired outcomes, and find similar groups to form an interest block if they want to alter the negotiation landscape. So, what climate change response policy should African negotiators advocate for in Copenhagen? Given the nature and the challenge of the issue along with the eco-diversity of Africa, there might not be a “one size fit all” solution for the entire continent. However, there might be a couple of policy instruments worth noting that African negotiators could carry in their negotiation tool box; namely:  Mitigation First**.** It is essential that African leaders bind together in advocating for arresting the climate change activities that are already underway. Both the North and BRIC should commit to a mandatory and quantifiable emissions cap. There is less likelihood that Copenhagen will produce such an outcome, but there are other venues of reaching such a goal. Researchers at the Harvard Project on International Climate Agreements led by Robert Stavins proposed an approach that has the potential for a meaningful outcome in Copenhagen. Mr. Stavins’ approach calls for a “Portfolio of Domestic Commitments Approach” where member countries agree to conform to climate change mitigation dictated by their domestic laws and regulations in the absence of global agreement. Capacity Building.True understanding of climate change impact and how we should respond is not an easy task by itself. Given Africa’s low capacity to adopt to this issue in terms of human capital and practical tools, African negotiators need to stress the need for institutional capacity building based on local needs.  Enhanced Adaptation**. Climate change is a reality and here to stay for the foreseeable future. All indications for Africa are increased draught, decreased areas suitable for agriculture, civil conflicts dictated by the climate change, rise of sea level and potential flooding of coastal areas. With this itinerary of a bleak picture,** African negotiators should negotiate outcomes that improve Africa’s ability to adapt based on strategies that depend on existing African strength.**Green Economy. It is true that every challenge presents an opportunity, climate change is no exception. Transition to green economy does not only address climate change, but diversifies African economy, creates jobs, and invests in human capital just to name a few.** African negotiators in Copenhagen need to be vocal about large scale clean technology transfer.

That’s key to prevent conflict

Amoako, 99

(The Economic Causes and Consequences of Civil Wars and Unrest in Africa” Address to the 70th Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, Algeria, 8 July 1999

http://www.africaeconomicanalysis.org/articles/gen/Africawarhtm.html) K. Y. Amoako, was the UN Under-Secretary-General and Executive Secretary of Economic Commission for Africa

**There continue to be common misperceptions as to what are the fundamental causes of the conflicts, which have set back national development in so many African countries.** We owe ourselves a closer look at their causes -- as well as, if you will, the determinants of peace. Various analysts in political science, anthropology and other sciences have looked at the causes of all our conflict, so perhaps it is only fair that we economists are having our turn, aided by regression analysis and other tools of our trade. At least four hypotheses have been advanced to explain why civil wars happen: The first is innate ethnic and religious hatred, where these hatreds are then exploited by ambitious leaders; The second is national grievance, where the performance of a government is held to be against the national interest; The third is distributional grievance, where government performance is held as having been particularly discriminatory against a given group or groups in society; The fourth is employment, where rebellion is an employment choice motivated by the opportunity cost of employment and the prospective gains from capturing the state and its resource base. Each one of these hypotheses has been subjected to rigorous econometric testing where appropriate proxy variables are used Fourth, polarized societies risk fracture. **Contrary to what so many analysts have said about how Africa can never be stable with so many ethnicities, the evidence is that ethnic and religious diversity is a stabilizing force.** There is a higher risk of civil wars in polarized societies (even if they are ethnically more homogeneous) than in more diverse societies. Diversity makes societies safer by reducing the probability of ethnic conflicts, as it is simply more expensive and complicated to foment trouble in diverse societies. Even if conflicts do break out in pluralistic societies, they tend to last for shorter periods, as it is harder for rebels to be cohesive. We know the results when poverty is high, natural resource endowments are not managed equitably, governments are undemocratic and societies are polarized. The results are conflicts and the costs are terrible. for the occurrence of war and for the implied explanatory variables. Since the most significant and crosscutting explanatory variables are socio-economic, let me briefly run you through some of those that deserve your attention: First, **conflict is inextricably related to poverty, particularly the lack of human capital, which influences the probability of a civil war. Poverty means that young men have no stake in staying where they are. Joining a rebel army becomes a viable employment opportunity where job markets do not incorporate youth**. Second, conflict is related to the inequitable sharing of valuable natural resources. This failure has led to a number of conflicts and exacerbated many others. And, whenever territories rich in natural resources are captured by marauding militias, these resources are most often looted, providing the private funding to continue conflict. Third, conflicts are more likely to break out where there are dysfunctional governments - characterized by weak, undemocratic economic and political institutions. There are many cases where the failure by governments to address national grievances has led to conflict and war. Clearly, civil conflict is less probable in a full democracy. The more democratic the society, the more it has outlets for frustration and ways to seek solutions. **The more governments respond to the issues people have, the lower the risk of civil war**.

