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\*\*Uniqueness- Will Pass\*\*

UQ: Will Pass- Bipartisan

Energy reform will pass- bipartisan support emerged from oil spill

Sabochik June 29th ( Katelyn, New Media Director at the Department of the Interior,*The White House Blog*, http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/06/29/next-steps-comprehensive-energy-reform , 6-29-10) ET

Today, **President Obama met with a bipartisan group of Senators to discuss the need for comprehensive energy** and climate legislation. Carol Browner, Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change, sent this email to the White House email list after the meeting. If you didn't get today's email from Carol Browner, you can sign up for the White House email list here. **Yesterday I returned from my fifth trip to the Gulf Coast region since the BP Deepwater Horizon oil rig burned into the sea and left the worst oil spill this country has ever seen in its wake.** A team of Administration officials met with Governors, mayors, parish presidents and other local officials from four states and reiterated President Obama's promise to the people of the Gulf Coast region**: We will not be satisfied until the leak is stopped, the oil in the Gulf is cleaned up, and the livelihoods of the people in the Gulf Coast region have been fully restore**d. There's another important message for every American: **The disaster in the Gulf is a wake-up call that we need a new strategy for a clean energy future, including passing comprehensive energy and climate legislation.** A lot of Americans are asking what this comprehensive energy reform will look like and whether we can really move towards a clean energy future. This afternoon at 4 p.m. EDT, Heather Zichal, Deputy Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change, will host a live chat on WhiteHouse.gov to talk about this issue:

Energy reform has bipartisan political support but Obama needs political capital to overcome small opposition

Weiss and Lyon 1/28 [Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress Susan, Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change Policy Carol Browner, 2010, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/01/sotu\_energy.html] KLS

Clean-energy reform has united many Democrats and some Republicans, progressives and conservatives, blue states and red states. A poll released last week by Republican pollster Frank Luntz found that 43 percent of Republicans “definitely” or “probably” “believe climate change is caused at least in part by humans.” Another poll out last week by Joel Benenson, President Obama’s 2008 pollster, found that 58 percent of likely 2010 voters support comprehensive global warming legislation as well. Respondents also said they were much more likely to vote for senators who supported such legislation and more likely to oppose those that do not. These two polls [and others](http://climateprogress.org/2009/12/18/public-opinion-stunner-washpost-abc-poll-finds-strong-support-for-global-warming-reductions-despite-relentless-big-oil-and-anti-science-attacks/) are evidence that Americans across the political spectrum want clean-energy and global warming legislation.

UQ- Will Pass- Brink- Obama

Energy legislation is on the brink- only obama pushing it will ensure it passes

Sohn July 2nd (Darren, *Politico*, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39309\_Page2.html, 7-2-10) ET

Climate and energy legislation is expected to hit the Senate floor when lawmakers return from their July 4 recess. But it’s going to have to find its way out of no man’s land first. President Barack Obama and Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada — the Democrats holding the reins of the bill — have not given clear public signals of what they want in the measure beyond making broad-brush calls for a “comprehensive” package that caps greenhouse gases and reduces U.S. dependence on foreign oil. Lawmakers say the silence from the top is making their job harder. “We can’t really negotiate pieces because we don’t know where it starts yet,” said Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio). “We don’t know what the vehicle is going to be.” “It’s not that nothing is happening on Capitol Hill,” said Eileen Claussen, president of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change and a former Clinton administration climate official. “There’s some work going on here. But not a lot is happening because no one knows which direction to go.” Obama, Reid and Vice President Joe Biden met in the Oval Office on Thursday to discuss their legislative strategy for the rest of the year, from energy to the upcoming confirmation vote on Supreme Court nominee Elena Kagan. But as he returned to the Capitol, Reid told POLITICO that no decisions came out of the meeting on the shape of the climate legislation or the contours of the floor debate. “We’re still thinking about it,” Reid said. “We have no set plans.” Speaking to reporters just before the Reid meeting, White House press secretary Robert Gibbs said the president wants the Senate to pass a broad climate bill after the July 4 recess. “We think that’s the right thing to do,” he said, adding that “putting a price on carbon has to be part of our comprehensive energy reform.” But even with Gibbs’s remarks, environmental groups are antsy as they see what might be their last, best chance for capping greenhouse gases slipping away — with little they can do but pressure the president whom they helped elect. “Without his leadership, then everything he’s done so far will lead to nothing,” said Fred Krupp, president of the Environmental Defense Fund, who cited Obama’s work to date setting climate-friendly rules for motor vehicles, as well as his all-night negotiations last December at U.N. climate negotiations in Copenhagen.

Energy legislation will pass- only with obama support

Sohn July 2nd (Darren, *Politico*, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39309\_Page2.html, 7-2-10) ET

Krupp said Obama needs to get into the details of a climate bill and fast. “For all the good things he’s done, which we acknowledge, he’s now got to roll up his sleeves and do the drafting of the bill.” Some activists are privately planning for failure. They doubt Obama and Reid can muster 60 votes for the sweeping, economywide legislation the president campaigned on. And they expect the Senate next month to move forward on “energy-only” legislation that would focus on a new national renewable electricity standard and measures related to the BP spill. Even some longtime

UQ: Will Pass- Concessions

Climate change will pass- concessions will be made

Muro june 28th (Mark, Fellow and Policy director @ metropolitan policy program, *Brookings Institute,* http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0628\_climate\_legislation\_muro.aspx, 7-28-10) ET

So as President Obama convenes senators for a come-to-Jesus moment this morning on energy and climate legislation it looks like Senate proponents of an economy-wide cap-and-trade climate bill are preparing to settle for a narrower emissions cap in the electric power sector. Yet another concession to lawmakers' skittishness about pricing carbon, the scaled-back approach will not please the absolutists but it does have the virtue of realism. It always seemed a bit of a fantasy that a comprehensive carbon pricing scheme could reach 60 votes in the Senate this year. And for that matter it's possible the narrower approach really could amount to a first step toward a broader system for reducing emissions, as Eileen Claussen and Jim Rogers, president of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change and Duke Energy respectively, wrote in an op-ed in Politico last week. Incrementalism isn't always timidity. And yet, for all that, there is every reason to worry that the latest efforts to gain political consensus in the Senate are continuing to neglect a crucial aspect of cleaning up the country's energy system—technology innovation. As we and many others have been saying for years, the nation badly needs to sign up for a new push for energy system innovation that seeks countless efficiencies but also triples to quintuples today's anemic baseline level of federal energy innovation R&D. (For some great discussion of this need see recent posts by Microsoft founder Bill Gates, a group of 34 Nobel Laureates, NYT Dot Earth blogger Andy Revkin, and Teryn Norris of Americans for Energy Leadership). The trouble with the new utility-only approach to emissions reductions, however, is that none of its proponents are saying anything that makes it seem likely that an adequate slice of the potential revenue the narrower system might generate will be reserved for technology innovation. In fact, it's pretty obvious that with few emissions allotments to auction off much less revenue would be generated through a utility-only program than under an economy-wide pricing system.

That's a problem because not only do we need to get a lot more money into the innovation system as soon as possible (so new technologies can roll out in time to help reduce climate change in this century) but because a smaller revenue pie will only intensify the inevitable interest group scuffle over the money to the detriment of the R&D claim.

UQ: Will Pass-Democrats

And energy reform bill will pass- dems warrant

Horner June 28th (Chris, Senior Fellow at CEI, *Big Government*, June 28-10, http://biggovernment.com/chorner/2010/06/28/robert-byrd-cap-and-trade-and-the-lame-duck/ ) ET

So the Dems think the Senate will pass a “Gulf spill” bill, the prospect of any vote against which they Dems are already styling as a vote for BP and Big Oil (they don’t say how). Then this will be merged with the House “energy” bill which was the 1,400 page monstrosity bearing cap-and-trade, among other odious delights of the Left.

It seems unlikely that Sen. Byrd would smile on this abuse of the rules of our representative democracy, but there you have it. His party will be against BP before they are for it…BP having invented carbon cap-and-trade with Enron, aggressively lobbying until this very day for the payoff it is designed to provide them.

The only issue is whether the Republicans are absorbing the message: the Dems are digging a political pit and layering its top with rhetorical palm fronds, certain that the Republicans will stumble into the “must do ’something’!” trap and pass a “Gulf spill bill”, with every sentient being knowing full well this is the Senate Dems’ ticket to a cap-and-trade, lame duck conference. And enactment of their last remaining high profile Power Grab.

Obama and the democrats can find the votes in the next few months put it will take more work.

Power-Gen 6/28/10(Power-Gen worldwide researcher, “Democratic Energy Builds for Energy Bill”)AQB

President Barack Obama and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) say that this time they are committed, really committed, to bringing some sort of clean energy bill to the floor this year. But after months of speed bumps, false starts and promises, some are wondering, can they really get something done? The new Democratic strategy seems clear enough: try to capitalize on the unprecedented oil spill disaster unfolding in the Gulf of Mexico to jump-start the bill and put Republicans on the defensive. Democrats hope to either tar Republicans as tools of Big Oil as the slick continues to spread, or have another signature accomplishment knocked off Obama's to-do list to go along with health care reform and a Wall Street overhaul. With the political fallout over the BP oil spill growing by the day, the president has injected a new sense of urgency into passing energy legislation in 2010. Obama has framed the disaster as a "wake-up call" on the need for action on climate change, and during a Carnegie Mellon speech last week, he significantly upped the ante by vowing to become more personally involved in helping to pass legislation this year. "The votes may not be there right now, but I intend to find them in the coming months. I will continue to make the case for a clean energy future wherever and whenever I can. I will work with anyone to get this done - and we will get it done," Obama said. White House officials readily admit they are trying to channel the outrage over the Gulf spill into momentum for energy reform. "I think it adds to the urgency of getting something done on energy," White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said last week.

UQ: Will Pass-Democrats

Energy reform will pass- Democrats pushing for it on limited timeframe

Goldenberg 4/26 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

Democratic leaders yesterday offered guarded assurances that the Senate would continue to put climate change first. However, Reid's office admitted it was unclear when the proposals would now be unveiled. John Kerry, the Massachusetts Democrat who has led the push for the climate change bill, acknowledged that time was running out for energy reform. "This year is our best and perhaps last chance for Congress to pass a comprehensive approach. Regrettably external issues have arisen that force us to postpone temporarily." America's failure to adopt legislation reducing greenhouse gas emissions has compounded the difficulties of getting developing and industrialised countries to agree on an action plan. Today's cancellation could jeopardise a six-month effort by Kerry and Graham and Connecticut independent Joseph Lieberman to neutralise opposition to the bill from the oil, coal and nuclear industries to help ease its passage in the Senate. Oil and electricity companies were expected to back the proposal at the launch today.

Energy reform gaining new momentum- Democrats back on board

Mascaro 6/13 [Lisa, Staff Writer, Los Angeles Times, 2010, Lexis] KLS

Passing a major energy bill seemed virtually impossible a few weeks ago, but Democrats, bolstered by public anger over the gulf oil spill, are pushing for legislation with renewed hope of success. A new energy bill could be shorn of its most controversial feature -- the costly and complex "cap-and-trade" system, which would set a declining limit on emissions from power plants and factories and force emitters to buy permits for the release of heat-trapping gases. But even without cap and trade, the measure contemplated by Senate Democratic leaders could bring far-reaching change, including new renewable energy requirements, tougher liability caps on oil companies and stronger energy-efficiency measures. Last week, the Senate narrowly defeated a Republican-led effort to strip the Environmental Protection Agency of authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions -- a vote seen by some as a test of the difficulties Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid could face in delivering yet another Obama administration priority without a filibuster-proof majority of 60 votes. The vote suggested that while energy and environmental legislation would not be easy to pass, it might be possible.

UQ: Will Pass- Drains Political Capital

And, if energy reform is going to pass it will take political capital

Sabochik June 29th ( Katelyn, New Media Director at the Department of the Interior,*The White House Blog*, http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2010/06/29/next-steps-comprehensive-energy-reform , 6-29-10) ET

Shifting to a clean energy economy won't be easy. For decades, we have grappled with the issue of how to end our addiction to fossil fuels. And for decades, we have lacked the political will and courage to take this important step towards securing our environment, our economy and our security. To anyone who thinks this can't be done, take a look at President Obama's track record of working with Congress to deliver the change that our country needs. Here are three examples: The health care reforms of the Affordable Care Act bring the stability and security for American families that seven Presidents tried -- and failed -- to deliver; The Recovery Act is widely regarded as a critical measure that prevented another depression and saved or created more than 2 million jobs; Reform of student loans makes higher education more affordable, allowing students to get loans without relying on large banks as unnecessary middlemen. Now is the time to work with the same determination on comprehensive energy reform. Just today, I joined the President at a meeting with Senators from both parties to discuss how to move forward.

UQ: Will Pass- Kerry

Energy reform will pass- Kerry will make concessions

Walsh June 29th (Bryan,  Political Director of the National Republican Congressional Committee., *Time,* http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2010/06/29/hope-seems-to-dim-for-cap-and-trade/?xid=rss-topstories) ET

 Though Obama reiterated his support for putting some kind of price on carbon, senators in the meeting told reporters that he would agree to an even more limited climate and energy bill. "We believe we have compromised significantly, and we're prepared to compromise further," said Kerry, in a statement that quickly reverberated around the Twittersphere. (Someone compared him to Neville Chamberlain. OK, it was me.) As the White House itself said in its statement on the meeting, the President no longer seems to be purely focused on a nationwide carbon cap—the policy environmentalists have long believed is the best way to deal with climate change: The President told the Senators that he still believes the best way for us to transition to a clean energy economy is with a bill that makes clean energy the profitable kind of energy for America's businesses by putting a price on pollution – because when companies pollute, they should be responsible for the costs to the environment and their contribution to climate change. Not all of the Senators agreed with this approach, and the President welcomed other approaches and ideas that would take real steps to reduce our dependence on oil, create jobs, strengthen our national security and reduce the pollution in our atmosphere.

UQ: Will Pass- Lame Duck

Energy reform bill will pass- lame duck vote if needed

Horner June 28th (Chris, Senior Fellow at CEI, *Big Government*, June 28-10, http://biggovernment.com/chorner/2010/06/28/robert-byrd-cap-and-trade-and-the-lame-duck/ ) ET

I don’t follow West Virginia politics closely but assume their version of Scott Brown would be Rep. Shelley Moore Capito. His or her identity, as well as whether the same phenomenon would play out, likely depend on if the election is held this fall, vs. 2012: there are some murky legal issues to sort through involving how long a placeholder would hold the seat. Still I’m pretty sure it will be someone staunchly anti-cap-and-trade (in both parties, in fact; the last West Virginia politician to show insufficient zeal against the scheme, Rep. Alan Mollohan (D), recently lost in a primary). Cap-and-trade of course is the vehicle by which the president vowed to cause your electricity prices to “necessarily skyrocket” as part of his effort to “bankrupt” the coal industry and anyone who sought to continue burning coal for that one-half of our electricity that it provides. Incidentally, today’s Wall Street Journal also notes how Obama’s anti-coal jihad just cost about 1,000 jobs in Wisconsin; West Virginia needs no such reminders yet as they pile up they also cannot help but be relevant. How strongly West Virginia can inveigh, through its congressional representation, against this cruel ideological push is of increasing importance right now. Democrat staff are increasingly bold in their discussion of suckering Republicans into helping them pass it in a lame duck session, without having to vote on it in the Senate until after the elections. The vehicle for said suckering is a “must-pass” Gulf spill bill — not that what is being proposed would have done anything to prevent the latest disaster of a company, BP, that like Enron lost the plot and fell apart as a result, any more than the financial services “reform” would have prevented the Fannie- and Freddie-precipitated meltdown. From today’s E&E Daily story (subscription required): What Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.) puts in the Senate climate and energy bill, and what gets added on the floor, may not matter as much as simply whether some bill passes. In the end, a joint House-Senate conference committee will likely hammer out the final version of the bill. That might not take place until a “lame duck” session after the November election, when much of the political pressure on lawmakers has dissipated.

And, democratic leaders are going to use the lame duck strategy to shove energy reform through

Horner June 28th (Chris, Senior Fellow at CEI, *Big Government*, June 28-10, http://biggovernment.com/chorner/2010/06/28/robert-byrd-cap-and-trade-and-the-lame-duck/ ) ET

Which means that despite the oft-repeated assertion by Sen. Lindsay Graham (R-S.C.) that “cap and trade is dead,” the House’s bill based on cap and trade could be back in play — someday, given the right conditions. Even if they do not enact cap and trade, Democratic leaders could use a conference to ratchet up the climate regultions [sic] past what the Senate agreed to and beyond what Democratic House centrists want. “We have a lot of wiggle room in conference,” said a House Democratic aide. And it could be hard for centrists in either party or either chamber to walk away from the bill if they have taken the risk of voting for it on initial passage. “Once you get to conference, it’s an up-or-down vote,” said Norm Ornstein, a veteran congressional expert at the American Enterprise Institute. “People who vote against it have to explain why they voted for it before they voted against it.” That lame duck strategy is little more brazen than the Democrats’ efforts to cram-down the health care takeover. Indeed, not only will embittered losers have nothing else left to lose given the elections will be behind them. Worse, given that many Dems will be out of jobs by that point, they actually will be in a bidding war for ambassadorships or other sinecures by doing Obama a solid and seizing the ever-closing Obama Window to “fundamentally transform America”.

UQ: Will Pass- Now Key

And now is key to pass reform- they just launched multiple campaigns and are spinning it

Good June 30th (Chris- Staff editor, *The Atlantic,* http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/06/an-11-million-push-for-energy-reform/58978/, 6-30-10) ET

It would seem that if ever there was an opportune time to pass aggressive energy reform and climate change legislation--large Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate, a major drilling catastrophe--it would be sometime between now and November, and yet significant doubts remain over whether it will happen. To try to push things over the edge, a liberal coalition is putting up $11 million for a multi-state ad campaign praising some senators and criticizing others. To put that in context, $11 million is enough to win a Senate race in some states, though not a competitive race in a big state with expensive media markets. the pro and con ads take markedly different approaches: in offering praise, the groups link energy reform to troops coming home from Iraq; in offering criticism, they compare senators who have received oil-company donations to oil-soaked wildlife in the gulf. The Service Employees International Union, VoteVets, the League of Conservation Voters, and the Sierra Club launched the campaign this morning with an initial $2 million buy. They're praising Democratic Sens. Claire McCaskill (MO) and Harry Reid (NV) and criticizing Republicans Richard Burr (NC) and Mike Johanns (NE) and Democrat Ben Nelson (NE).

UQ: Will Pass- Obama

Obama’s support will push energy reform through- lobbies warrant

Broder July 2nd (John, New York Times White House Correspondent, *New York Times,* 7-2-10, http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/07/02/activists-beg-obama-to-step-up-climate-push/ ) ET

A coalition of environmental organizations sent President Obama a letter on Friday pleading for him to intervene in the stalled Senate negotiations on climate and energy legislation. The groups, which have been largely supportive of the president’s energy policies, expressed concern that time was running out for any action on climate change this year. Only the president’s personal and persistent attention can break the stalemate, they say. “We strongly urge you to produce a bill, in conjunction with key senators, that responds to the catastrophe in the gulf, cuts oil use, and limits carbon pollution while maintaining current health and other key legal protections,” the environmental leaders state in their letter. “White House leadership is the only path we see to success, just as your direct leadership was critical in the passage of the recovery plan, health care reform and other administration successes.” Among the signatories are Fred Krupp, president of the Environmental Defense Fund; Maggie Fox, president of the Alliance for Climate Protection, the group started by former Vice President Al Gore; John Podesta, former White House chief of staff and president of the Center for American Progress; and Kevin Knobloch, president of the Union of Concerned Scientists. The leaders who signed the letter have been among the most vocal advocates of comprehensive climate and energy legislation and a strong international agreement to limit emissions of climate-altering gases. They have grown increasingly frustrated in recent months with the lack of progress in the Senate and the reluctance of the White House to step forward with a plan of its own. Most have been reluctant to criticize Mr. Obama, but now appear to believe that if they do not push him, the moment will be lost. In a session with reporters on Thursday, Mr. Krupp praised the president’s public statements on the issue, the deal he brokered to reduce automobile emissions and his efforts to salvage the collapsing international climate talks in Copenhagen in December.

And, energy reform will pass- obama pushes

Connelly June 29th (Joel- Seattle Post intelligence, http://blog.seattlepi.com/seattlepolitics/archives/212986.asp , *Seattle Post Intelligence*) ET

We'll get energy legislation," Cantwell said in an interview with seattlepi.com. "The question is how comprehensive. Will it start to get us off our dependence on fossil fuels? Will it get us on an aggressive path to developing new energy resources and creating green jobs?" The session ended without answering these questions. A carefully worded White House "Readout" fessed up to disagreement on a key issue: Will polluters be made to pay for despoiling the environment and emitting greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change? "The president is confident we will be able to get something this year," the White House statement added. Sen. George Voinovich, R-Ohio, hinted at possible passage of a limited bill that would seek to lower pollution from power plants. "I do not support an economy-wide piece of legislation," Voinovich said in a statement. "As far as a cap-and-trade program for the electric power sector, I understand there is no consensus in the utility industry." A bevy of West Coast industries, from major utilities (Pacific Gas & Electric) to technology pace settlers (Microsoft) to the retail sector have called for legislation that would set America down a new energy path. But Republicans have seized on the cap-and-trade issue, and Sen. Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., on Tuesday said the only way to get a workable bill is "to take a national energy tax off the table."

UQ- Will Pass- Oil Spill

Energy reform will pass- Republicans on board, Obama making a push

Goldenberg 6/30 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

"He was very strong about the need to put a price on carbon and make polluters pay," said senator Joe Lieberman. White House officials say the spill is a wake-up call for the urgency of breaking the US economy's dependence on fossil fuels, and had hoped to build momentum behind a cap-and-trade bill now before the Senate. Supporters of action on climate change had been pressing Obama to make a strong push for legislation. The oil disaster's ability to dictate events was underlined again when BP and the coast guard suspended oil skimming operations yesterday because of rough seas from tropical storm Alex. Senators at the much-anticipated meeting acknowledged there was political support only for modest reforms. Kerry told reporters he was prepared to scale back his proposals. Republican Senators, even those purportedly supporting energy reform, have been adamant in their opposition to putting an economy-wide price on carbon. Lisa Murkowski, an Alaska Republican at the meeting, told reporters such moves would be too costly for the average family.

Obama pushing hard now- oil spill will be used as an excuse to pass energy reform

PS June 30th (*Public Service*, 6-30-10, http://www.publicservice.co.uk/news\_story.asp?id=13382 ) ET

Barack Obama's hopes of bringing in sweeping clean energy legislation may have been forced into compromise in a bid to gain support from those who favour a more targeted approach**.** President Obama is pushing for action in the wake of the Gulf oil spill and has urged senators to find common ground. But **failure to develop a broad agreement of Democrat and Republican senators on energy and climate law could lead to new proposals that recast energy reform as a Gulf oil spill response** rather than broader and more extensive clean energy legislation. John Kerry, the Democrat who is leading the push for climate law change in the US senate said: "**We are prepared to scale back the reach of our legislation in order to try and find that place of compromise**, because we believe, and I think **the president believes very strongly, that what is important is for America to get started."**

Energy reform will pass- gulf oil motivation

CNN Wire Staff June 22nd ( *CNN Politics*, 6-22-10, http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/06/22/energy.bill.senate/ ) ET

Lieberman told CNN's "State of the Union" on Sunday that he believes an energy bill "does have a chance" this year. "There are about 50 senators who want to vote for a strong, comprehensive energy bill that puts a price on carbon pollution," Lieberman said. "There are about 30 who are set against it and there are 20 undecided. You've got to get to 60 to pass anything in the Senate. We need half of the undecided and we can do it." Lieberman added that he hoped the Gulf oil spill "will motivate us to do it, because the less we depend on oil, the less chance there is of another environmental disaster like this." Obama made a similar argument in his address to the nation on the oil spill last week, but Republicans say that Democrats are trying to exploit the disaster to push through policies that they say will increase energy costs and harm job creation. "They never missed an opportunity to seize on a crisis to turn to the far left to-do list," Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said on "FOX News Sunday." "And this has been a big item on the far left to-do list, a national energy tax. Mark my words, that is precisely what they intend to do, seize on the crisis in the Gulf to try to pass this."

Energy reform given new life- oil spill prompted new willingness to negotiate

Mascaro 6/13 [Lisa, Staff Writer, Los Angeles Times, 2010, Lexis] KLS

But the gulf spill may have changed the equation. "I want you to know, the votes may not be there right now, but I intend to find them in the coming months," President Obama said in an early-June speech in Pittsburgh. "I will work with anyone to get this done -- and we will get it done." Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) said, "I think it gets tough, but everybody is watching the oil spew from the gulf.... This is the time for us to be putting together a much more sustainable energy strategy." Reid will soon begin crafting a bill in much the way that he developed the healthcare overhaul, culling the most popular provisions from existing legislation. "I think the oil spill has generated a lot of discussion, a lot of soul-searching," said Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.), chairman of the finance committee. "This country has to address climate change. The question is how and when -- and when are there 60 votes?"

UQ- Will Pass- Political Capital High

Obama’s political capital high- gained republican and public support through health care

Pear July 1st (Robert , New York Times WA correspondent, *New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/02/health/policy/02health.html , 7-1-10) ET

WASHINGTON — President Obama gets high marks, even from some Republicans, for the way he has begun carrying out the new health care law in the 100 days since it was signed. And a new poll suggests a small increase in favorable views of the measure since May. But it remains unclear whether a substantial number of people will see tangible benefits before the November elections, and whether those benefits will help Democrats who voted for the legislation and are facing resistance from voters who view it as fiscally irresponsible and overly intrusive.

Obama’s political cap on the rise- media likes Health Care Bill

Pear July 1st (Robert , New York Times WA correspondent, *New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/02/health/policy/02health.html , 7-1-10) ET

“I give them an A for effort,” said Stuart M. Butler, a vice president of the conservative Heritage Foundation. “But there are land mines down the road because the law is fundamentally flawed.” Stephen E. Finan, a health economist at the American Cancer Society, said: “I am extremely impressed with what the administration has accomplished. They have cranked out a lot of regulations. They’re doing it methodically, and they’re doing it well.” On Thursday, the administration unveiled a Web site, HealthCare.gov, where consumers can obtain information about public and private health insurance options in their states. The administration and many states are also setting up high-risk insurance pools for people who have been denied coverage because of pre-existing conditions.

Health care gaining popularity is increasing capital- he gets the blame

Hilzenrath June 30th (David, Washington Post Staffwriter, *The Washington Post*, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/30/AR2010063000438.html , 6-30-10) ET

The health-care overhaul gained popularity from May to June, according to a new tracking poll. The results suggest that the Obama administration's promotion of the legislation may be paying off or that the public may be warming to the law as early provisions take effect. The Kaiser Family Foundation poll found that 48 percent of the public had a favorable view of the law in June while 41 percent had an unfavorable opinion. A month earlier, the split was 41 percent favorable to 44 percent unfavorable. The latest survey results were not much different from those in March, shortly before the law was enacted. Then, at the end of a bitter year-long battle, 46 percent said they supported the proposed legislation while 42 percent opposed it.

UQ- Will Pass- Political Capital Push

Obama’s political capital is on the brink- he must use his remaining political capital for energy reform

Usborne 6/17 [David, Staff Writer, 2010, The Independent, Lexis] KLS

For all the excitement that Mr Obama generated as an orator in 2008, he has hardly kept America in his thrall since taking office. (Only the Tea-Bag Obama -haters remain gripped.) That said, he has the habit of suddenly burning twice as brightly when he is really in a corner, but his preferred medium is a big speech before a crowd overseas (think nuclear-free world in Prague), or a hastily convened joint session of Congress (think healthcare). His presidency is once again on the line, on the cusp between disaster and redemption. Since the BP spill almost two months ago, his poll ratings have slipped, but not precipitously. Maybe the President can even spin a silver policy lining from the disaster, pushing through energy reform.

UQ- Will Pass- Public Support

Public supports energy reform

Geller June 8th ( Kate, Rutgers, *League of Conservative Voters*, http://www.lcv.org/newsroom/press-releases/poll-americans-want-real-energy-reforms-in-wake-of-gulf-coast-disaster.html , 6-8-10) ET

WASHINGTON – As the Gulf Coast oil disaster continues to unfold, the League of Conservation Voters released a new poll by the Benenson Strategy Group today showing overwhelming public support for comprehensive energy legislation that goes beyond simply making BP pay for the damage they’ve done. The poll also found that the oil spill is intensifying the public’s desire for clean energy investments and increased regulation on corporate polluters. Additionally, the poll shows that comprehensive energy legislation can be a powerful election issue, with high support among key electoral groups.

UQ: Will Pass- Reid

And, energy reform will pass- reid forcing vote ensures

Blue Wave News June 30th ( *Blue Wave News,* http://bluewavenews.com/2010/06/30/republicans-fear-climate-and-immigration-legislation-will-lead-to-failure-for-decades/ , 6-30-10) ET

Senate Democrats intend on forcing the Republicans to vote against a climate bill that includes drilling safety reform. Reid notes that there will be a vote and the threat to Republicans like Graham is that it will be very uncomfortable for them: “Whatever form it takes, we’re going to move forward,” Reid said directly after yesterday’s meeting. “We agree we must deal with the catastrophe in the Gulf, we must create millions of new jobs, we must cut pollution, and we must strengthen our national security and energy independence.” Democrats have been attempting to tie the need for sweeping energy and climate legislation to the ongoing BP PLC oil leak since it began, but the new plan appears to go a step further. By including drilling safety reform in the bill, they hope to make the case that a vote against the package is a vote for BP and “Big Oil.” “It will be an opportunity for senators to vote for oil safety,” Lieberman said.

Reform will pass- reid will trickster it through

Allan june 25th (Nicole, staff editor at *The Atlantic*, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/06/democrats-start-to-play-hardball-on-climate/58743/ ) ET

Thanks to BP's oil spill, significant climate-change legislation now has a real shot at passing, though not because it will gain votes for the Senate's struggling energy-reform bills. Democrats have another tactic in mind.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's latest energy strategy is to fold a comprehensive climate bill in with bipartisan legislation reforming the oil industry. The "spill bill," a response to the BP oil spill that would impose new safety and environmental rules and reform regulation of offshore oil exploration, is fast-tracked for approval in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee next week. Both Democrats and Republicans have rallied behind the need for refined regulation to ensure that a disaster like the Gulf spill does not happen again. Democrats are hoping that by sneaking energy provisions into the bill, Republicans won't be able to vote against it without looking like they're siding with Big Oil. Daniel J. Weiss, Senior Fellow and Director of Climate Strategy at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, lays out the dilemma Democrats are hoping to place in Republicans' laps:People have never been enamored with big oil companies, and now they're even angrier at them. The upcoming debate will pose a choice for senators to either vote with Big Oil and block reform or vote with the American people to make our rigs safer, reduce oil use, and reduce oil pollution. Democrats took a similar strategy with financial reform, using the economic collapse to pressure Republicans into voting for more Wall Street regulation. Next week's vote will determine the success of this strategy once and for all, but Democrats are confident that the bill will enjoy bipartisan support. With climate, however, they'd risk torpedoing vital reforms to the oil industry if the strategy did not work.

