# \*\*\*NEG\*\*\*

## \*\*TIGGER\*\*

### Inherency Indicts

#### **TIGGER was just funded – not inherent**

Lambert, Senior Change Manager Hartford, Connecticut Area Information Technology and Services, 12 (Lisa, July 17, 2012, “Volcker, Ravitch warn state budgets under long-term threat”, <http://blogs.reuters.com/lisa-lambert/>, ML, accessed : July 17, 201)

The money, intended to create environment-friendly transportation options as well as construction jobs, will be shared among 46 projects.

The department received 266 funding requests for a total $1 billion, it said.

Pennsylvania projects will receive the most funding, $18 million for purchasing hybrid buses and spreading the use of vehicles fueled by natural gas.

California agencies will receive $14 million, primarily for changing to electric, hydrogen fuel cell, hybrid and diesel hybrid buses that emit fewer pollutants into the air and rely less on oil.

Florida projects will receive $11 million, Illinois projects $8.2 million, Ohio $6.3 million, Texas $8.4 million, and Washington $6.8 million.

### TIGGER Cap K Links

#### Green Technology is just a myth which corporation use to make a profit and increase capitalism

Vivas, member of the Centre for Studies on Social Movements (CEMS) at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 10 (Esther, March, “Anti-capitalism and climate justice”, <http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article1838>, ML, accessed: July 17, 2012)

In this context, a movement able to challenge the dominant discourse of green capitalism, recognising the impact and the responsibility of the current model of capitalist production, distribution and consumption and linking the global climate threat with everyday social problems is urgent. Copenhagen saw the increased expression of the movement for climate justice, precisely to coincide with the tenth anniversary of the mobilizations against the WTO in Seattle. A protest which, under the slogan “Change the system, not the climate” expresses this diffuse relationship between climate and social justice, between social crisis and ecological crisis. But the success of the protests in Copenhagen contrasts with the weakness of demonstrations around the world, with some exceptions such as London. The current crisis raises the urgent need to change the world from below and do so from an anti-capitalist and radical eco-socialist perspective. Anti-capitalism and climate justice are two struggles which must be closely linked. Any prospect of rupture with the current economic model that does not take account of the centrality of the ecological crisis is doomed to failure and any environmental perspective without an anti-capitalist orientation of a break with the current system will deal with the surface of the problem and end up being an instrument at the service of green marketing policies. Slowing down climate change involves modifying the current model of production, distribution and consumption. A superficial and cosmetic retouching is of no point. Solutions to the ecological crisis mean taking up the foundations of the current capitalist system. If we want climate change we need to change the system. Hence, the need for a true eco-socialist perspective, or eco-communist perspective as Daniel Bensaïd said in one of his last articles. Also, we must combat the thesis of green neo-Malthusianism blaming the countries of the South for their high rates of population growth and seeking to control the bodies of women, undermining our right to decide on our bodies. To fight against climate change means to fight poverty: the greater social inequality, the more climate vulnerability. It is necessary to convert productive sectors with a serious social and environmental impact (military, cars, extractive industries and so on), creating employment in ecologically just and social sectors such as organic farming, public services (health, education, transport), among others. Putting an end to climate change means asserting the right of peoples to food sovereignty. The current agro-industrial model (delocalised, intensive, mileage intensive, oil-dependent) is one of the maximum greenhouse gas generators. An ecological, local peasant agriculture with short marketing circuits allow, as La Via Campesina say, the cooling of the planet. It should also incorporate the demands of native peoples, control of their lands and natural goods and their worldview and respect for the “pachamama”, “mother earth”, and defence of the “good life”. Enhancing these contributions posing a new type of relationship between humanity and nature is key to addressing climate change and the commodification of life and the planet. From a North-South perspective, climate justice involves unconditional cancellation of the debt of the countries of the South, an illegal and illegitimate debt and demanding recognition of a social, historical and ecological debt from North to South, the result of centuries of pillaging and exploitation. In cases of disaster, it is necessary to promote mechanisms of “popular relief”. We have seen as climate change increases the vulnerability of the popular sectors, especially in the countries of the South. The earthquakes in Haiti and in Chile are two of the most recent cases. These threats necessitate networks of international solidarity of rank and file social movements allowing a channelling of immediate and effective aid to local populations. The initiative cannot be in the hands of an international “humanitarianism” empty of political content. The fight against climate change is a fight against the current model of industrial production delocalised, "just in time", massive, dependent on fossil resources and so on. Union bureaucracies tail and legitimize policies of “green capitalism” with the farce of “green technology” to create employment and generate increased prosperity. It is necessary to remove this myth. The trade union left must call into question the current model of growth without limits by another “development” model in accordance with the finite resources of the planet. Climate change and environmental demands must be a central axis of combative trade unionism. Trade unionists cannot see ecologists as enemies and vice versa. All suffer the consequences of climate change and we need to act collectively.

#### **The threat of “warming” is really a justification for capitalist corporations to increase spending on Green Tech to get a profit**

**Dirmeier**, Technical University of Berlin, 12 (Alex, 4/23, “Socialism, Capitalism and the Environment”, <http://www.karlmarx.net/climate-change/socialismcapitalismandtheenvironment>, ML, accessed: July 17, 2012)

To begin with, one has to observe that all scientific surveys and papers, which deal with the technological feasibility of the conversion to renewable energy, basically agree that all the technological prerequisites are either existent today, or there is a clear idea of which further scientific developments are necessary and how they are to be done26. This is important because it shows that all the world's energy production can be converted to renewable energy sources without the need of a completely unknown or new technology or science. The potential for the conversion is present in today's technology and is nothing as distant as, say, space travel to the outer solar system. However, the main controversial roots in the question of the time frame necessary to implement this energy conversion. When one looks around in different papers the estimates of the time frame differ from two decades to two centuries27. It is simply very unlikely that most of these surveys are scientifically flawed and, in fact, one can easily check the logical consistence of the conclusions in most of these papers. The reason for the different estimates of the time frames can, hence, only be caused by different, more or less implicit, assumptions on available resources for technology development, the possible pace of the redirection of investments and available monetary resources. Thus, one must conclude that there are no technological obstructions to implement the conversion of energy production within the next two decades, because these different assumptions can all be changed by political decisions. There is no law of physics that limits the deployment of resources into the development of necessary electricity storage facilities or smart electric grids. There is no law of nature that prevents the radical skimming of profits of the energy monopolies and their investment in Green technology. And at last, there is only a limit of monetary resources of the masses of working people if one would like to let them pay by redistribution of wealth for the ecologic conversion. The total wealth produced in society is so large that this ecological restructuring can be easily afforded. The only problem is that this wealth drains away into the profits of the technology-conservative big capitalist companies and into the speculation in the finance sector. Hence, there are only political obstruction to the implementation of the ecological conversion of energy production, but political conditions are made by humans and can, thus, be changed by humans. We have to conclude that the time frame necessary for the conversion of energy production to renewable sources is essentially a political and not a technological problem.

#### Using Green Technology cannot be used to fix the environment, just to reinforce capitalism

Smith, Institute for Policy Research & Development, London, 11 (Richard, May 11, “Green capitalism: the god that failed”, <http://climateandcapitalism.com/2011/05/11/green-capitalism-the-god-that-failed/>, ML, accessed: July 17, 2012)

In rejecting the antigrowth approach of the first wave of environmentalists in the 1970s, pro-growth “green capitalism” theorists of the 1980s-90s like Paul Hawken, Lester Brown, and Francis Cairncross argued that green technology, green taxes, eco-conscious shopping and the like could “align” profit-seeking with environmental goals, even “invert many fundamentals” of business practice such that “restoring the environment and making money become one and the same process.”This strategy has clearly failed. I claim first, that the project of sustainable capitalism was misconceived and doomed from the start because maximizing profit and saving the planet are inherently in conflict and cannot be systematically aligned even if, here and there, they might coincide for a moment. That’s because under capitalism, CEOs and corporate boards are not responsible to society, they’re responsible to private shareholders. CEOs can embrace environmentalism so long as this increases profits . But saving the world requires that the pursuit of profits be systematically subordinated to ecological concerns: For example, the science says that to save the humans, we have to drastically cut fossil fuel consumption, even close down industries like coal. But no corporate board can sacrifice earnings to save the humans because to do so would be to risk shareholder flight or worse. I claim that profit-maximization is an iron rule of capitalism, a rule that trumps all else, and this sets the limits to ecological reform – and not the other way around as green capitalism theorists supposed. Secondly, I claim that contrary to green capitalism proponents, across the spectrum from resource extraction to manufacturing, the practical possibilities for “greening” and “dematerializing” production are severely limited. This means, I contend, that the only way to prevent overshoot and collapse is to enforce a massive economic contraction in the industrialized economies, retrenching production across a broad range of unnecessary, resource-hogging, wasteful and polluting industries, even virtually shutting down the worst. Yet this option is foreclosed under capitalism because this is not socialism: no one is promising new jobs to unemployed coal miners, oil-drillers, automakers, airline pilots, chemists, plastic junk makers, and others whose jobs would be lost because their industries would have to be retrenched – and unemployed workers don’t pay taxes. So CEOs, workers, and governments find that they all “need” to maximize growth, overconsumption, even pollution, to destroy their childrens’ tomorrows to hang onto their jobs today because, if they don’t, the system falls into crisis, or worse.

### SQUO Solves

#### Private company investment in green tech has surged

Herrera, editor at GreenBiz Group, 11 (Tilde, September 6, 11, “Private Firms Invested $400 Billion in Green Tech So Far in 2011”, <http://www.greenbiz.com/news/2011/09/06/private-firms-invest-400b-green-tech-so-far-2011>, ML, accessed: July 17, 2012)

The sputtering economy hasn't stopped global investors from plugging $2.4 trillion into green technologies since 2007.

That's a big jump -- up $400 billion from just seven months ago [PDF], according to the latest update of the Green Transition Scorecard released today from Ethical Markets Media. By 2020, renewable energy, efficiency and green construction, clean tech, smart grid and corporate R&D are on track to receive as much as $10 trillion in cumulative investments.

The report cites $1 trillion per year in investments as a good benchmark, since that level of steady commitment can "ramp up material and energy efficiencies, reduce costs of wind, solar, geothermal and other renewable energy, increase sustainable land-use and forestry, and support smart infrastructure, transport, building and urban re-design to solidify the Green Transition worldwide."

But in order for this to happen, institutional investors will need to shift away from "more speculative fossilized sectors, hedge funds, dark pools and commodity ETFs," said Hazel Henderson, who created the Green Transition Scorecard. That also means a shift away from tech IPOs, one of the factors that has been dragging down clean tech investments in recent months.

The report noted that these institutional investors needed to direct at least 10 percent of their portfolios toward green technologies; Investment consultant Mercer, meanwhile, recommends 40 percent.

In a statement announcing the Scorecard's August update, Henderson called the stats noteworthy, "in spite of economic uncertainty."

## \*\*SIBS (State Infrastructure Banks)\*\*

### SIBS Solve

#### SIBs rock- 3 reasons

Gifford 10 (Jonathan L. Gifford, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean for Research at the George Mason University School of Public Policy, 24 November 2010,“State Infrastructure Banks: A Virginia Perspective”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1714466 SC)

A state infrastructure bank (SIB) is a mechanism to provide capital funds to support the improvement of a state’s infrastructure systems. A SIB could be beneficial to the Common--‐ wealth of Virginia in three important ways.First, a SIB can reduce the cost of projects by providing a source of credit for a project with rates and repayment terms that may be better than available elsewhere in the market. Second, a SIB can provide the Commonwealth with a mechanism for supporting projects that is independent of federal or other external influences. And third, a SIB can accelerate project delivery by reducing the time and uncertainty associated with raising capital in the commercial markets or from federal or other programs within the traditional infrastructure financing system.

#### SIBs are awesome- they’re faster, avoid delay associated with federal projects, and can use less money by leveraging profits

Gifford 10 (Jonathan L. Gifford, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean for Research at the George Mason University School of Public Policy, 24 November 2010,“State Infrastructure Banks: A Virginia Perspective”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1714466 SC)

The benefit of establishing a SIB can be substantial, especially because of the stark outlook for infrastructure financing in the Commonwealth. The main benefits are: 1. The Capacity to Leverage: In addition to providing financial assistance for infrastructure projects, the SIB provides a mechanism whereby its initial capitalization can be leveraged through selling revenue bonds with the loan repayments as the revenue stream for debt service. This would not only expand the capacity of the current generation to invest in infrastructure, it would also function as a mechanism to share the costs of infrastructure assets between the current and future generations, without calling on the bond issuing capacity of the Commonwealth. 2. Accelerated Project Delivery: Under the existing infrastructure financing system, infrastructure projects suffer from additional cost and uncertainty while waiting for financial resources to become available. Generally, the longer the delay and the greater the uncertainty, the greater the final project cost. The leveraging mechanism of the SIB reduces overall costs of infrastructure by allowing construction sooner rather than later, and on a more predictable schedule. 3. Independence from Influence and Delay by Other Entities: Entities sponsoring infrastructure projects could reduce the project costs (both scheduling and financial) by avoiding regulations and restrictions they may have been subjected to if financed using with federal or other entities’ resources.

