## Aff answers

### Solvency

#### Clean energy doesn’t solve for emissions

Hessman 3/21 (Kristy Hessman, writer about warming, 21 March 2012, “More Clean Energy Doesn’t Mean Less Dirty Energy”, <http://www.earthtechling.com/2012/03/why-more-clean-energy-dont-mean-less-dirty-energy/> SC)

We like to assume that producing a new megawatt-hour of electricity from wind means we’ve eliminated a megawatt-hour of fossil-fuel produced electricity. But it doesn’t usually work that way, according to University of Oregon sociologist Richard York, and that’s why he believes it will take economic and political changes—not just cool new clean technology—to shift us away from our dependence on fossil fuels. York makes that argument in a paper recently published in the journal Natural Climate Change. He says that while most countries are relying on technological advances, like wind and hydro power, to limit the use of fossil fuels, this approach ignores the “complexity of human behavior.” He says that the addition of such renewable energy technology is doing little to actually displace the use of fossil fuels. York’s conclusions are based on studying electricity use in 130 countries in the past 50 years. He found it took more than 10 units of electricity produced from non-fossil sources, such as nuclear, hydropower, geothermal, wind, biomass and solar, to displace a single unit of fossil fuel-generated electricity. Take nuclear power: It began growing into a significant source of power beginning in the mid-20th century, but world use of fossil fuels kept right on growing with it. He fears the same thing could happen with wind, solar and other green power sources. “I’m not saying that, in principle, we can’t have displacement with these new technologies, but it is interesting that so far it has not happened,” York said in a statement. “One reason the results seem surprising is that we, as societies, tend to see demand as an exogenous thing that generates supply, but supply also generates demand. Generating electricity creates the potential to use that energy, so creating new energy technologies often leads to yet more energy consumption.” York concludes that we need to not just be looking to technology for changes, but to think about the technology in a social context. He said society needs to discover what political and economic factors lead to true displacement of fossil fuels. “We need to be thinking about suppressing fossil fuel use rather than just coming up with alternatives alone,” he said.

### Politics

#### The public doesn’t care about warming- the CP is unpopular

Laskowski 10 (Tara Laskowski, PhD, writer for George Mason University, 27 Jan 2010, “American Opinion Cools on Global Warming”,

http://eagle.gmu.edu/newsroom/794/ SC)

Public concern about global warming has dropped sharply since the fall of 2008, according to the results of a national survey released today by researchers at Yale and George Mason universities. The survey found: • Only 50 percent of Americans now say they are “somewhat” or “very worried” about global warming, a 13-point decrease. • The percentage of Americans who think global warming is happening has declined 14 points, to 57 percent. • The percentage of Americans who think global warming is caused mostly by human activities dropped 10 points, to 47 percent. In line with these shifting beliefs, there has been an increase in the number of Americans who think global warming will never harm people in the United States or elsewhere or other species. “Despite growing scientific evidence that global warming will have serious impacts worldwide, public opinion is moving in the opposite direction,” said Anthony Leiserowitz, director of the Yale Project on Climate Change. “Over the past year the United States has experienced rising unemployment, public frustration with Washington and a divisive health care debate, largely pushing climate change out of the news. Meanwhile, a set of emails stolen from climate scientists and used by critics to allege scientific misconduct may have contributed to an erosion of public trust in climate science.” The survey also found lower public trust in a variety of institutions and leaders, including scientists. For example, Americans’ trust in the mainstream news media as a reliable source of information about global warming declined by 11 percentage points, television weather reporters by 10 points and scientists by 8 points. They also distrust leaders on both sides of the political fence. Sixty-five percent distrust Republicans Arnold Schwarzenegger and Sarah Palin as sources of information, while 53 percent distrust former Democratic Vice President Al Gore and 49 percent distrust President Barack Obama. Finally, Americans who believe that most scientists think global warming is happening decreased 13 points, to 34 percent, while 40 percent of the public now believes there is a lot of disagreement among scientists over whether global warming is happening or not. “The scientific evidence is clear that climate change is real, human-caused and a serious threat to communities across America,” said Edward Maibach, director of the Center for Climate Change Communication at George Mason University. “The erosion in both public concern and public trust about global warming should be a clarion call for people and organizations trying to educate the public about this important issue.” The results come from a nationally representative survey of 1,001 American adults, age 18 and older. The sample was weighted to correspond with U.S. Census Bureau parameters. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3 percent, with 95 percent confidence. The survey was designed by researchers at Yale and George Mason Universities and conducted from December 23, 2009, to January 3, 2010 by Knowledge Networks using an online research panel of American adults.