UQ- Will Pass- Republicans

Energy reform will pass- Obama committed and making overtures to Republicans

Mufson and Shear 6/3 [Steven, Michael D, Staff Writer, The Washington Post, Lexis] KLS

The president vowed to gather votes for the climate bill in the "coming months" and repeated his intention to roll back billions of dollars in tax breaks for big oil companies, to tap natural gas reserves as an alternative to coal, and to increase reliance on nuclear power -- although energy experts said that such a program would leave the country just as dependent on offshore oil. "I will make the case for a clean-energy future wherever I can, and I will work with anyone from either party to get this done. But we will get this done," Obama said. "The next generation will not be held hostage to energy sources from the last century." Allies of the president have argued for weeks that the administration should stop talking about BP, the oil company responsible for the spill, and instead tap into the public attention to the catastrophe in hopes of giving it at least some redemptive value in the long term. "The oil disaster adds new urgency and a new opportunity for connecting with the public," said Daniel J. Weiss of the Center for American Progress. "The administration was going to do it anyway, but this gives it a new way to talk about it." Those urging action have sent White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel briefs that argue for a final push on the climate legislation, and others have had conversations with climate adviser Carol M. Browner and legislative director Phil Schiliro. In an online column posted Wednesday, Weiss and CAP President John D. Podesta argued that "the horrible BP oil disaster has reminded Americans that we must reduce our oil use," adding: "We share the view that this presents an unprecedented opportunity to take bold action to achieve this goal."

Goldilocks energy reform bill has gotten Republicans on board- will pass

Goldenberg 5/13 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

While the committee accused the oil industry of failing to anticipate the dangers of offshore drilling, senators John Kerry and Joe Lieberman unveiled their energy and climate change bill, after eight months of careful courtship of industry and political opposition. Kerry said it was the best hope of energy reform. "Everyone knows this is Congress's last, best chance to pass comprehensive climate and energy legislation." The passing of laws to limit US greenhouse gas emissions is seen as vital for a global deal to tackle climate change. But the American power act has no Republican backers after one of its co-authors, Republican senator Lindsey Graham, withdrew his support last month. Nonetheless, the White House climate adviser, Carol Browner, said the Obama administration would be pushing hard to get the bill through Senate. The 1,000-page bill addresses concerns about offshore drilling in the wake of the oil spill. "Mindful of the accident in the Gulf, we institute important new protections for coastal states," Kerry and Lieberman say in a summary. The bill gives states veto power over offshore drilling in waters 75 miles from their shores. States that go ahead will be able to keep a bigger share, 37%, of federal revenues from drilling. Otherwise, however, the bill remains carefully positioned to secure support from industry and moderate Republicans, making the final product far weaker than environmental organisations wanted.

Republicans will compromise now on energy reform

Jenkins June 30th (Jesse, director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute, http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/38947/seconds-clock-democrats-may-waste-last-chance-clean-energy-win , 6-30-10, *The Energy Collective*) ET

Last week, Republicans invited to the White House summit emerged from a quick planning huddle to tell reporters that they would press Obama to drop cap and trade and work with the GOP to promote several provisions to advance clean electricity, electrification of cars and trucks, and research and development of low-carbon energy technologies. The GOP has several "clean energy proposals which we are for and he's for too," said Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), who as Republican Conference Chair is at the center of GOP leadership. After Tuesday's inconclusive meeting, key swing Republicans reiterated that there was still an opening to move forward on clean energy-

UQ: Will Pass- Roll Call

Lawmakers are pushing energy reform- final roll call ensures it will pass

First Read June 25th (*First Read*, http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/06/25/4560992-congress-weve-got-a-deal ) ET

"Ending more than two weeks of often-contentious negotiations, House and Senate lawmakers reached agreement early Friday on the most far-reaching rewrite of financial rules since the Great Depression," the Los Angeles Times writes. "The final details, including creation of an agency to protect consumers in the financial marketplace and new regulations to reduce risk-taking by large banks and limit their trading of complex derivatives, were hashed out in a marathon 20-hour session that began Thursday morning."roll Call: "The vote puts the massive bill one step closer to the president's desk and marks a major victory for Senate Banking Chairman Chris Dodd… Votes are expected next week in the House and Senate. For Dodd, the legislation would be the capstone of his 30-year Senate career. The veteran Democratic lawmaker is retiring at the end of the year after five terms." The Wall Street Journal on the details: "In two important ways, the agreement is tougher on the banking industry than officials in the Treasury Department anticipated when they first drafted their version of the bill 12 months ago. Lawmakers agreed to a provision known as the 'Volcker' rule, named after former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, which prohibits banks from making risky bets with their own funds. To win support from Sen. Scott Brown (R., Mass.), Democrats agreed to allow financial companies to make limited investments in areas such as hedge funds and private-equity funds. The move could require some big banks to spin off divisions, known as proprietary-trading desks, which make bets with the firms' money."

UQ: Will Pass- Snowe

And, energy reform is close now , but Snowe supports

Dayen June 30th (David, pollster, 6-30-10, http://news.firedoglake.com/2010/06/30/snowe-other-republicans-dip-their-toe-in-utility-only-cap-strategy/ ) ET

Despite entreaties from Lindsey Graham to give up, I’m actually marginally more optimistic that something will pass on climate and energy, at least a tiny bit more today than yesterday. Really. OK, tiny in a sub-atomic sense.

This is mainly because our overlord Olympia Snowe dared to support a utility-only cap as a solution to evade the EPA command-and-control approach. “As I have long advocated, working toward energy independence is an imperative for our economic and national security. Which is why today I urged the President to seize control of our own energy destiny and, for the first time, establish clearly defined national timetables for clean energy production, benchmarks for oil consumption reduction, and goals for game-changing research – which no other president has ever done, to ensure we actually attain that independence [...] While there is consensus among us on energy, on the complex and difficult question of curbing greenhouse gas emissions, there is no consensus at this time. From my perspective, I’ve long asserted that placing a price on carbon will send the appropriate signals to entrepreneurs that would unleash the innovation to position America as a global clean energy industry leader. However, today we are in different and perilous economic times with last week’s new jobless claims actually increasing by 12,000, to a total of 472,000 Americans, and the full impact of the BP spill is yet unknown [...] And yet, we also recognize the threat of blanket and ad hoc EPA regulations that would threaten at least 1,600 major employers should we fail to act. Which is why I believe that one possibility is to more narrowly target a carbon pricing program through a uniform nationwide system solely on the power sector which is the sector with the most to lose from the EPA regulations and it’s also the sector in which businesses actually make decisions today based on prices 20 to 30 years in the future.” I don’t agree with her assessment of the EPA regulations, but Snowe seems to be the one Republican responding to that looming action by moving to a carbon pricing scheme. She abandons an economy-wide approach in favor of a utility-only cap, which is really the only kind of carbon pricing that even has a chance of making it into legislation. Similarly, Susan Collins tepidly endorsed the utility-only cap, if it’s organized in her preferred cap-and-dividend strategy. Marc Ambinder cites George Voinovich, George LeMieux and Scott Brown as other potential Yes votes for this. But given all the coal-state Dems, whether there are 60 votes for such an approach is completely unclear. And what support there is in the environmental community and among pro-climate business leaders stresses a utility-first, not utility-only, approach, which Republicans may balk at. I think Dave Roberts is right to be pessimistic

And Snowe is key to passage

Sharon June 30th (Susan, Deputy News Director, *Maine Public Broadcasting Network*, http://www.mpbn.net/News/MaineNewsArchive/tabid/181/ctl/ViewItem/mid/3475/ItemId/12777/Default.aspx ) ET

Some environmentalists are hoping Maine's two moderate Republican senators could be the key to breaking the stalemate on clean energy legislation in Congress. This week, Senators Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins met with the President about a strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Senator Snowe says she would support putting a price on carbon emitted from power plants, something environmentalists welcome, other Republicans oppose and scientists say doesn't go far enough.

UQ: Will Pass- Summit

And the summit was key to getting key votes- will be pushed through now

Jenkins June 30th (Jesse, director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute, http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/38947/seconds-clock-democrats-may-waste-last-chance-clean-energy-win , 6-30-10, *The Energy Collective*) ET

Heading into the Tuesday morning White House summit, Republicans eyed as key swing votes for any clean energy or climate bill telegraphed clear intentions: cap and trade would be a practical non-starter, but they were ready to act with the President on measures to promote zero-carbon electricity, electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles, and greater energy technology innovation, clean up dirty coal plants, and improve energy efficiency. The summit offered President Obama a prime opportunity to reset the Senate energy debate by calling a new play: take up the energy provisions Republicans have offered, counter with a more aggressive proposal on similar fronts, and begin earnest negotiations with GOP swing votes to ensure passage of a final bill that could move America towards a clean energy economy before the Congressional clock expires.

Energy reform will pass- holding a summit just like health care and will shove it through

CNN Wire Staff June 22nd ( *CNN Politics*, 6-22-10, http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/06/22/energy.bill.senate/ ) ET

President Barack Obama called Tuesday for the Senate to "stand up and move forward" on the issue in the aftermath of the Gulf oil disaster. "This has to be a wake-up call to the country, that we are prepared and ready to move forward on a new energy strategy that the American people desperately want but for which there has been insufficient political will," Obama told reporters after a Cabinet meeting at the White House. However, two Senate leadership aides told CNN later Tuesday that the White House abruptly postponed a planned meeting Wednesday with senators from both parties to try to reach agreement on a proposal that can pass the Senate. The Senate aides, one from each party, did not know why the meeting was called off. The White House had portrayed the talks as a chance for all participants to pitch their best ideas, similar to the health care summit earlier this year that emboldened Democrats to push through a Senate bill with no Republican support. "Senators from both parties with an array of ideas are coming to the table," Emanuel said of Wednesday's meeting, sounding like Obama did when he announced the health care summit that brought together top congressional Democrats and Republicans in February. This time, announced participants were only from the Senate, including Sens. John Kerry and Joe Lieberman, the co-sponsors of a comprehensive proposal that would reshape the U.S. energy industry. Others who were to take part in the postponed meeting included Democratic senators Barbara Boxer of California and Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico, along with Republican senators Susan Collins of Maine, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, Richard Lugar of Indiana and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska.

UQ: Will Pass A2: “Immigration Before Energy”

Immigration won’t be introduced- not out of committee

Goldenberg 4/26 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

Reid's office offered a carefully couched reply to Graham's accusations, saying he was committed to both energy and immigration reform. "Senator Reid is prepared to move either to the floor as soon as they are ready," a spokesman emailed. However, he noted that immigration would need "significant committee work that has not yet been done" - suggesting energy might indeed still come first.

UQ: Will Pass A2: Republicans Oppose

And republicans don’t oppose- they support two key requirements

Jenkins June 30th (Jesse, director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute, http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/38947/seconds-clock-democrats-may-waste-last-chance-clean-energy-win , 6-30-10, *The Energy Collective*) ET

Herein lies the last opportunity for Democrats to score a win for energy reform. To date, Republicans have backed a number of key Senate proposals that collectively offer the foundations for a bipartisan clean energy bill that could achieve actual progress, despite the limited time to act in the crowded Congressional calendar [1 - see notes at end for more detail]: Clean electricity generation: Republicans have backed both a (modest but first-ever) requirement that utilities nationwide purchase a portion of their electricity from renewable energy sources [2], as well as a more aggressive clean electricity requirement that would make nuclear power and carbon capture and storage at fossil fuels plants eligible alongside renewables [3]. Democrats have an opportunity to counter-offer with a slightly more expansive proposal, calling, say, for 25% of all U.S. electricity to come from new, zero-carbon electricity sources by 2020 and 35% by 2030, then negotiate from there. The end result would be a mandate to transform the U.S. electricity sector, putting American utilities on a path to a low-carbon future.

Republicans will back- empirics

Jenkins June 30th (Jesse, director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute, http://theenergycollective.com/jessejenkins/38947/seconds-clock-democrats-may-waste-last-chance-clean-energy-win , 6-30-10, *The Energy Collective*) ET

Similarly, Republicans have consistently championed financial incentives to deploy zero-carbon electricity sources. They, of course prefer nuclear power, but this offer still provides an opportunity for Democrats to counter. Instead of $10 billion to back loan guarantees for just nuclear power plants [4], Democrats could propose a similar (or even greater) amount of funding to capitalize a Clean Energy Deployment Administration capable of using a variety of flexible credit enhancement and financing mechanisms to spur the deployment of numerous innovative zero-carbon energy sources, including nuclear power, but also a suite of other cutting edge clean technologies [5].

UQ- Will Pass- A2: Republicans Take Majority

Reform can still pass even if Republicans take the majority – Public largely supports.

Lawrence 6/23/10(Jill, Senior correspondent for Politics Daily, “Why Energy Reform Is Likely This Year, and Six Forms it Could Take”)AQB

Even if Republicans sweep control of both chambers and are poised to take over in January, end-of-year energy action may not be dead. That's because out in America, people want to see changes. Republican strategist Frank Luntz has released research that shows broad bipartisan support for holding polluters accountable and for ending the U.S. addiction to foreign oil. Many polls show majorities across party lines think the government should regulate emissions to reduce global warming. It all comes down to politics: Whether cap-and-trade – a market-driven idea once supported by prominent Republicans – can be transformed into something smaller, simpler and more appealing to fence-sitters once the heat of the election season has cooled.

\*\*Uniqueness- Won’t Pass\*\*

UQ- Won’t Pass- Bipartisan

Republicans and Democrats wary of passing energy reform in wake of oil spill

Mascaro 6/17 [Lisa, Staff Writer, 2010, Los Angeles Times, Lexis]

Brown has said he would be unwilling to support such a system during the economic downturn. Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, who is among several Republican senators invited to the bipartisan meeting at the White House next week, said Obama was trying to put clean energy on the agenda, but "whether he follows through beyond the speech remains to be seen." Showing the difficulty Obama faces in winning support from even his own party for major energy reform, Sen. Ben Nelson of Nebraska is among several Democratic lawmakers who said they did not see the connection between the spill in the gulf and the need for a carbon pricing system.

UQ: Won’t Pass- Byrd

And energy reform won’t pass- Byrd’s death and bank tax

Montopoli June 29th ( Brian, CBS news poll analyst, *CBS News Politics*, 6-29-10, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-20009186-503544.html) ET

Following marathon negotiations at the end of last week, it appeared that historic financial reform legislation was on the cusp of becoming law. All that was left before the bill went to President Obama for signature was a full vote in the Senate and House to pass it - and because of the negotiations, it appeared the votes were there for passage. Then Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia died - and, in a situation reminiscent of the sudden imperiling of the health care bill after Republican Sen. Scott Brown's special election victory in Massachusetts, what looked like a done deal suddenly wasn't. The loss of what would have been the 60th vote for the legislation left Senate Democrats scrambling to pick off one more member - a process that has thus far not gone particularly well. West Virginia Democratic Gov. Joe Manchin has set no timetable for naming Byrd's successor, and with Democrats working to pass the bill this week, they cannot depend on a yes vote from the seat long held by Byrd. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid worked today and yesterday to find a vote to replace Byrd's, but he met with little success: Democratic Sens. Russ Feingold of Wisconsin and Maria Cantwell of Washington stood by their opposition to the bill, leaving Reid to win over every member of a small group of Republicans who have previously voted for the legislation. That group includes Brown, as well as Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins of Maine and Chuck Grassley of Iowa. But with the late addition of a $19 billion fee assessed to banks (inserted into the legislation in the conference report), Brown made clear that he was no longer on board. "This tax was not in the Senate version of the bill, which I supported," he said in a letter today to Senate Committee on Banking Chairman Chris Dodd and House Committee on Financial Resources Chairman Barney Frank. "If the final version of this bill contains these higher taxes, I will not support it." With 60 votes no longer in sight, Democrats are reopening the conference committee today to change how to pay for implementing the new regulations - that is, replace what Brown calls a "bank tax" with another funding source in order to win back Brown's vote. (Doing this would also help hang on to the votes of Snowe, Collins and Grassley, who have expressed concerns about the bank fee

And, climate change won’t pass - byrd’s death

Duckman June 30th (Justin, staff writer, http://www.talkradionews.com/news/2010/6/30/byrds-death-threatens-democrats-agenda.html , *Talk Media News*,) ET

Sen. Robert Byrd’s (D-W.V.) death will likely imperil several important pieces of legislation on the Democrats’ agenda. Most pressing is Wall Street Reform, which was initially expected to arrive on the President’s desk before Congress leaves for the July 4th recess. However, Sen. Scott Brown (R-Mass.), expected to be the sole Republican vote in favor of overhauling the nation’s financial regulatory system, wavered in his support after the conference committee added a tax on banks to offset the bill’s $19 billion price tag. Sen. Chris Dodd (D-Conn.) and Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) removed the tax, but Brown has still not committed to voting for the bill. Now, with the loss of Byrd, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) will need to secure the support of two Republicans in order to provide the 60 votes needed to sidestep a filibuster, a difficult task in such a partisan political environment where every vote counts. Reid’s attempt to pass an extension for unemployment benefits has hit a similar snag.

“If we had Senator Byrd’s replacement we would have 60,” Reid said during a press conference Wednesday. Reid added that he has the support of two unnamed Republicans, but is seeking one more. The push for an energy bill could also be hindered by the loss of West Virginia Democrat. Byrd heralded from a state that is economically dependant on the coal industry, but was nevertheless considered a guaranteed yes vote. Byrd’s eventual replacement will likely be less comfortable with current forms of the legislation, especially if it runs the risk of harming the state’s coal workers. Attempts to rally Republican support for an energy bill have thus far fallen flat. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) initially helped craft legislation with Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), but dropped his support. Gaining two Republicans or convincing Byrd’s replacement to back the bill will likely prompt Democrats to proceed with weakened provisions. Byrd, who died early Monday morning, was the longest serving member of Congress in U.S. history. West Virginia Governor Joe Manchin (D) will appoint a replacement to fill the rest of Byrd’s term.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Democrats

Energy reform wont pass- Democratic base not behind Obama

Wilson and Kornblut 6/17 [Scott, Anne E., Staff Writers, 2010 The Washington Post, Lexis] KLS

But Obama spoke only in general, often lofty terms about the need for Congress to pass energy reform legislation this year, a point he has made at least twice in the past month. He did not call for a price to be placed on carbon, even though one senior administration official said he thinks that is the most effective way to reduce U.S. energy consumption and protect against climate change. A presidential push for energy reform could energize a dispirited Democratic base heading into the fall campaign season. Liberals are dissatisfied with Obama on a range of issues -- including the still-stumbling economy and his escalation of the war in Afghanistan -- and the president's top advisers consider energy and the environment issues where he could work to restore his standing. But administration officials doubt the energy bill has enough support to pass in the Senate. "The votes don't exist now," one senior White House official said. "But he is going to press for it."

UQ: Won’t Pass- Elections

Energy Reform won’t pass- congressional elections means Democrats aren’t willing to take risks

Chestney 5/28[ Nina, Staff Writer, Reuters, http://blogs.reuters.com/nina-chestney/2010/05/28/u-s-climate-bill-seen-unlikely-in-2010-2/] KLS

COLOGNE, Germany (Reuters) – Senators are unlikely to pass legislation to tackle global warming this year as the time remaining to do so runs out, a panel of experts said on Friday at a carbon conference. U.S. Senators John Kerry and Joseph Lieberman unveiled a climate bill earlier this month. Congressional elections are less than six months away and with Democrats facing losses, June or July could be the last chance to pass a bill this year, before the political atmosphere gets too heated. Other countries are waiting anxiously for the bill to be passed so progress can be made later this year on an international pact to battle global warming. The U.S. legislation would establish a cap and trade system for reducing carbon emissions by utilities and industrial companies. Investors say cap-and-trade legislation will give them more certainty about their climate investments and international carbon trade. “There is little chance anything will happen this year,” said Tom Lewis, chief executive of Green Exchange. The political challenges in passing the bill are similar to those associated with a healthcare reform law, which was passed in March. “Healthcare legislation was passed because the president made a major push but no one is willing to take a major step prior to the mid-term elections,” Lewis said. “The Democrats are in line to lose a number of seats and I don’t see a passionate push between now and November 2 to get this over the finishing line,” he added, referring to the date of congressional elections.

UQ- Won’t pass- Empiric

The energy bill won’t pass- empirically a point of contention- our evidence assumes the BP oil spill

Khan June 29th ( Huma, Digital media producer, *ABC News*, http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/energy-climate-talks-stalled-cap-trade-debate/story?id=11045476 ) ET

Even as the sense of urgency to address the energy issue grows, momentum on the energy and climate bill is still stalled. The idea of a cap on carbon has become a central point of contention between Democrats and Republicans. President Obama strategizes how American can transition away from fossil fuels. The death of Sen. Robert Byrd, who, despite hailing from coal-producing West Virginia, became a proponent of fostering clean energy and passing a comprehensive bill, has also cast doubt on whether there will be enough Democratic votes to pass a partisan bill. Spencer Abraham, former energy secretary under President George W. Bush and a senator from Michigan for six years, said the current divisions are consistent with the history of energy politics. A similar outcry for energy reform erupted in 2003, when a power outage caused a massive blackout in the northeastern U.S. and parts of Canada, becoming, at the time, the second most widespread blackout in world history. But lawmakers still couldn't come together on energy legislation and even the "Energy Policy Act" that passed two years later was considerably watered down, said Abraham, whose new book "Lights Out!: Ten Myths about (And Real Solutions to) America's Energy Crisis" will be released next week. "It's not going to be easy because even with the oil spill and the pressure that's created, it reminds me a lot of 2003 where even though there's desire to do something, there's still very sharp divisions about what that something ought to be," Abraham told ABC News. President Obama, who has been mostly vague on specifically what he wants to see in a Senate energy bill, told Senators in a bipartisan meeting today that any energy bill should put a price on carbon pollution. "When companies pollute, they should be responsible for the costs to the environment and their contribution to climate change," the White House said in a statement. That, Republicans say, is not going to happen. "A cap and trade proposal, a national energy tax will not sell in this country at this time," Sen. Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, the ranking member on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, said after the meeting today. Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine, urged the administration to "carefully weigh the costs of action versus inaction to avoid unintended consequences that cost us jobs."

UQ- Won’t Pass- General

Obama still has to bid for more support to get Energy Reform Passed.

PS 6/29/10(Public Service News Service, “Support for Obama energy bill muted”, http://www.publicservice.co.uk/news\_story.asp?id=13382)AQB

Barack Obama's hopes of bringing in sweeping clean energy legislation may have been forced into compromise in a bid to gain support from those who favour a more targeted approach. President Obama is pushing for action in the wake of the Gulf oil spill and has urged senators to find common ground. But failure to develop a broad agreement of Democrat and Republican senators on energy and climate law could lead to new proposals that recast energy reform as a Gulf oil spill response rather than broader and more extensive clean energy legislation. John Kerry, the Democrat who is leading the push for climate law change in the US senate said: "We are prepared to scale back the reach of our legislation in order to try and find that place of compromise, because we believe, and I think the president believes very strongly, that what is important is for America to get started." But the path forward to that compromise will be difficult. Kerry has called for more offshore drilling, something that senators from coastal states such as Florida are opposed to. While others such as Lamar Alexander, a Tennessee Republican, are deeply opposed to putting an economy-wide price on carbon and have called on the president to instead focus on the spill.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Graham

Energy reform dead- Graham withdrawn, dead in the Senate

Mascaro 6/13 [Lisa, Staff Writer, Los Angeles Times, 2010, Lexis] KLS

"The obituary for comprehensive and clean-energy-reform legislation has been written every week," said Daniel J. Weiss, director of climate strategy at the liberal-leaning Center for American Progress Action Fund. "All of those predictions were wrong." The Senate has long been considered the place where such legislation goes to die. That became clear to House Democrats over the last year as their chamber passed a sweeping climate change bill only to see it stall in the Senate. House Democrats, many in reelection fights in swing districts, came under attack as Republicans deftly labeled the bill a light-switch tax because it could raise the cost of coal and other carbon fuels used to generate electricity.A Just eight House Republicans supported the measure. Hope for Senate action was dashed when the main Republican negotiator, Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, said in late April he was pulling back.

Energy reform won’t pass- Graham is opposing it- he’s key because he wrote it

Walsh June 29th (Bryan,  Political Director of the National Republican Congressional Committee, *Time* http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2010/06/29/hope-seems-to-dim-for-cap-and-trade/?xid=rss-topstories ) ET

Other than maybe Jason in Friday the 13th, nothing has supposedly died and come back to life more often than climate legislation and carbon cap-and-trade. A year ago, thanks in part to fierce opposition from business interests led by the Chamber of Commerce, the cap-and-trade bill cosponsored by Henry Waxman and Edward Markey just barely passed the House of Representatives, 219 to 212. As Eric Pooley writes in his great new book The Climate War, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi had to wield a mean whip to get her members in line for the vote. (Just eight Republicans voted for Waxman-Markey, and 44 Democrats opposed it.) And in the Senate this year, the path has only been tougher for cap-and-trade. Democrat John Kerry, independent Joe Lieberman and Republican Lindsay Graham worked together for months to build a Senate version of cap-and-trade, despite the daunting need to get at least 60 votes to beat a filibuster—only to see Graham drop out in late April out of anger that Democratic Majority Leader Harry Reid had indicated he might want to move first on immigration reform. Kerry and Lieberman still managed to bring cap-and-trade back from the dead, coming forward with a draft bill in mid-May. But since then, Graham himself has come out against the bill that he helped build, and senator after senator—including Democrats—has said that cap-and-trade simply doesn't have the votes to pass. Kerry and Lieberman kept plugging, and many greens hoped that the Gulf oil spill—showcasing just how dirty America's energy supply really is—would change the underlying politics of climate policy. But a meeting at the White House today between a group of bipartisan senators and President Barack Obama might finally be the last nail in a broad cap-and-trade bill. Senate Democrats at the meeting offered to further scale back their plans to cap greenhouse gases across the entire economy—even though the Kerry-Lieberman bill itself is a less ambitious version of the Waxman-Markey bill that was passed a year ago.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Kerry

Energy reform won’t pass- Kerry calls for too sweeping of demands and oil spill overshadows

PS June 30th (*Public Service*, 6-30-10, http://www.publicservice.co.uk/news\_story.asp?id=13382 ) ET

But **the path** forward **to** **that compromise will be difficult. Kerry** has **called for more offshore drilling**, **something** that senators from coastal states such as Florida are opposed to. While others such as Lamar Alexander, a Tennessee Republican, are deeply opposed to putting an economy-wide price on carbon and have called on the president to instead focus on the spill. "If we want a clean energy bill, take a national energy tax off the table in the middle of a recession while we focus on the oil spill and focus on what we agree on," said Alexander. "Priority one, two and three for any meeting on energy is to make sure we give the president whatever he needs to clear up the oil spill and to help people who are hurt and to make sure that it doesn't happen again." Lawmakers in the House and Senate are pursuing bills related to the oil spill, such as raising the legal liability for oil companies and limiting deepwater drilling. The bills are likely to be packaged together, although it's not clear whether spill legislation would be considered separately or attached to a larger energy bill. The legislation is likely to be delivered in July.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Obama

Obama over did pushing for reform through oil spill- won’t pass now

Goldenberg June 29th (Susan, staff writer, *The Guardian* , http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2010/jun/29/barack-obama-energy-bill ) ET

Barack Obama's hopes of leveraging public anger at the Gulf oil spill into political support for his clean energy agenda fell flat today after he failed to rally a group of Democratic and Republican senators around broad energy and climate change law. The standoff suggests the Senate would formally give up on climate change law, and recast energy reform as a Gulf oil spill response, that would roll in far more limited proposals such as a green investment bank, or a measure to limit greenhouse gas emissions that would apply only to electricity companies. Such a move would come as a personal rebuff to Obama who has put energy and climate change at the top of his agenda, and who called on the 23 senators at the White House meeting to establish a cap and trade system. "The president was very clear about putting a price on carbon and limiting greenhouse gas emissions," John Kerry, the Democratic senator leading the push for climate change proposals in the Senate said after the meeting. "He was very strong about the need to put a price on carbon and make polluters pay," said senator Joe Lieberman. White House officials say the spill is a wake-up call for the urgency of breaking the US economy's dependence on fossil fuels, and had hoped to build momentum behind a cap-and-trade bill now before the Senate.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Oil Thumper

Won’t pass- Oil Spill

Sohn July 2nd (Darren, *Politico*, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39309\_Page2.html, 7-2-10) ET

“**They’re clearly good proposals** that could be put before the Senate to restrict greenhouse gases, particularly in the utility sector, **but I don’t know if the votes are there**,” he added. **Echoing the talking points of several Senate Republicans**, Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) said on Wednesday that he thought **it’d be better for the Senate to spend its time before the August recess focusing on a response to the BP oil spill.** “It’s a stand-alone problem that needs to be solved,” he said. “Let us get through this. **The climate bill deserves its time, but it’s frankly, at the moment, a separate issue.”**

Energy reform not at the top of agenda- Gulf oil spill regulations take precedence

Goldenberg 6/30 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

Lamar Alexander, a Tennessee Republican, said Congress needed to focus on the spill. "Priority one, two and three for any meeting on energy is to make sure we give the president whatever he needs to clean up the oil spill and to help people who are hurt and to make sure it doesn't happen again." The stand-off suggests the Senate will now try to roll energy proposals into a broader Gulf-oil-spill bill that would impose tougher offshore drilling regulations, and higher penalties for oil companies. The Senate is expected to take up such a bill soon after the 4 July break. But energy proposals could still be in the mix.

Won’t pass- no point in passing until oil spill is dealt with

Sargent June 29th ( greg, editor of Election Central,, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/plum-line/2010/06/the\_morning\_plum\_40.html , 6-29-10, *The Plum Line*) ET

Hissy fit of the month**? The White House is holding a bipartisan meeting with Senators to discuss the way foward on energy reform, and Lindsey Graham says he's skipping it because of the Petraeus hearings**. But we suspect he's a no-show it because the oil continues to gush. After all**, what's the point in discussing energy reform until the spill is stopped?**

It’s time to git er done on Energy reform- there’s a limited window for passage- oil spill, Byrd, waning Democratic majority

Feldmann 6/29 [Linda, Staff writer, 2010, The Christian Science Monitor, Lexis] KLS

Finishing energy legislation by the end of the year could be a long throw. The Gulf oil spill has added fresh urgency to the issue, and the bill could raise the liability caps on oil companies and impose stricter rules on offshore drilling. But Democrats are hoping to achieve much more, as the clock winds down on their large majorities in Congress. The death Monday of Sen. Robert Byrd (D) of West Virginia adds another wrinkle to the party's drive for energy reform. Though Senator Byrd represented a coal state, he had shown recent signs of willingness to compromise on the carbon emissions question. West Virginia Gov. Joe Manchin (D) has yet to appoint a successor, but whoever it is may not be so flexible.

Energy reform wont pass-waning majority, oil spill, spent Democrat political capital

Feldmann 6/21 [Linda Staff writer, 2010, Christian Science Monitor, Lexis] KLS

Judging how the BP oil spill will affect Obama's political strength for the rest of this term - and ultimately, his reelection chances in 2012 - is like analyzing a basketball game at halftime. Not possible. Perhaps, after more than a week of daily public focus, Obama has now hit his stride on the oil spill, or at least will be seen as doing the best he can amid horrendous circumstances. It's also possible that Obama was not going to accomplish much more in the way of big, signature initiatives anyway this term. Financial regulatory reform is expected to reach his desk, but beyond that, immigration reform looks like a long shot. And despite the opening for comprehensive energy reform that the oil spill has created, as Obama laid out in his Oval Office speech June 15, that's another long throw. After a year and a half in control of both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, the Democrats seem nearly spent after passing the massive stimulus package, health-care reform, and, presumably, financial reform. Come January, after midterm elections, the Democrats' big majorities in Congress will likely be gone, making major accomplishments even more difficult to achieve.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Political Capital Shredded

Obama’s Political capital low for 3 reasons, 1- perception of ineffectiveness, 2- low approval rating, and 3- emotional detachment

Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

The president failed to communicate the value of what he wants to communicate. To a significant number of Americans, what came across was a new president trying to do too much in a hurry and, at the same time, radically change the equation of American life in favor of too much government. This feeling is intensified by Obama's emotional distance from the public. He conveys a coolness and detachment that limits the number of people who feel connected to him. Americans today strongly support a pro-growth economic agenda that includes fiscal discipline, limited government, and deficit reduction. They fear the country is coming apart, while the novelty of Obama has worn off, along with the power of his position as the non-Bush. His decline in popularity has emboldened the opposition to try to block him at every turn. Historically, presidents with approval ratings below 50 percent—Obama is at 45—lose an average of 41 House seats in midterm elections. This year, that would return the House of Representatives to Republican control. The Democrats will suffer disproportionately from a climate in which so many Americans are either dissatisfied or angry with the government, for Democrats are in the large majority in both houses and have to defend many more districts than Republicans. In any election year, voters' feelings typically settle in by June. But now they are being further hardened by the loose regulation that preceded the poisonous oil spill—and the tardy government response

Obama’s political capital low now- failure to hold election promises leave him barely treading water

Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

The hope that fired up the election of Barack Obama has flickered out, leaving a national mood of despair and disappointment. Americans are dispirited over how wrong things are and uncertain they can be made right again. Hope may have been a quick breakfast, but it has proved a poor supper. A year and a half ago Obama was walking on water. Today he is barely treading water. Then, his soaring rhetoric enraptured the nation. Today, his speeches cannot lift him past a 45 percent approval rating.