#### SIBs are much faster, and delay risks solvency deficits and increased cost

Gifford 10 (Jonathan L. Gifford, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean for Research at the George Mason University School of Public Policy, 24 November 2010,“State Infrastructure Banks: A Virginia Perspective”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1714466 SC)

Moreover, a SIB can also accelerate project delivery by providing timely funding. Federal funding and credit sources can add months or even years to a project because the federal administrative process can be very slow, and sometimes political. A project’s costs can increase significantly while it waits for federal approval. While delay does not always increase project costs, unanticipated changes in project financing and uncertain processes for securing funding can create unnecessary barriers to project delivery. SIB loans can play a variety of roles in a project’s financing. Most simply, a SIB loan might provide 100% of a project’s costs. More typically, project financing is provided from a number of sources, including project-specific bonds, federal contributions, SIB loans, and contributions from state tax and trust funds. To the extent a project is financed by loans and secured by toll or other revenue, the loans may be structured in such a way that some loans are “superior” to others, so that they are paid off first. A SIB loan might be “subordinated” to other loans to reduce project costs, because bond markets demand lower interest rates from debts that are superior, other things being equal. A SIB loan might also allow deferred payment, so that interest accumulates and repayment commences only after a passage of up to 5 years or more after completion of the project or the facility is open and collecting tolls.

#### SIBs are the best- South Caroline, Florida, and Minnesota prove

Gifford 10 (Jonathan L. Gifford, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean for Research at the George Mason University School of Public Policy, 24 November 2010,“State Infrastructure Banks: A Virginia Perspective”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1714466 SC)

StatesthathaveenhancedtransportationfundingbydevelopingSIBsprovidemanyinsightsintotheiroperationalandstructuralfeatures.Inmostcases,stateshavestartedSIBswiththehelpoffederalfunding,butafewSIBshavebeencharteredusingonlystatefunds.ThissectionsurveystheSIBsinSouthCarolina,Florida,andMinnesota,examiningboththeircommonfeaturesandimportantdifferences. […] ThestateofSouthCarolinaestablishedtheSouthCarolinaTransportationInfrastructureBank(SCTIB)inJune1997.Todate,theSCTIBhasprovidedthehighestleveloffinancingofanySIB,makingmorethan$3billioninloans. Thebankhassuccessfullysoldbondstoleverageitslendingcapacitytoasignificantdegree,whilestillreceivingstrongratingsfrommajorratingagencies.Forexample,betweenOctober1998andDecember2003,theSCTIBissuedaseriesofbondsinamountsrangingfrom$268.8millionto$368.3million,withsecurityfortheloansprimarilycomingfromstatetruckregistrationfees(transferredfromtheDepartmentofMotorVehicles),loanrepaymentsfromthecounties,federalhighwayprogramapportionments,andnon‐taxrevenuefundingfromtheSCDOT.Moody’sInvestorsServicegavearatingofA1tothesebonds,whileFitchRatingsassignedanA15(seeTable1).Givenhowhighlythesebondsleveragedthecapitalizationinthebank,theirrelativelyhighratingscanbeattributedtothreefactors.First,thebank’sportfolioincludesmultiplerevenuestreamscommittedforrepayments.Second,thebankdemonstrateditsselectionofhigh-­‐qualityprojectswithstrongrevenuestreams.Third,thebankcommittedinterestearningsonvariousstatefundstoabsorbpossiblerevenuevolatility.16 […] In 1997, the state of Florida established a State Infrastructure Bank in accordance with the federal government's National Highway System Act of 1995. Since its inception, the bank has provided total assistance of $1.1 billion to 64 projects, and has leveraged $8.3 billion in total project investment as of 2008. Since being established, the bank has developed considerably due in part to strong support from the legislature. In 2000, Florida also established an arm of the bank that is entirely state‐funded in order to provide more flexibility and avoid federal restrictions applicable to the federally funded portion. Florida is also one of the four states selected to implement a SIB under the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-­‐21). […]The Florida SIB’s record demonstrates the plausibility of achieving both high degrees of credit leveraging and highly rated bonds. The governor signed a bill in 2003 authorizing the State SIB to issue revenue bonds secured solely by repayment streams of the existing loan portfolio. This enabled the SIB to issue a $62.3 million bond in 2005, which was rated AA- by Fitch, A1 by Moody’s and A+ by Standard and Poor’s. The State did not pledge its full faith and credit. The factors behind this reasonably high rating include the SIB’s close and long‐term relationship with its borrowers, the state’s continued capital replenishment to maintain a coverage ratio attractive to the market, and its use as gap funding rather than the primary source of funding to the projects20. […] The state of Minnesota established the Transportation Revolving Loan Fund (TRLF) in 1997 to provide financial assistance to sub‐state governmental agencies (e.g., counties, townships) through revolving loans. These agencies use the funding for public transportation projects including construction, acquisition of right of way, maintenance, and repair of transportation related facilities. Unlike other SIBs, the Minnesota bank only loans to local governments that make repayments using public revenues and does not lend to revenue-producing projects such as privately operated toll roads. Further, the TRLF differs from other SIBs because it is jointly operated by the state Department of Transportation and the Minnesota Public Facility Authority. In its first four years of operation the bank received $58.5 million in funds, with a large portion coming from the federal government. Using bond sales it leveraged its funds by a factor of two, and made a total of $110 million in loans to 21 projects. […]The TRLF program has successfully delivered a number of infrastructure projects that otherwise may have been severely delayed or never completed. By expanding credit through leveraging funds, instead of directly loaning initial funds, the state obtained a larger investment capacity. One example is a $21 million leveraged loan from the transit account to the Twin Cities’ metropolitan planning organization, which consequently could completed 53 transit improvement projects. This bond was provided with the interest rate at 2.71%, and the Metropolitan Council is estimated to have reduced its interest payment by $4 mil--‐ lion26. As such, despite its rather stringent conditions to be met for the loan to be awarded, the TRLF has enabled many infrastructure projects in the state. In recent years the TRLF has made a number of significant loans. In 2007, $15.8 million was awarded to 2 projects; in 2008, $11.8 million was provided to 2 projects; and in 2009, total of $15.3 million was awarded to 6 projects.27

#### State infrastructure banks have many benefits

DOT, 12 (US DOT Federal Highway Administration, 2012, “State Infrastructure Banks (SIBs)” <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/pdfs/fact_sheets/2_tfi_sibs_1_19_12.pdf> SC)

SIBs complement traditional funding techniques and serve as a useful tool to meet project-financing demands, stretching both Federal and State dollars. The primary benefits of SIBs to transportation investment include: Flexible project financing, such as low interest loans and credit assistance, that can be tailored to the individual projects. Accelerated completion of projects.Incentive for increased State and/or local investment.Enhanced opportunities for private investment by lowering the financial risk and creating a stronger market condition.Recycling of funds to provide financing for future transportation projects.Although the authorizing Federal legislation establishes basic requirements and the overall operating framework for a SIB, States have customized the structure and focus of their SIB programs to meet State-specific requirements. A variety of types of financing assistance can be offered by a SIB; loans are the most popular form of SIB assistance. As of December 2010, 32 States and territories had entered into an estimated 700 SIB loan agreements with a total value of $6.5 billion. Potential advantages-Accelerate State-approved projects by providing direct loans and other credit assistance. Create a permanent additional revenue/financing source based on SIB interest income and other program income earned (revolving fund concept). Provide credit assistance with flexible and reasonable terms (including interest rates, repayment schedules, and maturity). Provide opportunity to local governments to advance their high-priority projects (through local funds or by borrowing against their State’s allocations of Federal aid). Provide opportunity to private sector borrowers to advance desired projects (as long as they are willing to provide a revenue source). Can be used to support or leverage other borrowing (e.g., issuing its own debt or guaranteeing other entities’ debt).

## \*\*HSR (High Speed Rail)\*\*

### Can’t Create Jobs

#### HSR won’t create as much jobs as promised-Japan proves

CBS 12 (July 13, 2012, “UC Study Raises Questions about California High-Speed Rail”, <http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2012/07/13/uc-study-raises-questions-about-california-high-speed-rail/>, July 17, 2012) ALK

LOS ANGELES (KCBS) – A new study casts doubt on whether the benefits of California high-speed rail will include the creation of 400,000 permanent jobspromised by boosters of the bullet trains. Jerry Nickelsburg,the economist behind the UCLA Anderson Forecast, said the Shinkansen bullet train in Japan has done little to spur job in the region between Tokyo and Osaka since it was built in the 1960s. “High-speed rail, unlike other transportation infrastructure like interstate highways or transcontinental railroads, moves people not goods. And it’s really lowering the cost of goods that is the big bang for the buck, not lowering the cost of moving people,” he said. Nickelsburg said he examined the Tokyo-Osaka region because of its geographic and demographic similarities to California. “It in many ways looks like San Francisco to L.A., sort of anchored by the two large cities and going through mountains and rural and semi-rural areas with small to mid-sized industrial cities,” he said

#### High speed rail creates only a few jobs for a very short time –some lasting only 6 months

Scott, 11 (Rick Scott, Governor of Florida, Gov. “Rick Scott says high-speed rail jobs won't last long”, <http://www.politifact.com/florida/statements/2011/mar/03/rick-scott/gov-rick-scott-says-high-speed-rail-jobs-wont-last/>, March 2, 2011, NC)

Florida Gov. Rick Scott made time during his two-day promotional tour of northern U.S. cities on March 2, 2011, to stop into New York's Fox News studios and talk high-speed rail. In an interview with Fox & Friends host Steve Doocy, Scott first brushed off a lawsuit filed by two state senators challenging the new governor's ability to unilaterally kill the project. "I represent the taxpayers," he said. "This doesn't make any sense." Doocy then asked if a high-speed train is "really what people need." But before Scott could answer, Doocy said the project would provide jobs, right? "Short-term jobs," Scott said. "The federal government gives you all this money and then you have to pay for it down the road." In a previous item, we checked a claim from U.S. Rep. Corrine Brown, D-Jacksonville, that the rail line from Tampa to Orlando would create 60,000 jobs and rated that False. This time, we wanted to drill down on Scott's assertion that the jobs created would be "short-term jobs." For starters, we should note that estimating job numbers is a little bit like estimating ridership figures when it comes to the Tampa-Orlando train. There is science to it, of course, but there is a bit of art, too. Nevertheless, the Florida Department of Transportation provided a detailed job-creation estimate (page 16) as part of its application to the federal government for high-speed rail funding in October 2009. The state was awarded $2.4 billion in federal money for the $2.7 billion project, the money that Scott rejected. The job estimates are spread out over the four-county area along the 84-mile high-speed line, covering Hillsborough, Polk, Orange and Osceola counties. The 2009 application was based on a four-year construction period, beginning in 2011, and broke down the jobs created into three basic categories -- construction, engineering services and operations/maintenance. The estimate includes direct jobs -- those directly hired as a result of the project -- and indirect jobs, which FDOT said are jobs created to support the suppliers of the materials and equipment to the project. FDOT concluded that the rail line would create a total of 48,800 direct and indirect jobs over the construction of the system and another 1,100 total jobs once the line is in operation. (FDOT predicted the line would start running in 2015.) The jobs are measured in job-years, which is different than how most people would classify a job. The idea is that a "job" equals a year someone is employed -- that's a job-year. It could be one person working a year, or two people working six months each, or some other combination. In counting job-years, FDOT adds each year's job total to create one big number. It's a perfectly valid calculation -- as long as you understand the difference -- but to many, it comes off as a way to inflate the impact of a project. Here's how the FDOT breaks down the job creation in job-years: Employment (job-years) 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Construction Direct 2,100 9,700 9,000 1,000 0 Total 4,500 20,400 18,900 2,100 0 Engineering Services Direct 700 500 0 0 0 Total 1,700 1,200 0 0 0 Operations/Maintenance Direct 0 0 0 0 600 Total 0 0 0 0 1,100 Total Direct 2,800 10,200 9,000 1,000 600 Total Overall 6,200 21,600 18,900 2,100 1,100 After 2015, FDOT says, the operations and maintenance jobs would continue (600 direct, 1,100 total) while the construction-related work would not. In the most favorable light, that's a total of roughly 50,000 job-years spread out over five years, with 1,100 of those jobs continuing in perpetuity. But 40,500 of those jobs -- more than 80 percent -- are confined to just two years during the rail construction, 2012 and 2013. Scott said the high-speed rail project provides "short-term jobs." He's largely right. More than 80 percent of the jobs created (talking job-years again) only exist for two years, and 98 percent of the jobs last no more than four years while the rail's being built. That leaves just 1,100 direct and indirect jobs created as a result of the operation of the train that are truly permanent. We rate Scott's claim Mostly True.