#### The public cares the least about warming- the CP is a waste of time

Saad 11 (Lydia Saad, 28 March 2011, “Water Issues Worry Americans Most, Global Warming Least”, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/146810/Water-Issues-Worry-Americans-Global-Warming-Least.aspx> SC)

PRINCETON, NJ -- With Earth Day about a month away, Americans tell Gallup they worry the most about several water-related risks and issues among nine major environmental issues. They worry least about global warming and loss of open spaces. At least three in four Americans surveyed in Gallup's 2011 Environment poll say they worry a great deal or a fair amount about contamination of soil and water by toxic waste, pollution of rivers, lakes, and reservoirs, pollution of drinking water, and the maintenance of the nation's supply of fresh water for household needs. Air pollution is nearly as high a concern for Americans, with 72% worried a great deal or a fair amount about it. A little more than 6 in 10 worry about the related problems of extinction of plant and animal species and the loss of tropical rain forests. Slightly fewer worry about urban sprawl and loss of open spaces, while barely half, 51%, worry about global warming. The poll was conducted March 3-6, prior to the emergence of an earthquake- and tsunami-generated nuclear crisis in Japan that has raised Americans' own concerns about nuclear power. The current levels of public concern about various environmental problems are essentially unchanged from 2010. However, Americans are less worried today than they were 10 years ago about all eight issues Gallup measured in 2001. The decline over the past decade spans a period when the public often expressed surging concern about terrorism, the Iraq war, gas prices, and the economy. Bottom Line Although the United States has experienced nothing like the mass drinking-water scare that is gripping Japan during its current nuclear crisis, Americans largely recognize the importance of clean water to their lives. All four environmental issues referring to "water" in this year's Gallup Environment poll rank in the upper tier of environmental concerns, with air pollution a close fifth. Perhaps not surprisingly, there is a slightly steeper drop-off in concern about several issues that aren't directly related to daily survival, such as the loss of tropical rain forests and urban sprawl. What may surprise some, given the broad exposure the issue has received in recent years, is that global warming ranks lowest -- consistent with other Gallup polling -- with barely half of Americans concerned and 48% only a little or not at all concerned.

#### EPA regulations are unpopular

Koch 11 (Wendy Koch, reporter for the USA Today, 4 Nov 2011 “Surprised? EPA issues unpopular news on Fridays”, http://content.usatoday.com/communities/greenhouse/post/2011/11/epa-declares-regs-on-fridays/1#.UArup7TY8Ss SC)

Since today is TGIF, it may be just the day for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to release news its critics won't like -- say new regulations on business. That's the finding of a new study that looked at 21,493 EPA press releases from 1994 to 2009. Researchers at the nonpartisan, research group, Resources for the Future, found that the EPA's news of enforcement actions or regulatory changes were issued more often on Fridays and before holidays, when they had the least impact on media coverage or financial markets. Veteran reporters could have told them that. It's almost a time-honored tradition in Washington, regardless of political party, for policymakers to release news they want coverage of earlier in the week and bury items they don't want covered on Friday afternoons or right before holidays. It's not just the EPA. When did the State Department issue its final, voluminous environmental review saying the controversial Keystone oil pipeline from Canada to the Gulf Coast would have no significant adverse impacts? You guessed, Friday (Aug. 26.) FOLLOW: Green House on Twitter In the late 1990s, when I covered gun control in Congress, I remember literally turning out the lights in the Senate press gallery (along with former USA TODAY reporter Kathy Kiely) at 2:30 a.m. Friday after the chamber cast a vote that many lawmakers knew would not be popular in their districts. "Announcements of (EPA) violations early in the week, rather than on Friday, would probably be more effective at getting attention," said Lucija Muehlenbachs, a co-author of the new study. Exactly!