And Obama’s disapproval rating is higher than his approval rating- no capital

Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

The American people wanted change, and who could blame them? But now there is no change they can believe in. Sixty-two percent believe we are headed in the wrong direction­—a record during this administration. All the polls indicate that anti-Washington, anti-incumbent sentiment is greater than it has been in many years. For the first time, Obama's disapproval rating has topped his approval rating. In a recent CBS News poll, there is a meager 15 percent approval rating for Congress. In all polls, voters who call themselves independents have swung against the administration and against incumbents.

Obama’s political capital is destroyed- his own support base now disapproves Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

Even some in Obama's base have turned, with 17 percent of Democrats disapproving of his job performance. Even more telling is the excitement gap. Only 44 percent of those who voted for him express high interest in this year's elections. That's a 38-point drop from 2008. By contrast, 71 percent of those who voted Republican last time express high interest in the midterm elections, above the level at this stage in 2008. And these are the people who vote.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Political Capital Shredded

And, obama has driven people to the republican-s no political capital

Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

Republicans are benefiting not because they have a credible or popular program—they don't—but because they are not Democrats. In a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC poll, nearly two thirds of those who favor Republican control of Congress say they are motivated primarily by opposition to Obama and Democratic policy. Disapproval of Congress is so widespread, a recent Gallup poll suggests, that by a margin of almost two to one, Americans would rather vote for a candidate with no experience than for an incumbent. Throw the bums out is the mood. How could this have happened so quickly?

Obama’s political capital was destroyed by failed programs which alienate the populous

Zuckerman July 2nd (Mort, magazine editor, publisher, and real estate billionaire, *US News World Report*, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/mzuckerman/articles/2010/07/02/mort-zuckerman-obama-is-barely-treading-water.html , 7-2-10) ET

There is a widespread feeling that the government doesn't work, that it is incapable of solving America's problems. Americans are fed up with Washington, fed up with Wall Street, fed up with the necessary but ill-conceived stimulus program, fed up with the misdirected healthcare program, and with pretty much everything else. They are outraged and feel that the system is not a level playing field, but is tilted against them. The millions of unemployed feel abandoned by the president, by the Democratic Congress, and by the Republicans.

Obama’s political capital gone- oil spill

Usborne 6/17 [David, Staff Writer, 2010, The Independent, Lexis] KLS

Which is why Tuesday's night's broadcast was so critical and intriguing. Mr Obama stands accused of having remained too detached from the Gulf disaster for too long. It was his chance to reassure Americans that he is on top of it all - on top of BP, especially, and on top of where the crisis goes next. He vowed to tackle the oil - and of course BP, whose top officers were trooped into the White House yesterday for a presidential spanking. The question is whether he managed to tackle himself also and deliver an Oval Office speech that was more than merely sensible and serious but also reassuring and inspiring. Cleverness is not enough in times of national peril. Obama needed to burn. But in the end, he failed to ignite and remained in his characteristic state of cautious smoulder.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Political Capital down

Obama’s political capital gone- business community doesn’t support him

Halperin 6/14 [Mark, Staff Writer, 2010, Time Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1996350,00.html] KLS

The President's current priorities are all liable to make a now bad relationship that much worse. The financial regulation bill is viewed as a typically ignorant Washington overreach. The ongoing efforts to deal with the BP spill are seen as proof that Obama is an incompetent manager and serial scapegoater of large corporate interests. And the attempt to use the Gulf crisis to revive the stalled effort to get Congress to pass major energy legislation appears to many business types as a backdoor gambit to raise taxes on corporations, mom-and-pop enterprises and consumers.

Obama no political capital- base has turned on him

Halperin 6/14 [Mark, Staff Writer, 2010, Time Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1996350,00.html] KLS

Where Obama's head and heart lies on these issues is, as usual, less clear. He certainly shares the irritation of his more liberal strategists that Big Business is being insufficiently grateful for all he has done for their needs and the nation. And he certainly believes in the power of the market much more than his detractors understand, or than his support for some emergency measures would indicate. He is likely to be surprised by the number of defections of big-money Democrats who raised contributions for him in 2008 and who will now — after the financial regulation bill is signed into law — begin a rigorous three-year-long effort to eliminate Democratic control of Congress and remove Obama from the White House.

Obama’s political capital gone- healthcare

Chestney 5/28[ Nina, EU carbon market correspondent, Reuters, http://blogs.reuters.com/nina-chestney/2010/05/28/u-s-climate-bill-seen-unlikely-in-2010-2/] KLS

 U.S. President Barack Obama has expressed hopes that the bill will pass this year as the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has highlighted the need for energy reform. The president may have exhausted his political influence after the tough fight to pass healthcare reform legislation in March, conference delegates said. “Obama may have used all his political capital to get healthcare over the finishing line,” said Chelsea Maxwell, managing partner of the Clark Group and former senior climate advisor to Senator John Warner. The best chance of passing the bill is before politicians break for Independence Day on July 4. “There is a window of opportunity between now and the recess of July 4 to make a lot of progress and we have to seize that opportunity,” said Annie Petsonk, international counsel at the Environmental Defense Fund. However, indecisive senators could threaten that chance. Congress could also focus on other issues on its busy agenda such as financial reform. “Fence-sitters mean the odds of getting something through before July 4 are really slim,” said Alison Wood, partner at Hunton & Williams.

UQ- Won’t Pass- Republicans

Climate change is going to “fail miserably” – lack of GOP support

Blue Wave News June 30th ( *Blue Wave News,* http://bluewavenews.com/2010/06/30/republicans-fear-climate-and-immigration-legislation-will-lead-to-failure-for-decades/ , 6-30-10) ET

Good old Lindsay Graham is doing his best to try and warn President Obama of the dangers of trying to actually pass legislation and fix the problems we elected him (and this Congress) to fix. Christina Bellantoni from TPM has the details on Graham’s pleading: But Graham is doubtful: “I don’t think any serious observer thinks that this Congress is going to enact comprehensive energy and climate policy and immigration between now and November.”Graham added that if Obama tries to pass a cap and trade system without GOP support, that would lead to “failure for decades.” “They’re not doing a good service to both issues, and both issues are important,” Graham told reporters when asked about the president’s dual efforts by TPMDC. “If you bring comprehensive immigration reform to the floor in this environment it will fail. It will fail miserably, and nobody will touch it for a decade and what you see in Arizona is going to happen throughout the country.”

Energy reform won’t pass- Republicans opposed on fiscal grounds

Mufson and Shear 6/3 [Steven, Michael D, Staff Writer, The Washington Post, Lexis] KLS

Moreover, the administration will have trouble finding enough support in Congress, where Republicans will try to keep Obama from turning the issues of climate change, financial regulation and health-care reform into a trifecta of legislative achievement heading into November's midterm elections. Senate Republicans immediately challenged Obama's call to action, saying he is using the gulf disaster to promote legislation that would undermine the nation's economy. "Instead of devoting every possible resource to getting the gulf cleaned up, the Obama administration is once again using a crisis to push its job-killing agenda," said Rep. Tom Price (Ga.), chairman of the Republican Study Committee. "The president seems to think American ingenuity cannot produce 21st-century energy solutions unless Washington raises the cost of everything Americans buy with a national energy tax."

UQ: Won’t Pass- THUMPER- Immigration

Energy not on the docket- Immigration takes precedence

Goldenberg 4/26 [Suzanne US environment correspondent 2010, The Guardian, Lexis] KLS

However, the calls for an overhaul of US immigration policy raised speculation that the White House was thinking of downgrading the energy and climate bill - as it did last year when it shifted its priority to healthcare. Reid, who has from the outset been hesitant to take up energy and climate, is facing a tough fight in the congressional elections, and his home state of Nevada has a large Latino population.

\*\* Internal Links\*\*

\

I/L - Bipartisanship

Bipart legislation build political capital

Gergen 2k [David, adviser to presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and Clinton, , Eyewitness to Power, p. 285]

As Richard Neustadt has pointed out, power can beget power in the presidency. A chief executive who exercises leadership well in a hard fight will see his reputation and strength grow for future struggles. Nothing gives a president more political capital than a strong, bipartisan victory in Congress. That's the magic of leadership. Clinton, after passage of his budget and NAFTA, was at the height of his power as president. Sadly, he couldn't hold.

I/L – Environment Lobbies

Oil lobbies are weak and unable to stop environmental groups– Democratic control of Congress and failure to influence past policy proves

Mayer 7 [Lindsay Renick, Money-in-politics reporter for Center for Responsive Politics PBS, “Big Oil Big Influence” 11-23-2007 <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/347/oil-politics.html> ]

Campaign contributions don't always get the oil industry desired results. Many of the oil industry chieftains, who were pushing to open ANWR for exploration, were disappointed when the 2005 energy bill came out of conference committee without that provision. Nor, do campaign contributions always get the industry's favorite candidates elected. Four of five of Big Oil's most favored candidates—all Republicans—lost their re-election races in 2006, despite hefty campaign contributions from oil and gas employees and PACs that cycle. The losers included Sens. Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania, Conrad Burns of Montana, George Allen of Virginia and James Talent of Missouri. With Democrats now in control of Congress, the oil and gas industry is finding that it's getting less for its money on Capitol Hill. Other industries with competing interests and far less cash to spread around, such as environmental groups and alternative energy producers, are now finding more support for their legislative goals. For example, the Clean Energy Act of 2007 seeks to repeal the 2004 and 2005 tax breaks to Big Oil and re-direct the money to renewable energy efforts. Because of the change in power, the oil industry faces the possibility of stricter oversight and fewer goodies from Congress. The industry "definitely has to be worried that there will be anti-oil legislation of all types, and also possibly regulations, depending on who takes over the White House," says David Victor, a law professor at Stanford University and a senior fellow on the Council for Foreign Relations. Victor was part of the council's task force on energy security.

Environmental lobbies are powerful due to Democratic control – oil lobbies will have little effect

Mayer 7 [Lindsay Renick, Money-in-politics reporter for Center for Responsive Politics PBS, “Big Oil Big Influence” 11-23-2007 <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/347/oil-politics.html> ]

Environmentalists, who had very little influence in Congress when Republicans were in control, are now seeing the lawmakers seriously consider their positions. This includes environmentalists' support of fuel efficiency standards, a mandate for electric utility companies to produce 15 percent of electricity from renewable sources and their opposition to coal-to-liquid fuel development. Nowhere is this change in tides more evident than in the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, which is heavily involved in energy legislation. California Sen. Barbara Boxer, considered one of the environment's biggest champions, has chaired the committee since her party assumed control of the Senate in the 2006 election. Boxer replaced Oklahoma Sen. James Inhofe, a Republican who has received $572,000 from the oil and gas industry since President Bush took office—more than all but three other members of Congress. Since 2001, Boxer has received less than $13,000 from the industry and nearly 69 times more from environmental policy groups than Inhofe. "The oil and gas industry, like almost every other industry, will shift some donations from Republicans to Democrats," says Eric Smith, a political scientist who researches environmental policy at the University of California-Santa Barbara. "It's clear that the industry strongly prefers to have Republicans in power, but industries generally focus on short-term advantages. In the short term—now and presumably after the 2008 elections—Democrats hold congressional majorities. So to win the short-term battles, the industry must try to persuade Democrats in Congress to go easy on them." Big Oil, which has always contributed heavily to Republicans, isn't likely to defensively switch its contributions to favor Democrats. But so far this year, 27 percent of the industry's contributions have gone to Democrats, up from 18 percent in the 2006 election cycle, when Republicans were still in power. In the presidential race, the Democrats' share is even higher—Democratic hopefuls for president have so far received 30 percent of the industry's contributions. Among Republicans, presidential candidate Rudy Giuliani has so far collected the most from the industry, while presidential candidate Hillary Clinton raised the most from the industry among Democrats.

I/L – Flip Flops Kill PC

Flip flops bad – presidential candidates prove

Reuters, 7 [June 10 http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N08360557.htm]

There are several things people are interested in when they're picking somebody to be president -- consistency, reliability and predictability," said a McCain senior adviser, Charlie Black. "You can't be sure what he's going to do when he's president when he has a history of changing positions," Black said of Romney. The Romney campaign is tired of McCain's attacks. "They can keep doing it if they want, and Romney just keeps getting stronger and stronger in the polls," said his adviser, former Missouri Sen. Jim Talent. "I've got to tell you, I'm a Romney guy, but I don't think it's working, these people making all these accusations." It seems that every major candidate has faced charges of switching positions based on the political winds. Besides her stance on Iraq, New York Sen. Clinton is accused of opposing government supports for ethanol, a big issue in the corn-growing and key presidential caucus state of Iowa, before she was for them. One of her Democratic opponents, former North Carolina Sen. John Edwards, is accused of having voted for and against storing nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and believed Americans were safer against terrorists, but now thinks they are not as safe. Illinois Sen. Barack Obama, who has only been in the Senate for two years, in May voted against a $100 billion Iraq war funding bill, saying it was time to change course in the war. But in April he vowed not to cut funding for U.S. troops. Schulman said the reason flip-flops are of such great interest is because U.S. political campaigns are now more personal. "In this modern world there is such an interest in the personality of the candidate that looking for chinks in the armor, looking for inconsistencies and playing gotcha has become much more prevalent," he said.

Flip flopping destroys a president’s legislative success and political capital

Fitts 96 [Michael A., Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School University of Pennsylvania Law Review, January, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827, Lexis]

<Yet, the ability of the president to justify actions through claims of "democratic legitimacy" has diminished in many ways. While the president could rely in the past on his popular election to legitimate his current position, today, public opinion polls and instant communication can bolster virtually any opposing political leader who claims popular support on a particular issue. n146 A president Clinton who is elected on a pledge to **[\*870]** reform health care, for example, must confront polling data that shows his plan does not enjoy popular support. At the same time, the narrowness of many of the issues faced by a modern unitary president and the decline of party identification more generally reduce the president's ability to rely on a past broad electoral mandate to legitimate particular decisions. n147 Modern leaders do not run on the basis of a clear platform. In this environment, the president's ability to lay claim to the democratic or party mantle has declined; he must often piece together a divergent coalition, bargaining, like other politicians, with individual political actors and groups who hold positions of influence in our divided government. This process of keeping members of a coalition together and prioritizing issues depends much more on conflict mediation skills than the traditional reliance upon party loyalty and claims of democratic legitimacy. In light of this shift, what should a unitary president do to maximize his influence? Under this analysis, his position demands a subtle balancing of roles. As the sweep of history has shown, the institutional power of the president is derived in part from his ability to rise above existing incremental relations and plot a new course for the country - that is, to solve the collective action problemof systematic change, whatever the direction. n148 As **[\*871]** Robert Inman and I have argued, n149 and as the literature describing a strong presidency suggests, n150 when confronted with the collective action problems of congressional and public action, the president's clarity of position and toughness in the face of adversity may be a precondition for effective leadership. The story of a president engaged in successful high visibility and high stakes politics has marked our vision of presidential leadership over the years. n151 Unfortunately, there is another side to the story, which emerges when the president is unsuccessful, or not involved, in such high stakes politics. As this Part indicates, the president's role as a visible focal point - so dependent on his singularity and clarity - can also create a conflict that, once unleashed, hinders the modern president's ability to mediate effectively as a single individual. n152 In areas such as social security or health care reform, the president may be poorly positioned to resolve conflict or to take the political heat if he does not. To paraphrase the language of law and economics, his virtue (in minimizing transaction costs) can be his vice (in mediating conflict over the public benefits or "surplus" produced by minimization). n153 **[\*872]** III. Individual Moral Assessments A second and related way in which the visibility and centralization of the presidency may undermine and frustrate the exercise of presidential power is by leading the public to evaluatethe president according to a standard of moral assessment appropriate for individuals, rather than for institutions. A greatdeal has been written over the years about the significance ofpresidential "style." Usually, the endless proliferation of relevantvariables in this literature limits the generalizability of the analyses. Every individual president has a unique style that can explain - although only in hindsight - his success or failure. My argument, however, is more generic: The presidential personality, whatever the style, can undermine the institution. In this sense, the presidential personality may produce a less valuable political "brand name." At first, this claim might seem unusual; as noted above in the description of the modern president, the public personality of politicians is usually perceived as a political advantage. Politicians routinely attempt to create public personae as warm, caring, and principled individuals who will do all they can to help their constituents. This image creation is one of the benefits of constituency servicing, public posturing, and the family stories that are so frequently planted in the press. To the extent that a politician simply presents herself as a "good and responsive person," her personality is usually thought to be a win-win issue, especially as compared to her actual positions on more divisive programmatic issues. n154 For members of Congress, personal connections may also complement quite well their roles as advocates for specialized constituencies in their districts. n155 **[\*873]** For the president, however, this type of familiarity can create two problems. First, part of the power of the presidency is its mystique and its ability to project general abstract symbols. The fact that "it is not just an office of incredible power but a breeding ground of indestructible myth" strengthens the president's authority. n156 We seem "to look to presidents for symbolic identification." n157 To tap into this resource, presidents have relied on the "royalty" of their position to garner broad support. n158 Yet a highly visible personal presidency is less able to invoke the grandeur of the office. Who is awed by the sight of a president jogging in running shorts or commenting on each public issue? n159 "Just as putting too much money in circulation causes

inflation and diminishes the value of a currency, too much presidential talk cheapens the value of presidential rhetoric." n160 Second, <CONTINUED>

I/L – Flip Flop Kills PC

Fitts 96

<CONTINUED NO TEXT REMOVED>the focus on individual presidents and their personalities can create greater tension with the president's pursuit of normal political activities. More than individual members of Congress, the unitary president is necessarily in a position to balance personally the interests of groups within his constituency as well as to change his individual position publicly over time, especially as he moves from the primaries, to the general election, to the presidency, and to the advancement of legislation through Congress. In order to be an effective leader, a president must, in other words, be less than candid to different constituencies and appear confident about positions that are subject to doubt or change. But balancing interests and changing positions in different institutional contexts can be in tension with his persona as a caring [\*874] and principled individual. As discussed in Part II, institutions are expected to mediate and evolve in this manner; individual politicians who are supposed to have strong moral convictions may not be offered that luxury. The modern personal presidency thus can be caught between the different normative standards frequently applied to individual and familial relationships, on the one hand, and political institutions, on the other. Commentators have pointed out this distinction in moral approaches in other contexts as well. n161 While we apply the personal standard to our friends, family, and extended family, whom we expect to be trustworthy, truthful, and caring, the president must often act impersonally toward individuals and the public. This detachment is often needed for public institutions and officials to balance competing interests and overcome the collective action problems that permeate government. n162 As a result, a single and visible president must act not only with impunity toward many individual constituents, but also strategically in order to balance their competing interests. What are some illustrations of this tension? On the one hand, the qualities that allow a politician to exercise power effectively in the political game have conflicted with the attitudes and normative values that will satisfy private normative standards. Reagan, for example, was constantly asked to reconcile his public concern for family values with his lack of concern for his own family. n163 Similarly, Clinton has been forced to reconcile his support for women's rights with his marital infidelity. n164 Carter may have had the opposite problem: a model personal life, but a seeming inability to engage in instrumental political behavior. **[\*875]** On the other hand, and more importantly, this tension can subject a president's public political behavior to private standards of morality. Clinton and Bush, for example, found that their attempts to mediate conflict on taxes and health care through evolving but inconsistent statements were not considered acceptable instrumental political methods, but rather a sign of a lack of character and moral conviction. Making "speeches that play to public opinion" tends to "create new discontinuities between past proclamations and present ones," n165 even though politicians may simply be attempting to keep up with evolving political forces. Good individuals with strong moral values are not supposed to change positions in light of changing political coalitions, although political institutions and parties can and should do so. n166 Caught in this predicament, politicians easily fall subject to characterizations such as "tricky Dick" (in the case of Nixon), "slick Willy" (in the case of Clinton), or someone who "runs under so many identities it [is] hard to keep track of who he [is] from day to day" (in the case of Bush). n167 The problem is especially difficult because, as studies on leadership have found, "the ultimate impact of [a] leader [often] depends most significantly on the particular story that he or she ... embodies." n168 The personal story of a modern president attempting to respond to changing political forces can be in tension with that role. n169 **[\*876]** >

I/L – Lobbies

Lobby Groups are key to the policy changes.

McCormick 2 [James M. Political analyst for Foreign policy changes, “Decision Making Processes and Actors in American Foreign Policy Formulation” “Decision making Processes” p 53-54, Google Books]

In a recent analysis, Stephen Zunes and Ben Terrall argued that Third World lobby groups, primarily human rights activists, were crucial in changing American policy toward the situation in East Timor. A pri­mary focus of this lobbying was the U.S. Congress, where the East Timor Action Network (ETAN) was able to affect American policy toward Indonesia and thus alter how the United States responded to East Timor. While Zunes and Terrall acknowledge that other factors were at work in the change in American policy, they also contend that "one cannot ignore the effectiveness of the pressure applied by human rights activists."' As this case suggests, interest groups can and do make a difference in addressing Third World issues within the United States. Yet an impor­tant question is whether this instance is typical for Third World issues and whether the American foreign policy-making process affords such groups ready access to the political arena. Put differently, how general­izable are the findings from this case? Are there identifiable sets of in­terest groups, much like business, labor, and ethnic groups, who regularly work to advance the interests of the Third World? In light of the current global environment and America's war on terrorism, do these groups have a role to play in the foreign policy-making process today? Most In his recent book, The Paradox of American Democracy, political ana­lyst John Judis identified three models of how the American political system works "and how it should work."

I/L – Oil Lobby

Big Oil is extremely influential in Congress – lobbying, funding, and political support prove

Mayer 7 [Lindsay Renick, Money-in-politics reporter for Center for Responsive Politics PBS, “Big Oil Big Influence” 11-23-2007 <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/347/oil-politics.html> ]

 <During his first month in office, President George W. Bush appointed Vice President Dick Cheney to head a task force charged with developing the country's energy policy. The group, which conducted its meetings in secret, relied on the recommendations of Big Oil behemoths Exxon Mobil, Conoco, Shell Oil, BP America and Chevron. It would be the first of many moves to come during the Bush administration that would position oil and gas companies well ahead of other energy interests with billions of dollars in subsidies and tax cuts—payback for an industry with strong ties to the administration and plenty of money to contribute to congressional and presidential campaigns. During the time that Bush and Cheney, both of whom are former oil executives, have been in the White House, the oil and gas industry has spent $393.2 million on lobbying the federal government. This places the industry among the top nine in lobbying expenditures. The industry has also contributed a substantial $82.1 million to federal candidates, parties and political action committees, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. 80 percent of the industry's contributions have gone to Republicans. This support has not gone unrewarded. In 2005, Bush, who has received more from the oil and gas industry than any other politician, signed an energy bill from the Republican-controlled Congress that gave $14.5 billion in tax breaks for oil, gas, nuclear power and coal companies. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, which was based on recommendations by Cheney's energy task force, also rolled back regulations the oil industry considered burdensome, including exemptions from some clean water laws. All of this transpired only one year after Congress passed a bill that included a tax cut for domestic manufacturing that was expected to save energy companies at least $3.6 billion over a decade. "Political action committees, lobbyists and executives do not give money to politicians or parties out of an altruistic support of the principles of democracy," says Tyson Slocum, director of Public Citizen's Energy Program. "They are savvy investors expecting a return on their investments. Politicians routinely deliver on campaign contributions that are provided to them... [by] giving goodies to the industry." And the size of those contributions matters. In comparison, environmental groups and alternative energy production and supply companies, which didn't see similar benefits come out of the Republican Congress's legislation, have made paltry contributions. Environmental groups, such as the Sierra Club, League of Conservation Voters and the Nature Conservancy, which often push for policy that is punitive to Big Oil, have given nearly 11 times less than the oil industry since 2001. The disparity is not a strategic difference, but the financial reality for these smaller competing interests. Exxon Mobil, for example, reported the largest annual profit on record for a U.S. corporation in 2006, bringing in $39.5 billion. Comparatively, the nonprofit Sierra Club Foundation—which funds organizations in addition to the Sierra Club—reported income in 2006 of $29 million. With members of Congress paying special attention to Big Oil, the policy that elected representatives have developed does not reflect the interest of the public, which wants "affordable, reliable, clean sources of energy," Slocum says. A 2006 survey by the Pew Research Center found a majority of Americans across the political spectrum want an energy policy that emphasizes renewable and alternative sources of energy. "Energy companies have a right to have a say in energy policy. Do they have a right to dictate energy policy, to be the only people at the table? Absolutely not. That was the main problem with the Cheney task force—[the industry] was the only one at the table," says Slocum. To keep its prominent seat, the industry spends big sums of money on hiring the top lobbyists in Washington to push its agenda on a variety of issues, not just related to energy but on issues ranging from education to real estate. After a few years of declining lobbying expenditures, the industry spent $63.3 million in 2005, most of which was probably related to the energy bill. (Lobbying reports don't require lobbyists to itemize their spending related to specific bills or amendments). In 2007, with a new energy bill in the pipeline, the industry's lobbying expenditures are on track to exceed last year's total of $73 million. Big Oil has spent seven times more than environmental groups on lobbying since President Bush took office. Marchant Wentworth, a lobbyist for the environmental advocacy group the Union of Concerned Scientists, says money buys access. "I've been working in the public interest environmental business for 30 years and 90 percent of the time I'm talking to staff," Wentworth said. "The oil and gas industry talks to the members themselves. That is a huge difference. Access is an important thing." "With a new energy bill in the pipeline, the industry's lobbying expenditures are on track to exceed last year's total of $73 million." The energy companies that spend the most on lobbying the federal government also tend to be those that give the most to politicians for their campaigns. Since 2001, Exxon Mobil, Marathon Oil, Shell Oil, Chevron and BP America—many of which provided guidance to Cheney's task force—have spent the most among energy companies on lobbying. Exxon Mobil and Chevron, in addition to El Paso Corp and Koch Industries, have been among the most generous campaign contributors within the industry during Bush's time in office. The American Petroleum Institute, which represents the oil industry in Washington, declined to comment for this story, and a spokesman from the national trade group the Independent Petroleum Association of America was unavailable for comment. Lawmakers, who live in areas that depend on oil production for their economy, are likely to be among the largest recipients of contributions from the oil and gas industry—and to vote in favor of legislation that helps it. The top three members of Congress to receive money from Big Oil during the Bush administration are all Republicans and are, not surprisingly, all from oil-rich Texas. The big names include Sens. John Cornyn and Kay Bailey Hutchison, both of whom have supported subsidies for gas and oil exploration and drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Also is Rep. Joe Barton, who sponsored the 2005 energy bill and was chair of the House Energy & Commerce Committee at the time. Fellow Texan Tom DeLay, who was the House Majority Leader in 2005 and was instrumental in pushing the energy bill through, also ranks among the top to receive money from the industry during Bush's two terms. Of the 50 members of Congress who have received the most contributions from oil and gas companies since 2001, only six are Democrats.>

I/L – PC Finite

Obama’s political capital finite- must trade off with other things

Bremmer 6/1 **[Ian, Staff Writer, Foreign Policy News, 2010, http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/category/topic/diplomacy]**

Obama has yet to lay out a clear strategy for the Doha Round. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk has said several times that the United States considers Doha completion as critical, but there's no evidence yet that he'll have the political support he needs to set policy and to bargain. Comments from Obama himself on Doha have been ambiguous at best, warning of an "imbalance" in potential trade-offs on the table in current negotiations. It's also not yet clear how much political capital Obama will put at risk at a moment when he needs the support of organized labor for a host of other domestic priorities. And in a nod to agricultural interests, he allowed his budget proposal to cut farm subsidies -- a critical sticking point in the Doha negotiations -- to die on arrival.

Time limited to pass legislation-

Feehery 9 [**John, staffer for former House Speaker Dennis Hastert , July 21, CNN, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html] KLS**

Time: The legislative calendar is simply not that long. A new administration has a little less than a year to pass its big-ticket items, mostly because it is very hard to get major initiatives done in an election year. Take away the three months it takes to hire key staff, a couple of months for the various congressional recesses, and you have about six months to really legislate. Since Congress is supposed to use some time to pass its annual spending bills (there are 12 that need to be passed each year, not counting supplemental spending bills), time for big initiatives is actually very limited. Each day the president takes time to travel overseas or to throw out the first pitch at an All Star game, he is taking time away from making contacts with legislators whose support is crucial for the president's agenda. Time is not a limitless resource on Capitol Hill.

Use or lose political capital

Feehery 9 **[John, staffer for former House Speaker Dennis Hastert , July 21, CNN, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html] KLS**

Political capital: A president enters office with the highest popularity ratings he will ever get (barring a war or some other calamity that brings the country together), which is why most presidents try to pass as much as possible as early as possible in their administrations. The most famous example of that was Franklin Roosevelt's Hundred Days. But there are other examples. Ronald Reagan moved his agenda very early in his administration, George Bush passed his tax proposals and the No Child Left Behind law very early in his White House. They understood the principle that it is important to strike while the iron is hot.

Finite store of political capital that perception affects- Bush proves

Feehery 9 **[John, staffer for former House Speaker Dennis Hastert , July 21, CNN, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html] KLS**

President Bush famously misunderstood this principle when he said that he was going to use the "political capital" gained in his re-election to pass Social Security reform. What he failed to understand was that as soon as he won re-election, he was a lame duck in the eyes of the Congress, and he had no political capital.

I/L – PC Finite

Political capital expires- not regenerative

Feehery 9 **[John, staffer for former House Speaker Dennis Hastert , July 21, CNN, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html] KLS**

President Obama believes he has a lot of political capital, and perhaps he does. But each day he is in office, his political capital reserve is declining. And each time he goes to the well to pass things like "cap and trade" makes it more difficult for him to pass his more important priorities like health care.

Plan can’t generate political capital- only domestic events matter

Feehery 9 **[John, staffer for former House Speaker Dennis Hastert , July 21, CNN, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html] KLS**

Focus: Congress can walk and chew gum at the same time. But focus is essential to achieving results. Presidential focus quite often moves off the domestic agenda and into the wider world of diplomacy. But that can spell greater political danger for a president and his party. George H.W. Bush spent most of his presidency winning a war against Iraq and successfully concluded the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union. But neither of those foreign policy successes helped him win re-election. His son, George W. Bush, understood that he had to keep a tight focus on the economy and one big domestic policy item (education), and while the war on terror did end up dominating his presidency, Bush never forgot to focus on his domestic achievements.