Prevents escalatory proxy wars

Jeffrey **Deutsch,** Rabid Tiger Project **2001**

http://users.rcn.com/jeff-deutsch/rtn/newsletterv2n9.html

The Rabid Tiger Project believes **that a nuclear war is most likely to start in Africa. Civil wars in the Congo (the country formerly known as Zaire), Rwanda, Somalia and Sierra Leone, and domestic instability in Zimbabwe, Sudan and other countries, as well as occasional brushfire and other wars** (thanks in part to "national" borders that cut across tribal **ones) turn into a really nasty stew. We've got all too many rabid tigers and potential rabid tigers, who are willing to push the button rather than risk being seen as wishy-washy in the face of a mortal threat and overthrown**. Geopolitically speaking, Africa **is open range. Very few countries in Africa are beholden to any particular power**. South Africa is a major exception in this respect - not to mention in that she also probably already has the Bomb. **Thus, outside powers can more easily find client states there than, say, in Europe where the political lines have long since been drawn, or Asia where many of the countries (China, India, Japan) are powers unto themselves and don't need any "help," thank you. Thus, an African war can attract outside involvement very quickly**. Of course, **a proxy war alone may not induce the Great Powers to fight each other. But an African nuclear strike can ignite a much broader conflagration, if the other powers are interested in a fight. Certainly, such a strike would in the first place have been facilitated by outside hel**p - financial, scientific, engineering, etc. Africa is an ocean of troubled waters, and some people love to go fishing. **Asia is a close second, due to the competition of major powers. For example, in an Indo-Paki confrontation, China may be tempted to side with Pakistan, since China and India are major nuclear powers sharing a long border.** However, the Asian powers are basically stable internally, at least for now. **The things to watch for are domestic economic and political instability in a nuclear power, the spread of nuclear weapons to new countries and new national antagonisms and great-power ties either weak or nonexistent enough to enable opportunistic alliances and destabilization, or strong enough that the great powers feel compelled to follow their client states.**

Cap and Trade Bad-Kills Economy

Cap and trade crushes the economy-energy prices, jobs

David Kreutzer, PhD, 5-7-2009; “The Economic Impact of Cap and Trade”

Kreutzer was an economist at Berman and Company, a Washington-based public affairs firm. From 1984 to 2007, he taught economics at Madison University in Harrisonburg, Va., where he also served as Director of the International Business Program.

http://www.heritage.org/Research/Testimony/The-Economic-Impact-of-Cap-and-Trade

Why Is It So Costly? Eighty-five percent of our energy use today is based on CO2-emitting fossil fuels. The ability to switch to non-CO2-emitting energy sources over the next 20 years is limited and expensive. Therefore, significant cuts in CO2 emissions require significant cuts in energy use. The energy cuts, in turn, reduce economic activity, shrink GDP, and destroy jobs. The cap-and-trade schemes, as well as more straight-forward carbon taxes, limit emissions by making energy sufficiently more expensive that they cut their energy use. In addition to the direct impact on consumers' budgets for [**electricity**](http://www.heritage.org/Issues/Energy-and-Environment/Energy-Economics/Domestic-Energy/Electricity), gasoline, heating oil, and natural gas, these higher energy costs force cutbacks on the production side of the economy and lead to lower output, employment, and income. It is important to note that these losses occur after consumers, workers, and businesses have adjusted as well as they can to the higher energy costs. After adjusting for inflation, household energy prices will rise 29 percent above the business as usual prices, even though consumers will have switched to smaller cars, moved into more energy efficient houses, and made greater use of public transit. The lost comfort, convenience, and satisfaction of making these changes are not included in our calculation of economic impacts, though the costs would be very real. Green Stimulus? Production drops even though firms will have adopted more energy efficient technologies and processes. To reiterate, the trillions of dollars of lost GDP and the hundreds of thousands of lost [**jobs**](http://www.heritage.org/Issues/Labor/Jobs-and-Labor-Policy/Jobs) occur even after homes and businesses have made the switch to greener methods. The hoped-for green-job gain is a mirage. Attached is a copy of a page from a 1945 issue of Mechanix Illustrated. It shows a cyclist pedaling a jerry-built generator to power hair dryers in a Parisian beauty salon. Though not the sort of green job that is currently talked about, this human-powered generator illustrates why costly energy policies are not a stimulus. A person on a bicycle generator would do very well to average 150 watts of output during a day. At this level, a modern-day cyclist/generator could produce electricity worth 10-15 cents per day at retail prices. With sufficient subsidies, people could be induced to power such generators and the proponents could then point to the "green " jobs that have been "created." What is not seen is the value of the cyclists' forgone output elsewhere. Even at minimum wage, the value of the [**labor**](http://www.heritage.org/Issues/Labor/Jobs-and-Labor-Policy) is $52.40 per day. So each human-powered generator would shrink the economy by over $50 per day. This is not an economic stimulus. Alternative energy schemes that require subsidies or that require protection from competing with conventional sources of power cannot be economic stimuli--their output is worth less than their inputs. An industry whose inputs cost more than its output is making the economy smaller and will necessarily reduce overall income.

Extinction

Kerpen 8 (Phil policy director for American’s for Prosperity 08 October 28, 2008 [http://www.philkerpen.com/?q=node/201 From Panic to Depression? The dangers of blaming free trade, low taxes, and flexible labor markets)

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors — not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale.