### Politics and Solvency

#### EPA regulations are super unpopular and kill jobs and the economy with little improvement in climate

Hutchison 11 (Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas), serves on the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, 4 Feb 2011, “EPA rules: Bad policy, bad time”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0211/48783.html#ixzz21HX9OZ7F> SC)

Since late last year, the Environmental Protection Agency has been rolling out new federal climate regulations that would have the same effects as the job-destroying cap-and-trade policy that Congress rejected last year. EPA has seized control over parts of several state air programs, empowering the agency to run them federally. EPA has also signaled that additional burdensome regulations are on the horizon. Implementation of these new rules would have devastating economic consequences for families and employers, send U.S. jobs overseas even as unemployment continues to hover above 9 percent and impose federal edicts on states. This is the wrong policy at the worst time, and I plan to fight these overbearing regulations. One of the administration’s key agenda items during the 111th Congress was passing cap-and-trade legislation. The goal was to purposely increase the price of traditional forms of carbon-based energy — such as coal, gas and oil — so that consumers would respond by using less. This misguided proposal passed the House by a narrow margin. The Senate, however, refused to consider a bill that would financially burden Americans and crush energy-dependent jobs. So the cap-and-trade proposal effectively died in that Congress. Now EPA is bypassing Congress with its own backdoor climate regulations, sending the clear message that it intends to impose the cap-and-trade program on Americans — one way or another. EPA’s backdoor climate regulations are likely to drive up the cost of energy in America. And everyone pays. Families, commuters, truckers, farmers and fliers — who now face gas and diesel prices that are significantly higher than last year — are likely to be hit even harder with steep energy costs. Employers are also likely to shoulder the burden of rising energy expenses — especially manufacturers and producers of energy-intensive products such as glass, steel, cement and transportation fuels. In response, they may be forced to lay off workers and pass on the higher costs to consumers. Farmers, confronted with higher production costs from more expensive fuel, could also face costly new regulations on livestock and dairy production, increasing food prices for our families. The terrible irony is that none of EPA’s planned actions are likely to have any impact on world temperatures. Greenhouse gas emissions are a worldwide issue, with China now emitting more than the United States. EPA scientists confirm that if the United States acts alone, without similar steps by other countries, like China, that refuse to curb their carbon output, it will produce no measurable change in world temperatures. Essentially, EPA wants to threaten our nation with millions of lost U.S. jobs and trillions of dollars in higher costs for the American people — in exchange for absolutely no improvement in the climate. There is wide opposition to EPA’s regulatory power grab. We must put the Obama administration on notice that we will exhaust all options to protect Americans from costly new EPA climate regulations in the 112th Congress. I intend to support a number of the legislative efforts planned by my colleagues to thwart these actions. I look forward to the work of Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.), the ranking member on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, and Rep. Fred Upton (R-Mich.), the House Energy and Commerce Committee chairman, as well as that of Sen. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.), which I also intend to support. I also appreciate the efforts of Sen. John Rockefeller (D-W.Va.), the Senate Commerce Committee chairman, to delay the regulations so their full impact can be assessed. I, too, stand ready to protect the American people from this threat. If bills to stop EPA climate regulations in the House and Senate this spring do not succeed, I plan to pursue a similar effort through the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve. The needs of American workers and families give us no choice but to succeed in passing legislation. President Barack Obama, in his State of the Union address, talked about a more competitive America. I can imagine few greater ways to hurt America’s competitiveness than allowing the EPA to proceed with backdoor climate regulations. As for his export goals, our biggest export under EPA’s proposals will be U.S. jobs to China. This is a threat to America we must stop this year. I look forward to working with my colleagues to lead the fight.