I/L – PC Key

Obama needs political capital to pass energy reform

Thrush and Shiner 6/9 [Glenn Meredith, Staff Writers, 2010, Politico, News http://www.netflix.com/WiPlayer?movieid=70024101&trkid=438381&strackid=44399cf14a7746b6\_0\_srl&strkid=2004907904\_0\_0] KLS

“This will likely be the last opportunity to legislate on energy, so I can’t imagine senators wanting to see this opportunity pass them by,” an energy committee aide said of the push. The other major factor is how much political capital the White House is willing to expend to pass the bill — and whether Obama would accept a humbling defeat on a floor vote. Alaska Sen. Lisa Murkowski, the ranking Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee, joked with reporters Tuesday that “the strategy this week is following the advice and statement of [White House chief of staff] Rahm Emanuel when he said, ‘Never let a good crisis go to waste.’”

With Obama’s ratings on the decline- he’ll need the last of his political capital to pass energy reform

Rische 6/14 [Robert, Congressional Paige, 2010, The Examiner, http://ww.examiner.com/x-36784-San-Diego-Conservative-Examiner~y2010m6d14-Obama-looks-to-capitalize-on-oil-spill-in-getting-energy-reform-legislation-passed] KLS

Americans should see through the opportunism and inconsistency of an administration that, not more than three months ago, openly called for more drilling. It should further see through the hypocrisy of then-candidate Obama, who vehemently criticized his predecessor for handling another disaster that occurred along the Gulf Coast, when compared to his own administration’s failings with respect to this current crisis. It has probably been said before, but you simply cannot legislate yourself out of an ongoing crisis. Yes, when the spill first occurred, who didn’t expect the environmental leftists to run to the forefront screaming, “We told you so?” Never mind, the benefit we have all received from extracting oil for decades and the lack of accidents that have occurred during that time as well. California’s own experience with an oil spill off the coast of Santa Barbara over 40 years ago has led to safer drilling practices along the state’s coast – but we have certainly not abandoned the practice altogether. A comprehensive energy bill may be the idyllic dream of the left, but they are shameful in using this catastrophe to get it passed. Obama’s window of political capital is quickly closing as the 2nd of November (Election Day) inches closer and closer. While they may succeed in this current endeavor, Americans should not turn a blind eye to the means by which they accomplished their objective.

I/L – PC Key

Political Capital can only help – increases make legislation more likely – not the other way around

Lee 5 [Andrew, The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association 2005 Conference http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]

Congressional Anticipation The last alternative explanation proposes that Congress drafts favorable legislation in response to the president’s increase in political capital. In contrast to the investment explanation, where the president uses veto threats differently depending on his capital and the legislation stays constant, this theory suggests that Congress changes its actions. The president’s use of the veto is constant, but Congress changes its legislation depending on the president’s approval rating. In recent years, the majority leadership in the House has aggressively used its power to control the agenda. If a measure seems likely to divide the majority party or face a presidential veto, then it will probably not reach a House floor vote in the first place (Simendinger 2003). When the president’s approval ratings increase, the Congress anticipates a stronger veto threat. This anticipation creates favorable legislation rather than unfavorable legislation that will trigger a veto. Therefore, when the president’s political capital is at its highest, the presidential veto will be least likely. In the current 109th Congress, however, there were signs of strain between the White House and the House Republican Leadership, possibly caused by the president’s decrease in political capital (“Bush Vows Stem Cell Veto” 2005).

Political Capital determines the agenda – above anything else

Light 99 [Paul C., Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Service

“the President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton”, 3rd Edition p. 34] KLS

In chapter 2, I will consider just how capital affects the basic parameters of the domestic agenda. Though the internal resources are important contributors to timing and size, capital remains the cirtical factor. That conclusion will become essential in understanding the domestic agenda. Whatever the President’s personal expertise, character, or skills, capital is the most important resource. In the past, presidential scholars have focused on individual factors in discussing White House decisions, personality being the dominant factor. Yet, given low levels in presidential capital, even the most positive and most active executive could make little impact. A president can be skilled, charming, charismatic, a veritable legislative wizard, but if he does not have the basic congressional strength, his domestic agenda will be severely restricted – capital affects both the number and the content of the President’s priorities. Thus, it is capital that determines whether the President will have the opportunity to offer a detailed domestic program, whether he will be restricted to a series of limited initiatives and vetoes. Capital sets the basic parameters of the agenda, determining the size of the agenda and guiding the criteria for choice. Regardless of the President’s personality, capital is the central force behind the domestic agenda.

High political capital makes legislation more likely – fear and cooperation

Lee 5 [Andrew, The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association, 2005 Conference, http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]

No single alternative theory can entirely explain the use of veto threats under President Bush’s first term. For example, the president would not be able to invest political capital without having the opportunity of increased legislation created by the legislative cycle. It is more likely that a combination of these factors produced the data in the first Bush administration. During periods of high legislative activity, the Congress, divided during the 107th Congress, anticipated more credible veto threats due to high political capital. Congress constructed legislation that was favorable to the president, and the president invested his political capital by decreasing his veto threats and opposition to legislation. Congress creates legislation that is more favorable to the president, and the president supports Congress in order to invest his political capital. Ultimately, this means that Congress and the president are inadvertently working to create agreeable legislation during times of high political capital. Conversely, when political capital decreases, the president gradually increases his opposition language.

I/L – AT: PC Key

Political capital is not key to the agenda

Lindberg  4 [Todd,  Editor of Policy Review Magazine, Research Fellow at the Hoover Institute, The Washington Times, December 7.  Pg. A21, Lexis]

Striking it is, then, that Mr. Bush came in for only half of the metaphor: He believes he possesses political capital, but rather than invest it, he proposes to spend it.I think this innovation may be an improvement. It removes the implicit expectation of an automatic return on the use of political capital. Because in reality, one may spend one's political capital and lose it - specifically, if things don't turn out the way you hope, namely, in glorious victory.

I/L – AT: PC Finite

Political Capital spills over between issues – 107th congress proves

Lee 5 [Andrew, The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association 2005 Conference http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]

The idea of investing political capital also supports the notion that the chief executive specializes in foreign and defense policy. The president may increase his domestic capital by cooperating on domestic legislation and then spend it implementing foreign policies. In executing foreign policy, the president will not issue SAPs on his own foreign policy. For example, if the president signs a treaty, Congress may or may not ratify it, but there is no opportunity for veto. Therefore, the president’s use of foreign policy is a spend maneuver, whereas his domestic policy is an invest maneuver. The 107th Congress, during which the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq began, supports this theory. President Bush may have spent his political capital towards executing those wars and attempted to invest his capital by cooperating on domestic legislation.

I/L – Public Key

Public perception key to Energy reform

Turgeon 10 [Evan N, Legal Associate at the Cato Institute, Journal of Land, Resources, & Environmental Law, 30 J. Land Resources & Envtl. L. 145, Lexis] KLS
The option of emphasizing imminent harm depends on government actors increasing the public's perception of the risk climate change poses because only severe, readily identifiable risks prompt changes in behavior. "Public officials could heighten the salience and hence the level of concern about the risks associated with climate change, and hence magnify the public demand for a regulatory response." n197 The media would play an important role in this. n198 Media portrayal of public health crises, acts of terrorism, or domestic natural disasters (such as flooding and drought) as resulting from volatile petroleum prices might drive the public to demand comprehensive transportation energy reforms that could include Pigovian fuel taxes. Representatives of regions made especially vulnerable to climate change effects could push such policies through the legislative process.

AT: Obama Won’t Get Blame

Presidents receive blame for legislation rather than gain credit

Segura and Woods, 2 [Presidential Approval and the Mixed Blessing of Divided Government Stephen P. Nicholson, Gary M. Segura & Nathan D. Woods, The Journal of Politics, Volume 64 Issue 3 Page 701-720, August 2002]

<Lau (1985, 119) defines negativity bias as the "greater weight given to negative information, relative to equally extreme and equally likely positive information in a variety of information-processing tasks." Under divided government, then, presidents should benefit far more from sharing blame than they lose by sharing credit. Not surprisingly, research on presidential approval shows that negative information has a greater effect than positive information. For instance, finding that economic downturns hurt approval ratings while upswings do not have the opposite effect, Mueller (1973) concludes that for presidents "there is punishment but never reward." Similarly, Goidel and Langley (1995) found that media coverage of negative economic conditions had a discernibly negative effect on public evaluations. Coupled with the routinely unfavorable media coverage of presidents (Brody 1991; Groeling and Kernell 1998; Gross- man and Kumar 1981; Patterson 1996), negative evaluations should figure prominently in judgments of presidential performance. From our standpoint, we are agnostic as to the basis for the asymmetry between credit and blame in evaluating presidents.5 Rather, we proceed from the assumption, well established in the literature, that such a negativity bias exists. Thus, we believe that the information implications of divided government for the president have a greater effect on assigning blame than credit.

President can’t avoid blame – unitary nature

Fitts 96 [Michael A., Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, January, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827, Lexis]

Centralized and visible power, however, becomes a double-edged sword, once one explores the different ways in which unitariness and visibility can undermine an institution's informal influence, especially its ability to mediate conflict and appear competent. In this context, the visibility and centralization of the presidency can have mixed effects. As a single visible actor in an increasingly complex world, the unitary president can be prone to an overassessment of responsibility and error. He also may be exposed to a normative standard of personal assessment that may conflict with his institutional duties. At the same time, the modern president often does not have at his disposal those bureaucratic institutions that can help mediate or deflect many conflicts. Unlike members of Congress or the agencies, he often must be clear about the tradeoffs he makes. Furthermore, a president who will be held personally accountable for government policy cannot pursue or hold inconsistent positions and values over a long period of time without suffering political repercussions. In short, the centralization and individualization of the presidency can be a source of its power, as its chief proponents and critics accurately have suggested, as well as its political illegitimacy and ultimate weakness

I/L – AT: Winners Win

Obama’s political capital waning without positive returns

Halperin 6/14 [Mark, Staff Writer, 2010, Time Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1996350,00.html] KLS

Like Bill Clinton in 1992, candidate Obama had stronger-than-usual support as a Democrat from both Wall Street and Main Street business leaders. Now, amid both the endgame of the struggle for financial regulation and the Gulf oil crisis, the President's alienation from the top level of the private sector leaves him weakened with Congress and the public, and as a political force.

I/L – AT: Winners Win

Winners –Lose – Bush’s past success prove

Weidenhof 7 [Jeremy, Staff Writer, Lone Star Times, http://lonestartimes.com/2007/05/03/president-george-w-bush-failure/]

The economy is probably one of the President’s strongest suits. Despite terrorist attacks on the nation and a resulting recession, the American economy has rebounded and remains strong years later. Mainstream liberal media may attempt to say otherwise, but very low unemployment and strong stock markets indicate a generally healthy economic picture. There have been stumbles along the way, but Bush’s tax reductions remain a shining conservative accomplishment. This initiative of the President must be regarded as a failure. Whatever the initial reasons for the attempt, Bush’s plan to sell conservatism as “mean” and needing his brand of fiscal “compassion” largely flopped. His efforts such as “No child left behind” and extensive reaching out to Congressional Democrats only resulted in more and more spending and no political capital gained with his opponents. Some Republicans, and the President must be numbered among them, continue under the delusion that hard-left Democrats like Ted Kennedy and Nancy Pelosi can be gotten along with, despite mountains of evidence to the contrary.

\*\*Impacts \*\*

I/L – Energy K/ Agenda

Energy reform key to obama’s agenda- fulfilling campaign promises

Norris June 16th (Teryn, Director Americans for Energy Leadership, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/teryn-norris/obama-signals-need-for-ne\_b\_613835.html, *The Huffington Post*, 6-16-10) ET

Cap and trade has long dominated the debate, but a large number of think tanks, business leaders, and academics are rallying behind such an "energy innovation consensus," which places these federal investments at the front and center of the energy and climate agenda. President Obama cited these experts in his speech, noting that "Others wonder why the energy industry only spends a fraction of what the high-tech industry does on research and development -- and want to rapidly boost our investments in such research and development." The energy innovation consensus currently includes dozens of Nobel Laureates, Breakthrough Institute, Brookings Institution, National Commission on Energy Policy, Third Way, Association of American Universities, Clean Air Task Force, Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, Google, and Americans for Energy Leadership, among others. The latest group to join is the American Energy Innovation Council (AEIC), made up of several of the nation's top business leaders: Bill Gates, Jeff Immelt, John Doerr, Chad Holliday, Norm Augustine, Ursula Burns, and Tim Solso. Last week, these leaders released a new report, "A Business Plan for America's Energy Future," calling for major new federal investment in clean energy technology RD&D -- at least $16 billion annually, more than triple the current level (see our news roundup).nIn fact, such an energy innovation strategy was originally at the center of the Obama administration's energy and climate agenda. Throughout his campaign and the beginning of his presidency, Obama consistently promised he would increase federal investment in clean energy R&D by $15 billion per year. As one of the administrations "Guiding Principles" on energy and environment, the White House website still states that it will "Invest $150 billion over ten years in energy research and development to transition to a clean energy economy." Time Magazine's Bryan Walsh wrote in response to the speech, "if Obama is really serious about changing some of the insane parts of our energy policy--like the fact that we spend less than $5 billion on energy R&D a year, a number that Bill Gates wants to triple--he could be truly revolutionary."

Competitiveness Impacts

Energy Reform key to competitiveness- China, Germany, India, energy dependence pose a threat

Weiss and Lyon 1/28 [Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress Susan, Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change Policy Carol Browner, 2010, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/01/sotu\_energy.html] KLS

Obama also urged the Senate to pass strong bipartisan energy and climate legislation to increase national security and bolster U.S. competitiveness overseas, saying, “Washington has been telling us to wait for decades, even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China’s not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany’s not waiting. India’s not waiting. These nations aren’t standing still. These nations aren’t playing for second place.” China, Germany, and other nations are, indeed, racing ahead of us to develop and produce the clean-energy technologies of the future. China is now a world leader in solar, wind, electric cars, and high-speed rail technologies. And China is the leading producer of solar photovoltaic cells even though the technology was invented and perfected in the United States. The U.S. market share of PV cell production dropped from 45 percent to under 10 percent between 1995 and 2005. But the investments sparked by ARRA, combined with legislation to reduce carbon pollution, will help the United States keep up this race. America’s dependence on foreign oil hurts our economy, helps our enemies, and puts our security at risk. A recent CAP analysis found that one in five barrels of oil consumed in the United States come from nations that are “dangerous or unstable,” according to the U.S. State Department. It is essential that we invest in clean-energy technologies and reduce global warming pollution to lower American consumption of foreign oil. As conservative Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) recently noted, “The idea of not pricing carbon, in my view, means you’re not serious about energy independence. The odd thing is you’ll never have energy independence until you clean up the air, and you’ll never clean up the air until you price carbon.”

Energy Reform Impacts- Climate Change Laundry List

Climate Change will cause anarchy, food and water shortages, and national security threats

Simpson 6/25 [Walter, Environmental Consultant, 2010, http://www.energyreallymatters.com/] KLS

There is a natural tendency to deny the inconvenient truth about fossil fuels but it is based on overwhelming scientific evidence. We ignore this problem at our own peril because as climate change gets worse our species will find itself living in a much less hospitable world with rising sea levels and more intense storms, heat waves, droughts, and floods.  Even now in parts of the world many people are just barely surviving.  Imagine the difficulties the world’s poor will have as natural environments fail.  Changing climates will cause millions of “eco-refugees” to illegally cross national boundaries, seeking land, food, and water resources to survive.  Water wars may rival oil wars as deserts expand and the glaciers and winter snowpack that feed rivers decline. The U.S. military understands the science and takes the threat of climate change seriously. As early as 2004, the Pentagon released a study which found that climate change could lead to anarchy in many parts of the world, making international conflict endemic.  The report, which was quickly suppressed by the Bush Administration, described global warming as a greater threat to national security than terrorism.  These findings were repeated in the recently released 2010 Pentagon Quadrennial Defense Review which described climate change as “an accelerant of instability” that “may spark future conflicts.”  While we spent 5 trillion dollars on national defense and war during the last decade, we have yet to address climate change and our addiction to fossil fuels in any meaningful way.

Energy Reform Impacts- Oil Uniqueness

We’re at the brink of collapse- increased Chinese demand, waning resources, militant IR

The Toronto Star 9 [January 1, Lexis] KLS

Certainly his reappointment of U.S. Defence Secretary Robert Gates, as well as his choice of hawkish Democrats Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden for key positions in his administration, suggest there may be little fresh thinking around so-called national security issues. Obama takes over at a time when international competition over oil is sure to intensify in the coming years. This may seem odd, given the recent collapse in oil prices and the economic downturn. But these lower oil prices are almost certainly a short-term development - and one that threatens to lull us into a false sense of security about future oil supplies. (Even though we need to dramatically reduce oil consumption to ward off climate change, we don't want to run out of oil before we've figured out how to replace it with an alternative energy source.) The reality remains that oil is a finite resource, a precious one-time inheritance we've used up recklessly over the past century. As a result, we've already consumed most of the Earth's easily accessible oil. Much of what's left can be produced only with great difficulty, at enormous environmental and financial cost - as Alberta's oil sands illustrate. For years, critics, including leading geologists and economists as well as prominent Houston investment banker Matthew Simmons, have argued that we're rapidly depleting global reserves of conventional oil, creating a potentially dangerous situation for the world. Governments, however, have ignored or played down the problem. But in a surprising development, the International Energy Agency, the developed world's oil watchdog, has revised its previously reassuring estimates and reported that the world's major oil fields are declining faster than previously thought. Last year, for the first time, the agency actually conducted a comprehensive study of the world's 800 largest oil fields and concluded that the natural annual rate of output decline is a disturbingly high 9.1 per cent, about double previous estimates. Meanwhile, the problem of declining output is exacerbated by rising world oil demand, largely due to the extraordinary increase in energy consumption in China and India. China, second only to the United States in oil consumption, is, like the U.S., highly dependent on oil imports, particularly from war-torn Sudan, and is restlessly searching the globe for new petroleum sources. China's ravenous oil appetite adds a dangerous new dimension to the U.S. determination to secure control over world oil reserves. Indeed, Chinese interest in the undeveloped oil fields of Iraq appears to have been on the minds of U.S. strategic planners in the run-up to the 2003 U.S. invasion. Among the secret documents prepared by U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney's task force on energy was a list of "foreign suitors" - including China - that had been making major oil deals with then-Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein. (With Iraq now under U.S. occupation, China has been pushed aside and lucrative oil deals have been awarded instead to U.S. and British oil multinationals.) A potential showdown could well be looming between the world's most populous nation and the world's most heavily armed nation as they race to lock up control of the world's remaining oil supplies - even as global production of that all-precious resource starts to seriously decline. Will Obama prevent this showdown? In many ways, the future of the world depends on it. But it may be expecting a bit much from a guy who already has quite a lot on his shoulders.

Peak oil is coming with dependence growing

Simpson 6/25 [Walter, Environmental Consultant, 2010, http://www.energyreallymatters.com/] KLS

**Peak Oil Will Make Things Worse**  In the absence of better energy policies we can expect more oil wars in the future, perhaps at an accelerating rate.  After all, our dependence on oil imports is still growing and most of the world’s remaining conventional oil is located in Middle East Islamic nations often not well disposed to the United States.  Plus it appears that the world has or will soon experience “peak oil,” a point in time when global oil production peaks and then declines as the oil reserves which are easiest to discover and tap are depleted and finding more oil becomes difficult and costly.  Peak oil, which is inevitable because global oil supplies are finite, will usher in an era of much higher gasoline prices and economic dislocation.  Even worse, peak oil could propel us toward “non-solutions” like reckless drilling for oil in fragile, irreplaceable natural environments or tapping Canadian oil sands -- which would be catastrophic given the energy requirements and carbon footprint associated with exploiting that resource.

Energy Reform Impacts- Oil Dependence

The US is willing to go to nuclear war for oil- Carter proves

Simpson 6/25 [Walter, Environmental Consultant, 2010, http://www.energyreallymatters.com/] KLS

In 1979, the Russians invaded Afghanistan and fears were running high that they were going after the Saudi Arabian oil fields.  President Jimmy Carter responded with the “Carter Doctrine” which designated those oil fields as vital U.S. interests and stated that we would use “any means necessary” to defend them -- apparently including nuclear weapons.

US Oil dependence causes war, market instability, and thousands of civilian causalities

Simpson 6/25 [Walter, Environmental Consultant, 2010, http://www.energyreallymatters.com/] KLS

**Risks of U.S. Foreign Oil Dependence**  Looking back, we see that the 1970s were watershed years in the energy world.  In 1973-1974 we experienced an “energy crisis” when Arab oil-producing nations imposed an oil embargo on the United States and its allies in response to U.S. support for Israel during and after the Arab-Israeli War of 1973. Many will remember long gas stations lines which called into question our love affair with large gas-guzzling cars.   That first energy crisis was followed in 1979 by a second energy crisis when the U.S.-supported Shah of Iran (Mohammad Reza Pahlavi) was overthrown and replaced by the Ayatollah Khomeini.  In addition to seizing American hostages, Iran’s new anti-American government turned off the oil spigot, reducing global oil supplies and causing gasoline prices to soar again.  These events and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan focused the Carter Administration on U.S. foreign oil dependence.  At the time only 37% of U.S. oil was imported -- compared to 57% now. While Jimmy Carter was an advocate of energy conservation, he was also willing to use U.S. military might to keep foreign oil flowing into our gas tanks.  Before Carter left office he created the Rapid Deployment Force, a new military command designed to quickly deploy to global hotspots like the Persian Gulf whenever U.S. interests were threatened. Our first oil war occurred in 1991 when U.S. and allied forces carried out operation “Desert Storm” to repel Iraqi military forces that had invaded Kuwait in 1990, seizing its oil fields.  While President George H.W. Bush took pains to wrap this war in the American flag, calling it a defense of “freedom and democracy,” the war was clearly all about oil. After all, Kuwait was not a democracy but it did contain the world’s fourth largest oil reserves.   While this Persian Gulf War was relatively short, each day of fighting cost taxpayers $1 billion or three times the annual federal budget for energy conservation. 148 American soldiers died liberating Kuwaiti oil.  Iraqi deaths were considerably higher -- 50,000 or more.  Civilian deaths were termed “collateral damage” with many killed during weeks of U.S. aerial bombing of Bagdad.

Oil dependence is systemic, provokes terrorism and costly wars

Simpson 6/25 [Walter, Environmental Consultant, 2010, http://www.energyreallymatters.com/] KLS

**One Oil War Leads to Another** Given the human and dollar costs of the Gulf War, the take home lesson should have been “let’s do everything we can to avoid another oil war.”  But that lesson was not learned.  Our cars remained inefficient and we drove them greater distances, causing U.S. foreign oil imports to grow during the 1990s.  Moreover, at the end of the Gulf War the seeds were sewn for the next oil war by establishing a permanent U.S. military base in Saudi Arabia.  This base was deeply resented by Saudi fundamentalists like Osama bin Laden and may have precipitated the Al-Qaeda terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, which served as a catalyst to our second oil war in 2003. The ancient Greek dramatist Aeschylus is credited with saying, “In war, truth is the first casualty.” Nothing could illustrate that maxim better than all the lies that were told by the second Bush Administration to mobilize our nation for “regime change” and war in Iraq.  We now know that Saddam Hussein and Iraq had nothing to do with the 9-11 attacks and that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction threatening the United States.  While the Bush White House was masterful in conjuring up phony rationales for invading Iraq, they never admitted the real one -- oil.  The role of Saudi Arabia in 9-11 was also obscured.  Saudi money, much of it recycled U.S. petrodollars, was funding fundamentalist Islamic schools throughout the region committed to jihad against the United States. Given the Bush Administration’s strong oil industry ties, it was not surprising that it immediately focused on foreign oil through Vice President Dick Cheney’s energy task force which met in secret with top oil company executives.  Its May 2001 report highlighted the dangers of U.S. foreign oil dependency, predicting that by 2020 as much as two-thirds of U.S. oil would be imported.  Cheney’s task force is believed to have reviewed maps of Iraqi oil fields, noting which U.S. oil companies wanted access to them. When the 9-11 terrorist attacks occurred, the administration was ready to use this tragic event as an excuse to go after the Iraqi oil reserves -- the second or third largest in the world.  When the cause of war is obvious, it’s remarkable that knowledgeable political leaders remain silent and sustain the masquerade.  It took Alan Greenspan, former Federal Reserve chairman, to say in his 2007 memoir, “I am saddened that it is politically inconvenient to acknowledge what everyone knows: the Iraq war is largely about oil.”  This statement’s truth was born out by the Bush Administration’s on-going attempts to pressure the new Iraqi government to sign no-bid contracts with western oil companies like Exxon, Mobil, Shell, Total, and BP which previously did not have access to Iraqi oil.  Our second oil war, which has yet to end, makes the first one look like a piker.  4,000 Americans were killed and over 30,000 wounded.  Iraqi deaths are estimated between 100,000 and 1 million.  So far the war has directly cost American taxpayers over $700 billion and the U.S. economy an estimated $3 trillion – that’s $3,000,000,000,000 or $10,000 for every American.

I/L Economy

Energy reform rebuilds world economy – increases consumer confidence.

Summers 10(Lawrence, 71st United States Secretary of the Treasury and 8th Director of the National Economic Council, “"The Economic Case for Comprehensive Energy Reform” National Economic Council)AQB

Second, comprehensive energy legislation will reduce uncertainty and increase confidence. The cheapest stimulus program in the world is enhanced confidence. I first met Ben Bernanke 35 years ago, when we were both graduate students in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His PhD thesis was an important part around exactly this point. He studied the question of the impact of uncertainty on investment. His example, when he talked about his work, was a boiler. If you knew the price of energy was going to be high, you’d be one kind of boiler. If you knew the price of energy was going to be low, you’d be another kind of boiler. If you didn’t know what the price of energy was going to be, you’d stick with your existing boiler for another year, waiting to see what was going to happen to the price of energy. Until we pass comprehensive energy legislation, that is exactly what we are doing. We are creating an environment in which there is no certainty for someone building a new power plant. There is no certainty for someone making the commitment to an industrial production process. There is no certainty for someone thinking about the generation of automobile models after the current generation of automobile models, five or ten years out. Clarity brings certainty, certainty brings confidence, and that is what moves the economy forward. I would also say to you also that uncertainty is not just about our own future policy. Look at the full range of the distribution of oil prices as you can infer from options. As long as we are as dependent on foreign oil as we now are, there is a substantial uncertainty about the range of outcomes, and that too discourages investment, reduces confidence, and slows our economy relative to what we could have achieved.

Energy legislation allows the US to become leaders in innovation – rebuilds a market we lead.

Summers 10(Lawrence, 71st United States Secretary of the Treasury and 8th Director of the National Economic Council, “"The Economic Case for Comprehensive Energy Reform” National Economic Council)AQB

Fourth, the right energy legislation will support what is for the very long run most important for our economy, which is our leadership in innovation. If what’s true in the short run is that what determines how many people are working is how much demand there is for the products they’re willing to produce, what determines our standard of living in the long run is how productive we are. And that depends on our ability to innovate and bring those innovations to market. In the nineteenth century, the technologies that reverberated across the economy included the transcontinental railroad, the telegraph, and the steam engine. In the twentieth, it was the automobile, the jet plane, and, over the last generation, everything associated with information technology. We can’t know exactly what the next defining innovation will be. It will come in multiple, different sectors. Each one of these technologies has their own story. But think about maximizing potential and minimizing risk for our country. Should we not seek to assure our leadership in energy and environmental technology, given their stake in some of the largest problems facing the planet? That’s why the President’s energy agenda is directed at strengthening the economic ecology that has been so crucial for America’s prosperity – an educated workforce, a fluid environment that stimulates entrepreneurship. When you think about the strengths and weaknesses of our country, never forget this: we are the only country in the world where, if you have a sufficiently good idea, you can raise your first $100 million dollars before you buy your first suit. That is, and that has been, a crucial feature of our country, and it is something we have to perpetuate. Enacting comprehensive energy legislation will help our country move down the technological learning curves in key sectors associated with energy efficiency, associated with battery technology, associated with renewables, that will be economically important in the years ahead.

I/L Economy

Obama’s energy legislation helps the US become an international competitor again – Key to the US and global economy.

Summers 10(Lawrence, 71st United States Secretary of the Treasury and 8th Director of the National Economic Council, “"The Economic Case for Comprehensive Energy Reform” National Economic Council)AQB

Finally, the emphasis on innovation is tied to my fifth and last point. Comprehensive energy legislation will strengthen our international competitive position. The twentieth century was an American century for many reasons. The size and scale of our country. The quality of our democracy. But I would say to you that it also had to do with our leadership in key science and technology. The twentieth century was a century of physics. The atomic bomb, the nuclear reactor, the computer, the silicon chip, the transistor, the Internet. We led in all those technologies, and that was crucial to why we led the world. No one knows exactly what will define leadership in the twenty-first century, but I would suggest to you that making sure that we lead as a developer of the technology is crucial. I would suggest something else to you. Producers need markets. We are the largest economy in the world. If we use the fact that we are the largest economy in the world, and we will be for a good long time, to ensure that we are also the world’s largest market for innovative energy technology in every sphere, that will create a virtuous circle of innovation and adoption, adoption and innovation, that can be a very substantial source for our country in the new century. Ultimately, economic policy choices, like investment decisions for a family, involve seeking opportunity and involve minimizing risk. If you think about the risks to our ecology, the risks to our security, we minimize those risks with comprehensive energy policy. And if you think about the opportunity to lead in what is really important, we maximize that opportunity with comprehensive energy legislation. That’s why energy is so crucial a part of President Obama’s economic strategy.

Energy reform legislation saves the US economy from collapse – not only creates jobs, it increases demand.

Summers 10(Lawrence, 71st United States Secretary of the Treasury and 8th Director of the National Economic Council, “"The Economic Case for Comprehensive Energy Reform” National Economic Council)AQB

I believe comprehensive energy legislation can contribute to our prosperity in five ways. First, it will raise demand and create jobs. Under the Recovery Act: We will double the renewable energy capacity over the next three years. We will make critical investments in transformative technology. We will enhance the energy efficiency of federal buildings by 75%. What better time is it to make these kinds of investments than now, when we have substantial unemployed resources? And we are making them in the way that is most cost effective in terms of creating demand to a significant extent. If the government spends a dollar, that is a dollar of demand. If the government lends a dollar with a 10 percent credit subsidy because it is likely to be paid back, then the cost to the government is 10 cents, but the extra demand created can be a dollar before you even get to its multiplier effect as it reverberates through the economy. That is why it’s so important that at a moment when credit markets are having their difficulties, albeit reduced difficulties, the Recovery Act has made significant credit available to support up to $40 billion in renewable energy and transmission. Support for energy investment that creates demand and puts people back to work at a time of unemployed resources and excess capacity is the first way that energy policy strengths our economy.

I/L – Energy Reform

Obama’s legislation increases jobs in the alternative energy sector – saves US from recession and collapse.

Fahey 6/25/10(Anna, Sightline Daily news, “Americans Want Strong Energy Policy, Pronto!”)AQB

The economic benefits of clean energy policy—good business, more jobs—are clear. The Wall Street Journal-NBC Poll—conducted June 17 – 21—found that 69 percent of respondents feel that Obama’s proposals to develop alternative sources of energy and reduce the amount of oil and other fossil fuels produced and used in the US would increase the number of available jobs in the US. Seventy-nine percent felt that such proposals would make life better for the next generation of Americans. On June 9, Small Business Majority released the findings of a national poll of small business owners’ opinions on clean energy and climate legislation. A majority (61 percent) agree that moving the country to clean energy will help restart the economy and help small businesses create jobs, and 58 percent think that adopting new energy policies will transform the economy and they want their business to be a part of it. A solid 50 percent of small business owners said they support policy that would “put a price on carbon emissions from energy sources like oil and coal, so companies would have to pay if they release these emissions into the air.” Interestingly, 78 percent of African-American and 60 percent of Hispanic small business owners support such policy.