Cap and Trade Bad-Kills Economy Ext

Cap and Trade kills the economy-germany and electricity prices

Ronald Bailey 12-17-2009 “The Green Jobs Delusion” In 1993, Bailey was the Warren T. Brookes Fellow in Environmental Journalism at the Competitive Enterprise Institute. Appeared on Nightly News, PBS' Newshour, several National Public Radio programs, and various C-SPAN programs. He has lectured at Harvard University, Yale University, Morehouse University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rutgers University, the University of Virginia, and many other places. In 2004, Bailey testified before a congressional committee on "[The Impact of Science on Public Policy](http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/archives/108/testimony/2004/ronaldbailey.htm)."

http://reason.com/archives/2009/12/17/the-green-jobs

“It’s all about the jobs,” declared U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi in her remarks at the Copenhagen climate change conference today. To hear Pelosi talk, saving the planet from climate doom is incidental to making sure Americans are employed making windmills, solar panels, electric cars, and weatherizing houses. Speaker Pelosi is heading up a 20-person congressional delegation here in Denmark, including such luminaries as Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), and Rep. Ed Markey (D-Mass.). The monikers of the latter two solons—Waxman-Markey—are shorthand for the American Clean Energy and Security Act cap-and-trade bill that passed the House last June. The bill would require the U.S. to cut its emissions of carbon dioxide by 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. Joining in the jobs theme, Rep. Markey also declared that the Waxman-Markey bill “is something that is going to create a technological revolution.” At his press conference the day before, Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), who is a co-sponsor of an energy and climate change bill in the Senate, similarly asserted, “Our bill is essentially a jobs bill.” Markey predicted that the scale of the changes sparked by congressional climate change legislation would exceed the telecommunications and Internet booms of the 1990s. So will new climate change policy spark a clean energy revolution? Given the array of government energy mandates and billions in subsidies poured into cleantech, there is no doubt that those sectors will see increased jobs. The effect on overall employment is far less clear. Cleantech energy is currently more expensive than conventional sources of energy. Many argue that the price difference simply reflects the fact that conventional sources—chiefly fossil fuels—are cheaper because no one is being forced to pay for their externalities, e.g., damaging the climate and health. Once people have to pay for their externalities through, say, a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade scheme, then renewable energy sources become more competitive. Fair enough. But either way, the price of energy is going to go up. If people and businesses are paying more for energy that means that they have less left over to buy other products and services, a fact that would tend to reduce employment downstream. Yet green energy proponents have produced reams of studies that show that carbon rationing leads to more jobs. For example, Bracken Hendricks, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, told The New York Times, “We found that you get four times the number of jobs from investing in efficiency and renewables than you get from investing in oil and natural gas.” This is largely because renewable technologies “are more local and they’re more labor-intensive.” At the Copenhagen conference, I met Nathan Ratledge, the director of the Community Office for Resource Efficiency, who confirmed Hendricks’ observation. As we rode the metro to the conference, Ratledge and I had a pleasant conversation about the great successes of Aspen, Colorado, in producing green jobs. With the financial crisis, construction jobs in Aspen disappeared. But thanks to stimulus money and tax breaks earmarked for weatherization, unemployed construction workers are now insulating houses. Tax breaks have similarly encouraged a solar power installation boom. When I asked him if solar was price competitive with conventional power without government guaranteed low interest loans and tax breaks, Ratledge admitted that it wasn’t. But he predicted that the price of Chinese solar panels was falling so fast that it would soon outcompete conventional power. I chided him that it sounded like the federal stimulus was actually creating green jobs in China. Ratledge did note one rapidly growing green sector in the U.S.: energy auditing. Of course, people and businesses wouldn’t need to hire energy auditors if the price of energy remained low or if they didn’t have to comply with new energy efficiency regulations. Other countries have tried to use energy policy to produce jobs. Germany is often cited as an example of how government policy can drive the adoption of renewable energy and produce scads of green jobs. For example, in his opening statement at a May 2009 climate change hearing, Sen. Kerry praised Germany for putting “in place strong policy mechanisms to drive investment in solar power and other renewable energy sources. As a result, renewable energy usage has tripled to 16 percent, creating 1.7 million jobs. By 2020, Germany's clean energy sector will be the biggest contributor to the nation's economy.” However, a study released in October finds that the German green job miracle is largely a mirage, and an expensive mirage at that. The report, published by the nonprofit German think tank Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI), notes that as a result of the German government's energy policies, Germany leads the world in solar panel installation and is second only to the U.S. in wind power generation. Great, right? Actually terrible, says the report. Let me quote some of the report’s sobering conclusions at length: While employment projections in the renewable sector convey seemingly impressive prospects for gross job growth, they typically obscure the broader implications for economic welfare by omitting any accounting of off-setting impacts. These impacts include, but are not limited to, job losses from crowding out of cheaper forms of conventional energy generation, indirect impacts on upstream industries, additional job losses from the drain on economic activity precipitated by higher electricity prices, private consumers’ overall loss of purchasing power due to higher electricity prices, and diverting funds from other, possibly more beneficial investment. Proponents of renewable energies often regard the requirement for more workers to produce a given amount of energy as a benefit, failing to recognize that this lowers the output potential of the economy and is hence counterproductive to net job creation. Significant research shows that initial employment benefits from renewable policies soon turn negative as additional costs are incurred. Trade and other assumptions in those studies claiming positive employment turn out to be unsupportable. In the end, Germany’s PV promotion has become a subsidization regime that, on a per-worker basis, has reached a level that far exceeds average wages, with per worker subsidies as high as 175,000 € (US $ 240,000). … Although Germany’s promotion of renewable energies is commonly portrayed in the media as setting a “shining example in providing a harvest for the world” (The Guardian 2007), we would instead regard the country’s experience as a cautionary tale of massively expensive environmental and energy policy that is devoid of economic and environmental benefits. Despite the fondest hopes of Kerry, Pelosi, Markey, and other Democrats in Congress, carbon rationing has not noticeably sparked a technological revolution in Europe yet. One might argue that a cleantech takeoff is just around the corner and that the energy revolution is just at the same stage as the Internet revolution was in 1991. Maybe. But the Internet analogy deployed by Kerry and co. misses the mark in another way—the Internet and cell phone boom took off as a result of deregulation and was largely financed by private capital. By contrast, the Capitol Hill denizens now haunting the Copenhagen conference imagine they can spark a similar technological revolution by passing a massive 1,400-page bill, laden with subsidies, tax breaks, and fine-grained regulations for all aspects of energy production. It might just be necessary to impose carbon rationing and boost energy prices in order to avoid possibly disastrous consequences of manmade global warming, but doing so will increase unemployment rather than lower it. When Congress tries to pass climate change legislation next spring, Speaker Pelosi may well find out that it really is “all about the jobs.”