#### The few jobs created by HSR will be the same highway construction jobs made by the transportation bill; all high level jobs will be outsourced

Associated Press, 10 (Associated Press, <http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2010/02/high-speed_rail_has_benefits_b.html>, Feb 12, 2010, NC)

WASHINGTON -- President Barack Obama is pitching his $8 billion high-speed rail program to Americans as a jobs generator that will revitalize the domestic rail industry. But the full picture is more complicated. Building ultra-fast trains won't create the kind of high-tech, high-paying jobs Americans covet any time soon. Indeed, many of the projects receiving high-speed dollars through Obama's program aren't what most of the rest of the world calls "high speed." And those projects that are truly high speed will have to rely on overseas companies with the experience building, supplying and operating the sleek, modern trains of Europe and Asia — an expertise that the U.S. lacks, say rail experts. That wasn't the picture Obama painted in his State of the Union speech Wednesday night, when he touted $8 billion in new railroad grants funded by the federal economic stimulus law. He said they would "create jobs and help our nation move goods, services, and information," and in the next breath lambasted companies who "ship our jobs overseas" and called for slashing their tax breaks. White House spokesman Bill Burton underscored the jobs message Thursday. "The program creates tens of thousands of jobs and is the largest investment in infrastructure since the interstate highway system was created," he said. There are good economic reasons to build high-speed rail, or even mid-speed rail, say transportation experts. The trains can move people between cities roughly 100 to 500 miles apart more swiftly and efficiently and with less environmental damage than either cars or airplanes — an important consideration as it becomes increasingly difficult to expand congested highways and airports. Trains that operate on electrified tracks — true of most high-speed trains — also don't rely on imported oil. But the jobs to design and make the rail cars and engines, signaling and track for the fastest trains will mainly go abroad to the European and Asian companies because it will take time for the U.S. to develop its own domestic high-speed rail industry, rail experts said. There will be U.S. manufacturing and engineering jobs for slower trains often described as "higher speed" or "midspeed." Much of the domestic high-speed work, however, will be the kind of construction and earth-moving work typical of highway projects, they said. European and Asian high-speed trains average over 110 mph and some reach top speeds of around 220 mph. There is nothing equivalent in the United States. Indeed, most of the grants announced by the White House Thursday will go to rail projects that aren't in the same league as the fast trains being built elsewhere. For the U.S. to decide to build high-speed train systems using primarily U.S. companies, "would be like Bangladesh deciding they want to have a space program and only use technology they have developed and manufactured themselves," said Anthony Perl, chairman of the National Research Council's intercity rail panel.

## \*\*Mass Transit\*\*

### Plan Unpopular

#### Plan unpopular – Politicians afraid of public reaction to the plan Disalvo, Professor DiSalvo received his doctorate in Politics from the University of Virginia, 12 (Daniel, May 16, “The political problem of the "Wimpy" state”, <http://www.publicsectorinc.com/forum/2012/05/the-political-problem-of-the-wimpy-state.html>, ML, accessed: 7/20/12) **Thepublic**, of course, **enjoys consuming more services than they are paying for in the here-and-now.** As many polls have shown, **many Americans like low taxes and extensive public services.** Large, long-term government debts are the foreseeable consequence of giving them what they want. Politicians didn't mind this arrangement as long as the bill didn't come due on their watch. However, **when the bill comes due** (as it is now in many places**) Americans don't want to pay the huge tax increases that covering it would require.** And citizen**s still don't want cuts in services. Government workers** (and their union representatives) **also resist changes in the bargain that was made with them. Politicians don't want to make cuts in services that are unpopular with citizens and they don't want to make changes in public employment that run afoul of powerful unions. Either option threatens their reelection chances. It's quite a political bind.**

#### The plan would be massively unpopular

**Worthen,** Resource Architect for Sustainability at the American Institute of Architects, **11** (Bill, “Putting the Masses Behind Mass Transit”, Reuters, 3-30-11, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/03/30/idUS188765760220110330>, ML, accessed: 7/20/12)

It's no secret that **Americans are in love with the automobile**. Yet, this heavy reliance on autos is taking a toll on the country's flawed transportation system. Fluctuating gas prices, rising everyday living costs, environmental concerns and an aging infrastructure further tax our transportation system and suggest that it's time to reconsider this long-standing love affair with cars. We're reaching the limits of our capacity and density regarding transportation. Anyone who commutes to work via automobile is likely well-versed in the frustrations caused by traffic, highway degradation and other problems. Yet **across the nation we see a real resistance to mass transit.** From New Jersey Governor Chris Christie's decision last fall not to build a second commuter rail line into Manhattan, to the current debate whether to connect Tampa and Orlando, Fla., via high speed rail, **mass transit projects often struggle to gain a foothold in the U.S. Negative associations with massive infrastructural changes, such as Alaska's much-maligned "Bridge to Nowhere"** or the extra $12 billion cost to construct the "Big Dig" in Boston, **have impacted government funding and public support for mass transit projects**. Yet, imagine an America with 50 percent fewer vehicles on the road, where most people commute for work and pleasure by train, where parking garages sit empty because of the popularity of buses as a main source of transportation. As it stands today, this kind of future is hard to imagine.

#### Mass transit unpopular; less than 3% of people ride it

**10 News, 12** (“Report: Public Transit Unpopular Among Locals”, 1/24/12, 10 News, <http://www.10news.com/news/30291681/detail.html>, ML, accessed: 7/20/12)

**A new report** obtained by 10News on Tuesday **reveals astounding new numbers on how San Diegans get to work. There is new information about the popularity of public transit** in the annual Quality of Life dashboard report issued by the research group Equinox Center. The report was released days after a state lawsuit critiquing the region's public transit. Local resident David Pettyjohn said he takes buses to work and school from Encinitas to Oceanside every day. "It's cheap transportation and saves me a lot of money on gas," said Pettyjohn. "That's why I do it." Pettyjohn is the exception. **Whether by train, bus or trolley, commuters are not using public transit, according to figures crunched by the research group Equinox Center. The report said 76 percent of local residents drive to work alone in a vehicle and 10 percent carpool.** Though some bike and some walk to work, **a little more than 3 percent of local residents take public transportation. When compared to other cities, San Diego's public transit rates are higher than a city like Dallas.** However, San Diego's rate is lower than cities such as Portland, Ore. and Los Angeles, which is at 6.15 percent. "We think of Los Angeles as being the ultimate car city, but more people are taking transit there," said Ann Tartre, the executive director of the Equinox Center. "I think it shows if a city like LA can tackle its transit issues, we can do that here too. There's definitely an impact. Other numbers show each of us is spending about 40 hours extra stuck in traffic per year. More traffic, of course, impacts pollution rates." The finding is one of many in the Equinox Center's just-released Quality of Life dashboard report, which provides a snapshot of issues ranging from trash and water to land use. "**With this being an election year, we're hoping the dashboard will be a tool for residents and candidates on some issues they care about to see how we are doing on those issues**," said Tartre.

#### Transportation Bill Proves Mass Transit Isn’t Popular with the Public or Government

Billups, Albany politics for NY1 News, 12

(Erin, “Washington Beat: MTA Leader Concerned As House Republicans Stall $260B Transportation Bill” 2/22/12, NY1, <http://www.ny1.com/content/news_beats/political_news/156475/washington-beat--mta-leader-concerned-as-house-republicans-stall--260b-transportation-bill>, ML, accessed:7/20/12)

**Unable to garner the needed votes, the House’s Republican leadership delayed consideration of a $260 billion transportation bill** last week, promising to address some of the nearly 300 amendments submitted by members on both sides of the aisle, including several from New York's congressional delegation. "I think that the drafters go back to the drawing board and they recognize that we have some issues that we can't just overlook," said Staten Island-Brooklyn Representative Michael Grimm. **Highways, roads, bridges and mass transit have been partially funded for 30 years through the U.S. Highway Trust Fund, which has been financed through the gas tax. The House bill removes mass transit from that fund**, and a spokesman says it refocuses the original purpose of the trust fund — maintaining the highways. During a call with transit officials from across the country, Metropolitan Transportation Authortiy Chairman Joseph Lhota said without dedicated funding his agency is in serious trouble. "That billion dollars in funding is used to buy rail stock and switching and signaling equipment, critical to maintaining our system in a state of good [repair](http://www.ny1.com/content/news_beats/political_news/156475/washington-beat--mta-leader-concerned-as-house-republicans-stall--260b-transportation-bill)," said Lhota**. House Republicans right now are trying to find $40 billion to fund mass transit for the next five years, but so far are falling short. "It doesn't look like in this era, public transit will get as much money from the general fund as it's gotten from the Highway Trust Fund**," said Urban Institute Infrastructure Initiative Director Sandra Rosenbloom. A spokesman for the House’s transportation committee says at this point they still plan to move forward with the bill, though they are considering some revisions. Meanwhile, Democrats are doubtful Republicans are taking their concerns into account. "We are not, in New York, going to be satisfied and think that our needs are taken care of. The Republicans who have the majority, they have shown no desire to work in a bipartisan basis," said Democratic Congressman Eliot Engel of the Bronx. The transportation bill may be brought up for consideration when lawmakers return to Washington next week.

## \*\*Next Gen\*\*

### Immunosuppression Impact D

#### Contrails have no health effects – they are just water

**USAF 10** (United States Air Force Media Report: “Contrails Facts”<http://www.af.mil/shared/media/document/afd-051013-001.pdf>, accessed 7/17, AR)

Contrails (short for "condensation trails") are line-shaped clouds sometimes produced by aircraft engine exhaust. The combination of high humidity and low temperatures that often exists at aircraft cruise altitudes allows the formation of contrails. Contrails are composed primarily of water (in the form of ice crystals) and do not pose health risks to humans. Contrails have been a normal effect of aviation since its earliest days. Depending on the temperature and the amount of moisture in the air at the aircraft altitude, contrails can either evaporate quickly or they can persist and grow. Engine exhaust produces only a small portion of the water that forms ice in persistent contrails. Persistent contrails are mainly composed of water naturally present alone.

#### Contrails pose no threat to human health

**EPA 12** ([www.epa.gov/otaq/aviation.htm](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/aviation.htm), accessed 7/12/12, AR)

Persistent contrails pose no direct threat to public health.All contrails are line-shaped clouds composed of iceparticles. These ice particles evaporate when localatmospheric conditions become dry enough (low enough relativehumidity). The ice particles in contrails do not reach the Earth’s surface because they fall slowly and conditions in the lower atmosphere cause ice particles to evaporate.Contrail cloudiness might contribute to human-induced climatechange. Climate change may have important impacts on publichealth and environmental protection.Do authorities regulate aircraftemissions?In the United States, some aspects of aviation emissions areregulated through the efforts of several government agencies.The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), under theClean Air Act (CAA) of 1970, has established commercial aircraftengine exhaust emissions standards for certain emittantsassociated with ground-level air pollution. Jet engine exhaustcontains, among other emittants, oxides of nitrogen (NOx) andhydrocarbons that contribute to ozone formation. Jet aircraft areone of many sources of these pollutants. Ozone is a primeingredient of smog in and near cities and other areas of thecountry. While EPA establishes emissions standards for aircraft,the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) of the U.S.Department of Transportation (DOT) administers and enforcesthese standards. This domestic framework for regulating aircraftengine emissions is more fully described in Box 2. Currently,there are no regulations addressing contrails and their atmosphericeffects.The Clean Air Act (CAA) directs the U.S. EnvironmentalProtection Agency (EPA) to establish aircraft andaircraft engine emissions standards for any air pollutantthat could reasonably endanger public health and welfare.In 1997, EPA aligned U.S. emissions standards (40CFR Part 87) with engine emissions standards and recommendedpractices (SARPs) prescribed by theInternational Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), aUnited Nations agency established in 1944 that developsSARPs using the technical support of member statesand the aviation community. The United States is anactive member of ICAO's Committee on AviationEnvironmental Protection, which is responsible for furtherdevelopment of engine emissions standards. Inestablishing U.S. emissions standards, EPA must consultwith the Department of Transportation (DOT) to ensuresuch regulations' effective dates permit the developmentof requisite technology, giving appropriate considerationto compliance cost. It must also consult with DOT concerningaircraft safety before promulgating emissionsstandards.Under the CAA, DOT is responsible for enforcing standardsestablished by EPA. DOT delegated enforcementresponsibility to the Federal Aviation Administration(FAA). FAA has issued regulations administering andenforcing the emissions standards that apply to civil airplanespowered by gas turbine engines. FAA ensurescompliance with these regulations by reviewing andapproving certification test plans, procedures, testreports, and engine emissions certification levels. Formore information on aircraft emissions or to accessEPA's or FAA's aircraft regulations, visit the AviationEmissions Website of EPA's Office of Transportation andAir Quality at <>.U.