Energy legislation increases reliance on market forces while reducing limiting regulations.

Summers 10(Lawrence, 71st United States Secretary of the Treasury and 8th Director of the National Economic Council, “"The Economic Case for Comprehensive Energy Reform” National Economic Council)AQB

Third, comprehensive energy legislation will reduce reliance on heavy-handed regulation and increase reliance on market forces. This is true in our country and this is true around the world. You know, the first rule of holes is that when you’re in a hole, you should stop digging. In that spirit, the first principle of rational energy policy is that when a fuel is associated with all kinds of what we economists call externalities, pollution locally, carbon dioxide globally, national security risks associate with importation, it is a bad idea to subsidize it. Yet around the world, fossil fuel subsidies exceed $300 billion a year – $300 billion a year – and account for 12 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions. I think there’s a chance that when the history is written the most important thing that happened in the last year was the agreement by the G20 countries that contain the vast majority of the world’s GDP to eliminate over time their energy subsidies. It doesn’t go far enough – ultimately the price of carbon is going to have to rise – but an elimination of those $300 billion of energy subsidies is a substantial step forward towards allowing market forces to operate in the energy arena. It’s not just eliminating subsidies in other countries. It’s what we do here. Now I’m an economist, so I’m a bit of an evangelist for markets. But anyone who thinks about our energy policy debates has to be impressed by the record of the smaller-scale, because this is a smaller-scale issue, but similarly designed sulfur oxide program in the United States. Many thought it was too hard to introduce a market. Many thought that the right answer was command-and-control legislation. But the fact is that by 2000 sulfur dioxide pollution had fallen nearly below 30 percent below 1990 levels, and the cost was a relatively small fraction of what everybody expected in 1990. We are going to regulate fossil fuel emissions in the future. Much better than we do it with market based mechanisms than enable those who can economize most cheaply to be the ones who economize. Allowing market forces to operate is the third reason why this is so important. Adding flexibility for the private sector will be particularly important with respect to ensuring that we take advantage of the vast increase in our potential natural gas supplies that has been identified over the past several years.

I/L Economy – Generic

Energy reform is an economic imperative

Jenkins and Swezey 4/19 [Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy Breakthrough Institute, Devon, Energy Political Analyst Project Director for Breakthrough Institute, 2010, http://www.google.com/#hl=en&q=Devon+Swezey&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs\_rfai=&fp=355c0c6008861bf6] KLS

Accelerating U.S. clean technology innovation, manufacturing, and market creation has become not just an environmental necessity but an economic imperative. A recent Pew study showed that the global clean energy industry has experienced rapid investment growth over the last five years. New clean tech investments in 2009 reached $162 billion, which is expected to grow 25 percent to $200 billion in 2010. With the global clean energy economy emerging as one of the largest economic opportunities of the 21st century, government policy and public investment will be critical determinants of which countries come out on top in the race to attract private sector investment in clean energy technologies.

Energy reform will revolutionize America’s clean energy market- ensuring US economic competitiveness, reaffirming American leadership

Jenkins and Swezey 4/19 [Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy Breakthrough Institute, Devon, Energy Political Analyst Project Director for Breakthrough Institute, 2010, http://www.google.com/#hl=en&q=Devon+Swezey&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs\_rfai=&fp=355c0c6008861bf6] KLS

In the face of aggressive foreign competition in the clean energy industry, the United States urgently needs a comprehensive competitiveness strategy of its own to accelerate the development of a domestic clean energy industry and take advantage of emerging export opportunities. Such a strategy should prioritize large and sustained public investments in clean energy R&D, advanced clean energy manufacturing, innovative deployment, and clean energy education. Clean energy technologies today are still too expensive relative to fossil fuels to be widely deployed at scale around the world. In the long term, relying on either high carbon prices or permanent ongoing subsidies to make clean energy competitive will effectively close off export opportunities to developing nation markets that will be unable to impose either high carbon fees or sustain large ongoing subsidies for clean energy sources. If the United States wants to tap the multi-trillion dollar export opportunity that lies in meeting the rapidly growing demand for energy in the developing world, we much therefore focus on making clean energy technologies cheaper in unsubsidized terms. The overarching goal that should permeate all aspects of a new clean energy competitiveness strategy should be to make clean energy cheap. In light of this goal, there is strong expert consensus around the need to dramatically boost public investment in energy R&D by at least $15 billion per year in order to invent new breakthrough technologies, and improve existing clean energy technologies and reduce their costs. The U.S. government must also invest in the creation of a robust clean energy manufacturing industry in the United States, and should adopt an explicit manufacturing agenda. They U.S. government has consistently lacked a set of policies to help U.S. clean energy manufacturers scale up, reduce costs, and stay at the cutting edge. The government must help provide the financing necessary for the creation of expansion of clean energy manufacturing facilities here in the United States. The government must also rethink the way that it structures its clean energy deployment policies. Currently policies like the wind production tax credit (PTC) are designed simply to drive more wind turbines into the ground. Rather, we need a set of policies that treat deployment as part of the innovation process and rationalize deployment around reducing the real costs of clean energy technologies. One proposed institution, the Clean Energy Deployment Administration (CEDA), would help achieve this goal, and has explicit technology and cost improvement goals as part of its mission. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the United States must inspire and train a new generation of scientists and engineers and equip them with the tools necessary to solve our long-term energy, climate, and economic challenges. U.S. students consistently trail their peers in leading science and math education indicators. Securing long-term economic competitiveness will require major new investments in our energy workforce as clean energy emerges as one of the most promising economic opportunities of our time. America can still be the world leader in new global clean tech industry. We remain one of the most innovative and entrepreneurial countries in the world. But without a comprehensive clean energy competitiveness strategy that can compete with those implemented around the world, America will lose out on one of the greatest economic opportunities of the 21st century.

I/L Economy – Oil dependence

Public want energy reform- sick of oil dependence hurting our economy

Geller June 8th ( Kate, Rutgers, *League of Conservative Voters*, http://www.lcv.org/newsroom/press-releases/poll-americans-want-real-energy-reforms-in-wake-of-gulf-coast-disaster.html , 6-8-10) ET

“This poll makes crystal clear that the Gulf Coast disaster is the final straw for voters when it comes to allowing corporate polluters to dictate our energy policies,” said LCV President Gene Karpinski. “Now, more than ever, it is clear that our dependence on oil – be it from hostile nations or friendly coasts – hurts our economy, threatens our security and harms our environment. Senators must work to deliver comprehensive energy and climate legislation this year that prevents future energy disasters, makes polluters pay their fair share and creates a thriving clean energy economy.” “Voters firmly believe Congress needs to do more than just make BP pay for the Gulf Coast oil spill, they want Senators to pass real reforms to invest in clean American energy and hold polluters accountable,” said Joel Benenson, President of the Benenson Strategy Group.

Econ Impacts – Disease

Global economic turmoil forces deadly disease prevention organizations to cut aid.

Skirble 9 (Rosanne, Writer for the Voice of America, VOA “Economic Downturn Threatens Global Fund for AIDS, TB, Malaria” 04 February http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2009-02/2009-02-04-voa23.cfm?CFID=256884522&CFTOKEN=31 541345&jsessionid=de307b49f1da35d5dbcd4a1e52696331c2f6)

As world leaders grapple with the global financial crisis, the world's largest source of funds to combat killer diseases is facing a crisis of its own. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria supplies one-quarter of all AIDS funding, two-thirds of tuberculosis funding and three-fourths of malaria funding. A $5 billion funding gap now threatens this institution's worldwide programs. Every year since 2001, leaders from the world's wealthier nations have renewed their commitments to fund all approved disease treatment, prevention and research programs in poor countries. According to Jeffrey Sachs, a special United Nations advisor and director of the Earth Institute at Columbia University, the Global Fund was designed to keep the promises made to the world's poor to help them fight AIDS, TB and malaria. Sachs says that despite the urgency of its mission, the Global Fund has been forced by the recession-pinched budgets of its donor countries to cut back or delay funding. "It already cut by 10 percent the budgets for the approved plans. And it's warned that it would have to cut by 25 percent the second half of those plans," he says. The current funding cycle has been postponed for several months, which he says, "puts at risk the malaria control effort." The cutbacks are all the more distressing to Global Fund supporters because in its relatively short life, the organization has reported remarkable progress against killer diseases. For example, malaria deaths are down 66 percent in Rwanda and 80 percent in Eritrea over the past five years.

Econ Impacts – Key to Global

The world econ directly influenced by the US econ.

Arora & Vamvakidis 5 (Vivek & Athanasios, IMF Senior Resident Representatives, “Economic Spillovers” Finance and Development; Sept, Vol 42, No 3; http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2005/09/arora.htm)AQB

Economists usually see the United States as an engine of the world economy: U.S. and world output are closely correlated, and movements in U.S. economic growth appear to influence growth in other countries to a significant degree. Certainly, given its size and close links with the rest of the world, the United States could be expected to have a significant influence on growth in other countries. In 2004, U.S. GDP accounted for over one-fifth of world GDP on a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis and for nearly 30 percent of world nominal GDP at market exchange rates. The United States accounted for nearly a quarter of the expansion in world real GDP during the 1990s. World and U.S. growth have moved closely together in recent decades, with a correlation coefficient of over 80 percent. Trade with the United States accounts for a substantial share of total trade in a large number of countries. Estimates of the overall impact of U.S. growth on growth in other countries during the past two decades, in the context of a standard growth model, suggest that U.S. growth is a significant determinant of growth in a large panel of industrial and developing countries, with an effect as large as one-for-one in some cases (Arora and Vamvakidis, 2004). The impact of U.S. growth turns out to be higher than the impact of growth in the rest of the world. This could be explained by the role of the United States as a major global trading partner. The results are robust to changes in the sample, the period considered, and the inclusion of other growth determinants, including common drivers of growth in both the United States and other countries. We also found the impact of U.S. growth on growth in other countries to be larger than that of other major trading partners. For example, the impact of EU growth on the rest of the world is significant but smaller than the impact of U.S. growth.

Econ Impacts – War

Encouraging economic growth ensures peace through interdependence.
Grisworld 7(Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute “Trade, Democracy and Peace: The Virtuous Cycle”)AQB

A little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story a while back reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." In 2006, a survey by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute found that the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century. Since the early 1990s, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 17, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. The Institute's latest report found that 2005 marked the second year in a row that no two nations were at war with one another. What a remarkable and wonderful fact. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the Associated Press report, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Current estimates of people killed by war are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news--the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them--but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author argued in a forgettable book, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war. I would argue that free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, as I argued a moment ago, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies--a record high. Some studies have cast doubt on the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars. While it's true that democracies rarely if ever war with each other, it is not such a rare occurrence for democracies to engage in wars with non-democracies. We can still hope that has more countries turn to democracy, there will be fewer provocations for war by non-democracies. A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by promoting more economic integration. As national economies become more intertwined with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. The 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report contains an insightful chapter on "Economic Freedom and Peace" by Dr. Erik Gartzke, a professor of political science at Columbia University. Dr. Gartzke compares the propensity of countries to engage in wars and their level of economic freedom and concludes that economic freedom, including the freedom to trade, significantly decreases the probability that a country will experience a military dispute with another country. Through econometric analysis, he found that, "Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free." By the way, Dr. Gartzke's analysis found that economic freedom was a far more important variable in determining a countries propensity to go to war than democracy. A third reason why free trade promotes peace is because it allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Such assets cannot be easily seized by armies. In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming relatively less important in a high-tech, service economy. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. In short, globalization and the development it has spurred have rendered the spoils of war less valuable.

Recession will lead to another World War and the fascist takeover of countries – Empirically the root of both WWI and II.

O’Donnell 10(Sean, The Baltimore Examiner, “Will this recession lead to World War III?”)AQB

Could the current economic crisis affecting this country and the world lead to another world war? The answer may be found by looking back in history. One of the causes of World War I was the economic rivalry that existed between the nations of Europe. In the 19th century France and Great Britain became wealthy through colonialism and the control of foreign resources. This forced other up-and-coming nations (such as Germany) to be more competitive in world trade which led to rivalries and ultimately, to war. After the Great Depression ruined the economies of Europe in the 1930s, fascist movements arose to seek economic and social control. From there fanatics like Hitler and Mussolini took over Germany and Italy and led them both into World War II. With most of North America and Western Europe currently experiencing a recession, will competition for resources and economic rivalries with the Middle East, Asia, or South American cause another world war? Add in nuclear weapons and Islamic fundamentalism and things look even worse. Hopefully the economy gets better before it gets worse and the terrifying possibility of World War III is averted. However sometimes history repeats itself.

Econ Impact Helper –US K/ Global

US economy is key to global economy

News Ratings 6 **[**June 23,http://www.newratings.com/analyst\_news/article\_1304298.html] KLS

NEW YORK, June 23 (newratings.com) – Analysts at Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein say that the US economic slowdown is likely to have a significant impact on the global economy. In a research note published this morning, the analysts mention that exports continue to be the key growth driver in major economies, such as Japan and the Eurozone. Any deceleration in the US economy would impact exports and adversely affect domestic demand, the analysts say. Moreover, the reversal of interest rate expectations, triggered by a US slowdown, is likely to weaken the US dollar, maybe very substantially, Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein adds. A slowdown in demand from the US, combined with a weaker dollar, has historically exerted pressure on global economic growth, the analysts point out.

Fossil Fuel Impacts

A. Energy reform key to addressing global warming, competitiveness and energy dependence

Weiss and Lyon 1/28 [Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress Susan, Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change Policy Carol Browner, 2010, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/01/sotu\_energy.html] KLS

The State of the Union showcased President Obama’s leadership and the need for moderate senators of both parties to cooperate to adopt comprehensive clean-energy and global warming legislation that would create jobs, increase energy security, cut pollution, and increase economic competitiveness.

B. Reliance on fossil fuels makes a nuclear conflict inevitable – transition to alternate sources of energy is key

Heinberg 4 [Dave, core faculty member at New College of California, October 27, http://www.energybulletin.net/2291.html] KLS

Last One Standing – The path of competition for remaining resources. If the leadership of the US continues with current policies, the next decades will be filled with war, economic crises, and environmental catastrophe. Resource depletion and population pressure are about to catch up with us, and no one is prepared. The political elites, especially in the US, are incapable of dealing with the situation. Their preferred “solution” is simply to commandeer other nations’ resources, using military force. The worst-case scenario would be the general destruction of human civilization and most of the ecological life-support system of the planet. That is, of course, a breathtakingly alarming prospect. As such, we might prefer not to contemplate it – except for the fact that considerable evidence attests to its likelihood. The notion that resource scarcity often leads to increased competition is certainly well founded. This is general true among non-human animals, among which competition for diminishing resources typically leads to aggressive behaviour.  Iraq is actually the nexus of several different kinds of conflict – between consuming nations (e.g., France and the US); between western industrial nations and “terrorist” groups; and – most obviously – between a powerful consuming nation and a weaker, troublesome, producing nation.  Politicians may find it easier to persuade their constituents to fight a common enemy than to conserve and share. War is always grim, but as resources become more scarce and valuable, as societies become more centralized and therefore more vulnerable, and as weaponry becomes more sophisticated and widely dispersed, warfare could become even more destructive that the case during the past century.  By far the greatest concern for the future of warfare must be the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The US is conducting research into new types of nuclear weapons—bunker busters, small earth-penetrators, etc. Recent US administrations have enunciated a policy of nuclear first-strike.   Chemical and biological weapons are of secondary concern, although new genetic engineering techniques may enable the creation of highly infectious and antibiotic-resistant “supergerms” cable of singling out specific ethnic groups

Fossil Fuel Impacts- Helper

US economy on the brink to collapse from energy dependence

Duncan 7 [Garry Senior Executive for Accenture Finance and Performance Management, Business Times, November 12, http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/columnists/article2852863.ece] KLS

We have all been pretty lucky so far. Over the past four years oil prices have soared ever higher, yet the world economy has just kept on motoring – literally and metaphorically. While the twin oil shocks of the Seventies brought global growth to a juddering halt and plunged the West into prolonged and painful recessions, things have been very different this time around – so far, at least. As oil prices have risen from a quite-hard-to-recall $30 a barrel as recently as the end of 2003 to $50 in 2004, $60 in 2005, $70 in 2006 and, in recent weeks, more than $90 a barrel, the global economy has cruised on almost regardless. The past few years have, in fact, marked the strongest sustained worldwide economic boom since the Seventies. Yet with analysts now sounding warnings that the cost of crude will almost inevitably breach $100 a barrel within days, the question is: can the world’s luck last? Are we, finally, reaching a tipping point where the relentless bad news from the black stuff will at last exact a real economic toll? Worryingly, it seems likely that we are, indeed, approaching just such a threshold. To understand why, we need to consider the key factors that have insulated the West’s oil-consuming nations from the impact of surging energy costs and whether we can continue to rely on these to shield our economies as crude prices climb into triple digits. The West can at least continue to draw considerable comfort from the knowledge that, essential to our economies though oil may be, our dependence on it has vastly diminished since the Seventies. What economists call the “oil intensity” of GDP – the amount of oil needed for each pound of national output we produce – has dropped to just 15 per cent of its level in 1970. Even gas-guzzling America needs only 13 per cent of the oil that it required in the Seventies for each dollar of output. And Europe’s “oil intensity” is a tenth of what it was back then. While this reduced reliance on crude is reassuring, two further vital factors that have helped the developed world to escape any serious economic fallout from dearer energy now fail to offer the protection that they have up to this point. First, the dynamic behind spiralling oil prices has shifted. Over the past few years, the driving force propelling the cost of crude to ever-greater highs has been the potent demand for energy created by a very robust global economy. Now, however, oil prices are continuing to climb even as prospects for world growth next year are deteriorating sharply. It is true that demand for oil continues to be reinforced by China’s burgeoning appetite for energy, with rising Chinese consumption taking up three quarters or more of any extra crude production. Yet it still seems apparent that, on top of this, significant concerns over supply and a very substantial speculative element are giving added impetus to prices. ING, the investment bank, notes that speculative long positions in the crude market, betting on oil reaching prices well in excess of $100, and as high as $200, are at extreme levels not seen for years. More serious than this changed dynamic behind oil’s rise, however, is that the surge in crude comes at a time when the US economy is dangerously vulnerable. The world economy’s resilience to oil’s rapid rise during this decade has owed a great deal to the ability of a robust American expansion to absorb shocks of all sorts. This time, though, this first line of defence for global growth looks very weak indeed. The US economy is already reeling from the impact of a brutal housing slump and the severe credit squeeze sparked by the resulting shake out in the sub-prime mortgage market. Now, America faces a further “double whammy” as the record cost of crude undermines growth while at the same time triggering a leap in US inflation that will seriously impede the Federal Reserve’s ability to respond with lower interest rates. As Capital Economics suggests in a timely report today, the malign combination of badly faltering growth with rising inflationary pressures now confronting the United States raises the spectre of another Seventies economic terror – stagflation. The risks to US growth are all too clear. The knock-on effects of oil prices could see the cost of gasoline for US motorists rise by as much as 50 per cent over the next couple of months. On top of that, the average American’s home heating bill is set to double this winter. Combined with the continued toll from the housing market’s downturn and the credit squeeze, it is far from implausible that these blows will see the US economy shrink in the final quarter of this year. Yet at the same time, the Fed is likely to have to grapple with a probable jump in inflation. Capital Economics forecasts that the effects of sharply increased energy costs could push headline US inflation to nearly 5 per cent, levels not seen for 16 years, by December. With the plunge in the dollar also stoking inflationary pressures in America, the almost inevitable consequence of this for the Fed will be that it will take longer to deliver the cuts in interest rates that will ultimately be necessary to shore up economic activity. In turn, that points to a more painful outcome, not just for America, but for the rest of the world.

Heg & Econ Impacts

Energy reform will revolutionize America’s clean energy market- ensuring US economic competitiveness, reaffirming American leadership

Jenkins and Swezey 4/19 [Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy Breakthrough Institute, Devon, Energy Political Analyst Project Director for Breakthrough Institute, 2010, http://www.google.com/#hl=en&q=Devon+Swezey&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs\_rfai=&fp=355c0c6008861bf6] KLS

In the face of aggressive foreign competition in the clean energy industry, the United States urgently needs a comprehensive competitiveness strategy of its own to accelerate the development of a domestic clean energy industry and take advantage of emerging export opportunities. Such a strategy should prioritize large and sustained public investments in clean energy R&D, advanced clean energy manufacturing, innovative deployment, and clean energy education. Clean energy technologies today are still too expensive relative to fossil fuels to be widely deployed at scale around the world. In the long term, relying on either high carbon prices or permanent ongoing subsidies to make clean energy competitive will effectively close off export opportunities to developing nation markets that will be unable to impose either high carbon fees or sustain large ongoing subsidies for clean energy sources. If the United States wants to tap the multi-trillion dollar export opportunity that lies in meeting the rapidly growing demand for energy in the developing world, we much therefore focus on making clean energy technologies cheaper in unsubsidized terms. The overarching goal that should permeate all aspects of a new clean energy competitiveness strategy should be to make clean energy cheap. In light of this goal, there is strong expert consensus around the need to dramatically boost public investment in energy R&D by at least $15 billion per year in order to invent new breakthrough technologies, and improve existing clean energy technologies and reduce their costs. The U.S. government must also invest in the creation of a robust clean energy manufacturing industry in the United States, and should adopt an explicit manufacturing agenda. They U.S. government has consistently lacked a set of policies to help U.S. clean energy manufacturers scale up, reduce costs, and stay at the cutting edge. The government must help provide the financing necessary for the creation of expansion of clean energy manufacturing facilities here in the United States. The government must also rethink the way that it structures its clean energy deployment policies. Currently policies like the wind production tax credit (PTC) are designed simply to drive more wind turbines into the ground. Rather, we need a set of policies that treat deployment as part of the innovation process and rationalize deployment around reducing the real costs of clean energy technologies. One proposed institution, the Clean Energy Deployment Administration (CEDA), would help achieve this goal, and has explicit technology and cost improvement goals as part of its mission. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the United States must inspire and train a new generation of scientists and engineers and equip them with the tools necessary to solve our long-term energy, climate, and economic challenges. U.S. students consistently trail their peers in leading science and math education indicators. Securing long-term economic competitiveness will require major new investments in our energy workforce as clean energy emerges as one of the most promising economic opportunities of our time. America can still be the world leader in new global clean tech industry. We remain one of the most innovative and entrepreneurial countries in the world. But without a comprehensive clean energy competitiveness strategy that can compete with those implemented around the world, America will lose out on one of the greatest economic opportunities of the 21st century.

Heg Impacts- Shell

Energy Reform key to restoring American primacy- technology, competitiveness

Jenkins and Norris 6/9 [Jesse, director of energy and climate policy at the Breakthrough Institute Teryn, Director of Americans for Energy Leadership; Senior Advisor at Breakthrough Institute, Breakthrough Institute, http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/2010/06/kerry\_lieberman\_competitiveness.shtml#more] KLS

A new policy brief released today by the Breakthrough Institute and Americans for Energy Leadership provides the first independent analysis of how the Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act would impact U.S. competitiveness in the global clean energy industry, benchmarking its provisions against key policy components for technological innovation and industrial development in the low-carbon power and transportation sectors. The policy brief, titled "The Power to Compete: Analysis of Key Clean Energy Technology and Competitiveness Provisions in the Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act of 2010," assesses the proposal's key technology provisions, including research and innovation, manufacturing, and domestic market demand -- the central pillars of a national clean energy competitiveness strategy -- as well as supportive mechanisms in infrastructure, workforce development, and industry cluster formation. Federal energy policy has become a primary U.S. national priority in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and amidst the ongoing Senate debate over comprehensive climate and energy reform. The May 2010 release of the Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act (APA) currently represents the flagship proposal for comprehensive reform in the Senate, and its future within the context of broader energy legislation will be determined in the weeks ahead. The renewed urgency for energy reform arrives among growing national concern that the United States is falling behind its competitors in the growing clean energy industry. Thus, in addition to reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, one of the core objectives of the Kerry-Lieberman proposal is to enhance U.S. competitiveness in clean energy technology markets. As Senator Kerry declared in the opening of the APA release press conference, "The bill that we are introducing today and revealing today, the American Power Act, will restore America's economy and reassert our position as a global leader in clean energy technology."

 Energy reform key to restoring American leadership

Jenkins and Norris 6/9 [Jesse, director of energy and climate policy at the Breakthrough Institute Teryn, Director of Americans for Energy Leadership; Senior Advisor at Breakthrough Institute, Breakthrough Institute, http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/2010/06/kerry\_lieberman\_competitiveness.shtml#more]

As the policy brief notes, restoring U.S. leadership in this industry requires a robust, comprehensive, and well-targeted set of public investments and policies to match and exceed those of competing nations. This includes substantially larger and more targeted technology investments and incentives, as well as improved institutional structure and policy mechanisms. If federal policy aims to secure the nation's leadership in this growing sector, the scale and scope of these provisions must be significantly improved in future legislative proposals.

**Nuclear war**

**Khalilzad 95** [Zalmay, RAND analyst and now U.S. ambassador to Iraq, The Washington Quarterly, Lexis]

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

Heg Impacts- Uniqueness

America is ahead now- but needs to make continued commitments to Energy Reform to sustain global dominance

Jenkins and Swezey 4/19 [Jesse, Director of Energy and Climate Policy Breakthrough Institute, Devon, Energy Political Analyst Project Director for Breakthrough Institute, 2010, http://www.google.com/#hl=en&q=Devon+Swezey&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs\_rfai=&fp=355c0c6008861bf6] KLS

As we concluded in Rising Tigers, Sleeping Giant, our comprehensive report on the competitive cleantech positions of the United States, China, Japan and South Korea, the United States lags its economic competitors in the production of virtually all clean energy technologies, from solar cells to wind turbines, nuclear reactors to high-speed rail, and advanced vehicles and the batteries that power them. China currently leads the world in the production of solar cells and wind turbines, and China, Japan, and South Korea collectively control over 90% of the advanced battery market. These Asian nations are also quickly commercializing and deploying clean energy technologies. China has doubled its installed wind capacity each year for the past five years, including in 2009, when it installed 13GW of new turbines, surpassing the United States as the largest wind market in the world. South Korea has recently become a major market for solar PV cells, increasing its new annual installed capacity six-fold to make it the fourth largest PV market in the world. And while the U.S. has historically been a global leader in energy innovation, other nations are moving quickly to close the gap. The United States government now invests only slightly more than Japan in energy R&D, and as a percentage of GDP Japan and South Korea both invest far more. China is also rapidly developing it's capacity for "indigenous innovation," and recently announced the creation of 16 new energy R&D centers to develop wind, grid, nuclear and other technologies. Each of these nations employing comprehensive government strategies to build domestic clean energy industries, which include major public investments in R&D, manufacturing, infrastructure, and market deployment. Indeed, the governments of these three nations will out-invest the U.S. government by three to one over the next five years, even if the United States enacts into law the House-passed Waxman-Markey climate bill.

Oil dependence Impacts– Poverty

Increase in fuel prices increases potential for poverty.

Stallman 9(Bob, President of The American Farm Bureau Federation, Letter to Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works)AQB

According to the latest EPA "Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2005" updated in 2008. agriculture and forestry emit between 6 percent and 7 percent of the total GHG emitted in the United States. The same EPA report also indicates that agriculture and forestry have the potential to sequester between 15 percent and 20 percent of total U.S. emissions. The USDA says that currently these two sectors sequester about 11 percent of total emissions, so these sectors are responsible for reducing more GHG emissions than they emit. It stands to reason that any climate change policy should seek to maximize these contributions from agriculture.

Any legislation will also impose additional costs on all sectors of the economy and will result in higher fuel, fertilizer and energy costs to fanners and ranchers. Cost increases incurred by utilities and other providers resulting from climate change/energy legislation will ultimately be borne by consumers, including fanners and ranchers. Electricity costs are expected to be one-third higher than would otherwise be the case by 2040. EPA's own estimates suggest coal costs could rise by more than 100 percent by 2020. Unlike other manufacturers in the economy, agricultural producers have a limited ability to pass along increased costs of production to consumers. It is extremely important that those costs be minimized to the greatest extent possible. Fanners are heavily dependent on the price and availability of inputs such as fertilizer and crop protection products. A productive agriculture sector requires viable fertilizer and chemical industries. The fertilizer industry has already gone through major restructuring due to higher natural gas prices and the closure of many U.S. production facilities. More than half of the nitrogen fertilizer used in the United States is imported. Another rise in natural gas prices as EPA projects would likely result from this legislation could threaten the remaining fertilizer manufacturing facilities in the United States. This would make us even more dependent on fertilizer imports.

I/L – Energy Reform K/ To Big Climate

Energy reform essential to getting bigger bills passed

Thrush and Shiner 6/9 [Glenn Meredith, Staff Writers, 2010, Politico, News http://www.netflix.com/WiPlayer?movieid=70024101&trkid=438381&strackid=44399cf14a7746b6\_0\_srl&strkid=2004907904\_0\_0] KLS

Backers of energy reform see one possible but risky path to victory: piggybacking the Kerry-Lieberman package on a much more popular effort to eliminate the cap on BP’s liabilities for the Gulf spill. The hope is that senators will want to stick to the BP measure so badly that they’ll go along with larger energy reforms, including limits on carbon emissions. But there are two potential obstacles: One, Republicans and coal state Democrats might try to strip the BP language, which could deny the larger bill the votes needed for passage. And supporters will have to sell the idea to a skeptical White House, which is likely to demand passage of the BP bill with or without the larger energy measure. “A bill is going to pass — the question is what kind of bill is it going to be?” said Tony Kreindler of the Environmental Defense Fund. “The key is to have all the elements in it.”

Energy reform essential to getting bigger bills passed

Thrush and Shiner 6/9 [Glenn Meredith, Staff Writers, 2010, Politico, News http://www.netflix.com/WiPlayer?movieid=70024101&trkid=438381&strackid=44399cf14a7746b6\_0\_srl&strkid=2004907904\_0\_0] KLS

Backers of energy reform see one possible but risky path to victory: piggybacking the Kerry-Lieberman package on a much more popular effort to eliminate the cap on BP’s liabilities for the Gulf spill. The hope is that senators will want to stick to the BP measure so badly that they’ll go along with larger energy reforms, including limits on carbon emissions. But there are two potential obstacles: One, Republicans and coal state Democrats might try to strip the BP language, which could deny the larger bill the votes needed for passage. And supporters will have to sell the idea to a skeptical White House, which is likely to demand passage of the BP bill with or without the larger energy measure. “A bill is going to pass — the question is what kind of bill is it going to be?” said Tony Kreindler of the Environmental Defense Fund. “The key is to have all the elements in it.”

I/L – Energy K/ To Big Climate

And, climate and energy bill key to further legislation- it’s the gateway

Muro june 28th (Mark, Fellow and Policy director @ metropolitan policy program, *Brookings Institute,* http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0628\_climate\_legislation\_muro.aspx, 7-28-10) ET

And so the possibility of a scaled-back climate and energy bill—while a disappointing reminder of how hard transforming the U.S. Energy system is going to be—really doesn't change the fundamentals of the present juncture. Bill by bill, the energy innovation remains an afterthought, the potential yield for R&D remains paltry, and the temporary burst of investment applied through the stimulus package continues to look like a one-shot wonder without follow-through. In that sense, what bears watching is not just the breadth of whatever carbon initiatives emerge in the coming weeks but their seriousness about financing a new push for energy innovation. But don't take it from me. Listen to Daniel Kammen, an energy and policy expert at the University of California at Berkeley, whose remarks in another great post at Dot Earth I will defer to as a closing. Writes Kammen— ...the 800-pound gorilla in the room is not being addressed: what plans or political will or results exist to justify and maintain...funding levels post-ARRA stimulus? The key issue is to develop a sane and calm path from where we are now—with a large amount of short-term funding—to a strategy for long-term investment in energy science and technology that has a clear management plan to bring these to the market. Right now many federal agencies are awash in funds, but as the ramp-down happens, infighting and battles over which program is better on merits, or better-connected politically, will emerge. To avoid this we need clear energy and climate legislation (which could be combined or could be separate) and a national strategy. That would send important priority and marching orders across agencies, and allow an orderly evolution, not a destructive scramble.