Cap and Trade Increases Emissions

Cap and Trade Increases Emissions-Remove the Stigma from CO2

CSM 08 “Why Cap and Trade Could Backfire”,

http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2008/0716/p09s02-coop.html

**Environmentalists claim that** capping greenhouse-gas emissions and creating a market for emissions trading – a policy prescription called "**cap-and-trade"** – **would reduce carbon dioxide output and with it the risk of global warming. But it could achieve the opposite**. Here's **how: By turning carbon emissions into commodities that can be bought and sold, cap-and-trade policies could remove the stigma from producing such emissions**. In the late 1990s, Israeli researchers Uri Gneezy and Aldo Rustichini performed an experiment that provides a useful model. They chose six random day-care centers in Haifa at which parents sometimes arrived late to pick up their children. Intending to reduce the frequency of tardiness, the two imposed a fine on late parents. Mr. Gneezy and Mr. Rustichini explain that, typically, "when negative consequences are imposed on a behavior, they will produce a reduction of that particular response." But the experiment did not produce the anticipated results. Instead, the incidence of late arrivals increased. In fact, the percentage of parents who were late more than doubled. Behavioral law and economics help explain this counterintuitive result. Prior to the imposition of the fine, parents – recognizing it is wrong to make a teacher stay past normal hours with their children – experienced feelings of guilt and shame when they were late. In other words, some parents were motivated to arrive on time by the stigma attached to arriving late. Imposing the fine reduced the stigma. **The fine created a good, and a market where none previously existed. Parents were no longer "arriving late," but rather, purchasing extra child-care hours. A similar situation could occur under a cap-and-trade regime**. Under cap-and-trade rules, **the government places an artificial cap on the amount of carbon each regulated facility may emi**t. Facilities producing more carbon than they are allowed are required to purchase additional credits to make up the difference. The opportunity to purchase these credits creates a market where none previously existed. As in the example of the fined parents, the purchase of the right to emit greenhouse gases would likely reduce any stigma associated with doing so. Emission levels, consequently, could rise. This phenomenon is already seen on an individual level. Al Gore says the risk of catastrophic global warming is so great that Americans should act immediately to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Yet his home uses 20 times more energy than the average American home, according to the Tennessee Center for Policy Research. That's OK, the former vice president assures us, because he purchases offsets to ensure that he lives a carbon-neutral lifestyle. His message – albeit unintentional – is simple: Produce carbon to your heart's content; just pay a carbon broker to "neutralize" your carbon footprint and your guilt. If Mr. Gore could not purchase offsets, would he feel more pressure to reduce his energy use? The likely answer is "yes." Columnist Charles Krauthammer explains in Time magazine that "purchasing carbon credits is an incentive to burn even more fossil fuels, since now it is done under the illusion that it's really cost free to the atmosphere." Perhaps that helps explain why most European nations have increased their carbon emissions since adopting the Kyoto global-warming treaty in 1997. **By most accounts, the European Union's cap-and-trade system isn't working. In its first year of operation (2005-06), emissions covered by the trading scheme rose 0.8 percent**. During the same time, according to the Energy Information Agency, emissions in the US – which hasn't ratified the Kyoto Protocol or adopted a cap-and-trade system – dropped 1.8 percent. Samuel Bowles, a professor at the Santa Fe Institute, has noted that "[p]olicies designed to harness self-regarding preferences to public ends may be counterproductive. These failures occur when conventional self-interest-based policies compromise the beneficial effects of intrinsic motivation and ... a desire to uphold social norms**." The social stigma of carbon emissions grows stronger each day. As this stigma grows, companies are increasing their investments into research and technologies to reduce and store carbon. If Congress removes the stigma associated with these emissions by assigning a price to them, it may not like the results.**

Cap and Trade Increases Emissions

Waxman Markey crushes the EPA’s ability to regulate greenhouse gases and investment capital in alternative energy

FOE 6-24-2009; “Waxman-Markey Strips EPA of Clean Air Act Authority to Fight Global Warming”, Friends of the Earth International, Friends of the Earth and our network of grassroots groups in 77 countries defend the environment and champion a more healthy and just world. Friends of the Earth is led by Erich Pica, a leading expert on how federal tax dollars subsidize pollution,