## \*\*Equity\*\*

### Title V Reform CP

#### Reforming DOT to follow Title VI solves the aff.

National Council of La Raza, their solvency author, 12(“Latino Priorities for Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization”http://www.nclr.org/images/uploads/pages/PolicyPriorities.pdf, accessed 7/17) CC

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s (DOT) rules pertaining to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits recipients of federal aid from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin, bars intentional discrimination as well as disparate impact discrimination, and requires metropolitan planning organizations and transit agencies to accommodate any stakeholder who wishes to engage in the planning process. Yet, H.R. 4348 threatens to weaken community engagement and impact requirements. Instead, Congress should bolster compliance with DOT Title VI regulations to promote community engagement. NCLR urges the conference committee to remove distracting provisions attached to H.R. 4348 that would impede the rights of local communities to offer input for and make decisions about projects. One such provision is: The elimination of environmental review requirements to consider alternatives and solicit public input in the decision-making process for some projects—a proposal made under the guise of “environmental streamlining” (H.R. 4348-RDS, Title VI, Sec. 609) 3) Defend public transportation as a vital lifeline. While everyone is affected by transportation issues, some communities rely more than others on public transit as a lifeline to overcome physical or economic barriers. Hispanics in particular rely on public transportation options to access essentials such as grocery stores, hospitals, and schools, and are four times more likely than Whites to rely on public transit for their work commute.4 Federal transportation funding must ensure strong and affordable public transit options for all communities, especially those facing physical or economic barriers to opportunity. NCLR recommends that the conference committee uphold positive provisions in MAP-21, such as: Maintaining federal funding for public transportation (S. 1813, Sec. 20003, §5301) Incentivizing transit projects to compete for the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program (S. 1813, Sec. 2002, §601) Extending the commuter benefits for transit users which ensure that all employees are eligible for up to the maximum $240 pre-tax transportation benefit (S. 1813, Sec. 40204) Expanding access to technical assistance that may include transportation equity to assess the impact that planning, investment, and operations have on low-income people and communities of color (S. 1813, Sec. 20003, §5301(b)(6)) Expanding eligibility for recipients of federal funds to conduct research on impact of transportation on transit-dependent populations (S. 1813, Sec. 20003, §5301(b)(8)) Establishing National Goals for the federal transit program, especially those that support mixed-use, transit-oriented development (S. 1813, Sec. 20003, §5301(c)) Maintaining federal support for public transportation services designed to transport eligible low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment, including those with nontraditional hours or reverse commutes (S. 1813, Sec. 20008, §5311(g)(A)) 4) Promote safety for pedestrians and bikers. Transportation in America is more than automobiles and trains. For Latinos, walking and biking are vital modes of daily transportation and commuting.5 However, pedestrian deaths are on the rise in minority communities due in large part to hazardous road conditions; Latinos suffered a pedestrian death rate of 2.23 per 100,000 persons from 2000 through 2007, a rate nearly 62% higher than that of non-Hispanics. At least one-third of Americans cannot or choose not to drive.6 Hispanics are also less likely than their White counterparts to own a car, and 14% of Latino households do not have access to a vehicle.7 Federal transportation policy should support the development of biking and pedestrian options on all roads to ensure a transportation infrastructure that is safe and convenient for both motorized and nonmotorized users. NCLR urges the conference committee to maintain important provisions, as passed in MAP-21, such as: The National Complete Streets policy, which ensures that transportation planners design and operate the entire roadway with all users in mind (S. 1813, Sec. 33006, §413)Revisions to the Highway Safety Improvement Program which define road users as motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians, and the inclusion of safety enhancements for nonmotorized users (S. 1813, Sec. 1112, §148)Upholding the intent of bicycle and pedestrian programs like Safe Routes to School and requiring states to implement grant programs for pedestrian projects (S. 1813, Sec. 1113, §149(l)(1-3))

## \*\* Warming ADV CP\*\*

### CP Text

#### The EPA should invest in a short and long term transition to clean energy by capping and cutting emissions, reviewing and responding to climate science, and requiring international cooperation through commitments and incentives.

### Link Sheild

#### The public is concerned about alternative energy

Public Agenda 9 (Public Agenda, researchers on public opinion, 2009, “Public Views on Energy Problems”, http://www.publicagenda.org/pages/energy2009-finding1 SC)

Almost everyone in the energy field assumes that public concern rises and falls with gas prices, and there is strong historical evidence for that. The Energy Learning Curve™ survey suggests, however, that this pattern could change. Even though energy prices have fallen since the oil price spike of 2008, public concern over cost remains both strong and intense. An overwhelming 9 in 10 Americans (89 percent) say they worry about the cost of gas and fuel. Even more important is the intensity of that concern, with 57 percent saying they worry “a lot.” Eight in ten (83 percent) worry that the U.S. economy is too dependent on oil, with 47 percent saying they worry “a lot.” Nearly three quarters of the public (73 percent) disagree with the statement that “if we get gas prices to drop and stay low, we don’t need to be worried about finding alternative sources of energy.” Fully 53 percent of the public strongly disagree with that statement, showing this is a firmly held belief. This may be because the public believes there’s a long-term trend at work here. Seven in ten say that “over the long run, the price of oil will go up” because “supplies are decreasing and demand continues to rise.” Despite the high number, the public still has some contradictory views on this trend. Nearly as many (68 percent) also blame “speculators who drive up the price of oil” for cost increases. Concern about dependence on foreign oil isn’t as high as concern about price, but it’s not far behind. Eight in ten (80 percent) say they worry dependence on foreign oil will involve us in wars and conflicts in the Middle East, with 43 percent worrying “a lot.” Climate change, however, is significantly less of a concern. Seven in ten (71 percent) say they worry about global warming, but only 32 percent say they worry “a lot” about it — that’s 25 points behind price. The issue of global warming simply doesn’t have the same urgency yet for the public, possibly because it’s further off, but the high price of gas remains fresh in their minds.

#### Renewable energy is popular with the public

Teixeira 8 (Ruy Teixeira, American political scientist with a PhD in sociology, 1 August 2008, “Voters Want Renewable Energy, Not Drilling”, Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/07/renewables\_not\_drilling.html SC)

The current energy crisis has made American voters look more favorably on a wide range of ideas that can be used to deal with our energy problems. But voters don’t favor all of these ideas equally; they have clear views on which approaches they think will work best. Consider these data from a recent Quinnipiac University poll of voters in four key swing states: Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Voters were asked what was “the best way to help solve the energy crisis and make America less dependent on foreign oil”: new nuclear power plants; drilling offshore and in Alaska; developing renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and biofuels; releasing oil from the strategic petroleum reserve; or mandating higher mileage standards for cars. Developing renewable energy sources was ranked far ahead of all the other choices in all four states. In Colorado, renewable energy was deemed the best approach by 54 percent, with the second choice (drilling) far behind at 21 percent. In Michigan and Minnesota, it was 56 percent renewable energy, followed by drilling at 18 percent. And in Wisconsin, it was 59 percent for renewable energy, followed by nuclear power at a mere 9 percent. More generally, voters were asked whether they wanted the next president to focus more on developing new sources of oil, natural gas, and nuclear power, or wind, solar, and biofuels. In every state, voters preferred the latter, a renewable energy focus, by a wide margin: 55-33 in Colorado, 58-33 in Michigan, 61-31 in Minnesota, and 62-32 in Wisconsin. These data make it clear that, no matter what conservatives claim, voters have clear preferences on the best way to deal with energy problems going forward, and those preferences involve renewable energy, not drilling.

#### Doesn’t link to politics- the EPA takes the blame for everything

Wilder 4/17 (Forrest Wilder, writer about the environment with a degree in Anthropology, 17 April 2012 “When in Doubt, Blame the EPA”, <http://www.texasobserver.org/forrestforthetrees/when-in-doubt-blame-the-epa/> SC)

Sometimes it seems the EPA is the best thing to happen to Texas Republicans. The federal agency makes a handy scapegoat for problems besetting Texas’ electric grid. Case in point: Last week’s hearing of the Senate Natural Resources Committee on EPA regulations. The tone was unrelentingly negative and gloomy. The theme: Blame the EPA. It called to mind the great South Park satirization of scapegoating, "Blame Canada." The hearing opened with Trip Doggett, the CEO of grid operator ERCOT, telling the committee that Texas will have trouble keeping the lights on in the coming years. Doggett pointed to Luminant, Texas' biggest private utility, and the company's threat to shutter two lignite-fired units — the dirtiest in its fleet — in the face of new EPA regulations on sulfur dioxide and smog-forming nitrogen oxides. (On Friday, a federal appeals court in Washington, D.C., is considering a challenge to the rule, called the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, by Texas and 14 other states.) Doggett said the "uncertainty of the effect of the environmental regulations" was contributing to reluctance on the part of investors to build new power plants. ERCOT likes to have a reserve margin — the difference between projected power needs and available generation — of 13.75 percent. If Luminant keeps its lignite plants on-line this summer, the reserve margin would be almost exactly 13.75 percent. Any less and the likelihood of power outages increases. The picture worsens in the years to come, Doggett said. Very few new power plants are in the pipeline and the state’s population is growing. "This is kinda alarming," said state Sen. Craig Estes, R-Wichita Falls. You would think the main problem here is that overbearing EPA. But if you were listening closely, both Doggett and Public Utility Commission Chairman Donna Nelson underscored problems in the power sector that have little to do with the EPA. The fundamental problem, Doggett said, is that investors don't think they can make money on new power plants right now, and there is very little state regulators are willing to do about that in Texas' deregulated market. Cheap natural gas, now selling at a decade-low of $2 thanks largely to the fracking boom, has radically slackened enthusiasm in ERCOT by depressing profit margins "The average wholesale price is not sufficient to induce companies to come in and invest because if they invest they can't get their money back," said Nelson. Cheap gas, cheap electricity — that's primarily what's killed coal in Texas, not EPA regulations, though they've certainly hastened its demise. But the deregulated system certainly doesn't help with the crisis. Donna Nelson, who's taken a hard-line on anything that remotely smacks of meddling in the market, was at pains to explain how the PUC was acting to avoid blackouts. "We are working hard to send the right signals," she said. The PUC is likely to raise a cap on wholesale electric prices (at $3,000/megawatt-hour, it's already one of the highest in the world) in order to boost prices. That will almost certainly trickle down to consumers in the form of higher rates. Nelson said she was striving to find the "sweet spot" — not so high as to shock consumers with higher rates, not so low as to keep investors on the sidelines and plunge the state into dark. Sen. Troy Fraser, chafing at the straitjacket, tried to send his own signal. "We've got to send — and I hope the financial markets are listening to this hearing — because I want to send signals to those financial people: Come invest in Texas, we need generation built, we need steel in the ground and we'll figure out a way to make it cost effective for you to do it. Because if you look at the out years, two or three years from now, if we don't project that message lights are going to go off." Lights are going to go off. The most vicious EPA-bashing was left to the brain trust at the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. TCEQ, which is acting like a wholly-owned subsidiary of Texas fossil fuel industries, sent up one of their third-stringers — chief engineer Susana Hilderbran — to offer up a bill of particulars against EPA. Notably, the TCEQ has now morphed into an agency capable of predicting near- and long-term changes in the energy markets based on their interpretation of environmental rules. "At a minimum the combination of these rules will likely mean that no new coal or petroleum coke power plants will be built in the U.S.," said Hilderbran. "At its worst, the rules could result in shutdown of existing facilities in Texas, further straining electric reliability." EPA didn't give adequate time to respond to the cross-state rule. EPA miscalculated the amount of power generation in Texas. EPA used an air monitor in Illinois to prove that Texas affects air quality out of state. (Hilderbran said the monitor shows Texas' sulfur dioxide contribution as minuscule, just .18 micrograms per cubic meter. "That's approximately a baby aspirin spread over 350 acres.

#### There is growing concern about global warming

Langer 6 (Gary Langer, reporter for ABC news, 26 March 2006, “Poll: Public Concern on Warming Gains Intensity”, <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/GlobalWarming/story?id=1750492&page=1> SC)

The intensity of public concern about global warming has spiked sharply over the last decade, along with a change in personal experience: Half of Americans say weather patterns have grown more unstable and temperatures have risen where they live, and 70 percent think weather patterns globally have become more unsettled in recent years. A vast majority, 85 percent, believes global warming probably is occurring, up slightly from 80 percent in a 1998 poll. But fewer than four in 10 are very sure of it, a level of uncertainty that reflects broad and continued belief that scientists themselves disagree on whether or not it's happening. Sampling, data collection and tabulation for this poll were done by TNS. Nonetheless, the intensity of concern is up. In 1998, 31 percent called global warming extremely or very important to them personally. Today that's sharply higher, 49 percent, with an additional three in 10 calling it "somewhat" important. It may be that personal experience with disrupted weather patterns -- reported equally across U.S. regions -- is counteracting continued misapprehensions about scientific disagreement.

### Solvency

#### Renewable energy is key to solve global warming

Zervos and Coequyt 7 (Arthouros Zervos, European Renewable Energy Council (EREC), and John Coequyt, Climate & Energy Unit, Greenpeace USA, January 24, 2007 “Increasing Renewable Energy in U.S. Can Solve Global Warming” http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2007/01/increasing-renewable-energy-in-u-s-can-solve-global-warming-47208 SC)

The good news first. Renewable energy, combined with energy efficiency, can meet half of the world's energy needs by 2050. This new report, "Energy Revolution: A Blueprint for Solving Global Warming," shows that it is not only economically feasible, but also economically desirable, to cut U.S. CO2 emissions by almost 75% within the next 43 years. These reductions can be achieved without nuclear power, and while virtually ending U.S. dependence on coal. Contrary to popular opinion, a massive uptake of renewable energy and efficiency improvements alone can solve our global warming problem. All that is missing is the right policy support from the President and Congress. The bad news is that time is running out. The overwhelming consensus of scientific opinion is that the global climate is changing and that this change is caused in large part by human activities; if left unchecked, it will have disastrous consequences for Earth's ecosystems and societies. Furthermore, there is solid scientific evidence that we must act now. This is reflected in the conclusions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a collaborative effort involving more than 1,000 scientists. Its next report, due for release early this year, is expected to make the case for urgent action even stronger. In the United States there is a groundswell of activity at the local and state levels. Many mayors, governors, and public and business leaders are doing their part to address climate change. But they can only do so much; action is needed at the federal level. Now is the time for a national, science-based cap on greenhouse gas emissions. It's time for a national plan to address global warming. Such a plan will create jobs, improve the security of America's energy supply, and protect Americans from volatile energy prices. It will restore America's moral leadership on the critical international issue of climate change. And real action in the United States will inspire confidence as the rest of the world negotiates future global commitments to address climate change. In addition to global warming, other energy-related challenges have become extremely pressing. Worldwide energy demand is growing at a staggering rate. Over-reliance on energy imports from a few, often politically unstable, countries, and volatile oil and gas prices, have together pushed energy security to the top of the political agenda, while threatening to inflict a massive drain on the global economy. But while there is a broad consensus that we need to change the way we produce and consume energy, there is still disagreement about what changes are needed and how they should be achieved. The Energy Scenario The European Renewable Energy Council (EREC) and Greenpeace International commissioned this report from the Department of Systems Analysis and Technology Assessment (Institute of Technical Thermodynamics) at the German Aerospace Centre (DLR). The Worldwatch Institute was hired to serve as a technical consultant for the U.S. and North American portions of the report. The report presents a scenario for how the United States can reduce CO2 emissions dramatically and secure an affordable energy supply on the basis of steady worldwide economic development through the year 2050. Both of these important aims can be achieved simultaneously. The scenario relies primarily on improvements in energy efficiency and deployment of renewable energy to achieve these goals. The future potential for renewable energy sources has been assessed with input from all sectors of the renewable energy industry, and forms the basis of the Energy [R]evolution Scenario. The Potential for Renewable Energy Renewable energy technologies such as wind turbines, solar photovoltaic panels, biomass power plants, solar thermal collectors, and biofuels are rapidly becoming mainstream. The global market for renewable energy is growing dramatically; global investment in 2006 reached US$38 billion, 26% higher than the previous year. The time window available for making the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy is relatively short. Today, energy companies have plans to build well over 100 coal-burning power plants across the United States; if those plants are built, it will be impossible to reduce CO2 emissions in time to avoid dangerous climate impacts. But it is not too late yet. We can solve global warming, save money, and improve air and water quality without compromising our quality of life. Strict technical standards are the only reliable way to ensure that only the most efficient transportation systems, industrial equipment, buildings, heating and cooling systems, and appliances will be produced and sold. Consumers should have the opportunity to buy products that minimise both their energy bills and their impact on the global climate.