Warming Impact- Coral

Warming kills coral reefs- hurricanes and waves

The Guardian 8 (1/24/08, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/jan/24/climatechange) ET

Warmer seas and a record hurricane season in 2005 have devastated more than half of the coral reefs in the Caribbean, according to scientists. In a report published yesterday, the World Conservation Union (IUCN) warned that this severe damage to reefs would probably become a regular event given current predictions of rising global temperatures due to climate change. According to the report, 2005 was the hottest year on average since records began and had the most hurricanes ever recorded in a season. Large hotspots in the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico powered strong tropical hurricanes such as Katrina, which developed into the most devastating storm ever to hit the US. In addition to the well-documented human cost, the storms damaged coral by increasing the physical strength of waves and covering the coast in muddy run-off water from the land. The higher sea temperature also caused bleaching, in which the coral lose the symbiotic algae they need to survive. The reefs then lose their colour and become more susceptible to death from starvation or disease.

Coral reefs are critical to human survival.

Mccmichael 3 (Anthony J, National Centre of Epidemiology and Population Health Director, Climate Change and Human Health: Risks and Responses, p. 254, http://books.google.com/books?id=tQFYJjDEwhIC&pg=PA254&lpg=PA254&dq=coral+reefs+critical+human+survival&source=web&ots=PpvyXNZ\_Ve&sig=HuTi0RaOUUfhEhs1\_zYoDQhJFz0&hl=en&sa=X&oi=book\_result&resnum=4&ct=result#PPP1,M1)

Coral reefs are one of the most threatened global ecosystems and also one of the most vital. They offer critical support to human survival, especially in developing countries, serving as barriers for coastal protection; major tourist attractions; and especially as a productive source of food for a large portion of the population (39, 40). Coral reefs supply a wide variety of valuable fisheries, including both fish and invertebrate species (41). Some fisheries are harvested for food, others are collected for the curio and aquarium trades.

Warming Impacts- Disease

Warming will strain the health care industry while increasing infectious disease spread.

IPCC 7 (*Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, “ 12/12-17, p. 26) ET

The health status of millions of people is projected to be affected through, for example, increases in malnutrition; increased deaths, diseases and injury due to extreme weather events; increased burden of diarrhoeal diseases; increased frequency of cardio-respiratory diseases due to higher concentrations of ground-level ozone in urban areas related to climate change; and the altered spatial distribution of some infectious diseases. {WGI 7.4, Box 7.4; WGII 8.ES, 8.2, 8.4, SPM} Climate change is projected to bring some benefits in temperate areas, such as fewer deaths from cold exposure, and some mixed effects such as changes in range and transmission potential of malaria in Africa. Overall it is expected that benefits will be outweighed by the negative health effects of rising temperatures, especially in developing countries. *{WGII 8.4, 8.7, 8ES, SPM}*

Global disease spread culminates in human extinction.

Dutta-Roy 7 (Debajyoti, software technician, 5/31, <http://globalstudy.blogspot.com/2007/05/coming-pandemic-threat-of-human.html>) ET

As we are relying more and more on antibiotics, modern medical marvels, IMHO…we humans, the hairless apes who are now dominating this Blue Planet….are living on an “artificial life support system”. This might sound shocking to you, but many experts agree this is the TRUTH. Look around us……observe closely those “inferior” creatures who are around us – starting from the domesticated animals to the creatures of the wild. Let’s say, bird flu or a dangerous strain of the ebola virus hits us. WHO DO YOU THINK HAS A BETTER CHANCE OF SURVIVING? The so-called “inferior” animals, through millions of years, developed a robust immune system…..they have been through hundreds of such bacterial & viral outbreaks…..the weakest have died in the beginning….much the stronger ones have survived. Now, they are much equipped to fight off a pandemic like the Bird Flu. Sure, millions would die. But the majority will survive. But, I don’t think humans have much chance. Man of today, though much advanced in his “cranial capacity” is, from a biological point of view, a much poorer specimen than the Man of, say, 10,000 years back.

Warming Impacts- Economy

Global warming makes huge weather problems- collapses economy

Brown 8 (Lester R., founder of the Worldwatch InstituteEarth Policy Institute , *Earth Policy Institute*, p. 64) ET

As the climate changes, more extreme weather events are expected. Andrew Dlugolecki, a consultant on climate change and its effects on financial institutions, notes that damage from atmospherically related events has increased by roughly 10 percent a year. “If such an increase were to continue indefinitely,” he notes, “by 2065 storm damage would exceed the gross world product. The world obviously would face bankruptcy long before then.” Few double-digit annual growth trends continue for several decades, but Dlugolecki’s basic point is that climate change can be destructive, disruptive, and very costly.69

And, a hurricane caused by global warming in New York would shut down the economy for months

National Geographic News 6 ( National Geographic, 5-19, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/05/060519\_hurricanes.html) ET

Forecasters are warning that a hurricane making landfall at or near New York City could cause catastrophic damage in the U.S.'s largest urban center. While a storm is unlikely to make direct landfall on Manhattan, a nearby storm would cause extensive flooding and heavy storm surges, experts say. Major Hurricane Threat Seen for Northeast U.S., Experts Warn Even a minimal hurricane could put the runways at John F. Kennedy Airport underwater, and the battering action of wind-driven waves could cause significant damage to buildings, says Stephen Baig, a storm surge specialist with the National Hurricane Center in Miami. A minor hurricane could also cause flooding throughout Lower Manhattan, depending on how the storm approached and whether it arrived at high or low tide. Making matters worse, many New York residents may not realize how severely they could be affected by a hurricane. Scott Mandia, a professor of physical sciences at Suffolk County Community College in Selden, says Long Island's 4 million residents could be surprised by the aftermath of a storm. "What I think they don't understand is how many days and weeks after a hurricane that their lives will be completely changed," Mandia said. "People who live away from the water think a hurricane will mean one day away from work, then back to normal." "There will be an economic shutdown for a few weeks, if not a month," he said. "The economic standstill will be the biggest surprise for people."

Warming Impacts- Environment

Warming leads to environmental collapse through biodiversity loss, natural disasters, and destruction of water and food supplies.

IPCC 7 (*Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,* , 12/12-17, p. 26) ET

The resilience of many ecosystems is likely to be exceeded this century by an unprecedented combination of climate change, associated disturbances (e.g. flooding, drought, wildfire, insects, ocean acidification) and other global change drivers (e.g. landuse change, pollution, fragmentation of natural systems, overexploitation of resources). {WGII 4.1-4.6, SPM} \_ Over the course of this century, net carbon uptake by terrestrial ecosystems is likely to peak before mid-century and then weaken or even reverse16, thus amplifying climate change. {WGII 4.ES, Figure 4.2, SPM} \_ Approximately 20 to 30% of plant and animal species assessed so far are likely to be at increased risk of extinction if increases in global average temperature exceed 1.5 to 2.5°C (medium confidence). {WGII 4.ES, Figure 4.2, SPM} \_ For increases in global average temperature exceeding 1.5 to 2.5°C and in concomitant atmospheric CO2 concentrations, there are projected to be major changes in ecosystem structure and function, species’ ecological interactions and shifts in species’ geographical ranges, with predominantly negative consequences for biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services, e.g. water and food supply. {WGII 4.4, Box TS.6, SPM}

Environmental collapse means human extinction.

Irish Times 02 (*Irish Times,* 7-27) ET

Such pleasure is probably the least important reason why biodiversity is a good thing: human survival is more to the point. Conservationists insist that biodiversity is basic to the Earth's life-support system and that the progressive loss of species - as in the current destruction of natural forest - could help destabilise the very processes by which the planet services our presence and wellbeing. Most ecologists, probably, go along with the idea that every species matters. Like rivets in an aeroplane, each has its own, small importance: let too many pop and things start to fly apart. But some are now arguing that since so many species seem to do much the same job, mere "species richness" may not be essential: so long as "keystone species" are identified and cared for, their ecosystems will probably still function.

Warming Impacts- Extinction

And, continued accelerated climate change will annihilate humanity

Tickel 8

(Oliver, , Climate Researcher. The Gaurdian, 8-11-2008 “”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>) ET

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

Global warming leads to extinction- highest probability

Roach 4 (John, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2004/01/0107\_040107\_extinction.html , *National Geographic*, July 12.4) ET

As global warming interacts with other factors such as habitat-destruction, invasive species, and the build up of carbon dioxide in the landscape, the risk of extinction increases even further, they say. In agreement with the study authors, Pounds and Puschendorf say taking immediate steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is imperative to constrain global warming to the minimum predicted levels and thus prevent many of the extinctions from occurring. "The threat to life on Earth is not just a problem for the future. It is part of the here and now," they write.

Warming Impacts- Plankton

Climate change kills plankton

Brahic 6 (Catherine Brahic (December, <http://environment.newscientist.com/channel/earth/dn10743-warming-oceans-produce-less-phytoplankton.html>) ET

As the Earth’s oceans warm, the masses of tiny plants growing at their surface is declining, say US researchers. Their results show that the productivity of global oceans is tightly linked to climate change and has steadily decreased between 1999 and 2004.

The team was led by Michael Behrenfeld, at Oregon State University, US, and used a sensor on NASA’s SeaWiFS satellite to measure different shades of green in the ocean (watch an animation of the satellite at work, mpeg file). This allowed them to watch how chlorophyll in the oceans ebbed and flowed over the past 10 years. They looked at how these changes fitted changes in ocean temperatures and the predictions of computer models.

Their research, published in Nature, revealed two phases. Between 1997 and 1998, the amount of phytoplankton in the seas rose. At this time, the oceans were cooling after the strongest ever El Niño, which had warmed ocean temperatures.

From 1999 to 2004, there was a general warming of the oceans and, the images from space revealed, a persistent decrease in phytoplankton. In some regions, the drops in ocean productivity were often over 30%. Globally, the reductions meant that, between 1999 and 2004, about 190 million tonnes of carbon per year were not absorbed by the tiny plants and converted into organic matter. After 2004, there was a small upturn in productivity (see *Cooling oceans buck global trend*).

Plankton key to human survival

Cribb 6 (Julian Cribb Sep 16, http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,20867,20398844-5003900,00.html) ET

THEY are the most numerous and least considered beings on the planet, yet humanity cannot survive without them. Invisibly, they form the air we breathe and serve as the fount of life in oceans, rivers and lakes. Plankton have existed for 3.5 billion years, quietly making our planet habitable for people, plants and animals. These minute architects are the true builders and shapers of Earth's beauty and diversity. Yet individuals are palaces as elegant as Versailles itself: filigreed, roseate, fluted, crenellated, striated, stellate, spinose, perforated, multifoliate, ornamented more wildly and beautifully than a human mind could conceive. And like many beautiful things, some are deadly, either as the producers of lethal nerve poisons or as the raw material used in explosives. In Plankton: a Critical Creation, University of Tasmania marine biologist Gustaaf Hallegraeff has brought the microscopic world of these creatures into vivid focus with a breathtaking selection of electron microscope images. These are accompanied by a fascinating, and gently reproachful, essay on the wonders of the planktonic universe. It is the privilege of science to reveal the world we thought we knew in startling and unexpected ways, causing us to view it differently thereafter. Hallegraeff has done just this here, introducing us to creatures as exquisite as any sculpture and as fit for purpose as any instrument. It is a voyage through the Earth's inner space, depicting organisms as small as a few millionths of a millimetre and their elaborate structures. These range from the "familiar" blue-green algae, microscopic filaments often toxic, to the vanished fossils of millions of years ago that built the White Cliffs of Dover and, indeed, much of the world's sedimentary rocks and soils. He explores plankton with skeletons of calcium and silica in wild and alien or eerily familiar forms. Here is one that resembles the leaning Tower of Pisa, down to the very columns. Here, others like a radiant star, a sunburst, a vol-au-vent, a Catherine wheel, a flower, a host of trumpets, a loufa ... It all raises the question: does the shape of man-made devices hark back to some ancestral patterning perfected and implanted a billion years ago? Plankton are certainly providing inspiration for modern architects and, increasingly, the question of how they grow these elaborate and robust structures is being explored by nanotechnologists, eager to unlock their biochemical secrets in order to revolutionise the way we makethings. Besides their role in producing oxygen, processing CO2, absorbing nutrients and underpinning the global food chain, these microscopic plants serve in other ways: their mildly abrasive skeletons are used in toothpaste, to make concrete and filter swimming pools. Perhaps most importantly, they help to regulate the Earth's climate, producing the chemicals that allow clouds to form. Of great concern, says Hallegraeff, is the thought that if the gradual acidification of the oceans by human production of CO2 destroys these creatures, the results could be catastrophic both for the climate and the global food web. At present, it is thought plankton absorb half the world's CO2 from theatmosphere. Hallegraeff traces his own journey of fascination with this microscopic world from his childhood in The Netherlands, growing up a few kilometres from where Anton van Leeuwenhoek invented the microscope in 1673 and revealed the invisible world that engulfs us. Gazing at the whirling green creatures in a drop of pond water, the young Hallegraeff was hooked for life, pursuing his studies into the largely unexplored biological realm of Australia and the southern seas. Here most people's awareness was restricted to periodic panics about algal blooms in drinking water, toxic red tides and the risks of paralytic shellfish poisoning or ciguatera. He decided to redress the balance, revealing planktonic life in all its diversity, wonder and beneficial -- as well as risky -- aspects. "In the past 30 years," he writes, "scientific appreciation of the global importance of single-celled microscopic plants and animals has escalated. It is now obvious that most of the action on our planet is in the plankton. "Life originated in the primeval fluid of the plankton world. The microbial engine of the plankton plays a key role in our planet's ability to adapt to climate change. It is perilous to our own survival to ignore this critical creation."

Warming Impacts- Resource Wars- Water

Climate change will destroy our already stressed water supply- resource wars

CNA 7 (CNA, http://securityandclimate.cna.org/report/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Threat%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf ) ET

Adequate supplies of fresh water for drinking, irrigation, and sanitation are the most basic prerequisite for human habitation. Changes in rainfall, snowfall, snowmelt, and glacial melt have significant effects on fresh water supplies, and climate change is likely to affect all of those things. In some areas of the Middle East, tensions over water already exist. Mountain glaciers are an especially threatened source of fresh water [3]. A modest rise in temperature of about 2° to 4°F in mountainous regions can dramatically alter the precipitation mix by increasing the share falling as rain while decreasing the share falling as snow. The result is more flooding during the rainy season, a shrinking snow/ice mass, and less snowmelt to feed rivers during the dry season [4]. Forty percent of the world’s population derives at least half of its drinking water from the summer melt of mountain glaciers, but these glaciers are shrinking and some could disappear within decades. Several of Asia’s major rivers—the Indus, Ganges, Mekong, Yangtze, and Yellow—originate in the Himalayas [4]. If the massive snow/ice sheet in the Himalayas—the third-largest ice sheet in the world, after those in Antarctic and Greenland—continues to melt, it will dramatically reduce the water supply of much of Asia. Most countries in the Middle East and northern Africa are already considered water scarce, and the International Water Resource Management Institute projects that by 2025, Pakistan, South Africa, and large parts of India and China will also be water scarce [5]. To put this in perspective: the U.S. would have to suffer a decrease in water supply that produces an 80 percent decrease in per capita water consumption to reach the United Nations definition of “water scarce.” These projections do not factor in climate change, which is expected to exacerbate water problems in many areas.

And, global warming causes resource wars

Thompson 7 (Andrea, Live Science staff writer, *Live Science,* http://www.livescience.com/environment/070709\_gw\_wars.html, 7-9-7) ET

Food and water shortages fueled in the future by global warming could spur conflicts and even wars over these essential resources, the authors of a new study warn. History suggests the controversial idea might be on track. Changes in climate, such as temperature and rainfall, can significantly alter the availability of crops, livestock and drinking water. Resource shortages could, in turn, prompt people to turn to war to get what they need to survive, several experts have warned. A new study, detailed in the August 2007 issue of the journal Human Ecology, suggests this was the case in the past. The authors reviewed 899 wars fought in China between 1000 and 1911 and found a correlation between the frequency of warfare and records of temperature changes. “It was the oscillations of agricultural production brought by long-term climate change that drove China’s historical war-peace cycles,” wrote lead author David Zhang of the University of Hong Kong. Similarly, several top retired American military leaders released a report in April warning of the national security threat posed by global warming, predicting wars over water, refugees displaced by rising sea levels and higher rates of famine and disease. Climate change could possibly improve growing conditions in some areas (particularly higher latitudes), while hurting them in others (especially the tropics), explained William Easterling of Pennsylvania State University.

Wars over resources are deadly, and lead to Armageddon

Lendmen 7 ( Stephen,Progressive Radio Newshour host, 6-6-7, *global research.ca*, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5892 ) ET

The new "Great Game's" begun, but this time the stakes are greater than ever as explained above. The old one lasted nearly 100 years pitting the British empire against Tsarist Russia when the issue wasn't oil. This time, it's the US with help from Israel, Britain, the West, and satellite states like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan challenging Russia and China with today's weapons and technology on both sides making earlier ones look like toys. At stake is more than oil. It's planet earth with survival of all life on it issue number one twice over. Resources and wars for them means militarism is increasing, peace declining, and the planet's ability to sustain life front and center, if anyone's paying attention. They'd better be because beyond the point of no return, there's no second chance the way Einstein explained after the atom was split. His famous quote on future wars was : "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." Under a worst case scenario, it's more dire than that. There may be nothing left but resilient beetles and bacteria in the wake of a nuclear holocaust meaning even a new stone age is way in the future, if at all. The threat is real and once nearly happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October, 1962. We later learned a miracle saved us at the 40th anniversary October, 2002 summit meeting in Havana attended by the US and Russia along with host country Cuba. For the first time, we were told how close we came to nuclear Armageddon. Devastation was avoided only because Soviet submarine captain Vasily Arkhipov countermanded his order to fire nuclear-tipped torpedos when Russian submarines were attacked by US destroyers near Kennedy's "quarantine" line. Had he done it, only our imagination can speculate what might have followed and whether planet earth, or at least a big part of it, would have survived.

Warming Impacts- Sea Level Scenario (1/2)

Warming is causing huge increases in sea levels

Gornitz 7

(Dr. Vivien, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies scientist, , Jan., http://www.giss.nasa.gov/research/briefs/gornitz\_09/) ET

Twentieth century sea level trends, however, are substantially higher that those of the last few thousand years. The current phase of accelerated sea level rise appears to have begun in the mid/late 19th century to early 20th century, based on coastal sediments from a number of localities. Twentieth century global sea level, as determined from tide gauges in coastal harbors, has been increasing by 1.7-1.8 mm/yr, apparently related to the recent climatic warming trend. Most of this rise comes from warming of the world's oceans and melting of mountain glaciers, which have receded dramatically in many places especially during the last few decades. Since 1993, an even higher sea level trend of about 2.8 mm/yr has been measured from the TOPEX/POSEIDON satellite altimeter. Analysis of longer tide-gauge records (1870-2004) also suggests a possible late 20th century acceleration in global sea level. Recent observations of Greenland and the West Antarctic Ice Sheet raise concerns for the future. Satellites detect a thinning of parts of the Greenland Ice Sheet at lower elevations, and glaciers are disgorging ice into the ocean more rapidly, adding 0.23 to 0.57 mm/yr to the sea within the last decade. The West Antarctic Ice Sheet is also showing some signs of thinning. Either ice sheet, if melted completely, contains enough ice to raise sea level by 5-7 m. A global temperature rise of 2-5°C might destabilize Greenland irreversibly. Such a temperature rise lies within the range of several future climate projections for the 21st century. However, any significant meltdown would take many centuries. Furthermore, even with possible future accelerated discharge from the West Antarctic Ice Sheet, it highly unlikely that annual rates of sea level rise would exceed those of the major post-glacial meltwater pulses.

Sea level rise kills biodiversity by destroying wetlands, changing water salinity, and increasing hazardous waste leakage

Titus 84

(James G., EPA, p. 1, http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/GlobalWarming.nsf/content/ResourceCenterPublicationsRisk\_of\_rise.html) ET

Like the physical effects, the environmental impacts of sea level rise fall into the categories of shoreline retreat, salt intrusion, and increased flooding. Perhaps the most serious environmental consequence would be the inundation and erosion of thousands of square miles of marshes and other wetlands. Wetlands (areas that are flooded by tides at least once every 15 days) are critical to the reproductive cycles of many marine species. Because marsh vegetation can collect sediment and build upon itself, marshes can "grow" with small rises in sea level. But for faster rates of sea level rise, the vegetation will drown. Its resulting deterioration may significantly erode land previously held together only by the marsh vegetation. Relative sea level rise of one meter per century is eroding over one hundred square kilometers (about fifty square miles) per year of marshland in Louisiana. Salt intrusion is a threat to marine animals as well as vegetation. Many species must swim into fresher water during reproduction. In response to sea level rise, fish might swim farther upstream, but water pollution could prevent such an adaptation from succeeding. Some species, on the other hand, require salty water, such as the oyster drill and other predators of oysters. Consequently, salinity increases have been cited for the long-term drop in oyster production in the Delaware Bay (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1979; Haskin and Tweed, 1976), as well as recent drops in the Chesapeake Bay. Salt intrusion could also be a serious problem for the Everglades. Flooding could have a particularly important impact on environmental protection activities. As Chapter 9 indicates, regulations for hazardous waste sites promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act currently impose special requirements for sites in 100-year flood zones. Another EPA program, Superfund, has responsibility for abandoned waste sites, some of which are in low-lying areas such as Louisiana and Florida that could be inundated. There are over one thousand active hazardous waste facilities in the United States located in 100-year floodplains (Development Planning and Research Associates, 1982) and perhaps as many inactive sites. Sea level rise could increase the risk of flooding in these hazardous waste sites. For example, if a hazardousSea Level Rise: Overview of Causes and Effects waste facility is subjected to overwash by strong waves or simply to flooding that weakens the facility's cap, the wastes can be spread to nearby areas, thus exposing the population to possibly contaminated surface water. Moreover, by intruding into clay soils (which are often used as liners for hazardous waste disposal) saltwater can increase leaching of wastes.

Warming Impacts- Sea Level Scenario (2/2)

Loss of biodiversity causes extinction

Diner 94

(David, JD Ohio State, *Military Law Review*, Winter) ET

4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is better than simplicity. As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist stress... [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which is cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wing, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

Warming Impacts- Starvation

Warming decreases global food production, causing worldwide starvation.

IPCC 07 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 12/12-17, p. 26) ET

At lower latitudes, especially in seasonally dry and tropical regions, crop productivity is projected to decrease for even small local temperature increases (1 to 2°C), which would increase the risk of hunger (medium confidence). {WGII 5.4, SPM} \_ Globally, the potential for food production is projected to increase with increases in local average temperature over a range of 1 to 3°C, but above this it is projected to decrease (medium confidence). {WGII 5.4, 5.5, SPM}

Insufficient production causes world resource wars and famine.

Calvin 98 ( William, Prof @ U of WA, *Atlantic Monthly*) ET

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands-if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem-and could lead to a Third World War-but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic. There is another part of the world with the same good soil, within the same latitudinal band, which we can use for a quick comparison. Canada lacks Europe's winter warmth and rainfall, because it has no equivalent of the North Atlantic Current to preheat its eastbound weather systems. Canada's agriculture supports about 28 million people. If Europe had weather like Canada's, it could feed only one out of twenty-three present-day Europeans. Any abrupt switch in climate would also disrupt foodsupply routes. The only reason that two percent of our population can feed the other 98 percent is that we have a well-developed system of transportation and middlemenbut it is not very robust. The system allows for large urban populations in the best of times, but not in the case of widespread disruptions to adapt to climate change. It is perilous to our own survival to ignore this critical creation."

Warming Impacts – War

Wars and the increase of civil wars in places like Africa are rooted in the increase of global temperatures.

Aldhous 9(Peter, The New Scientist “African conflicts spurred by warming;” Lexis)AQB

AFRICA is poised to experience a surge in civil wars, causing nearly 400,000 additional battle deaths by 2030 - all as a direct result of rising temperatures. This bold prediction is one of the most alarming results yet to emerge from attempts to discover how climate change will affect patterns of human conflict. It is already proving controversial. Previous attempts to model the effects of climate on patterns of conflict in Africa have mostly concentrated on rainfall. But now researchers led by Marshall Burke at the University of California, Berkeley, and David Lobell of Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, have studied both rainfall and temperature. They found that warming was much more strongly associated with civil strife than precipitation was (*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* , DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0907998106). Burke and Lobell analysed data on the incidence of African civil wars alongside local temperature and rainfall measurements from 1981 to 2002. They found a strong relationship between spikes in temperature and the likelihood of civil war. Because climate models give fairly consistent predictions for warming across Africa, the researchers were able to forecast a 54 per cent rise in the incidence of civil conflict by 2030, resulting in an extra 393,000 combat deaths. The prediction assumes that global carbon dioxide emissions are not curbed in the short term. Other researchers agree that temperature changes may affect conflict, but some are sceptical that the effect will be as large as Burke and Lobell claim. "I'm just not convinced," says Peter Brecke of the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, who has previously found a global link between increased conflict and the Little Ice Age, which lasted from around 1400 to the late 1800s. One issue is that the two-decade period studied by Burke and Lobell may have been unusually conflict-prone, amplifying the apparent effect of temperature. Cullen Hendrix, a political scientist at the University of North Texas in Denton, points out that some countries were destabilised when the superpowers withdrew aid to African dictators as the cold war ended. "This is probably going to wind up being the first salvo in a pretty significant debate," he says. "We're very willing to be proven wrong," says Lobell. But the link with temperature remained even after the researchers controlled for measures of wealth and democracy. "The result seems remarkably robust," adds Burke. If the link stands up under further scrutiny, policy-makers will need to know how warming triggers conflict. Burke and Lobell say the most likely explanation is that warmer temperatures reduce crop yields or other aspects of economic productivity, increasing social tension. But some studies have suggested that it's inherent in people to become more violent when the mercury rises. Rich nations can provide economic aid or share plant-breeding technologies that allow crops to withstand extremes of climate, says Hendrix, "but we can't change human nature".

Warming Impacts- Water Wars

Warming causes huge water shortages.

Pauchari 7 (R.K., IPCC chairman, “Acceptance Speech for the Nobel Peace Prize Awarded to the [IPCC]”, 12/10, p. 5-6, http://www.ipcc.ch/) ET

Climate change is expected to exacerbate current stresses on water resources. On a regional scale, mountain snowpack, glaciers, and small ice caps play a crucial role in fresh water availability. Widespread mass losses from glaciers and reductions in snow cover over recent decades are projected to accelerate throughout the 21st century, reducing water availability, hydropower potential, and the changing seasonality of flows in regions supplied by meltwater from major mountain ranges (e.g. Hindu-Kush, Himalaya, Andes), where more than one-sixth of the world’s population currently lives. There is also high confidence that many semi-arid areas (e.g. the Mediterranean Basin, western United States, southern Africa, and northeastern Brazil) will suffer a decrease in water resources due to climate change. In Africa by 2020, between 75 and 250 million people are projected to be exposed to increased water stress due to climate change.

Water scarcity will cause World War 3.

Stonehill 8 (Alex, co-founder of Common Language Project for humane international journalism, *Z Magazine*, 08, http://209.85.141.104/search?q=cache:ezAcQF4xJZMJ:www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/water/2008/0619ethiopconflict.htm+water+scarcity+world+war+3&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=13&gl=us)

Water is the new oil. While western politicians and consumers fret over the declining economy and increasing oil prices, the news from East Africa is that with a growing majority of the world living on less than a dollar a day, the liquid that fuels bodies is becoming even more contentious than the liquid that fuels cars. I've spent the last four months reporting stories about water from Ethiopia and Kenya, two countries at the forefront of the world's coming water crisis. The director of a local water NGO told me a few days after I arrived in Ethiopia in January 2008, "As you may know, Alex, the coming World War III will be fought over water, not oil." Variations on that refrain were echoed by aid workers and researchers across the region over the next several months. Women walk for miles each day to collect drinking water; farmers are pushed into deadly conflict by dwindling river flows, and city water supplies are drained by overzealous irrigation. The bigger picture that the smaller stories hint at is one of ecological disaster and conflict over resources that will affect millions and have repercussions around the world.

Warming Impacts- Water Shortage- Prolif

Water shortages caused by warming cause prolif and nuclear war

Stipp 4 (David http://www.climate-talks.net/2005-ENVRE130/PDF/20040126-Fortune-Pentagon-and-Climate.pdf) ET

Warming would cause massive droughts, turning farmland to dust bowls and forests to ashes. Picture last fall's California wildfires as a regular thing. Or imagine similar disasters destabilizing nuclear powers such as Pakistan or Russia—it's easy to see why the Pentagon has become interested in abrupt climate change. The changes relentlessly hammer the world's "carrying capacity"—the natural resources, social organizations, and economic networks that support the population. Technological progress and market forces, which have long helped boost Earth's carrying capacity, can do little to offset the crisis—it is too widespread and unfolds too fast. As the planet's carrying capacity shrinks, an ancient pattern reemerges: the eruption of desperate, all-out wars over food, water, and energy supplies. As Harvard archeologist Steven LeBlanc has noted, wars over resources were the norm until about three centuries ago. When such conflicts broke out, 25% of a population's adult males usually died. As abrupt climate change hits home, warfare may again come to define human life. Nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable. Oil supplies are stretched thin as climate cooling drives up demand. Many countries seek to shore up their energy supplies with nuclear energy, accelerating nuclear proliferation. Japan, South Korea, and Germany develop nuclear weapons capabilities, as do Iran, Egypt, and North Korea. Israel, China, India, and Pakistan also are poised to use the bomb.

Water scarcity is empirically a source of tension between neighbors. Despite the lack of water wars, climate change is likely to exacerbate conflicts over water.

Kolmannskog 8 ( Vikram , April, *Norweigan Refugee Council*, http://www.nrc.no/arch/\_img/9268480.pdf, Accessed 6/28/8) ET

Water scarcity may trigger distributional conflicts. Water scarcity by itself does not necessarily lead to conflict and violence, though. There is an interaction with other socio-economic and political factors: The potential for conflict often relates to social discrimination in terms of access to safe and clean water. The risk can therefore be reduced by ensuring just distribution so that people in disadvantaged areas also have access to the safe and clean water. As already pointed out, a main problem today (and probably for the near future) is still the so-called economic water scarcity, and good water management can prevent conflict. Within states, groups have often defended or challenged traditional rights of water use: In semi-arid regions such as the Sahel there have been tensions between farmers and nomadic herders. According to *The Stern Review on The Economics of Climate Change*,41 the droughts in the Sahel in the 1970s and 1980s may have been caused partly by climate change and contributed to increased competition for scarce resources between these groups. The Tuareg rebellion in Mali in the beginning of the 1990s, is also mentioned as an example of a climate change-related conflict. Many of the drought-struck nomads sought refuge in the cities or left the country. The lack of social networks for the returnees, the continuing drought, competition for land with the settled farmers and dissatisfaction with the authorities, were factors that fuelled the armed rebellion.

In the past there have been few examples of “water wars” between states. In fact there are several cases of cooperation (for example between Palestine and Israel), but these have generally concerned benefit-sharing, not burden-sharing. According to Fred Pearce, the defining crises of the 21st century will involve water.42 He sees the Six Day War in 1967 between Israel and its neighbours as the first modern “water war”, specifically over the River Jordan. Most of the world’s major rivers cross international boundaries, but are not covered by treaties. According to Pearce, this is a recipe for conflict and for upstream users to hold downstream users to ransom. This could be helped by internationally brokered deals for sharing such rivers.