Many concerns have been raised about the ability of the Waxman-Markey bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as quickly as necessary or to the level necessary to protect our climate. Yet, the Waxman-Markey bill would lock the U.S. into the new, flawed system it creates, taking away almost all of the EPA’s existing authority to reduce greenhouse gas pollution under the Clean Air Act. Specifically, the Waxman-Markey bill prohibits any greenhouse gas, including CO2, from being listed as a "criteria pollutant"2 or a "hazardous air pollutant"3 on the basis of its effect on climate change. The bill does not permit greenhouse gases to trigger New Source Review,4 nor affect the granting of a permit to operate under Title V5 of the Clean Air Act. The EPA is further prohibited from regulating greenhouse gas emissions as international air pollutants6 or setting technology-based standards for any capped sources7. What all of this language means is that if the Waxman-Markey bill passes, the EPA’s hands will be tied and it will not effectively be able to use the Clean Air Act to reduce global warming pollution. Consequences of Elimination of EPA Authority This policy choice to strip the EPA of authority to reduce greenhouse gas pollution has a number of negative implications; foremost among them is that, as currently constituted, the Waxman-Markey bill is likely to undermine investment in technology development. First, it undermines the certainty of regulation associated with the Clean Air Act, which has been a significant technology driver in the past. Second, it allows use of offsets until approximately 2030, putting off any need for immediate investment in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If industry does not begin to invest in new technology now, we are likely to find ourselves approaching 2030 with no hope of achieving needed reductions. Further, the Waxman-Markey bill lacks significant penalties for corporations that violate it, in contrast to the Clean Air Act. As a result, regulated entities will be less driven to find solutions or may simply find it cheaper to pay penalties than to invest in new technologies. A second major drawback of eliminating the EPA’s ability to regulate greenhouse gas emissions is that, if the market system the Waxman-Markey bill puts in place proves unworkable, or is delayed by a series of problems such as has been experienced by Europe’s greenhouse gas trading system, the EPA will not be allowed to step into the breach. Similarly, if climatic conditions change, and significantly greater reductions are necessary in a shorter amount of time, it will be difficult to revise the Waxman-Markey bill to the degree necessary or as quickly as necessary to protect our climate. Given the difficulty in passing a strong cap and trade bill despite our current Democratic majority, a supportive president, and a mandate for change from the public, it must be acknowledged that fixing a failed bill, let alone requiring more stringent future reductions, may be a pipe dream. The authors themselves have stated that that passage of this bill, now, is critical, because the chances of doing so in the future are low. If history is a guide, the frustrating inability to increase fuel efficiency standards for vehicles for more than thirty years, despite the acknowledged need to do so, should caution Congress not to lock us into a potentially failed system or take away the tools necessary to make critical mid-course adjustments. In the fuel economy example, a single important industry opposed to improvements was able to grind the wheels of progress to a standstill. In the case of climate legislation, with every major industry subject to the Waxman-Markey standards, any future improvement of the bill could be a long-shot indeed. Finally, removing the EPA’s authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act means that the EPA will not be able to put in place any early action measures. This is a missed opportunity to put quick and relatively cheap requirements in place to immediately reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Cap and Trade Bad-Chemical Industry

The next year will redefine the chemical industry-its resurging but recovery is uncertain

REUTERS 2009 (Ernest Scheyder, “ANALYSIS - Chemical industry upbeat but cautious on 2010,” Dec 21, <http://in.reuters.com/article/idINIndia-44885420091221>)

**The next 12 months hold much opportunity for** investors in **the U.S. chemical industry as it**s members **hope to ride a wave of cautious economic optimism and** capitalize on **growing consumer confidence.** After two years of frenzied stock swings, debt downgrades, and slumping revenue and profit, some of the industry's biggest players are charily confident that a long-awaited economic uptick is coming next year. While in 2008 and 2009 consumers eschewed many of the products made from chemicals, including automobiles and electronics, **analysts expect 2010 to bring a resurgent economy and shopper**. "**History tells us that the best time to (become) a chemical investor is in the depth of a trough**," Alembic Global Advisors **analyst** Hassan **Ahmed said**. Indeed, despite jumping more than 50 percent so far in 2009, the Dow Jones U.S. Chemicals index is still about 30 percent off an all-time high touched in 2008. Commodity **chemical makers are** generally seen as **good investments as recessions** begin to **abate because demand begins to rise for plastics, clothing and other basic items that their products they go into**. As a full-blown recovery emerges, **specialty chemicals** -- which go into electronics, adhesives and other high-technology products -- **are** generally seen as **places for investors to shift their funds as discretionary income returns**. Huntsman, Solutia and Cabot are among the larger specialty chemical makers, while Air Products and Chemicals, Praxair and Eastman Chemical are some of the bigger commodity chemicals makers. Investors often prefer companies with a mix of both commodity and specialty chemicals, such as Dow Chemical and DuPont. Few chemical companies provide specific financial forecasts. But DuPont says it expects earnings to grow by at least 7.7 percent in 2010, and Dow bullishly told investors last month that its profit could start to jump next year and increase more than six times by 2012. CONSERVING CASH, BUILDING MARGINS **After coming through a tough recession, many chemical companies will spend carefully in 2010, and most have stated they will work to cut costs next year**. But fast-growing markets like the Middle East will probably still see a lot of capital expenditure dollars. Dow Chemical, for instance, is busy building the Ras Tanura refinery in Saudi Arabia, but the chemical giant is unlikely to spend more money in the United States in 2010, industry observers say. **Prices for chemicals probably will not rise in 2010 due in part to excess capacity and relatively low energy prices.** That is not the best news for an industry focused largely on cash generation and retention. But low prices also encourage consumers to buy more, and those companies with excess capacity would have the ability to take market share when the economy recovers. In the past 18 months, **chemical prices did not drop as much as energy costs, which helped the industry's margins hold steady or improve slightly in 2009**. Cost cuts should continue in 2010, but not at the same pace as 2008 and 2009. Many in the industry have laid off thousands of workers and are working to shed billions of dollars from their cost structure. "As long as we don't see a big spike in raw material (costs) ... I do think you're going to see margin expansion in 2010," Credit Suisse analyst John McNulty said. Margins may also benefit if chemical makers close some of their U.S. plants, whose average age is about 30 years, since it takes a lot of maintain those inefficient facilities. ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL **The chemical industry** is worried that it **could suffer from pending U.S. climate change legislation**, although many of its members support doing something about global warming. While the legislation has yet to be finalized, chemical makers are worried **they could be penalized just for using carbon, rather than emitting it.** For instance, **chemical companies use natural gas to make plastic, but the carbon in the natural gas is locked into the plastic, not emitted into the atmosphere. If the industry is charged merely for using the carbon, it would substantially boost costs.**