#### The US reducing emissions is key to solve global warming

Environment California 08 (Environment California, statewide environmental advocacy with researchers on climate change, 3 Dec 2009, “America on the Move: State Leadership in the Fight Against Global Warming and What it Means for the World” http://www.environmentcalifornia.org/reports/global-warming/global-warming-reports2/america-on-the-move-state-leadership-in-the-fight-against-global-warming-and-what-it-means-for-the-world#idaTu6h88H\_3ZY7rhpEwjH6w)

As world leaders prepare to meet in Copenhagen to develop a plan of action to combat global warming, all eyes are on the United States. As the world’s largest economy, the second-largest emitter of global warming pollution, and the nation responsible for more of the human-caused carbon dioxide pollution in the atmosphere than any other, the success of the Copenhagen negotiations – and the future of the planet – depend on American leadership. The United States has gained a reputation, exacerbated during the presidency of George W. Bush, of obstructionism in the fight against global warming. But, over the last decade, America’s state governments – where the bulk of on-the-ground energy policy decision-making is made in America’s federal system of government – have taken the nation on a different course, one of innovative and increasingly aggressive action to reduce global warming pollution. The impact of state-level actions to reduce global warming pollution is significant on a global scale. A review of dozens of individual state policies, federal policies based on state models, and new federal policies in which states will have key roles in implementation suggests that state actions will reduce carbon dioxide emissions by approximately 536 million metric tons by 2020. That is more global warming pollution than is currently emitted by all but eight of the world’s nations, and represents approximately 7 percent of U.S. global warming pollution in 2007. America’s clean energy revolution – led by the states – shows that the nation is ready to commit to the emission reductions science tells us are necessary to prevent the worst impacts of global warming. President Obama should build on these actions by working to forge a strong international agreement to address global warming during the Copenhagen talks. President Obama should lead the way in negotiating an international agreement that will deliver sufficient emission reductions to prevent an increase in global average temperatures of more than 2° C (3.6° F) above pre-industrial levels – a commitment that would enable the world to avoid the most damaging impacts of global warming. • The United States should commit to emission reductions equivalent to a 35 percent reduction in global warming pollution from 2005 levels by 2020 and an 83 percent reduction by 2050, with the majority of near-term emission reductions coming from the U.S. economy. • Individual states should move forward with effective implementation of policies already adopted while continuing to shift toward a clean energy economy and aggressively reducing global warming pollution.

#### CP solves for warming and oil dependence

USCUSA 8 (Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of science experts that write about global warming, 24 October 2008, “How to Solve America’s Energy Crisis and Global Warming” http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/global\_warming/Principles-for-Solving-Global-Warming.pdf SC)

The start of the 21st century holds major challenges for Americans. Rising oil prices are straining our nation’s pocketbook and forcing a hard look at how we plan to meet our energy needs for the future. Continued reliance on oil means we will remain vulnerable to unexpected price shocks and dependence on foreign countries. Continued reliance on coal and other fossil fuels also means that global warming will continue to get worse, resulting in more extreme droughts, more severe storms, and other climatic disruptions that will take a toll on our nation’s public and economic health. We can rise to these challenges with a significant national response that delivers real solutions for Americans. We can choose a new path, one that uses the practical and long-lasting solutions of efficiency and renewable energy sources like wind, solar and sustainable biomass to reduce global warming pollution and reduce the pain of rising energy costs. Energy efficiency and renewable energy sources can play a major role in meeting America’s energy needs. We must make them the center of a robust national strategy instead of following the same failed strategies of the past. Choosing a clean energy future will increase America’s independence, reinvigorate our economy with new jobs and make our environment cleaner and safer. This transition will require millions of Americans to do the work of building, delivering and installing clean energy solutions, and will create significant and sustainable economic growth. To leave the era of dirty energy behind us and head toward a clean energy economy, we need a national policy that accelerates moving in the new direction we are setting and makes sure that American families, energy companies and businesses have the tools and help to get there. Congress and the President need to create a comprehensive national policy that achieves four key goals: 1. Reduce emissions from the use of coal, oil and gas on the scale that is needed to avoid dangerous global warming; 2. Invest in the immediate and long-term transition to energy efficiency and clean energy sources that can stabilize energy costs, invigorate the economy and create new jobs for America’s workers; 3. Assist workers and communities most affected by the transition; and 4. Protect the communities and ecosystems most vulnerable to the economic and physical impacts of global warming. To meet each of these goals, a national policy must include the following key elements: 1. Reduce emissions from the use of coal, oil and gas on the scale that is needed to avoid dangerous global warming The United States must do its part to keep global temperatures from rising more than 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) above pre-industrial levels. The scientific community warns that above this level, dangerous and irreversible changes to the Earth’s climate are predicted to occur. To meet this goal, the legislation must: • Cap and cut global warming emissions to science-based levels with short and long-term targets. Total U.S. emissions must be capped by a date certain, decline every year, be reduced to 15% to 20% below current levels in 2020, and fall to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. • Review and respond to advancing climate science. The effects of global warming are happening much faster than scientists predicted several years ago, and there may be tipping points at which irreversible effects occur at lower levels of greenhouse gas concentrations than previously predicted. A mechanism for periodic scientific review is necessary, and EPA, and other agencies as appropriate, must adjust the regulatory response if the latest science indicates that more reductions are needed. • Make emissions targets certain and enforceable. Our strong existing environmental laws depend on enforceable requirements, rigorous monitoring and reporting of emissions, public input and transparent implementation, and government and citizen enforcement. All of these elements must be included in comprehensive global warming legislation. Cost-containment measures must not break the cap on global warming pollution. Any offsets must be real, additional, verifiable, permanent, and enforceable. The percentage of required emissions reductions that may be met with offsets should be strictly limited, and should be increased only to the extent that there is greater certainty that the offsets will not compromise the program’s environmental integrity. • Require the United States to engage with other nations to reduce emissions through commitments and incentives. The United States must reengage in the international negotiations to establish binding emissions reductions goals under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The legislation must encourage developing countries to reduce emissions by assisting such countries to avoid deforestation and to adopt clean energy technologies. This is a cost-effective way for the United States and other developed nations to achieve combined emissions reductions of at least 25% below 1990 levels by 2020, as called for by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

## \*\*Politics Links\*\*

### DHS Unpopular

**DHS gravy train unpopular**Langdon 11 (Langdon, Writer for Technopolis, The "Homeland Security" Boondoggle: $75 billion per year welfare for the rich, <http://technopolis.blogspot.com/2011/08/homeland-security-boondoggle-75-billion.html>, July 2, 2012, D.A.G.)

While the poor, disabled, elderly, students, and ordinary working people are being clobbered by budget cuts at the federal, state and local levels, **America's two exorbitantly costly gravy trains -- The Pentagon and its twin brother, Homeland Security -- just roll on and on. Details about the internal features of these Big Government juggernauts remain largely unreported, sheltered from public debate**. Year after year they float above scrutiny, cherished as the nation's citadels of fear. It seems that our politicians and much of the citizenry would rather drive the country into bankruptcy than confront the irrational policies and staggering levels of waste these institutions involve. On rare occasion some in the press corps bother to ask: "**How much are we paying for this stuff and what are we getting for it?" Thus, an article in the LA Times recently surveyed the $75 billion per year spent on the projects (many of then patently absurd) called "Homeland Security.**" "Large sums of Homeland Security money, critics complain, have been propelled by pork barrel politics into the backyards of the congressionally connected. Yet the spending has also acted as a cash-rich economic stimulus program for many states at a time when other industries are foundering. "Utah is getting a $1.5-billion National Security Agency cyber-security center that will generate up to 10,000 jobs in the state. **The Pentagon in July launched bidding for a $500-million U.S. Strategic Command headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska, which likes to point out that former President George W. Bush flew here for shelter after the Sept. 11 attacks." \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* Few people in public life want to talk about it -- much of the colossal budget for the Pentagon and Homeland Security amounts to welfare for the rich, e.g., lots of six figure salaries and lots of "research and development" on high tech toys**. When it comes to "addressing America's spiraling debt," welfare programs in this category are never "on the table." Think of them as "entitlements

**DHS is just a big waste of money and never accomplishes anything**Johnson-Freese 11(Joan Johnson-Freese, Expert on US military space, Chinese space and the PLA. Professor at Naval War College and lecturer at Harvard University. , Homeland Security Department: 'Colossal, Inefficient Boondoggle', <http://defense.aol.com/2011/09/06/homeland-security-department-colossal-inefficient-boondoggle/>, July 2, 2012 D.A.G.)

One of the lasting legacies of 9/11 that continues to affect the daily life of every American **is the Department of Homeland Security. It sounds like something out of a bad dystopian novel, and it is: given its sheer size -- over 225,000 employees -- massive expense (estimated at $55 billion in 2010), and vast political reach**, its very existence has fueled endless X-Files conspiracy theories. It is the perfect foil for every argument that all the U.S. government needed to cement its control over the population is a major attack that would scare Americans so witless they would sign their lives over to the gray men of the national security bureaucracy. f only the government were that efficient or far-sighted. Alas, **the truth is more mundane: the reality is that DHS is a colossal and inefficient boondoggle, an institutional over-reaction similar to Jimmy Carter's panicky creation of the Department of Energy in response to an energy crisis that came and went in the 1970s**. Enough time has passed that other ill-advised policies that were adopted in the heat of the post-9/11 moment have been discarded or scaled down: the Patriot Act, for example, was renewed only in parts (although still too many), rather than in toto, by the Obama administration. It is time to reconsider the role and expense of Homeland Security -- or whether it should even exist. **DHS was a panic reaction, a precipitous act by a Bush administration determined to show it was "doing something" about terrorism. The horses had already escaped, but the Bush administration went ahead anyway and bought more land, constructed extra barns, equipped them with state-of-the-art doors, and then hired thousands of conscientious civil servants to slam them shut over and over again, for the rest of eternity**. The first Secretary of the new department, former Pennsylvania governor Tom Ridge, was unquestionably a formidable man and a proven American leader, and he was promptly installed with great fanfare atop a blob of institutional spaghetti that no one, to this day, can make any sense of. (Quick: name Ridge's successors.) Like all mediocre ideas, the creation of DHS involved a movement of organizational boxes and the creation of layers of administration that would shame a Soviet central planner. The glass boxes that surround the Washington Beltway once again hum with vibrant activity. Like the last wave of young, dedicated, eager, and inexperienced Cold Warriors brought to Washington by Ronald Reagan's investments in defense a generation earlier, young men and women assemble in the wee hours of the morning -- their importance proclaimed by the security badges they carefully display by wearing them around their necks in public -- to join the inevitable brigades of contractors and revolving door executive-branch retirees clogging the Virginia and Maryland interstates as they head to work for a long day of creating pretty slides that they then brief to each other at top dollar. **Out in the land, meanwhile, armies of newly-minted security guards at airports check the shampoo bottles of shoeless matrons and belt-less executives. The Coast Guard has been shuttled from the Department of Transportation to DHS to remain an armed service outside the armed services. While one might assume the states are now amply funded to prepare should terrorists decide, after tiring of New York and Washington, to strike at America's amber waves of grain, complaints from the heartland that too much federal anti-terrorism funding go to those and other "high risk" cities abound.** Everyone wants their place at the feeding trough. **The amount of money unleashed by anything with the name "security" in it has been stupendous. The most obvious result of all this bureaucracy is a whopping tab for a department t**hat, when taken with the Defense Department and other agencies, is now part of a national security establishment so large that **no one,** as William Arkin and Dana Priest of The Washington Post recently wrote, **can even keep track of it anymore or tally its actual costs.** None of this is to impugn either the motives or the dedication of our colleagues at DHS; we ourselves are Federal employees -- although note, we speak for no one but ourselves -- and we know that government workers, contrary to the sniping stereotypes, do in fact work hard and believe in their service to the United States and the American people. But fundamentally the question must be asked: Has any of this orgy of money, bureaucracy, and PowerPointing improved U.S. national security? The war on terror is a classic case of an "away game," in which the most important guarantee of the security of the American public is to stop plots, and the plotters, at the source. This is especially the case since the threat comes in small packages, literally, as individuals and small groups plot overseas. No amount of money or bureaucracy, for example, stopped a Nigerian from getting on a U.S. airliner wearing explosive underwear in 2009. Resources would be better spent intercepting him in Yemen, along with the people who trained him, not trying to stop him moments from the aircraft. Massive bureaucracies are not suited to stealthy threats, any more than elephants are suited to stomping out mosquitoes. More to the point, there is only so much "security" that can be achieved in a free society. We cannot screen every person who walks into an airport, mall, school, or theater. (Just ask the Russians. They've tried.) Bolting layers of bureaucrats onto existing organizations does not make those organizations more efficient, it just makes them more expensive and intrusive. So where should we redirect our resources now that al-Qaeda is in tatters and billions have been sunk into dubious "security" institutions? First, the priority should be on intelligence, domestic and foreign. We already know how to do this, and our civilian and military intelligence services should lack for nothing, including human resources, in carrying out their missions. The U.S. military has the finest operators in the world in it, and elite professionals like Seal Team Six are more than capable of pulling up the terrorists by the roots if they are pointed in the right direction. One more tired airport screener or one more glossy briefing will not have the impact of seizing the computers of dead jihadists. Second, we need a longer term strategy for dealing with terrorism overall. Perhaps the most disappointing non-event of the past ten years has been the complete failure of America's intellectual infrastructure, including its colleges and universities, to create a reserve of expertise similar to that funded by the U.S. government in the wake of the Soviet challenge in the 1950s. There's enough blame to go around here: civilian academics are loath to work with the government and (often rightly) suspect either that their research will be tainted or that such an association will hurt their careers. The government, for its part, has tried as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates (echoing Arthur Schlesinger decades ago) admonished, to "embrace the eggheads" though many of the programs set up toward that end have already come and gone. As we have said before, academics and defense intellectuals can do better working with each other, and must. Even a fraction of the DHS's riches, if properly administered, could create a far more secure foundation for fighting Islamic extremism than we have now. A quick check of this week's website top stories at the DHS website reveals a wealth of information about... Hurricane Irene. Is this why DHS was created? To cope with bad weather and floods, no matter how deadly? Is this why a 500-page bill was passed while the remains of the World Trade Center smoldered at Ground Zero? Don't we already have a National Weather Service and a National Guard? Come to think of it, perhaps the weather service should be put under Homeland Security. Everything else is.