Warming Impacts- Water- Bio Diversity scenario

And water shortages cause loss of biodiversity

Xinhua 5 (http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-05/11/content\_441252.htm) ET

A third of the world's population lives in countries that find it difficult or impossible to meet water needs, a proportion that could double by 2025, said Rajendra K. Pachauri, chairman of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Wednesday. In developing countries, about 14,000 to 30,000 people die each day in developing countries from water-related diseases, Pachauri said at a conference of the IPCC Working Group I for the Fourth Assessment Report held in Beijing, which will end on Thursday. Climate changes, including rising temperatures and sea levels, precipitation change, droughts and floods may wield great power over human and natural systems, he said. Water shortage will be the most serious issue, affecting food production and bio-diversity as well as human water consumption, he said. The world has to rethink socio-economic development, including economic growth technology and population governance, to adapt to these changes, he said.

 Loss of a single species risks extinction

Warner 94 (Paul, American University, Dept of Internat’l Politics and Foreign Policy, August, *Politics and Life Sciences*, 1994, p177) ET

Massive extinction of species is dangerous, then, because one cannot predict which species are expendable to the system as a whole. As Philip Hoose remarks, "Plants and animals cannot tell us what they mean to each other." One can never be sure which species holds up fundamental biological relationships in the planetary ecosystem. And, because removing species is an irreversible act, it may be too late to save the system after the extinction of key plants or animals. According to the U.S. National Research Council, "The ramifications of an ecological change of this magnitude [vast extinction of species] are so far reaching that no one on earth will escape them." Trifling with the "lives" of species is like playing Russian roulette, with our collective future as the stakes.

Impact calc – loss of biodiversity is irreversible and outweighs nuclear war

Chen 2k (Jim, Prof. of Law and Vance K. Opperman Research Scholar *Global Trade 157*) ET

The value of endangered species and the biodiversity they embody is "literally ... incalculable." What, if anything, should the law do to preserve it? There are those that invoke the story of Noah's Ark as a moral basis for biodiversity preservation. Others regard the entire Judeo-Chhstian tradition, especially the biblical stories of Creation and the Flood, as the root of the West's deplorable environmental record. To avoid getting bogged down in an environmental exegesis of Judeo-Christian "myth and legend," we should let Charles Darwin and evolutionary biology determine the imperatives of our moment in natural "history." The loss of biological diversity is quite arguably the gravest problem facing humanity. If we cast the question as the contemporary phenomenon that "our descendants [will1 most regret" the "loss of genetic and species diversity by the destruction of natural habitats" is worse than even "energy depletion, economic collapse, limited nuclear war, or conquest by a totalitarian government."Natural evolution may in due course renew the earth with a diversity of species approximating that of a world unspoiled by Homo sapiens - in ten million years, perhaps a hundred million.

Warming Impacts- Weather

Warming makes weather extremes like hurricanes, heat waves, and droughts worse

IPCC 7 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, , 12/12-17, p. 24)ET

There is now higher confidence than in the TAR in projected patterns of warming and other regional-scale features, including changes in wind patterns, precipitation and some aspects of extremes and sea ice. {WGI 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 9.4, 9.5, 10.3, 11.1} Projected warming in the 21st century shows scenario-independent geographical patterns similar to those observed over the past several decades. Warming is expected to be greatest over land and at most high northern latitudes, and least over the Southern Ocean (near Antarctica) and northern North Atlantic, continuing recent observed trends (Figure 3.2 right panels). {WGI 10.3, SPM} Snow cover area is projected to contract. Widespread increases in thaw depth are projected over most permafrost regions. Sea ice is projected to shrink in both the Arctic and Antarctic under all SRES scenarios. In some projections, Arctic late-summer sea ice disappears almost entirely by the latter part of the 21st century. {WGI 10.3, 10.6, SPM; WGII 15.3.4} It is very likely that hot extremes, heat waves and heavy precipitation events will become more frequent. {SYR Table 3.2; WGI 10.3, SPM} Based on a range of models, it is likely that future tropical cyclones (typhoons and hurricanes) will become more intense, with larger peak wind speeds and more heavy precipitation associated with ongoing increases of tropical sea-surface temperatures. There is less confidence in projections of a global decrease in numbers of tropical cyclones. The apparent increase in the proportion of very intense storms since 1970 in some regions is much larger than simulated by current models for that period. {WGI 3.8, 9.5, 10.3, SPM} Extra-tropical storm tracks are projected to move poleward, with consequent changes in wind, precipitation and temperature patterns, continuing the broad pattern of observed trends over the last halfcentury. {WGI 3.6, 10.3, SPM} Since the TAR there is an improving understanding of projected patterns of precipitation. Increases in the amount of precipitation are very likely in high-latitudes, while decreases are likely in most subtropical land regions (by as much as about 20% in the A1B scenario in 2100, Figure 3.3), continuing observed patterns in recent trends. {WGI 3.3, 8.3, 9.5, 10.3, 11.2-11.9, SPM}

Warming causes extreme weather- increase water stress, devastate food production, hurt health, and strain the economy.

IPCC 7 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 12/12-17, p. 43) ET

Risks of extreme weather events. Responses to some recent extreme climate events reveal higher levels of vulnerability in both developing and developed countries than was assessed in the TAR. There is now higher confidence in the projected increases in droughts, heat waves and floods, as well as their adverse impacts. As summarised in Table 3.2, increases in drought, heat waves and floods are projected in many regions and would have mostly adverse impacts, including increased water stress and wild fire frequency, adverse effects on food production, adverse health effects, increased flood risk and extreme high sea level, and damage to infrastructure.

 Warming Co-Opts Impacts – Positive Feedback Loop

The positive feedback loop of global warming makes all the impacts inevitable.

Leipoldt 8(Erik, PhD in Philosophy and researcher for AES(Alternative Energy Sources), “Effects Of Global Warming - Affecting Everyone”)AQB

Melting glaciers and permafrost may be at a stage where there is no turning back. As they contribute their fresh water to the oceans and as methane gas is released these events will further accelerate global warming. This is called the positive feedback effect. It is a scenario climate scientists have feared since first identifying "tipping points" - delicate thresholds where a slight rise in the Earth's temperature can cause a dramatic change in the environment that itself triggers a far greater increase in global temperatures. Huge deposits of methane are trapped in ice crystals under the oceans. If these would be released the atmosphere would experience sudden and significant further warming.

Warming Impact Calc- High probability/ High magnitude

Climate change is high probability/high magnitude – outweighs the risks of the Cold War

Sullivan 7

(Gen. Gordon, Chair of CNA Corporation Military Advisory Board and Former Army Chief of Staff, http://securityandclimate.cna.org/report/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Threat%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf) ET

“We seem to be standing by and, frankly, asking for perfectness in science,” Gen. Sullivan said. “People are saying they want to be convinced, perfectly. They want to know the climate science projections with 100 percent certainty. Well, we know a great deal, and even with that, there is still uncertainty. But the trend line is very clear.” “We never have 100 percent certainty,” he said. “We never have it. If you wait until you have 100 percent certainty, something bad is going to happen on the battlefield. That’s something we know. You have to act with incomplete information. You have to act based on the trend line. You have to act on your intuition sometimes.” In discussing how military leaders manage risk, Gen. Sullivan noted that significant attention is often given to the low probability/high consequence events. These events rarely occur but can have devastating consequences if they do. American families are familiar with these calculations. Serious injury in an auto accident is, for most families, a low probability/high consequence event. It may be unlikely, but we do all we can to avoid it. During the Cold War, much of America’s defense efforts focused on preventing a Soviet missile attack—the very definition of a low probability/high consequence event. Our effort to avoid such an unlikely event was a central organizing principle for our diplomatic and military strategies. When asked to compare the risks of climate change with those of the Cold War, Gen. Sullivan said, “The Cold War was a specter, but climate change is inevitable. If we keep on with business as usual, we will reach a point where some of the worst effects are inevitable.” “If we don’t act, this looks more like a high probability/high consequence scenario,” he added. Gen. Sullivan shifted from risk assessment to risk management. “In the Cold War, there was a concerted effort by all leadership—political and military, national and international—to avoid a potential conflict,” he said. “I think it was well known in military circles that we had to do everything in our power to create an environment where the national command authority—the president and his senior advisers—were not forced to make choices regarding the use of nuclear weapons.

Warming Impact Calc- Multiplier

And, warming causes conflict and makes security conflicts worse

CNA 7 (CNA, http://securityandclimate.cna.org/report/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Threat%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf ) ET

For example: • Some nations may have impaired access to food and water. • Violent weather, and perhaps land loss due to rising sea levels and increased storm surges, can damage infrastructure and uproot large numbers of people. GEO-STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE • These changes, and others, may create large number of migrants . When people cross borders in search of resources, tensions can arise. • Many governments, even some that look stable today, may be unable to deal with these new stresses. When governments are ineffective, extremism can gain a foothold. • While the developed world will be far better equipped to deal with the effects of climate change, some of the poorest regions may be affected most. This gap can potentially provide an avenue for extremist ideologies and create the conditions for terrorism.

Now is key- climate change is a threat multiplier and will only get worse

CNA 7 (CNA, http://securityandclimate.cna.org/report/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Threat%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf ) ET

Climate change can act as a threat multiplier for instability in some of the most volatile regions of the world, and it presents significant national security challenges for the United States. Accordingly, it is appropriate to start now to help mitigate the severity of some of these emergent challenges. The decision to act should be made soon in order to plan prudently for the nation’s security. The increasing risks from climate change should be addressed now because they will almost certainly get worse if we delay.

Climate change bad; 3 reasons 1- threat multiplier, 2- political instability, 3- destruction of ecosystems

CNA 7 (CNA, http://securityandclimate.cna.org/report/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Threat%20of%20Climate%20Change.pdf ) ET

The predicted effects of climate change over the coming decades include extreme weather events, drought, flooding, sea level rise, retreating glaciers, habitat shifts, and the increased spread of life-threatening diseases. These conditions have the potential to disrupt our way of life and to force changes in the way we keep ourselves safe and secure. In the national and international security environment, climate change threatens to add new hostile and stressing factors. On the simplest level, it has the potential to create sustained natural and humanitarian disasters on a scale far beyond those we see today. The consequences will likely foster political instability where societal demands exceed the capacity of governments to cope. Climate change acts as a threat multiplier for instability in some of the most volatile regions of the world. Projected climate change will seriously exacerbate already marginal living standards in many Asian, African, and Middle Eastern nations, causing widespread political instability and the likelihood of failed states. Unlike most conventional security threats that involve a single entity acting in specific ways and points in time, climate change has the potential to result in multiple chronic conditions, occurring globally within the same time frame. Economic and environmental conditions in already fragile areas will further erode as food production declines, diseases increase, clean water becomes increasingly scarce, and large populations move in search of resources. Weakened and failing governments, with an already thin margin for survival, foster the conditions for internal conflicts, extremism, and movement toward increased authoritarianism and radical ideologies.

Warming Impact Calc- Threat Multiplier

Global warming causes resource wars and is a threat multiplier- worst impact

Knickerbocker 7 (Brad, Staff writer at the Christian Science Monitor, Apr 19, http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0419/p02s01-usgn.html , *Christian Science Monitor*) ET

For years, the debate over global warming has focused on the three big "E's": environment, energy, and economic impact. This week it officially entered the realm of national security threats and avoiding wars as well. A platoon of retired US generals and admirals warned that global warming "presents significant national security challenges to the United States." The United Nations Security Council held its first ever debate on the impact of climate change on conflicts. And in Congress, a bipartisan bill would require a National Intelligence Estimate by all federal intelligence agencies to assess the security threats posed by global climate change. Many experts view climate change as a "threat multiplier" that intensifies instability around the world by worsening water shortages, food insecurity, disease, and flooding that lead to forced migration. That's the thrust of a 35-page report (PDF) by 11 admirals and generals this week issued by the Alexandria, Va.-based national security think tank The CNA Corporation. The study, titled National Security and the Threat of Climate Change, predicts: "Projected climate change will seriously exacerbate already marginal living standards in many Asian, African, and Middle Eastern nations, causing widespread political instability and the likelihood of failed states.... The chaos that results can be an incubator of civil strife, genocide, and the growth of terrorism. "The U.S. may be drawn more frequently into these situations, either alone or with allies, to help provide stability before conditions worsen and are exploited by extremists. The U.S. may also be called upon to undertake stability and reconstruction efforts once a conflict has begun, to avert further disaster and reconstitute a stable environment." "We will pay for this one way or another," retired Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni, former commander of American forces in the Middle East and one of the report's authors, told the Los Angeles Times. "We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today … or we'll pay the price later in military terms. And that will involve human lives." As quoted in the Associated Press, British Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett, who presided over the UN meeting in New York April 17, posed the question "What makes wars start?" The answer: "Fights over water. Changing patterns of rainfall. Fights over food production, land use. There are few greater potential threats to our economies ... but also to peace and security itself." This is the concern behind a recently introduced bipartisan bill by Sens. Richard Durbin (D) of Illinois and Chuck Hagel (R) of Nebraska. It would require all US intelligence agencies – the CIA, the NSA, the Pentagon, and the FBI – to conduct a comprehensive review of potential security threats related to climate change around the world.

Impacts- A2: Adaptation

And, warming happens to fast, no chance of adaptation

Costello 8 (Anthony, co-director of the Institute for Global Health at University College London, *Oxford University Press*, 8) ET

Climate change affects all ecosystems. Carbon dioxide will reach two to three times its mid-19th-century level by 2100 leading to major changes in seasonal temperatures and rainfall patterns. Normally with this sort of climate change animals and plants would simply migrate with their preferred climate. However, the rate of human-induced climate change is so rapid that many plant species cannot migrate fast enough and also in many places human beings already occupy the space into which the ecosystem would migrate. Ecosystems most at risk are alpine meadows, cloud forests, arctic tundra, and coral reefs.

Impact Helper – US K/ Climate

And, US leadership is necessary for world action to act on climate change

PEGG 8

(J.R., Staff Writer for the Environmental News Servicem *The Environmental News Wire*, Feb 1, http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/feb2008/2008-02-01-10.asp) ET

The head of the United Nations scientific climate panel spoke with U.S. lawmakers Wednesday, encouraging them lead to the world in cooling the overheated planet. "We really don't have a moment to lose," said Rajendra Pachauri, chair of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC. The massive reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to avoid serious disruptions to Earth's climate system are impossible without U.S. leadership, Dr. Pachauri told members of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. "It is essential for the U.S. to take action," said Pachauri, who also spoke at a public briefing Wednesday afternoon convened by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The United States is responsible for some 22 percent of current greenhouse gas emissions. Although China recently emerged as the leading emitter, U.S. emissions are four times greater than China's on a per capita basis. Despite broad criticism from across the world, President George W. Bush and his administration have rejected mandatory limits on greenhouse gases. And many U.S. lawmakers remain reluctant to commit their nation to deep cuts without similar obligations from China, India and other developing nations. The IPCC chairman said that view is misplaced. "The rest of the world looks to the U.S. for leadership [but] the perception round the world is that the U.S. has not been very active in this area," Pachauri said, adding that strong action would "undoubtedly reestablish confidence in U.S. leadership on critical global issues." Pachauri presented the House committee with an overview of the key messages contained in recent reports issued by the IPCC panel, which shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with former U.S. Vice President Al Gore. The IPCC includes some 2,500 scientists from across the United States and around the world. The panel does no original research but rather assesses the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change. A native of India, Dr. Pachauri is an economist and engineer who has served on the Board of Directors of the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., a Fortune 500 company, and on the Economic Advisory Council to the Prime Minister of India. He has taught at several American universitites, including the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. Pachauri told lawmakers that greenhouse gas emissions must peak in 2015 - and drop 25 to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 - if the world is to keep global average temperatures from rising above 2.4 degrees Celsius. Without such restraint, the world faces a variety of potential troubling humanitarian and environmental problems. Pachauri cited concern over rising sea levels, the increased frequency of drought, heat waves and severe storms, as well as threats to agriculture and adverse impacts on the environment. Committee chair Ed Markey, a Massachusetts Democrat, said the work of the IPCC "highlights our moral obligation to reduce global warming pollution and prepare for those impacts that have become unavoidable." It is time for U.S. lawmakers to ensure the nation is a "leader, not a laggard" in the fight against global warming, Markey said. But it is unclear how serious U.S. lawmakers are about tackling global warming - only five of the nine Democrats on the panel attended the hearing and none of the committee's six Republicans were present.

\*\*DA Turns Case\*\*

DA T/ Case- Oil Dependence

Oil dependence will collapse the US government

Lundberg 6/25 [Jan, 2010, http://www.culturechange.org/cms/index2.php?option=com\_content&do\_pdf=1&id=661] KLS

 Massive oil dependence, decade after decade -- as environmental, fiscal and military costs mount -- has retarded more than encouraged renewable energy as well as efficient lifestyles. Unchecked oil dependence, along with U.S. imperialism and devastating exploitation of nature, has generated a wide assortment of people inside and outside the U.S. wishing the U.S. government to just go away. The idea of toppling the U.S. government has much appeal to a small minority of frustrated or rebellious minded people throughout the country, but they have very little power, have no autonomous territory, and are not a military factor. This helps ensure that the U.S. will probably not topple as long as it has more oil than tea. But the government will collapse, probably sooner rather than later due to intensifying global, domestic and ecological pressures.

DA T/ Case- → Terrorism

Environmental destruction leads to terrorism

Diamond 4 [Jared, B.A.Harvard, Ph.D., University of Cambridge, Pulitzer Prize for General Non-Fiction, Japan's Cosmos Prize, National Science Medal, January 3, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.item&news\_id=55747] KLS

Diamond listed the environmental problems we face today, some of which we share with past societies—deforestation, overpopulation, over-fishing, biodiversity loss, freshwater scarcity—and some of which are new: greenhouse gas, toxic releases, alien species, and fossil energy shortage. “These dozen environmental problems are time bombs with fuses of about 50 years…and will get resolved one way or another—pleasantly or unpleasantly—within the next 50 years,” warned Diamond. However, these environmental problems can blow up sooner: countries that are overwhelmed by environmental problems tend to develop political and economic problems, as desperate people turn to drastic measures like civil war and terrorism. Take an ecologist who is politically naïve…and ask that ecologist to name the countries in the world today that have the worst environmental problems or problems of overpopulation or both, and the environmentalist would say…the countries include Afghanistan, Burundi, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, the Solomon Islands….Then ask a first world politician who doesn’t care about the environment or dismisses the importance of environmental problems just to name the world’s trouble spots…and your politician would say…those trouble spots include: Afghanistan, Burundi, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, the Solomon Islands.

Global warming triggers terrorism

Zalman 7 [Amy, Ph.D. from New York University's Department of Middle Eastern Studies, as well as degrees from Cornell and Columbia Universities June 9, http://terrorism.about.com/b/2007/06/09/g8-climate-change-commitment-is-good-for-security-environment-too.htm] KLS

The G-8 Summit got a twofer this week. In making a commitment to address global climate change, they have also taken a step toward making the global security environment better, too. Slowly, but reasonably surely, the recognition is growing that there's a link between the climate and terrorism. In April, the Military Advisory Board, a panel made up of former generals, made the case that climate change is a security issue.Droughts and storms can exacerbate already fragile political, social and political situations, and destabilize even stable countries. Extreme environmental conditions can leave people hungry and thirsty, diseased, homeless, completely uprooted and thus vulnerable to extremist ideologies. According to a Board member, Admiral T. Joseph Lopez, the former Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Naval Forces Europe and of Allied Forces, Southern Europe, the links between climate changes and violent extremism are direct: Climate change will provide the conditions that will extend the war on terror … You have very real changes in natural systems that are most likely to happen in regions of the world that are alreadyfertile ground for extremism. Droughts, violent weather, ruined agricultural lands—those are the kinds of stresses we'll see more of under climate change . . . More poverty, more forced migrations, higher unemployment. Those conditions are ripe for extremists and terrorists.

DA T/ Case- → War

Ecological Decline leads to war

Buckley 4 [Adele, Independent Public Policy Professional, 54th PUGWASH CONFERENCE, May 9, http://www.pugwashgroup.ca/events/documents/2004/2004.11.04-Buckley.Seoul\_paper.htm] KLS

Roy Woodbridge, in his new book[11], The Next World War, points out the perils of global ecological decline and the unsustainable human draw on natural systems. He calls on all societies to wage war against global ecological decline, and points out that, in spite of much discussion over the past decades, little progress has been made. He introduces provisioning, a concept that requires mobilizing global effort to secure access, for all, to ecological goods and services. With the combined effect of climate change and ecological decline, world security is clearly at a dangerous juncture. Disruptions in access to resources are certain to produce an even greater measure of desperate nation states or non-state groups who will choose violence as their only means of achieving access. All entities that exercise global influence and power must utilize means at their command to address this; and this includes multinational corporations, who must recognize their responsibility to act to turn around this potentially disastrous scenario. In this situation, weapons of mass destruction are a problem of alarming proportions. This is particularly true of nuclear weapons, as a significant nuclear conflict would make the earth uninhabitable. While nuclear weapons are probably the last thing under discussion in the boardrooms of the world, and it may seem a difficult task to raise awareness to the degree of danger that exists, nuclear arms control is without doubt an overarching

\*\*AFF Answers\*\*

A2: Heg/Competitiveness Impacts

No impact- Energy reform cant address all the components needed to regain US environmental leadership

Jenkins and Norris 6/9 [Jesse, director of energy and climate policy at the Breakthrough Institute Teryn, Director of Americans for Energy Leadership; Senior Advisor at Breakthrough Institute, Breakthrough Institute, http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/2010/06/kerry\_lieberman\_competitiveness.shtml#more]

The United States currently lacks an effective national strategy for competitiveness in this sector, and as numerous reports have documented -- including our previous report "Rising Tigers, Sleeping Giant," which provided the first comprehensive comparison of clean energy competitiveness in the U.S. and Asia -- the nation is falling behind in a number of core metrics. However, the policy brief finds that the American Power Act does not contain a comprehensive clean energy competitiveness and technology innovation strategy. While the legislation includes a number of measures with varying degrees of support, it falls substantially short in each core policy component of clean energy competitiveness. In research and innovation, the legislation would invest an order of magnitude less than the majority of energy experts recommend. In manufacturing, it would provide a modest expansion of existing programs, along with some targeted support for advanced vehicles and general manufacturing efficiency. Beyond a modest carbon price, APA would not provide robust and direct support for clean energy deployment and market creation besides carbon capture and storage, with largely insignificant results for renewable energy technology. Finally, it provides little support for clean energy industry cluster formation, clean energy workforce development, and infrastructure development.

A2: Energy Dependence Impacts

Energy reform can’t address energy dependence

Weiss and Lyon 1/28 [Daniel J, Senior Fellow and the Director of Climate Strategy at American Progress Susan, Assistant to the President for Energy and Climate Change Policy Carol Browner, 2010, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/01/sotu\_energy.html] KLS

New Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell delivered [the Republican response](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/27/bob-mcdonnell-speech-full_n_439508.html) to the State of the Union and urged adoption of [Bush-Cheney-Palin energy policies](http://climateprogress.org/2010/01/25/palin-urges-america-to-stay-addicted-to-oil/). His energy plan would primarily rely on [more offshore oil drilling](http://www.bobmcdonnell.com/index.php/issues/issue_green) and higher oil company profits, while opposing reductions in global warming pollution. Following big oil’s agenda by pursuing offshore oil drilling is no panacea for our oil dependence. The Department of Energy determined that even drilling for oil and gas in the newly opened Outer Continental Shelf and the expansion of shale gas production would still require liquid fuel imports of [45 percent in 2035](http://www.eia.doe.gov/neic/speeches/newell121409.pdf). The most cost-effective solution is to reduce demand for oil by making cars and trucks much more fuel efficient, and to transition to cleaner nonoil fuels, including electricity, natural gas, and advanced clean bio fuels.

I/L – Winners Win

Winners win- Obama’s popularity proves

Singer 9 [Jonathan, senior writer for the progressive blog MyDD, March 3, Direct Democracy.com, http://mydd.com/2009/3/3/by-expending-capital-obama-grows-his-capital]KLS

Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration.

Winners win and losers lose – losing makes Bush look weak

Barnes 3 [Fred, Executive Editor of the Weekly Standard, The Weekly Standard, March 24, Lexis]

That Bush has persisted on Iraq in the face of sinking polls, diplomatic setbacks, and rising criticism argues against the cynical view. Thomas DeFrank of the New York Daily News reported last week that Bush told friends nearly a year ago that he'd concluded Saddam Hussein must be deposed. Since then, the president hasn't flinched. "He's using his political capital to take a reluctant nation to war," says a White House official. It's not the other way around--Bush taking the country to war to build political capital. Let's not exaggerate. Bush has lost some ground politically, but he's not in freefall. The latest Gallup Poll showed approval of his performance dipped from 63 percent to 57 percent over the past two months. This brings Bush roughly back to where he was prior to September 11. The rally-around-the-president phenomenon usually vanishes in seven or eight months. With Bush, it took 18 months to disappear, and it's likely to return when war with Iraq begins. The long road to war has created uncertainty about the future, and this is partly responsible for the weak economic recovery. Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan, among others, says so. The vote by Turkey not to join the war, the opposition of France, Russia, and Germany, the troubles at the U.N.--all have shown the president as less than dominant. And not only have Bush's political opponents been emboldened, an antiwar movement has had time to mobilize, though less effectively in America than in Europe. Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute has a theory that winners win. That sounds tautological, but it means that winners create confidence in their ability to keep winning and thus improve their chances of doing just that. But lose or hit a roadblock, and the opposite occurs. "If you're not winning, you look vulnerable," Ornstein says. Rebuffs by allies and the U.N. "make Bush look less formidable. He looks not impotent but weaker." There's something to this. Certainly Daschle and House Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi and Democratic presidential candidates act as though they believe it. Their criticism of Bush has become frequent and harsh.

I/L – Winners Win

Political Capital evaporates – only by fighting and winning can the president get more

Lee 5 [Andrew, The Rose Institute of State & Local Government – Claremont McKenna College – Presented at the Georgia Political Science Association, 2005 Conference, http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf]

The prevalent theory of political capital focuses on its three uses: giving and receiving political capital, investing political capital, and spending political capital. Most presidents constantly engage in one or more of these three uses because unused political capital diminishes (Edwards 2002; Lindberg 2004). In particular, a president’s political capital usually decreases in the second term, usually through the standard measure of favorability and job approval polling numbers. To accrue political capital, the president may support a particular lawmaker’s legislation by issuing an SAP urging support, thereby giving that legislator more pull in the Congress and at home. The president may also receive capital from Congress by winning larger legislative majorities. For example, the president’s successful efforts at increasing Republican representation in the Senate and House would constitute an increase in political capital. The president may also receive political capital from increased job favorability numbers, following through with purported policy agendas, and defeating opposing party leaders (Lindberg 2004). Because political capital diminishes, a president can invest in policy and legislative victories to maintain or increase it. For example, President George W. Bush invests his political capital in tax cuts which he hopes will yield returns to the economy and his favorability numbers. By investing political capital, the president assumes a return on investment.

I/L – Winners Win

Legislative success is key to a president’s momentum and political capital

Eshbaugh-Soha, 5 [Ph.D., Texas A&M University; assistant professor of political science, UNT Political Research Quarterly, “The Politics of Presidential Agendas” ; 58: 257-268, Lexis]

Past research holds that if presidents are to increase their success in Congress, they must set the policy agenda in their favor. But what determines the propensity of presidents to propose or support different policies? Because presidents influence the agenda-setting stage of the policy process, presidents develop their yearly domestic policy agendas in anticipation of each policy's success or failure in Congress. After all, presidents want to emphasize their strengths to achieve their goal of policy enactment in Congress. From this assumption, I devise a typology of long-term and important presidential policies, and argue that political limitations and fiscal constraints influence the president's yearly domestic policy agenda. I show that presidents offer different types of policies as part of their yearly domestic agendas given Congressional makeup and the federal budget deficit. The president's agenda is of immense importance to American politics. Several argue that presidents have substantial influence over the agenda-setting stage of the policy process (Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Cobb and Elder 1983; Kingdon 1995; Schattsneider 1960). Others maintain that the way presidents package their agenda explains much of their eventual success or failure in Congress (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Edwards 1989; Jones 1994; Light 1999; Neustadt 1990). The implication of these works is that presidents anticipate the contextual environment and, when it is favorable, will be successful in Congress. Edwards (1989: 146) argues that the president may be successful given a strategically packaged agenda and a favorable contextual environment, while the "the president's greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged" (Bond and Fleisher 1990: 230). Despite scholarly consensus that agenda setting is important to American politics and presidential-Congressional relations, previous research relies on the assertion that agenda setting is important to presidential relations with Congress (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Edwards 1989), without providing empirical support for if and how presidents strategically package their domestic policy agendas. Indeed, these works do not answer one important question: what determines the president's propensity to propose or support different types of policies? Two scholars have explored the determinants of the president's policy agenda. Light (1999) notes that information, expertise, and political capital are a premium in the presidents agenda decisions, and that presidents have the most potential to shape the legislative agenda early in their tenure. He shows how these factors influence the types of policies on the presidents agenda, without confirming his inferences through hypothesis testing (see King 1993). Peterson (1990) also studies the president's agenda. He analyzes the contextual environment and its impact on whether presidents prefer large or small, and new or old policies. Although he finds that the Congressional environment is important in the presidents agenda decisions, seemingly relevant variables such as the federal budget deficit are statistically insignificant. The underlying premise of agenda-setting research is that the president should be able to package policy priorities so as to increase the likelihood of their adoption. Doing so may require presidents to assess the probability that a proposal will be successful depending on contextual circumstances, such as Congressional makeup. Nevertheless, Peterson (1990: 207-08) finds little impact of the contextual environment on presidential policies, bringing into question the conventional wisdom that presidents can package their agendas strategically to increase their success in Congress (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Edwards 1989). With this in mind, I rely on agenda-setting and anticipative reactions theories to argue that fiscal and political factors should affect the content of the president's yearly domestic policy agenda from 1949-2000. Lacking any readily available data source to test this argument, I also advance a new policy typology that categorizes domestic policies across both time and importance dimensions. I use the number of yearly policies for each policy type (major, minor, incremental, and meteoric) as dependent variables in four separate analyses. To account for the yearly changes in the political environment, I offer a timeseries analysis of several hypotheses. I argue that presidents seek to optimize their domestic policy preferences, and because their success depends on broad legislative cooperation, presidents anticipate the reaction of Congress and support or propose different policies accordingly in their yearly domestic policy agendas.1

Aff – No I/L Econ

Energy reform doesn’t solve econ – ramps up energy prices which has devastating effects on businesses and families.

Needham 9(Vicki Roll Call, “Energy Reform Debate Is a High-Stakes Game” June 22)AQB

While House Democrats tout the benefits of their bill, Energy and Commerce ranking member Joe Barton (R-Texas) has said the measure is too expensive and argues that implementing a cap-and-trade program is a major gamble that will break the federal bank and lead to exorbitant energy prices — which in turn will prevent families from being able to pay their power bills. If the legislation doesn’t cause a spike in other energy prices such as gasoline, diesel and natural gas, the measure as structured could be a victory for ratepayers, setting up a system for them to recoup some of the expected rise in residential energy bills. When the proposed cap-and-trade program begins in 2012, electric utilities would receive 35 percent of the allowances with 30 percent going to local distribution companies for the specific purpose of offsetting costs to customers. In a recent analysis, the Natural Resources Defense Council determined that consumer energy bills would actually decline under the House bill. But the American Petroleum Institute has argued that the inequity of how allowances have been distributed could easily create a rise in other energy prices — along with massive job losses. An average family could pay $1,500 a year more for energy than it does now and 74 percent more for gasoline, according to a study quoted by the API. “While the bill has laudable environmental and economic goals, its inequitable system of allocations remains intact and if enacted would have a disproportionate adverse impact on consumers, businesses and producers of gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, crude oil and natural gas,” API President Jack Gerard said in a statement.