Cap and Trade Kills the Chemical Industry

Loris 2009 (Nicolas, Research Assistant at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, studies energy, environment and regulation issues, “Waxman Markey Cap and Trade’s Biggest Losers: Chemical Plants and Chemicals,” June 25, http://blog.heritage.org/2009/06/25/waxman-markey-cap-and-trades-biggest-losers-chemical-plants-and-chemicals/)

**This is a problem for** proponents of **cap and trade, because the chemicals industry is one of the most energy-intensive industries in the U**nited **S**tates. **Since cap and trade artificially drives up the price of energy by taxing the use of carbon-emitting fossil fuels, the news is grim for** Congressman Green’s **chemical plants**. **According to The Heritage Foundation analysis of** the Waxman-Markey **cap and trade** bill, **over the 2012-2035 timeline, chemical industry job losses average over 25,000. By 2035**, a projected **47,800 jobs** are lost below the baseline – without a cap and trade bill. **There will be 32,000 fewer jobs when the emissions reductions commence in 2012.Cap and trade isn’t good for** Congressman Gene Green’s district – or **any** Member’s **district**, for that matter. This is the definition of mutually exclusive.

That’s the only scenario for surviving this century

Baum 99 – editor-in-chief of the American Chemical Society's Chemical and Engineering News [Rudy M. Baum, C&E News, “Millennium Special Report,” 12-6-99, http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html]

The pace of change in today's world is truly incomprehensible. Science is advancing on all fronts, particularly chemistry and biology working together as they never have before to understand life in general and human beings in particular at a breathtaking pace**.** Technology ranging from computers and the Internet to medical devices to genetic engineering to nanotechnology is transforming our world and our existence in it. It is, in fact, a fool's mission to predict where science and technology will take us in the coming decade, let alone the coming century. We can say with finality only this: We don't know.  We do know, however, that we face enormous challenges, we 6 billion humans who now inhabit Earth. In its 1998 revision of world population estimates and projections, the United Nations anticipates a world population in 2050 of 7.3 billion to 10.7 billion,with a "medium-fertility projection," considered the most likely, indicating a world population of 8.9 billion people in 2050. According to the UN, fertility now stands at 2.7 births per woman, down from 5 births per woman in the early 1950s. And fertility rates are declining in all regions of the world. That's good news.  But people are living a lot longer. That is certainly good news for the individuals who are living longer, but it also poses challenges for health care and social services the world over. The 1998 UN report estimates for the first time the number of octogenarians, nonagenarians, and centenarians living today and projected for 2050. The numbers are startling. In 1998, 66 million people were aged 80 or older, about one of every 100 persons. That number is expected to increase sixfold by 2050 to reach 370 million people, or one in every 24 persons. By 2050, more than 2.2 million people will be 100 years old or older!  **Here is the fundamental challenge we face: The world's growing and aging population must be fed and clothed and housed and transported in ways that do not perpetuate the environmental devastation wrought by the first waves of industrialization** of the 19th and 20th centuries. As we increase our output of goods and services, as we increase our consumption of energy, as we meet the imperative of raising the standard of living for the poorest among us, we must learn to carry out our economic activities sustainably.  There are optimists out there, C&EN readers among them, who believe that the history of civilization is a long string of technological triumphs of humans over the limits of nature. In this view, the idea of a "carrying capacity" for Earth—a limit to the number of humans Earth's resources can support—is a fiction because technological advances will continuously obviate previously perceived limits. This view has historical merit. Dire predictions made in the 1960s about the exhaustion of resources ranging from petroleum to chromium to fresh water by the end of the 1980s or 1990s have proven utterly wrong.  While I do not count myself as one of the technological pessimists who see technology as a mixed blessing at best and an unmitigated evil at worst, I do not count myself among the technological optimists either. **There are environmental challenges of transcendent complexity that I fear may overcome us and our Earth before technological progress can come to our rescue. Global climate change, the accelerating destruction of terrestrial and oceanic habitats, the catastrophic loss of species across the plant and animal kingdoms—these are problems that are not obviously amenable to straightforward technological solutions.**  But I know this, too: **Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium.**  Chemists, **chemistry, and the chemical industry**—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—**will play central roles in addressing these challenges**. The first section of this Special Report is a series called [**"Millennial Musings"**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749muse1.html) in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry.  The five essays that follow explore **the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century.** The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to humanity's future.  The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the [**chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production.**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749sustain.html) Although it is not well known to the general public, **the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero.** Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities.  This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va.  **Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences.** Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. **It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies**. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in [**feeding the world's population**](https://mail.kinkaid.org/Redirect/pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749food.html) in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food.

Cap and Trade Bad-Protectionism

Cap and Trade causes protectionism and collapses global free trade

Feldstein 6-25-2009; Martin Feldstein, Professor of Economics at Harvard, was Chairman of President Ronald Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors, and is former President of the National Bureau for Economic Research.