### Spending Links

#### The plan would cost at least 8 billion dollars

**Rugy**, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, **5** (Veronique de, September 7, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?”, <http://directory.cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>, accessed: 7/7/12, ML)

The stated objective of the Port Security Grant Program is to fund security upgrades to help protect ports in case of a terrorist attack. According to an estimate by the Coast Guard, the cost for enhancing security at America’s 361 maritime facilities would be $1.5 billion in the first year, plus an additional $7.3 billion over the next decade.61 Thus, if the goal is to enhance security in our ports, $140.9 million is likely to be inadequate. That remains true even if we include the $706 million in direct grants already allocated to ports to improve their physical and operational security and spending.62

## \*\*Romney Bad\*\*

### Romney tank US-Russian relations

#### Romney hates Russia and won’t cooperate with Russia on Syria

Mataconis 6/19 (Doug Mataconis, an attorney with a J.D. in political science, 19 June 2012, “Romney Continues to Attack Russia”, http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/romney-continues-to-attack-russia/ SC)

Mitt Romney made headlines back in March when he referred to Russia as “our number one geopolitical foe,” a comment that was immediately criticized by Russian leaders and many members of the foreign policy establishment. Additionally, as The New York Times noted in an article last month, Romney’s remarks and his continued hard-line position toward Russia have been the subject of controversy within Republican foreign policy circles, with even some of Romney’s own advisers quite obviously disagreeing with their boss on the matter. Any chance those advisers might have influenced Romney to tone down his rhetoric, though, seems to have gone out the window now that Romney has essentially doubled down on his previous comments: Showing no sign of backing down on his hawkish stance on Russia, Mitt Romney said in a radio interview broadcast on Tuesday that the country is continuing “to pursue a course which is antithetical” to that of the United States. In the interview with Fox Radio, Romney repeated his earlier characterization of Russia as “geopolitical foe” – a position that has raised questions among Democrats and even some Republicans about whether he remains stuck in a Cold War mindset. He sought to put the notion to rest, but did not deviate from his earlier controversial assertions. “The nation which consistently opposes our actions at the United Nations has been Russia,” Romney said. “We’re of course not enemies. We’re not fighting each other. There’s no Cold War, but Russia is a geopolitical foe in that regard.” Romney’s remarks came as President Obama has been meeting with Russian leader Vladimir Putin at Mexico’s G-20 summit to try to seek common ground over how to deal with Syria, one of Russia’s allies. Romney blasted Obama for what he called an ill-advised concession on withdrawing missile-defense sites from Eastern Europe, which he called Putin’s “number one foreign-policy objective.” “I think it was an enormous mistake to give them that and what he got in return shows the extraordinary naiveté of a presidency that does not understand the power of resolve and strength,” he said.

#### Romney will kill US-Russia relations

Larison 6/27 (Daniel Larison, Ph.D. in history and a contributing editor at The American Conservative, 27 June 2012, “U.S.-Russian Relations Would Get Much Worse under Romney”, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/u-s-russian-relations-would-get-much-worse-under-romney/ SC)

Ognyan Minchev offers an unpersuasive interpretation of Putin’s thinking: Putin might share some of that same distrust of liberal partners and be more apt to deal with a hard-line conservative in the White House. Yet, there would almost certainly be tradeoffs. A conservative president would likely engage in more assertive policies toward Moscow. A more active U.S. policy toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, or Central Europe would risk clashing more openly with Russia’s positions. Why would Putin want this, given the fragility of Russian power today? Threats have been a key driver of Russian power politics throughout the history of the Empire. Putin’s calculations could take many forms. A more active U.S. policy on disputed issues might demonstrate not only American power but also reveal American weaknesses. A more assertive U.S. presence in the spheres of Russian interest might also provoke more active opposition by China, and Russia may benefit from greater competition between Beijing and Washington. Or Putin might prefer an immediate, open rivalry with what he perceives to be a weakened United States across a range of issues. The easier (and more accurate) answer is that Putin doesn’t actually want a “hard-line conservative in the White House.” Putin distrusts the U.S. because he believes that the Bush administration behaved in an ungrateful and untrustworthy fashion in the previous decade, and U.S.-Russian relations improved as much as they did because the current administration seemed to be more reliable. U.S.-Russian relations reached their lowest point in the last twenty years in no small part because of a “more active U.S. policy” toward the Middle East, the South Caucasus, and central Europe. Putin might be willing to deal with a more hard-line American President, but only so long as it this translated into tangible gains for Russia. Provided that the hard-liner was willing to live up to his end of the bargain, there could be some room for agreement, but there isn’t any. Since Romney’s Russia policy is essentially to never make any deals with the current Russian government, Putin doesn’t have much of an incentive to cooperate. That will guarantee that U.S.-Russian relations will deteriorate much more than they have in the last year.

#### Obama’s election is key to US-Russian relations- when Romney is elected, even if he doesn’t destroy relations, Putin will

Larison 6/20 (Daniel Larison, Ph.D. in history and a contributing editor at The American Conservative, 20 June 2012, “The Presidential Election’s Effects on U.S.-Russian Relations”, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-presidential-elections-effects-on-u-s-russian-relations/ SC)

Not only does Putin have no strong incentive to take risks in pursuing new deals with Obama before the election, but he has good reason to believe that a Romney administration would halt or reverse most or all of Obama’s initiatives related to Russia. If Romney wins in November, Putin has even less incentive to cooperate with the U.S., because he will assume (correctly) that the incoming administration is going to be much more antagonistic. Arms control isn’t likely to be a top priority in a Romney White House. To the extent that he has said anything about arms control, Romney is openly hostile to new agreements and unwilling to make even the smallest concessions on missile defense. The good news is that U.S.-Russian relations might start to recover once the election is over, but that depends on the outcome. Romney’s election would represent the confirmation of Russian hard-liners’ suspicions that the post-2008 thaw in relations was a fluke and couldn’t be sustained. Indeed, the Republican nominee seems to have crafted his Russia policy to maximize distrust and paranoia in Moscow. The 2008 and 2012 campaigns have been unusual in the post-Cold War era for the intensity of anti-Russian sentiment expressed by the Republican nominees in these cycles. If it had just been the 2008 cycle, it could have attributed to McCain’s longstanding anti-Russian attitudes and dismissed as such. The re-emergence of Russophobia as a major theme of Republican foreign policy makes that impossible. Weiss also points to the danger that Putin will contribute to wrecking the relationship for opportunistic domestic reasons: Still, Putin knows how to cater to the two-thirds of the Russian electorate that voted for him in March and reside primarily in Russia’s smaller cities and countryside. He may find it hard to resist the temptation to play upon their worst fears and anti-Western stereotypes. Sacrificing the past several years of dramatic improvement in the U.S.-Russian relationship may seem like a small price to pay if it breathes new life and legitimacy into his rule. If Romney is elected, his desire to scrap good relations with Russia would make it extremely easy for Putin to do just that.

#### Romney will wreck relations with Russia if elected, and many people would support him

Bastil 3/28 (Edward Bastil, political correspondent, 28 March 2012, “MITT ROMNEY READY TO START A WAR WITH RUSSIA ON DAY ONE”, http://scrapetv.com/News/News%20Pages/Politics/pages-5/Mitt-Romney-ready-to-start-a-war-with-Russia-on-day-one-Scrape-TV-The-World-on-your-side-2012-03-28.html SC)

Responding to questions about President Obama’s hot mic exchange with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, Romney came out aggressively against the old rival and essentially made it clear that he was ready and willing to wage war against Russia if elected, something which will surely please hawks but might scare away swing voters. “I’m saying in terms of a geopolitical opponent, the nation that lines up with the world’s worst actors, of course the greatest threat that the world faces is a nuclear Iran, and nuclear North Korea is already troubling enough, but when these terrible actors pursue their course in the world and we go to the United Nations looking for ways to stop them,” Romney told CNN. “When Assad, for instance, is murdering his own people, we go to the United Nations and who is it that always stands up for the world’s worst actors? It is always Russia, typically with China alongside, and so in terms of a geopolitical foe, a nation that’s on the Security Council, that has the heft of the Security Council, and is of course a massive security power — Russia is the geopolitical foe.” Medvedev dismissed Romney’s comments, probably because he expects Obama to win in November or possibly because they were kind of stupid. Romney has thus far not detailed his plans for the war against Russia, though that may be part of the longer plan, owing to his passion for reversing Obamacare and fixing the economy in his first few days in office. “I think Medvedev go it absolutely right when he said that Romney was trying to appeal to the Hollywood vision of Russia, that they are some kind of monolithic enemy because the President spoke to one of them in what he thought was a private conversation. The line of logic there is a little faulty, but of course many people in America hate Russians so it works with them,” said Scrape TV Political analyst Gabriel Kinsey. “For the rest of the country though I think the notion of starting a hot war with a formidable rival before you even get into office is at best arrogant, and at worst an unmitigated disaster that could result in the death of millions and possible nuclear annihilation, which is usually not the best way to get votes. Usually, at least, this year things are kind of up in the air.” In light of the comments, it’s not clear which candidate newly elected Russian President Putin will support.