#### EPA regulations are unpopular with everyone and kill jobs and the economy

Loris 11 (Nicolas Loris, Policy Analyst at the Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies who studies energy, environment and regulation issues, 28 September 2011, “EPA’s CO2 Regulations are What’s ‘Comically Wrong’”, http://blog.heritage.org/2011/09/28/epa%E2%80%99s-co2-regulations-are-what%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%9Ccomically-wrong%E2%80%9D/ SC)

The Environmental Protection Agency called a Daily Caller report “comically wrong” this morning. That is an interesting analysis given that the EPA’s hideously bad global warming regulations are more of a joke than actual regulatory structure. Either way, the fun and games will soon end when Americans are paying higher energy prices and businesses are shedding jobs as a result of these “comically wrong” regulations. Earlier this week, The Daily Caller’s Matthew Boyle wrote that “The Environmental Protection Agency has said new greenhouse gas regulations, as proposed, may be “absurd” in application and “impossible to administer” by its self-imposed 2016 deadline. But the agency is still asking for taxpayers to shoulder the burden of up to 230,000 new bureaucrats—at a cost of $21 billion—to attempt to implement the rules.” The figures come from the EPA’s recently filed court brief from litigation over the agency’s backdoor cap-and-trade policy—regulating carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. The $21 billion per year—more than double the EPA’s annual budget—is just for paperwork and permitting to comply with the agency’s global warming regulations. The way the Clean Air Act is currently written, the endangerment finding would require that the EPA regulate sources or establishments that emit 100 or 250 tons or more of a pollutant per year, results in apartment buildings, schools, hospitals and churches falling victim to regulation. The EPA is firing back because the agency proposed a tailoring rule that would amend the Clean Air Act so that only large emitters of greenhouse gas regulations will be hit by the regulations. Both industry and environmental activists are upset with the tailoring rule, Robin Bravender reports in Politico: “industry groups are challenging the tailoring rule in court, saying the EPA doesn’t have the Clean Air Act authority it says it has, while some greens say the EPA proposal is too permissive.” In other words, there are green groups who want everything under the sun regulated. Even with the tailoring rule, the EPA is going to need many more bureaucrats and a lot more cash to regulate CO2. With the tailoring rule in place, more than 1,200 small businesses—including brick manufacturers, small municipal utilities, small coal mines, and small paper and pulp mills. Although smaller business may be protected, most would still be indirectly hit through higher energy costs. Regardless of how the tailoring rule is applied, it would only be for six years- during that time the EPA will evaluate the threshold and work on a streamlined process to regulate smaller entities. In essence, it’s open fire on everything…regardless of size. And that’s not a joke. Since fossil fuels provide about 85 percent of America’s energy, these regulations act like an energy tax. Higher costs force businesses and families to use less energy. Without the higher energy prices, the Administration cannot reach its goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Households spend more money on less energy. Businesses pass the higher costs onto consumers, and in turn, consumers buy less. The result is a dramatically slower economy and lost jobs. Of course, proponents of regulations argue that they create jobs—not only because of the 230,000 new bureaucrats, but also because companies will have to build new plants, or existing power plants will have to install scrubbers or other technologies to comply with stricter rules. This line of argument purports that the higher the compliance costs, the more jobs the regulations will create. This is patently absurd. The “regulations = jobs” crowd ignores the negative impacts higher energy prices have when they ripple through the economy. It also ignores the fact that money spent complying with arduous regulations could be spent elsewhere by a company. For instance, instead of hiring workers to install scrubbers, the firm could invest that money to operate more efficiently (thus lowering prices for consumers) or to expand its operations. In either case, the result is actual job creation, whether employment expands to produce more energy or as a result of additional consumer activity. EPA regulations cause the exact opposite. Congress needs to enact policy that would permanently prevent unelected bureaucrats from regulating CO2, preventing the catastrophic economic consequences that come along with it. If Congress prevented the regulation of CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, this would provide the regulatory certainty businesses need to grow the economy.