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/feldstein11/English>

There is a serious danger that the international adoption of cap-and-trade legislation to limit carbon-dioxide emissions will trigger a new round of protectionist measures. While aimed at reducing long-term environmental damage, cap-and-trade policies could produce significant harmful economic effects in the near term that would continue into the future. Scientific evidence appears to indicate that the accumulation of CO2 in the atmosphere from the burning of fossil fuels (primarily coal, oil, and natural gas) – mainly in electricity production, transportation, and various industrial processes – contributes to gradual global warming, with long-term adverse effects on living conditions around the world. It is with this in mind that representatives of more than 150 countries are scheduled to meet in Copenhagen in December to discuss ways to reduce CO2 emissions. A common suggestion is to impose a tax on all CO2 emissions, which would be levied on companies that emit CO2 in production, or that sell products like gasoline that cause CO2 emissions when used. Such a tax would cause electricity companies and industrial firms to adopt techniques that reduce their CO2 emissions, as long as the cost of doing so is less than the tax that they would otherwise have to pay. The higher cost of production incurred to reduce emissions – and of any emissions tax still due – would, of course, be included in the price charged to consumers. Consumers would respond to the tax-induced increase in the cost of the emissions-intensive products by reducing their consumption of those goods and services in favor of goods and services that create smaller amounts of CO2 emissions. A carbon tax causes each firm and household to respond to the same cost of adding CO2 to the atmosphere. That uniform individual cost incentive allows total CO2 to be reduced at a lower total cost than would be achieved by a variety of administrative requirements, such as automobile mileage standards, production technology standards (e.g., minimum renewable fuel inputs in electricity generation), etc. Yet we do not see carbon taxes being adopted. Although governments levy taxes on gasoline, they are reluctant to impose a general carbon tax because of public opposition to any form of taxation. Governments have therefore focused on a cap-and-trade system as a way of increasing the cost of CO2-intensive products without explicitly imposing a tax. In a cap-and-trade system, the government sets total allowable national emissions of CO2 per year and requires any firm that causes CO2 emissions to have a permit per ton of CO2 emitted. If the government sells these permits in an auction, the price of the permit would be a cost to the firm in the same way as a carbon tax – and with the same resulting increases in consumer prices. The cap-and-trade system thus imposes a carbon tax without having to admit that it is really a tax. A cap-and-trade system can cause serious risks to international trade. Even if every country has a cap-and-trade system and all aim at the same relative reduction in national CO2 emissions, the resulting permit prices will differ because of national differences in initial CO2 levels and in domestic production characteristics. Because the price of the CO2 permits in a country is reflected in the prices of its products, the cap-and-trade system affects its international competitiveness. When the permit prices become large enough to have a significant effect on CO2 emissions, there will be political pressure to introduce tariffs on imports that offset the advantage of countries with low permit prices. Such offsetting tariffs would have to differ among products (being higher on more CO2-intensive products) and among countries (being higher for countries with low permit prices). Such a system of complex differential tariffs is just the kind of protectionism that governments have been working to eliminate since the start of the GATT process more than 50 years ago. Worse still, cap-and-trade systems in practice do not rely solely on auctions to distribute the emissions permits. The plan working its way through the United States Congress (the Waxman-Markey bill) would initially give away 85% of the permits, impose a complex set of regulatory policies, and allow companies to buy CO2 offsets (e.g., by paying for the planting of trees) instead of reducing their emissions or buying permits. Such complexities make it impossible to compare the impact of CO2 policies among countries, which in turn would invite those who want to protect domestic jobs to argue for higher tariff levels. There is no easy answer to this problem. But before rushing to impose tariffs, it is important to remember that cap-and-trade policies would not be the only government source of differences in competitiveness. Better roads, ports, and even schools all contribute to a country’s competitiveness. No one attempts to use tariffs to balance those government-created differences in competitiveness, and there should be no such attempts if a cap-and-trade system is introduced. If an international agreement to impose a cap-and-trade scheme is adopted in Copenhagen, the countries there should agree as well that there will be no attempt to introduce offsetting tariffs that would ultimately threaten our global system of free trade.

Trade wars go nuclear

Michael Spicer, economist and member, Tory Party, British Parliament, The Challenge from the East and the Rebirth of the West, 1996, p. 121.

The choice facing the West today is much the same as that which faced the Soviet bloc after World War II: between meeting head-on the challenge of world trade with the adjustments and the benefits that it will bring, or of attempting to shut out markets that are growing and where a dynamic new pace is being set for innovative production. The problem about the second approach is not simply that it won't hold: satellite technology alone will ensure that the consumers will begin to demand those goods that the East is able to provide most cheaply. More fundamentally, it will guarantee the emergence of a fragmented world in which natural fears will be fanned and inflamed. A world divided into rigid trade blocs will be a deeply troubled and unstable place in which suspicion and ultimately envy will possibly erupt into a major war. I do not say that the converse will necessarily be true, that in a free trading world there will be an absence of all strife. Such a proposition would manifestly be absurd. But to trade is to become interdependent, and that is a good step in the direction of world stability. With nuclear weapons at two a penny, stability will be at a premium in the years ahead.