## \*\*Romney is a Mad-Man\*\*

#### Romney is lying about what he’ll do after he’s elected

Friedersdorf 4/18 (Conor Friedersdorf, a staff writer at The Atlantic who focuses on politics and national affairs, 18 Apr 2012, “Obama vs. Romney: Unknowable Foreign-Policy Differences”, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/04/obama-vs-romney-unknowable-foreign-policy-differences/256044/ SC)

Says Andrew Sullivan, making the case that Obama is clearly the better choice on foreign policy, "If Romney is elected, and if no deal with Iran is accomplished before then, we will go to war in a third Muslim country, and possibly escalate again in Afghanistan. The rebooting of the global religious war would be instant. The US will almost certainly become the guarantor of all of Greater Israel, rendering us cut off from the entire Arab and Muslim world, as well as increasingly isolated from Europe. Russia, Romney tells us, is the number one 'threat'." Maybe. On the other hand, as the Associated Press reported last month, "President Barack Obama said Sunday the United States will not hesitate to attack Iran with military force to prevent it from acquiring a nuclear weapon." Obama also avowed a willingness to attack Iran in his interview with Jeffrey Goldberg. Maybe Obama is bluffing. Maybe Mitt Romney is bluffing. Who can tell when either of those two are telling the truth? Certainly not me. I've seen too many betrayals. Says Doug Mataconis: I would submit that it tells us that the most likely outcome of a Romney victory in November would be, for the most part, continuity rather than radical change. Granted, there are concerns to be drawn from the rhetoric that Romney engaged in during the primary campaign regarding foreign policy issues, and which he is likely to continue to push during the General Election campaign. Leaving aside that rhetoric, though, the mainstream of American foreign policy seems to me to be really well set. Unless Mitt Romney does something totally insane like making John Bolton Secretary of State (which I would submit is about as likely as Rick Santorum being selected as the next spokesperson for GLAAD), a Romney Administration's foreign policy is likely to be not all that different from what we've seen over the past three years. Which, to be all that honest, hasn't been all that impressive. Totally plausible. Is it true? Unknowable. Romney could be much better than Obama or much worse, or pretty much the same, regardless of your notions of what better means, because it's very difficult to tell what he'd do, or the political climate that will shape his decisions, or even what unexpected foreign-policy challenges he'll face. There are, to be sure, differences in the larger Democratic and Republican coalitions that are likely to factor into the foreign-policy decisions made by Romney or Obama and that determine the pool of talent from which they'll draw their advisers. If I thought that information was enough to reliably tell me which candidate will, by my lights, be better on foreign policy, I'd vote for him. As yet, I find it difficult to discern how much Romney is pandering to neoconservatives as opposed to being in sympathy with them, how strong the growing anti-war sentiment in the Republican Party is, or how Romney feels about war spending. I presume that Obama will continue to wage drone wars in a secret number of countries; keep adding to his list of people, including American citizens, to kill extra-judicially; ponder military interventions without congressional permission; and either continue to lose in or withdraw from Afghanistan. Hence the likelihood that neither man will earn my vote.

## \*\*Economy Cards\*\*

### AT: Econ Collapse

#### No econ. Collapse, No UQ or link triggered, Econ already bad

KingWorldNews 12

(Egon von, Founder and Managing Partner of Matterhorn Asset Management AG & GoldSwitzerland, 6/28/12, http://kingworldnews.com/kingworldnews/KWN\_DailyWeb/Entries/2012/6/28\_Greyerz\_-\_Greatest\_Financial\_Collapse\_The\_World\_Has\_Ever\_Seen.html, accessed on 7/2/12 EW)

With global stock markets trading in the red, today Egon von Greyerz told King World News that investors are going to witness the greatest financial collapse the world has ever seen. Egon von Greyerz, who is founder and managing partner at Matterhorn Asset Management out of Switzerland, also said, “...investors are under the illusion that the system will continue, but it won’t.” Here is what Greyerz had to say about the the financial collapse: “As always, Eric, I’m focusing on the big picture. We are in a crisis, and the outcome is absolutely certain. What is not certain is how we get there. The problem is it’s not only one crisis, it’s a number of crises. We have the first one which is the sovereign crisis.”Egon von Greyerz continues: “Almost every single major country in the world is bankrupt, and no one has the tools or a plan to get these countries out of this crisis. So countries will go bankrupt by default or by printing excessive money. This situation will continue to get worse and ultimately lead to a hyperinflationary depression. Then you have the banking crisis. The banks are insolvent and they are also in a liquidity crisis. And this is, again, worldwide. There is no way the banks will be able to survive this without massive assistance. This is a banking crisis of the magnitude which will amount to trillions of dollars, and if we take the whole of the derivative positions, it could be hundreds of trillions of dollars because of the counterparty risks. The third crisis is the economic crisis. Every single country is suffering tremendously and economic figures are continuing to deteriorate, whether it’s in the US, in Europe, China or Japan. This crisis will also lead to a depression. Any of these three crises is sufficient to bring the world down because they are not just in one country, they are worldwide “The three crises together are guaranteed to bring down the world economy**. The fourth crisis that will come out of this will be the social crisis because people are suffering today. Most people can hardly afford to live today because the costs of their food, fuel and housing are so expensive. This will lead to more social unrest. All of these factors are why this will be the most serious depression the world has ever experienced. The problem is not having a gold standard, which has meant that the world economy has lost its integrity and honesty.** That’s what’s happening now, we have a dishonest financial system. So we have a world without values.**” Greyerz also added: “Europe is in a crisis, but they can never decide anything in these meetings. They might come out with a little package, but in the end it will be irrelevant. The real package will come out when there is panic. We shouldn’t even listen to what these politicians are saying today because they are incapable of facing the truth. Many countries in Europe are already bankrupt, such as Greece, Spain, Italy, and many others are on the way to bankruptcy such as France, the UK, etc.. In the short-term Europe will hold together. Longer-term the EU will break up and the euro will disappear, but shorter-term it’s not going to happen. Right now investors have the illusion that things are actually okay because the stock market is near the recent highs. The reality is the stock market is not near the highs because it’s down 80% vs gold in the last 10 years. The other problem is the bond market which is the biggest bubble right now. Who wants to buy government bonds and earn zero to 2% from bankrupt governments? There will be a guaranteed collapse of the bond market. So, in reality, investors are under the illusion that the system will continue, but it won’t. This is why investors have to focus on protecting their wealth. I’m still of the firm opinion that the only investment that will protect investors purchasing power is physical gold, stored outside of the banking system. Gold cannot be printed, it cannot be destroyed, and it will continue to act as money as this crisis deteriorates even further. We now have the BIS proposing that gold should be part of Tier-1 capital. This means that gold, as Tier-1 capital, will involve zero percent risk. Up to now it’s been counted as having a 50% risk. Therefore, it is likely that a lot of the central banks and international banks are going to increase their investment in gold. This could have a major effect on the demand for gold in the next couple of years. So in the short-term gold is like a bouncing ball. The swings are getting smaller and smaller. The price of gold has simply gone sideways for ten months, but now the range is narrowing. While gold may experience short-term pressure, the next big move is going to be on the upside, and investors need to be positioned for that.”**

#### No economic collapse – we are already to low

Roche 11 (founder and CEO of an investment partnership. His primary areas of expertise include global macro portfolio construction, quantitative risk, Cullen, 9/9, “5 REASONS THE U.S. ECONOMY WON’T COLLAPSE”, <http://pragcap.com/5-reasons-the-u-s-economy-wont-collapse>, ML)

I keep repeating that the debate over a double dip is meaningless. Why? Because we’ve been in one long balance sheet recession this entire time. So, a good way to think about this is to think of the U.S. like a boxer. We were knocked flat on our back in 2008 and have since struggled to one knee. We never got back to our feet though. So these conversations that imply we might be on the verge of falling down again are rather pointless. Sure, we might fall down again, but we already have one knee on the canvass! The point is, with this much slack in the economy, it’s unlikely that any economic downturn from here will be substantial. Does that mean I think the U.S. economy can’t contract from here? No, but I would be very surprised if we were to experience another blow similar to the 2008 recession where real GDP fell 5%. To put this argument in some perspective, analysts at ING tend to agree. They see the economy as muddling through, but not collapsing. They cite 5 reasons for this perspective: “Cyclical sensitive sectors, namely the housing sector and the auto sector, are already weak and are unlikely to contract much more. Households’ balance sheets have improved since the global financial crisis. Lower rates over a considerable period of time benefit net borrowers. Most US households will benefit from low borrowing rates. The trade deficit is likely to narrow due to slower import growth, decline in energy and commodity prices and a weak trade weighted dollar. Decline in commodity prices will check headline inflation and could lift households’ purchasing power. Investors’ fears are based on their most recent experience. The unpleasant memories of the global financial crisis are biasing investors’ sentiments. ” Equity markets could be a bit of a different story here. I am actually becoming increasingly concerned about a potential profits recession in the USA as international growth tapers off (remember, the market is not the economy). But with all of this doom and gloom in the air, I think it’s important to keep things in some perspective. The downside for the US economy as a whole isn’t enormous here. We just don’t have that much further to fall because we never really got up…

#### World economy won’t collapse

Bloom 12 (Economist, “Why the World Economy Won’t Collapse, Bullish for Stock Stocks”, May 3, <http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article34463.html>, ML)

Frankly, I think that the arguments regarding a systemic collapse are both premature and excessively pessimistic and, even if they were accurate, then nothing anyone can do (including the 1%) will stave off a consequential collapse of the world's economy. And, if the world economy collapses, what would be the benefit of owning gold when it won't be able to buy you anything except on the black market? Clearly, to me, rampant printing of fiat money will inevitably lead to systemic collapse. And if an ordinary bloke like me can see it then why should we assume that the 1% cannot see it. And, if the 1% can see it, then why would they do that (drown the world economy in fiat currency)? To assume that they will do that is to assume that they are stupid. I may not agree with Bernanke or Geithner or whoever else is taking these politically driven decisions to spruik the markets and the economy but the last thing I would accuse these people of is "stupidity". In summary, the charts are telling me that the current secondary up-move in the Primary Bear Market will continue for the foreseeable future and that the markets are not expecting rampant inflation. I have argued with the market twice before since 2008. I won't do it a third time. My guess is that at or soon after the presidential elections, a dose of reality will likely emerge and the "final" Primary down leg will emerge - which will become visible on the charts. That leg will be extremely painful for everyone. It will be deflationary and it will continue - on and on and on until the sovereign debt overhang problem is finally resolved. It may take upwards of 15 years before the next Primary Bull Market emerges. My guess is further, that if/when the Bull Market emerges it will be at a shallower angle of incline to that which prevailed between 1933 and 2000. The depths to which the third primary down leg will plumb will be a function of how "neatly" the sovereign debt issue is addressed. It also seems to me that, because "real" growth is now trending towards population growth and productivity savings, (as demonstrated in last week's blog) there will be not much purpose served in continuing to print excessive amounts of money. Economic activity will remain growing slowly and, therefore, demand for excessive amounts of capital will abate (after the current debt has been repaid). Therefore, the "ladder" of risk will shift downwards in the foreseeable future. Maybe Government bonds will be 2% and the market will yield 6% and venture capitalists will demand 18%. Or maybe it will be 1%, 3% and 9%. Who knows? Whatever happens, it will be painful for retirees. That it must happen, fundamentally, is being dictated by the amount of sovereign debt that needs to be serviced. In my mind, the neatest way to clear the sovereign debt decks (and minimise the impact of an all-out Depression) will be "equity for debt swaps" and, in The Last Finesse, I make a suggestion regarding how up to a 1/3 of all global sovereign debt might be taken off the books in this manner. Ultimately, the reason I am optimistic about the long term future is that the depth and breadth of new technologies currently under development is breathtaking. There will be two limiting issues: Resource availability and the need for a greater emphasis on ethical behaviour. For the purposes of disclosure: I stopped trading on the markets some years ago - long before the GFC manifested - because the short term charts were becoming unreliable in their signals. Since then, my spare capital has been diverted to buy-and-hold situations that require an enormous amount of patience - which I happen to have. These investments were made in anticipation of the underlying companies eventually becoming cash cows. I continue to watch the charts from a long term, strategic perspective and will continue to comment thereon.

#### Economic recovery inevitable

Phillips 12 (Ph.D. from the University of Rochester, Kerk, May 14, “Economic recovery is inevitable, but better policies influence it”, <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/765576026/Economic-recovery-is-inevitable-but-better-policies-influence-it.html?pg=all>, ML)

Despite these dampening effects, growth in the application of technology has not slowed appreciably. This means that labor productivity in terms of output-per-hour-worked has been rising. Eventually this will translate into a greater demand for labor and an increase in production of goods and services. Detrimental policies in the short run can delay this inevitable recovery, but cannot stop it. In fact, the longer the recovery stalls, the stronger output is likely to surge when it occurs. All this assumes, of course, that the growth in applying technology does not slow down appreciably. As noted above, high tax and regulatory burdens can dampen innovation if they remain in place permanently. If this happens, the economy will have fewer new technologies to implement. In that case, recovery is still inevitable in the sense of wages, jobs and GDP per capita returning to and surpassing their previous highs, but long-run growth rates will be lower, resulting in incomes rising more slowly than has been the case in the past. Hence, recovery is inevitable if we wait long enough, but better policies are likely to bring about a more rapid recovery and return the economy to a higher long-run growth path.

#### US economy resilient

Amadeo 11 (M.S., Sloan School of Business, M.I.T. and M.S. Planning, Boston College, Kimberly, “The Power of the U.S. Economy”, September 6,

<http://useconomy.about.com/od/supply/p/Economic_power.htm>, ML)

The economic power of the United States is matched by no other country around the world. Total output for the U.S. economy in 2010 was $14.6 trillion, one fifth of the world's total output. Although the EU is larger, at $14.8 trillion, it is a collection of countries. China is the second largest, at $10.09 trillion, and Japan is third, at $4.3 trillion. Please note: these comparisons are made using purchasing power parity. (Source: CIA World Factbook, Rank Order GDP) In fact, the GDP of most countries are the same as many U.S. states. To put these numbers in perspective, check out this map, which shows which country has the same GDP as each state. The U.S. Economy Provides One of the Highest Standards of Living in the World: The power of the U.S. economy is seen in its GDP per capita, which was $47,400 in 2010. This effectively measures a country's standard of living. Nine countries have higher GDP per person, but it is only because they are small: Liechenstein, Qater and Luxembourg, to name a few. Although the EU is the world's largest economy, its GDP per capita was only $32,700. (For more, see GDP per Capita) Think of the incredible economic power it takes to both be the country with the largest economy in the world while producing one of the highest standards of living per person. While other countries, such as Norway and Bermuda, have higher GDP per capita, they aren't also a driver of the global economic engine that the U.S. is.