Cap and Trade Bad-Agriculture

Copenhagen Bad-kills U.S. agriculture forces farm consolidation

**THORNING** (American Council for Capital Formation, Center for policy Research) 12/13/**99** [Margo, “How Climate Change Policy Could Shrink the Federal Budget Surplus and Stifle US Economic Growth,” Oil & Gas Journal, p. 22, LOW NOW

**US agriculture would also lose competitiveness if the US were to comply with the Kyoto Protocol.** A study based on the DRI model by Terry Francl of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Richard Nadler of K. C. Jones Monthly, and Joseph Bast of the Heartland Institute (FNB), predicts that implementation of the protocol would cause higher fuel oil, motor oil, fertilizer, and other farm operating costs (Francl, Nadler, and Bast 1999). **This would mean higher consumer food prices and greater demand for public assistance with higher costs. In addition, by increasing the energy costs of farm production in America while leaving them unchanged in developing countries, the Kyoto Protocol would cause US food exports to decline and imports to rise. Reduced efficiency of the world food system could add to a political backlash against free-trade policies at home and abroa**d. Further, the higher energy costs, notes the FNB analysis, together with the reduced domestic and export demand, **could lead to a very severe decline in investment in agriculture and a sharp increase in farm consolidation. Small farm numbers likely would decline much more rapidly than under baseline conditions, while investment even in larger commercial farms likely would stagnate or decline.** The FNB analysis, which concludes that US agriculture would be adversely affected by the Kyoto Protocol, stands in sharp contrast with the May 1999 report by **the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), which finds that the Kyoto Protocol would have "relatively modest" impacts on US agriculture. The USDA report is seriously flawed for two reasons, according to a new analysis by Francl. First, the USDA report relies on the unrealistic assumptions about the impact of the Kyoto Protocol on energy prices** contained in the administration's 1998 CEA analysis. Second, the USDA report makes the heroic assumption that US farmers will have unrestricted access to carbon credit trading (Francl 1999).

Collapse of U.S. Ag makes extinction inevitable

Lugar, 4 – U.S. Senator (Richard, <http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html>)

**In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril.** **One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is** not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also **world peace and security.** History tells us that **states** may **go to war over access to resources**, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. **Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of** **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, **the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels.** People in rapidly **developing nations will** have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will **raise demand for feed grain** at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: **developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations.** As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe.   Productivity revolution  **To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years**, we in **the** **U**nited **S**tates **will have to grow** roughly **three times more food on the land we have.** That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course **there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more** in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. **The** **U**nited **S**tates **can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.**

Warming Legislation Bad – Doesn’t Solve / Competitiveness

Warming legislation doesn’t solve – triggers offshoring of domestic industry and collapses manufacturing competitiveness

Holecek 8

Andrea, The Times, New environmental policy could hurt steelmakers, manufacturing,” http://nwi.com/articles/2008/11/07/business/business/docd02314e7dc222413862574f900781cbf.txt

President-Elect Barack Obama's reported plan to implement a cap-and-trade policy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions could make the integrated steel industry noncompetitive, according to a noted steel analyst. Charles Bradford, president of New York-based Bradford Research Inc./Soleil Securities, said a cap-and-trade policy could put Northwest Indiana's large steelmakers out of business because of its high cost. The Alliance to Save Energy and other environmental organization are urging the president-elect to make good on his campaign promises to focus on energy efficiency, including a economy-wide cap-and-trade program, as a key solution to the nation’s energy, economic, and environmental challenges. "He (Obama) wants cap and trade where people have to pay for their carbon emissions," Bradford said. "Integrated steelmakers put out three times more carbon emissions than the minimills." Integrated steelmakers, such as U.S. Steel Corp. and ArcelorMittal, produce steel using a two-step process, first by heating a combination of iron ore, coke and limestone in blast furnaces to produce pig iron, which is then made into steel in basic oxygen furnaces. Minimills melt steel scrap metal in electric furnaces to produce steel. Bradford said the integrated companies currently are losing their competitiveness. "In the summer they (integrateds) were the low cost producers because the price of prime scrap was $878 a ton, now its $133 a ton," he said. "At the same time (the integrateds) steelmaking costs are $600 or closer to $700 a ton. The minimills are under $300 (per ton) when you add conversion costs." However, because minimills use considerably more electricity than integrated steelmakers, their costs could rise if energy production would become more expensive under a cap and trade policy. U.S. Steel Corp. spokesman John Armstrong, wouldn't comment on competitiveness issues between U.S. steelmakers. U.S. Steel's concern is that any U.S. carbon reduction program could put U.S. manufacturing as a whole at a disadvantage in the global marketplace and force manufacturing offshore, he said. "Our biggest concern about (carbon dioxide) reduction schemes is that unless developing countries are held to the same standards, industry will go offshore," Armstrong said. "One of the ultimate paradoxes is that it would increase rather than decrease (carbon dioxide) emissions because developing countries don't have the same efficiencies in production of electricity, and don't would have stringent emission requirements and could generate more (carbon dioxide)." Nancy Gravatt, spokeswoman for the American Iron and Steel Institute, said the steel industry is "very energy intense and its processes involve carbon. "It's part of the process so its obviously a major concern as to what type of legislative approach will be taken for carbon reduction," she said Global manufacturing competitiveness is a big concern, Gravatt said. "Coming into office in an economy in financial crisis, President-elect Obama would have to take U.S. manufacturing competitiveness into consideration as he evaluates climate policy," she said. The steel industry has advanced a global steel sectorial approach to a policy on climate change, Gravatt said. "It would be approach that holds foreign manufacturers to comparable standards so U.S. jobs stay in America," she said. "It would be more be more harmful to the environment if U.S. manufacturers migrate to foreign lands where they won't have to deal with U.S. emissions standards."