# \*\*\*AFF\*\*\*

## \*\*Politics\*\*

### Link Turns

#### Public wants better transportation infrastructure

Hart Research Associates 9 (“The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey Findings from a national survey of registered voters, conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies”, <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>, ML, accessed: 7/7)

Even with a highly polarized electorate that remains steadfast in its belief that things in the nation are off on the wrong track there is wide agreement—across the partisan spectrum—that leaders in Washington should be seeking common ground. Nowhere is this more true than legislation related to the country’s transportation infrastructure. Indeed, two in three voters say that making improvements in infrastructure is very important, and most voters say that in its current state the nation’s transportation system is barely adequate. Voters seek better and safer roads and more public transportation options, widely agreeing that the United States would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

## \*\*Terror\*\*

### Attack Timeframe Cards

#### Terror Attack by 2013, Al Qeada has plans of WMD

Sacks 10

(Ethan, 1/26/12, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2010-01-26/news/29437024\_1\_al-qaeda-major-attack-devastating-terror-attack, accessed on 7/2/12, EW)

Al Qaeda planners are lying in wait, plotting another major attack on U.S. soil involving weapons of mass destruction, according to a dire new report. Osama bin Laden's terror network has made several attempts to acquire large-scale biological, chemical or nuclear weapons in the years since the Sept. 11 attacks, according to a new report. Former high-ranking CIA official Rolf Mowatt-Larssen reported in a paper for Harvard's Kennedy School that al Qaeda operatives are desperate to launch the most devastating terror attack yet. "We have done things that have made the country safer," Mowatt-Larssen told the News. "But we have to ask ourselves does that mean they can't mount another attack like 9/11 with 19 core, well-trained terrorists? "It doesn't require a giant organization to pull off a spectacular terrorist attack like that. We have to be careful that we don't become complacent." Mowatt-Larssen, who led the U.S.'s probe into whether or not Al Qaeda had aquired WMDs in the wake of the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, speculates that the lack of another major attack is due in part to luck. "If Osama bin Ladin and his lieutenants had been interested in employing crude chemical, biological and radiological materials in small scale attacks, there is little doubt they could have done so by now," wrote Mowatt-Larssen in his report. The report, released Monday, comes ahead of a congressional meeting to assess the country's preparedness for the type of major attack Mowatt-Larssen is warning about, the Washington Post reported. That commission released a sobering report in December 2008 that predicted a major attack involving WMDS by 2013. "After New York and America were attacked in 1993, we fell asleep," Sen. Charles Schumer (D.-NY) said in a statement. "We learned on 9-11, when America and New York were attacked again, that we can never - ever - make that mistake again. "We must be vigilant in protecting Americans and our nation's infrastructure from potential acts of terrorism and we must ensure that we our providing or local and national law enforcement authorities with the resources they need to get the job done." Since the Sept. 11 attacks, Al Qaeda has spear-headed largely smaller-scale, localized attacks. This weekend, bin Laden surfaced in a new audio tape claiming responsibility for the failed Christmas Day attempt by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, a lone Nigerian man, to ignite a liquid-powder bomb aboard Northwest Airline Flight 253 as it prepared to land in Detroit. One of the motivations for his report, Mowatt-Larssen said, was the concern that government officials were getting too bogged down in focusing on the potential for smaller scale terrorist attacks like individual suicide bombers or plots to bring down a single aircraft. "Just like a football coach that might say, 'We're never going to fumble, we're never going to have an interception,' well that's not going to last long," he said. "In the war on terror, we're going to have to -- as hard as it is for people to hear this message -- we're going to have to get used to making risk management decisions that means we're not going to stop everything. "But the important thing, the most important thing, is stopping the next 9/11."

### WMD Impacts

#### Nuclear attack inevitable and devastating

Fox News 8

(12/2/8, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,459927,00.html, accessed on 7/1/12, EW)

A nuclear device detonated near the White House would kill roughly 100,000 people and flatten downtown federal buildings, while the radioactive plume from the explosion would likely spread toward the Capitol and into Southeast D.C., contaminating thousands more. The blast from the 10-kiloton bomb — similar to the bomb dropped over Hiroshima during World War II — would kill up to one in 10 tourists visiting the Washington Monument and send shards of glass flying the length of the National Mall, in a scenario that has become increasingly likely to occur in a major U.S. city in recent years, panel members told a Senate committee yesterday. “It’s inevitable,” said Cham E. Dallas, director of the Institute for Health Management and Mass Destruction Defense at the University of Georgia, who has charted the potential explosion’s effect in the District and testified before a hearing of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. “I think it’s wistful to think that it won’t happen by 20 years.” The Senate committee has convened a series of hearings to examine the threat and effects of a terrorist nuclear attack on a U.S. city, as well as the needed response. Yesterday’s panel stressed the importance of state and local cooperation with federal authorities in the wake of an attack, assistance from the private business sector to aid recovery and the dire need to boost the capabilities of area hospitals. They recommended expanding emergency personnel by training physicians like pharmacists and dentists to aid in all-hazards care, monitoring the exposure of first responders to radiation and clearly disseminating information to the public. “The scenarios we discuss today are very hard for us to contemplate, and so emotionally traumatic and unsettling that it is tempting to push them aside,” said Sen. Joe Lieberman, Connecticut independent and committee chairman. “However, now is the time to have this difficult conversation, to ask the tough questions, and then to get answers as best we can and take preparatory and preventive action.” Ashton B. Carter, co-director of the Preventive Defense Project at Harvard University, said the likelihood of a nuclear attack on U.S. soil is undetermined, but it has increased with the proliferation of weapons by Iran and North Korea and the failure to secure Russia’s nuclear arsenal following the Cold War. “For while the probability of a nuclear weapon one day going off in a U.S. city cannot be calculated, it is almost surely larger than it was five years ago,” Mr. Carter said. Mr. Carter described a more destructive blast effect. He said the ground-based detonation of a 10-kiloton bomb would result in near-total devastation within a circle about two miles in diameter, or the length of the Mall. The zone of destruction is projected to be less than that of Hiroshima, where the bomb was dropped from an airplane and detonated above the city. A similar blast in a more densely populated city than the District, such as Chicago or New York, would result in an injury toll up to eight times higher. A plume a few miles long could also dole out lethal doses of radiation, Mr. Carter said. However, the experts emphasized that the explosion would not impact most of a major city and that in many cases, residents could remain safe by not evacuating immediately and clogging area roadways. “It is also expected that, due to lack of information getting to the public, many people will try to flee by car or on foot, often in the wrong direction, again exposing themselves to high levels of radiation, as vehicles provide virtually no protection,” Mr. Carter said. Mr. Dallas said a major problem facing most cities is a lack of available hospital beds for victims of burns that would result from a nuclear blast. He said up to 95 percent of such victims would not receive potentially life-saving care.“We’re completely underprepared,” he said. “Most of them will die.” Mr. Dallas said the District also faces a unique challenge because of the way the city is configured geographically: A wind blowing west to east would gradually spread radiation from the explosion into the low-income neighborhoods of Southeast, where there are limited health care options available and only one hospital. Area officials have spent millions of dollars in recent years to develop evacuation plans and stockpile emergency supplies after a 2006 study by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security said local preparation for a disaster was “not sufficient.” Darrell L. Darnell, director of the District’s Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, said the city is continuing to develop its “emergency preparedness capabilities” and has numerous methods of informing residents of actions they should take, including through text messages, voice alerts and Web sites like www.dc.gov and http://72hours.dc.gov. “We are confident that the District is prepared to respond to a catastrophic incident affecting the District,” Mr. Darnell said. Still, Mr. Dallas said the majority of victims in a nuclear explosion will likely have to fend for themselves in the first hours after an attack. “These people are going to be on their own,” he said after the hearing. “There’s no white horse to ride to the rescue.”

## \*\*Oil Spills\*\*

### Environmental Impacts

#### **Environmental Protection k2 Economy**

Pfeiffer 12

(Eric, 4/4/12, http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/sideshow/next-great-depression-mit-researchers-predict-global-economic-190352944.html, accessed on 7/1/12, EW)

A renowned Australian research scientist says a study from researchers at MIT claiming the world could suffer from a "global economic collapse" and "precipitous population decline" if people continue to consume the world's resources at the current pace is still on track, nearly 40 years after it was first produced. [The Smithsonian Magazine](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/Looking-Back-on-the-Limits-of-Growth.html) writes that Australian physicist Graham Turner says "the world is on track for disaster" and that current research from Turner [coincides](http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/324392/20120405/world-track-disaster-researcher-supports-1970-s.htm) with a famous, and in some quarters, infamous, academic report from 1972 entitled, "[The Limits to Growth.](http://limits-to-growth.org/)" Turner's research is not affiliated with MIT or The Club for Rome. Produced for a group called [The Club of Rome](http://www.clubofrome.org/?p=326), the study's researchers created a computing model to forecast different scenarios based on the current models of population growth and global resource consumption. The study also took into account different levels of agricultural productivity, birth control and environmental protection efforts. Twelve million copies of the report were produced and distributed in 37 different languages. Most of the computer scenarios found population and economic growth continuing at a steady rate until about 2030. But without "drastic measures for environmental protection," the scenarios predict the likelihood of a population and economic crash. However, the study said "unlimited economic growth" is still possible if world governments enact policies and invest in green technologies that help limit the expansion of our ecological footprint. The Smithsonian notes that several experts strongly objected to "The Limit of Growth's" findings, including the late Yale economist Henry Wallich, who for 12 years [served as a governor of the Federal Research Board](http://articles.latimes.com/1988-09-17/news/mn-1824_1_henry-wallich) and was its chief international economics expert. At the time, Wallich said attempting to regulate economic growth would be equal to "consigning billions to permanent poverty." Turner says that perhaps the most startling find from the study is that the results of the computer scenarios were nearly identical to those predicted in similar computer scenarios used as the basis for "The Limits to Growth." "There is a very clear warning bell being rung here," Turner said. "We are not on a sustainable trajectory." Correction: This post has been edited to reflect that MIT has not updated its research from the original 1972 study.

## \*\*AT: US- Russia Relations\*\*

### Relations bad

#### US-Russia relations are bad- low relations key to stopping Russian expantionism

Cohen ‘9 (Ariel, Senior Research Fellow in Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, Heritage Foundation, “How the Obama Administration Should Engage Russia,” 3-19, http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/CohenTestimony090319a.pdf)

President Obama should now provide the firm foundation for a policy devoted to deterring Russia from taking similar action in the future, for example against Ukraine or Azerbaijan. The Obama Administration should implement the Strategic Cooperation Charters signed with Ukraine and Georgia on December 19, 2008, and January 9, 2009, respectively. In negotiations with Russia, the Obama Administration should also stress that the U.S. will not tolerate any foreign adventures in Georgia. If such admonitions are not made, this may be taken as a de facto green light for a new conflict. While there is little chance that Russia will renounce its recognition of Abkhazia or South Ossetia, the Obama Administration should explore every option for making Russia pay a diplomatic and economic price for its recent acts of aggression against Georgia's territorial integrity, sovereignty, and international law. To do otherwise will only invite Russia to try more of the same in the future. The White House should rethink the format of the G-8. It should expand the current G-8 to G-20, in which Russia, China, Brazil, India, and other major powers participate, while holding future meetings of the leading industrial democracies in the G-7 format. This will send a clear signal to Moscow that if it chooses to remove itself from the boundaries of acceptable behavior in the club of the largest democracies, it will no longer enjoy the benefits of being part of that club.

#### Russian expansionism escalates to nuclear exchange

Knight 8 (Alex, Master's Degree in Political Science, 26 August 2008, “Imperialism’s Chess Board: War in the Caucuses and the Fall of Pax Americana”, http://endofcapitalism.com/2008/08/26/imperialism%E2%80%99s-chess-board-war-in-the-caucuses-and-the-fall-of-pax-americana/)

**U.S. foreign policy strategists are bitter and enraged over losing their chess** piece in Georgia, and **that doesn’t bode well for rational thinking** amongst imperialists. The State Department’s immediate response to Georgia’s routing was to sign a deal with Poland on which it had previously been stalling, to put in place a missile shield by 2012. The deal includes 10 interceptor missiles and a battery of long-range Patriot missiles, operated by 100 U.S. troops. While the State Department claims the measures are to defend against “future adversaries such as Iran,” this is a pretty preposterous scenario, given that all the missiles are pointed at Russia. **Russia is** obviously **not happy, and is firing back with words, and maybe eventually** with **missiles** of its own. **The Russian military deputy chief of staff**, Anatoly Nogovitsyn, **said** that “**by deploying, Poland is exposing itself to a strike – 100%” from Russia**. **In the form of nuclear warheads.** No, **this is not the ’60s, and yes, Russia is threatening nuclear war,** while **Poland and the U.S. seem perfectly willing to risk provoking one**.

#### US-Russia war is the only existential risk – sheer magnitude of nuclear arsenals

Bostrom 2 (Nick, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford University, 2002, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

**A** much greater existential **risk emerged with** the build-up of **nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR.** **An all-out nuclear war** was a possibility with both a substantial probability and **with consequences that might** have been persistent enough to **qualify as** global and **terminal**. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html#_ftn4)  **Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation**, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that **a smaller nuclear exchange**, between India and Pakistan for instance, **is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might** however **be a** local **terminal** risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.