Energy reform makes the economy trillions of dollars weaker.

Kreutzer and Loris 6/17/10(David Senior Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change and Nicolas Research Assistant at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, “EPA’s New Analysis of Cap and Trade Same Old Faulty Logic” The Heritage Foundation)AQB

The EPA uses household figures and measures consumption changes only. First, a household is not necessarily a family. The average household size is 2.6 people. Adjusting household size to a family-of-four standard adds another 53 percent. Secondly, consumption changes are typically less than income changes, as families respond to income losses by saving less. When income drops, people prevent consumption from dropping by dipping into savings. In turn, lower savings reduces the ability of families to cope with other shocks and reduces their future income. Further, consumption comes from after-tax dollars, so losses in tax revenue do not show up in data on household consumption. The real economic cost is the loss of income. Change in national income, as measured by gross domestic product (GDP), is a better measure of the overall economic impact of a policy. In the end, Americans will be much poorer and the economy would be trillions of dollars weaker with climate change legislation in place than without it, as Heritage Foundation analyses of past cap-and-trade bills have shown.

Aff – No I/L Econ

Reform policy would wreck economy in the next 30 years, five warrants – Electricity cost, GDP, national income, job loss and national debt.

Carroll 6/15/10(Conn, Assistant Director for The Heritage Foundation's Strategic Communications “Morning Bell: The Obama Energy Tax Game Plan” The Heritage Foundation)AQB

As far as the strategy in the Senate goes, White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel told The New York Times last week that Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) would use elements of the Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act, the Cantwell-Collins carbon pricing plan, and the Bingaman renewable energy standard bill. A Senate aide told Politico: “an energy deal must include some serious effort to price carbon as a way to slow climate change.” The important thing to remember is that none of this is new. As Heritage Foundation Senate Relations Deputy Dan Holler reported the day before the Deepwater Horizon explosion, Reid has been planning a bait-and-switch from the beginning: first bringing up the Kerry-Lieberman cap-and-trade bill, striking it, and then replacing it with the less well known Bingaman renewable energy standards. The left knows that the American public has been educated about the economic harms of cap-and-trade, and they are hoping they can use the BP oil spill to pass renewable energy standards (RES) before the public wises up. Don’t be fooled: an RES is just another way for the enviro-left to inflict an economy-killing energy tax on the American public. The Heritage Foundation’s Center for Data Analysis has crunched the numbers and found that an RES would: 1) Raise electricity prices by 36 percent for households and 60 percent for industry; 2) Cut national income (GDP) by $5.2 trillion between 2012 and 2035; 3) Cut national income by $2,400 per year for a family of four; 4) Reduce employment by more than 1,000,000 jobs; and 5) Add more than $10,000 to a family of four’s share of the national debt by 2035. In The Godfather, at Vito Corleone’s funeral, the family consiglieri Tom Hagan leans into the new Don Michael Corleone and whispers: “Do you know how they’re gonna come at’cha?” If the American public wants to avoid a self-inflicted economic disaster on top of the existing environmental one, they need to know how President Obama is going to come after them. Now you know.

Aff – No I/L Econ

Reform destroys economic recovery – forces US to rely on undeveloped and expensive energy sources

Holler 10(Dan, Senate Relations Deputy for The Heritage Foundation, “The Senate’s Bait-and-Switch on Cap-and-Trade” The Heritage Foundation April 21)AQB

In other words, the Senate plans to force sweeping, expensive, job-destroying changes to America’s energy policy in much the same way they forced ObamaCare upon unwilling Americans. Next week, Senators John Kerry (D-MA), Lindsey Graham (R-SC) and Joe Lieberman (I-CT) plan to unveil their plan aimed at combating global warming, an issue that Americans rank as the country’s least pressing priority. With gas prices already surpassing $3 per gallon in some locations, Americans will have little appetite for another energy tax proposal. Unfortunately, liberal policymakers will not hesitate to move forward with unpopular and economically harmful policies – see ObamaCare. Would liberals dare move forward on Kerry-Graham-Lieberman, which may include a sector-by-sector (i.e., preferential industry treatment) cap-and-trade scheme and a hidden gas tax? Probably not, but they are positioning themselves to move swiftly on an equally destructive and innocuous sounding renewable electricity standard (RES). How will this happen? After Kerry, Graham and Lieberman unveil their plan, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) will begin working behind closed doors to craft a proposal he believes can win the support of 60 Senators. As part of that effort, he will jettison the cap-and-trade and gas tax provisions proposed by the trio of Senators. In its place, he will insert the RES approved by the Senate Energy Committee last year. And, as with ObamaCare, a lot of goodies will be doled out to special interests. If Reid decides to bring a bill to the floor in June, he will argue the absence of cap-and-trade and a gas tax makes it worthy of broad-based support. The media may embrace that logic, but it should not fool Americans who are concerned about jobs and the economy. An RES will mandate the use of inefficient, expensive and unproven energy sources. That combination will weaken the economy, resulting in less jobs and lower standards of living. Americans should make no distinction between cap-and-trade, energy taxes or an RES. Granting the government a more prominent, powerful role in selecting our energy sources will guarantee energy that is more expensive and less consumer choice in the future. Backroom deals. Less consumer choice. More expensive. Sounds a lot like ObamaCare.

Energy reform kills more than 5,000,000 jobs by 2050.

Prandoni 6/1/10(Christopher, ATR(American Tax Reform) “Kerry-Lieberman Energy Bill Will Kill 522,000 Jobs and Reduce GDP by $39 Billion”)AQB

After overhauling America’s healthcare industry, Democrats have returned to their favorite, possibly even more divisive, prerogative -- energy policy. Unfortunately for Democrats who saw the House-passed Cap-and-Trade stall in the Senate last year, Kerry-Lieberman includes many of the same problematic ramifications: job loss, GDP reduction, and less disposable income. Americans for Tax Reform sent out the following release outlining these negative economic effects: The Kerry-Lieberman American Power Act is an attempt by the Obama Administration to put a stranglehold on the economy by unnecessarily inflating the price of energy and taxing American families. This butchering of the free market will cause severe negative effects for the economy. A study performed by Chamberlain Economics, L.L.C on behalf of the Institute for Energy Research provides figures which illustrate this point: 522,000 Increase in unemployment in 2015 5,000,000 Jobs lost by 2050 $1,042 Cost to households annually $125 billion Over economic loss each year 75 percent Seniors that would forfeit 2.3 percent of their income 5.8 percent Income forfeited for those making less than $10,000/yr 0.9 percent Amount of cash income those making $150,000/yr would be taxed $1,174/yr Increase in household bills for Northeast residents $987/yr Annual increase households in the South would face 14 percent Increase in petroleum prices to consumers 12 percent Electricity and utility increase families will bare $39 billion Reduction in GDP by 2015 $384 billion 2050 total loss in GDP 119,000 Job losses to the petroleum industry 81,400 Natural gas and electric utility job losses 49,7000 Chemical product industry job losses.

Aff – No I/L Environment

Reform fails to solve the environment – No reliable transition energy.

Stallman 9(Bob, President of The American Farm Bureau Federation, Letter to Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works)AQB

However, the second essential element is lacking in both of the bills. There is little in either bill that would provide an alternative source of energy to the fossil fuels that will be lost. Americans are being asked to forego the use of coal, of which the United States has tremendous reserves. yet we are being offered nothing in its place. Each of the potential replacement sources of energy has significant problems and issues, and none of these issues is addressed in the bills. Energy experts indicate, and advocates of cap-and-trade acknowledge, that renewable sources of energy are not sufficiently available to "plug this hole." These energy sources are in their relative infancy. In fact, there are such significant issues with regard to siting and transmission of these sources that they may do little more than be able to meet the increase in energy demand of our nation for several years. There have been well-publicized objections to the siting of wind turbines in certain areas. More recently, we have seen stories of conflicts between wind turbines and the impact on endangered species, thus underscoring the competing interests between energy production and natural resource protection. There seems little prospect that these sources of power can actually replace fossil fuels. In the case of wind power, for instance, there is general recognition that it does not have the capacity to replace base load power on the grid due to its intermittent nature.

Aff – No I/L Econ or Enviroment

Energy reform won’t solve global warming or the economy – by 2100 only decreases global temperature by .2 degrees while ramping up energy costs which weaken the economy.

Kreutzer and Loris 6/17/10(David Senior Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change and Nicolas Research Assistant at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, “EPA’s New Analysis of Cap and Trade Same Old Faulty Logic” The Heritage Foundation)AQB

Even the most generous scenario in this EPA report shows that costs will be forced on the economy—higher energy prices and lost income. For every year reported, household consumption drops compared to a world without Boxer-Kerry. This is a climate bill and, even according to the EPA, it will reduce economic activity. Spinning this as a job-creating, green stimulus bill is simply untrue. Regardless of whether the lower cost estimates are true, this bill provides negligible environmental benefit. Global temperature reduction from Kerry-Lieberman would be .077 degrees Fahrenheit by 2050 and 0.200 degrees by 2100. And despite the best attempt for politicians to marry the Gulf oil spill and cap and trade legislation, even the EPA analysis shows cap and trade will do very little to cut petroleum use (page 31). Yet, after President Obama’s speech in the Oval Office, former Vice President Al Gore said, “Placing a limit on global warming pollution and accelerating the deployment of clean energy technologies is the only truly effective long-term solution to this crisis.” Cap and trade is an effective solution to raise energy prices for years to come and choke our economy, but that’s about it.

Aff- No Link- Japan- Public

No Link- Public indifferent about Japan as an economic or political threat

Sutter 96 [Robert G., Professor, School of Foreign Service, April 25, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub95.pdf] KLS

Under these circumstances, these advocates see a strong need for the United States to work prudently and closely with traditional U.S. allies and associates. Their cautious approach argues, for example, that it seems foolish and inconsistent with U.S. goals not to preserve the long-standing U.S. stake in good relations with Japan and with friends and allies along the periphery of Asia and in Oceania. Their security policies and political-cultural orientations are generally seen as in accord with U.S. interests. Although opinion surveys sometime claim that the American public and some U.S. leaders see Japan as an economic competitive "threat" to U.S. well-being, these observers stress a different line of argument. They highlight the fact that few polls of U.S. public opinion or U.S. leaders support the view that it is now in America's interest to focus U.S. energies on the need to confront the Japanese economic threat, in a way that confrontation with the Soviet Union came to dominate U.S. policy during the Cold War.

Public no longer regards Japanese defense as important

Huntington 96 [Samuel P, Political Scientist, “The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order”, Simon and Shuster Publications, Pg 221- 222] KLS

In the early 1990's Japanese-American relations became increasingly heated with controversies over a wide range of issues, including Japanese attitudes toward American human rights policies with respect to China and other countries, Japanese participation in peacekeeping missions, and, most important, economic relations, especially trade. References to trade wars became commonplace. American officials, particularly in the Clinton administration demanded more and more concessions from Japan; Japanese officials resisted these demands more and more forcefully. Each Japanese-American trade controversy was more acrimonious and more difficult to resolve than the previous one. In March 1994, for instance, President Clinton signed an order giving him authority to apply stricter trade sanctions on Japan, which brought protest not only from the Japanese but also from the head of GATT, the principal world trading organization. A short while later Japan responded with a "blistering attack" on U.S. policies, and shortly after that the United States "formally accused Japan" of discriminating against U.S. companies in awarding government contracts. In the spring of 1995 the Clinton administration threatened to impose 100 percent tariffs on Japanese luxury cars, with an agreement averting this being reached just before the sanctions would have gone into effect. Something closely resembling a trade war was clearly underway between the two countries. By the mid 1990's the acrimony had reached the point where leading Japanese political figures began to question the US military presence in Japan. During these years the public in each country became steadily less favorably disposed towards the other country. In 1985, 87 percent of the American public said they had a generally friendly attitude toward Japan. By 1990 this had dropped to 67 percent, and by 1993 a bare 50 percent of Americans felt favorably disposed toward Japan and almost two- thirds as they tried to avoid buying Japanese products. In 1985, 73 percent of Japanese described U.S.- Japanese relations as friendly; by 1993, 64 percent said they were unfriendly. The year 1991 marked the crucial turning point in the shift of public opinion out of its Cold war mold. In that year each country displaced the Soviet Union in the perceptions of the other. For the first time Americans rated Japan ahead of the Soviet Union as a threat to American security, and for the first time Japanese rated the United States ahead of the Soviet Union as a threat to Japan's security.

Aff- No Links- Kuwait- Government

And, the government withholds information on the invasion of these countries- plan wouldn’t even be perceived

Turse 9 (Nick, editor at the nations institute Tom dispatch, http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=15479 , *Corp watch*, nov 22) ET

Given that the current conflict with al-Qaeda stemmed, in no small part, from the U.S. military presence in the region, the issue is obviously of importance. Nonetheless, coverage has been so poor that much about U.S. military efforts there remains unknown. A review of U.S. government documents, financial data, and other open-source material by TomDispatch, however, reveals that an American military building boom yet to be seriously scrutinized, analyzed, or assessed is underway in the Middle East. Consider, then, what we can at present know now about this Pentagon build-up, country by country from Qatar to Jordan, and while you're reading, think about what we don't know -- and why Washington has chosen this path.

A2: Economy- Defense- Alt Cause to Poverty

Alternate causalities to poverty – Economic collapse is not the root.

Madan 2 (Anisha, Financial analyst for GE and MBA at Kellogg School, Northwestern University, “The Relationship between Economic Freedom and Socio – Economic Development”, pg 8-10,) AQB

There is a vast amount of literature and studies performed that show that economic growth is not the end-all and be-all of economic development. Focus needs to be on social indicators that depict the quality of life of people. The Basic Needs approach to development formulated by Paul Streeten attempts to provide opportunities for the full physical, mental, and social development of the human personality and then derives ways of meeting this objective. The emphasis is on ends rather than means and non-material needs are recognized. (Streeten, 1981). Thus, mere economic growth rates cannot be a proxy for the quality of life and cannot indicate that basic needs are met. This is explained as follows: (1) The income or economic growth approach to measuring human progress deals only with the quantity of products but not with the appropriateness of those goods and services. (2) Some basic needs can only be satisfied, or more effectively satisfied through public services (education, water, and sanitation), through subsidized goods and services, or through transfer payments. (3) Consumers, both poor and rich are not always efficient in optimizing nutrition and health. Additional income can be spent on foods with lower nutritional value leading to a decrease in health. (4) The manner in which additional income is earned may affect the quality of life adversely. Compared to others, certain production choices can increase income more but have a greater negative impact on human and environmental well being. One example of this is female employment. Although the mother's income can rise, breast-feeding may reduce, which decreases the nutrition of babies. (5) Increased income does not guarantee a reduction in the mal-distribution of wealth within society or households. Therefore, the Basic Needs Approach shows that the economic growth approach neglects the importance of non-material needs and ignores the significance of socio-economic development.

**A2: Economy- Defense- resilient**

US economy is resilient – it can take more than one major hit.

Blanchard 6/5/10(Niklas, economist for Modeled Behavior, “This is Resilience”)AQB

The US economy is like Rocky Balboa — it can take multiple hard hits, spend a good deal of time beaten down…but then come back and win the fight against striking odds. As you may know, I’m a proponent of the Scott Sumner view of events surrounding the Great Recession. Indeed, I think monetary policy remains too tight relative to the needs of the economy (to return to our previous NGDP growth path). However, from Stephen Gordon (via the BEA), we learn that on net, not even fiscal policy has been particularly expansionary: There has been much talk of the size of the US federal stimulus, and much debate about whether or not it has been an effective counter-cyclical policy instrument. But it’s important to remember that the proper measure for fiscal stimulus is not spending by the federal government; it is spending by all levels of government. And when you look at the contributions to US GDP growth (Table 1.1.2 at the BEA site), total government spending has been a drag on growth over the past two quarters. The increases at the federal level have not been enough to compensate for the spending cuts at the local and state levels. And yet, even severely battered, the little engine that could keeps chugging along. There is a lot of ink being spilled over the theory of fiscal policy “expectation traps”, or what Krugman terms the Tinkerbell principle. The theory is very interesting, and well-worth pursuing, but is a fiscal policy that is demonstratably not expansionary ever expansionary?

A2: Economy- Defense- US Not K to Global

U.S. not key to global economy—Other countries will replace

Baily and Slaughter 8 (Martin, senior fellow in economic studies at the Brookings Institution and Matthew Professor of international economics at the Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth, Private Equity Council, “Strengthening U.S. Competitiveness in the Global Economy”, p. 8, )AQB

To many Americans, the persistent large trade deficit represents a sign that the US economy is no longer competitive, especially in the manufacturing sector, and is losing out to the billions of workers in China, India and elsewhere that are now participating in global trade. there is both truth and fiction to this idea. It is correct to say that the ability of the US economy to compete in international trade is not what it was in the past when the mighty US economy dominated the world with technologies and organizational and managerial techniques that were far ahead of competitors**. that era is past**. the US economy no longer dominates the global economy because other countries have developed their production capacity and best practices have spread around the world—oftentimes through the investments that US multinational companies have made overseas. And, of course, instead of being self-sufficient in oil, we now pay exorbitant prices to foreign producers. but just because the world has changed does not mean that the U.S. economy can no longer compete globally. Contrary to some popular opinion, we judge that the US economy—which remains one of the most productive in the world—is ca-pable of competing globally, expanding exports and even seeing some recovery in import-competing sec-tors. Nor do we cast China, India and NAFtA as villains or even as the cause of the huge US trade deficit.

U.S. not key to global econ—East Asia is the new leader.

Xinhua Net 9 (“East Asia playing bigger role in global economy, Bush says”)AQB

BOAO, Hainan, April 18 (Xinhua) -- Former U.S. President George. W. Bush said Saturday that East Asia is playing a bigger role in global economy, and the world economic center has moved from Atlantic to Asia Pacific. The Asia Pacific takes up 55 percent of the global economy, and it is of vital interest to stay "heavily engaged" with the countries in the region, he said at a banquet speech held during the Boao Forum for Asia (BFA) annual conference 2009. "That's why I have never missed a single APEC meeting when I was in office, because I know how important it is to the prosperity," he said. "The global financial system does need reform, needs greater transparency," he noted. "Accessible banking standard is needed to be in place to prevent over leverage. A better warning system is needed to be put into place to anticipate crisis," he said. He said that 20 years ago, a meeting of G7 or G8 was enough to sort out the problems, since they comprised a large share of the global economy. But now they are no longer significantly large, so such a meeting has to expand to 20, said Bush. "We learn lessons from the past that we are intervened in close coordination with each other," he said. As the 43rd U.S. president, Bush spoke out the fact that he had maintained good personal relations with China. He said making friends with Chinese leaders made it easier to do diplomacy. He said changes in China are marvelous, and to have discussions without China sitting at the table makes no sense. He stressed the world must resist isolation and protectionism, and must resist the temptation to over-correct. "More we interact, more quickly we can succeed," he said. In mid-March, Bush gave his first speech after leaving office in Calgary of Canada, which stirred up a protest of 200 people and shoe throwing outside the event, according to media reports.

**A2: Economy- Defense – War (1/2)**

Economic collapse doesn’t cause war --- lack of resources prevents military conflict

Bennett and Nordstrom 00 (Scott and Timothy Department of Political Science Professors at Pennsylvania State, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, February, Ebsco)AQB

In this analysis, we focus on using economic conditions to understand when rivalries are likely to escalate or end. Rivalries are an appropriate set of cases to use when examining substitutability both because leaders in rival states have clearly substitutable choices and because rivalries are a set of cases in which externalization is a particularly plausible policy option.7 In particular, when confronted with domestic problems, leaders in a rivalry have the clear alternatives of escalating the conflict with the rival to divert attention or to work to settle the rivalry as a means of freeing up a substantial amount of resources that can be directed toward solving internal problems. In the case of the diversion option, rivals provide logical, believable actors for leaders to target; the presence of a clear rival may offer unstable elites a particularly inviting target for hostile statements or actual conflict as necessary. The public and relevant elites already consider the rival a threat or else the rivalry would not have continued for an extended period; the presence of disputed issues also provides a casus belli with the rival that is always present. Rivals also may provide a target where the possible costs and risks of externalization are relatively controlled. If the goal is diversion, leaders willwant to divert attention without provoking an actual (and expensive)war. Over the course of many confrontations, rival states may learn to anticipate response patterns, leading to safer disputes or at least to leaders believing that they can control the risks of conflict when they initiate a new confrontation. In sum, rivals provide good targets for domestically challenged political leaders. This leads to our first hypothesis, which is as follows: *Hypothesis 1*: Poor economic conditions lead to diversionary actions against the rival. Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a “guns versus butter” world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States. *Hypothesis 2*: Poor economic conditions increase the probability of rivalry termination. Hypotheses 1 and 2 posit opposite behaviors in response to a single cause (internal economic problems). As such, they demand a research design that can account for substitutability between them.

A2: Economy- Defense – War (2/2)

Economic crisis deters war – makes price too high.

Miller 1(Morris, Professor of Economics, “Poverty: A Cause of War?”)AQB

Library shelves are heavy with studies focused on the correlates and causes of war. Some of the leading scholars in that field suggest that we drop the concept of causality, since it can rarely be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to look at the motives of war-prone political leaders and the ways they have gained and maintained power, even to the point of leading their nations to war. Poverty: The Prime Causal Factor? Poverty is most often named as the prime causal factor. Therefore we approach the question by asking whether poverty is characteristic of the nations or groups that have engaged in wars. As we shall see, **poverty has never been as significant a factor as one would imagine**. Largely this is because of the traits of the poor as a group - particularly their tendency to tolerate their suffering in silence and/or be deterred by the force of repressive regimes. Their **voicelessness and powerlessness translate into passivity**. Also, because of their illiteracy and ignorance of worldly affairs, the poor become susceptible to the messages of war-bent demagogues and often willing to become cannon fodder. The situations conductive to war involve political repression of dissidents, tight control over media that stir up chauvinism and ethnic prejudices, religious fervor, and sentiments of revenge. The poor succumb to leaders who have the power to create such conditions for their own self-serving purposes. Desperately poor people in **poor nations cannot organize wars**, which are exceptionally costly. The statistics speak eloquently on this point. In the last 40 years the global arms trade has been about $1500 billion, of which two-thirds were the purchases of developing countries. That is an amount roughly equal to the foreign capital they obtained through official development aid (ODA). Since ODA does not finance arms purchases (except insofar as money that is not spent by a government on aid-financed roads is available for other purposes such as military procurement) financing is also required to control the media and communicate with the populace to convince them to support the war. Large-scale armed conflict is so expensive that governments must resort to exceptional sources, such as drug dealing, diamond smuggling, brigandry, or deal-making with other countries. The reliance on illicit operations is well documented in a recent World Bank report that studied 47 civil wars that took place between 1960 and 1999, the main conclusion of which is that the key factor is the availability of commodities to plunder. For greed to yield war, there must be financial opportunities. **Only affluent political leaders and elites can amass such weaponry**, diverting funds to the military even when this runs contrary to the interests of the population. In most inter-state wars the antagonists were wealthy enough to build up their armaments and propagandize or repress to gain acceptance for their policies. Economic Crises? Some scholars have argued that it is not poverty, as such, that contributes to the support for armed conflict, but rather some catalyst, such as an economic crisis. However, a study by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik shows that this **hypothesis lacks merit**. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin American and Asia since World War II, they concluded that much of the conventional thinking about the political impact of economic crisis is wrong: "The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... or (in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another)."

A2: Economy- Offense- DeDev

**Ecological collapse and human extinction are inevitable without an economic collapse**

Barry 8 [Dr. Barry, PhD in Land Resources from UW-Madison and President and Founder of Ecological Internet, 1/14/2008 Glen, <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>] KLS

Given widespread failure to pursue policies sufficient to reverse deterioration of the biosphere and avoid ecological collapse, the best we can hope for may be that the growth-based economic system crashes sooner rather than later Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration.

Makes their impacts inevitable

Barry 8 [Dr. Barry, PhD in Land Resources from UW-Madison and President and Founder of Ecological Internet, 1/14/2008 Glen, <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>] KLS

Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

A2: Economy- Offense- Mindset Shift

**Economic collapse now causes mindset shift**

Berg 8 [Peter, assistant professor of physics at the University of Ontario, Institute of Technology, 10/16/2008 "First global crisis of century harrowing," http://newsdurhamregion.com/opinion/article/110488]

Whether we will go through a major recession, long and deep, or even a depression, what might emerge is the realization that our society is much poorer than we had realized. The housing bubble, credit crunch and stock market crash have wiped out trillions of dollars and this will not go unnoticed. This is truly the first global crisis of the 21st century. It is not climate change. It is not pollution. It is not a fresh water crisis. It is not a food crisis, notwithstanding current food security issues in several countries. It is not an energy crisis, although energy prices might have played a major role in bursting the U.S. housing bubble. It is an economic crisis of epic proportions that questions the very economic system we chose to build. The house of cards called Wall Street and banking sector has tumbled. The Ponzi scheme has been revealed. The response of our political leaders so far has been the nationalization of banks, insurance and mortgage companies, lowering of interest rates (i.e. more easy money) and seizure of bad credit portfolios, to name a few. The scale is truly mind boggling, reaching into trillions of dollars in liabilities. For example, the liabilities that the U.S. taxpayer was forced to assume easily equals the market capitalization of the 10 largest U.S. corporations. All nationalized. It seems that capitalism works great until the day it collapses and socialism does not look so bad after all. These are strange and dangerous times. The world economy and financial sector are changing for good. Our young generation will grow up and deal with a new order. And future crises are already looming. If we manage to recover from the current disorder, will we be able to navigate through the global oil production peak?

Mindshift creates sustainable societies- solves the DA

**Lewis 00** – [ Chris, Ph.D. University of Colorado at Boulder, Chris H, June http://www.cross-x.com/archives/LewisParadox.pdf]

With the collapse of global industrial civilization, smaller, autonomous, local and regional civilizations, cultures, and polities will emerge. We can reduce the threat of mass death and genocide that will surely accompany this collapse by encouraging the creation and growth of sustainable, self-sufficient regional polities. John Cobb has already made a case for how thismay work in the United States and how it is working in Kerala, India. After the collapse of global industrial civilization, First and Third World peoples won't have the material resources, biological capital, and energy and human resources to re-establish global industrial civilization. Forced by economic necessity to become dependent on local resources and ecosystems for theirsurvival, peoples throughout the world will work to conserve and restore their environments.Those societies that destroy their local environments and economies, as modern people so often do, will themselves face collapse and ruin.

A2: Energy Reform- Offense- Agriculture

Energy reform destroys US agriculture market.

Stallman 9(Bob, President of The American Farm Bureau Federation, Letter to Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works)AQB

The increased fuel, fertilizer and energy costs that will result from H.R. 2454 and S. 1733 will greatly impact the relationship of American producers with the rest of the world. U.S. agriculture is an energy-intensive industry that relies to a large extent on international markets. These increased input costs will put our fanners and ranchers at a competitive disadvantage with producers in other countries that do not have similar GHG restrictions. Any loss of international markets or resulting loss of production in the United States will encourage production overseas in countries where production methods may be less efficient than in the United States. The production of food and fiber in the United States is important both to the U.S. and to the world and must ensure that our producers are not put at a competitive disadvantage. As much as our producers rely on exports for then\* markets, the rest of the world relies on the United States for the production of then\* food. Increased production costs in the United States resulting from this bill will likely raise world food prices at a time when most countries cannot afford it. Trade issues become more complicated, because any trade equalization measures seeking to "level the playing field" for our producers must also comply with our World Trade Organization commitments. Provisions such as those contained in the House bill effectively imposing border tariffs on goods from countries that do not have similar GHG restrictions will almost certainly be challenged in the WTO and are in serious jeopardy of being found to be non-compliant with our obligations. Moreover, such actions could very likely lead to retaliation.

A2: Warming- Impact Calc

Turn-focusing on global warming distracts us from short term security threats like the aff which outweigh

Shaefer and Lieberman 7 (Jay, Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs. Senior Policy Analyst, Energy and Environment http://www.heritage.org/Research/InternationalOrganizations/wm1425.cfm) ET

The United Kingdom is wrong to foist this issue on the Council. First, the extent, source, and consequences of global warming are subject to debate, and the possible implications of global warming, particularly the security implications, are speculative. Even if these consequences occur as predicted in the IPCC report, they are not immediate security threats. Second, numerous policy initiatives, forums, and organizations are focused on studying and evaluating the consequences of global warming. The focus of these efforts and discussions is to clarify the science of global warming and weigh the costs of action to address global warming against the risks of inaction. A debate in the Security Council is unlikely to contribute to these ongoing efforts. Finally, the Security Council has a full docket of immediate threats to international peace and security that is has failed to resolve. Focusing on speculative threats that may arise decades in the future undermines the seriousness of the body and is an affront to those suffering from immediate crises. Worse, it distracts the Council from pressing threats to international peace and security.

A2: Warming- Defense- Alt Cause: China

China’s CO2 emissions will overshadow emission cuts

National Geographic 8 (Mar 18-8, (http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2008/03/080318-china-warming.html)ET

China's greenhouse gas emissions are rising much faster than expected and will overshadow the cuts in global emissions expected due to the Kyoto Protocol, according to a new study. Forecasts from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) had predicted that China's carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions would rise by about 2.5 to 5 percent each year between 2004 and 2010. But the estimates are two to four times too low, according to new research led by Maximilian Auffhammer of the University of California, Berkeley. The study calculated that for the period from 2004 to 2010, [China](http://www.nationalgeographic.com/places/countries/country_china.html)'s CO2 emissions will have grown by at least 11 percent a year. "The emissions growth rate is surpassing our worst expectations, and that means the goal of stabilizing atmospheric CO2 is going to be much, much harder to achieve," Auffhammer said. The new findings threaten to throw a damper on the Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Most countries—including all major industrialized countries except the U.S.—have signed on to the Kyoto Protocol. (Related: ["Australia Signs Kyoto Protocol; U.S. Now Only Holdout"](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/12/071203-AP-aus-kyoto.html) [December 3, 2007].) But a major sticking point for the U.S. is that the agreement only mandates reductions for developed countries, mostly in North America and Europe. These areas are currently responsible for most of the CO2 that's causing [global warming](http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/environment/global-warming). Developing nations such as China, India, and Brazil are exempt from any reduction targets. But China, the world's most populous country, has been developing at lightning speed—perhaps faster than any country in history. Since most of its electricity comes from coal, for instance, China has been building coal-fired power plants at a rate of roughly two a week for the past few years. The country recently surpassed the U.S. to become the world's single leading emitter of CO2, according to another recent study. (China has more than four times the population of the U.S., however, so China's emissions per person are much lower.) China's greater-than-anticipated emissions may completely nullify the Kyoto reductions, raising the pressure to find ways for the country to grow cleanly, according to experts. "Making China and other developing countries an integral part of any future climate agreement is now even more important," Auffhammer said. To create the updated forecast, the new study took the novel approach of looking at each of China's provinces individually. "Everybody had been treating China as single country," said study co-author Richard Carson of the University of California, San Diego. But each of its more than 20 provinces is large, with populations bigger than many European countries, Carson pointed out. The areas have different standards of living and different rates of development and population growth—all of which the new study factors in. Also, many of the new coal-fired power plants that have been built in the past few years are low-cost designs, which are less efficient and therefore emit more CO2. "The problem is that power plants, once built, are meant to last for 40 to 75 years," Carson said. "Our forecast incorporates the fact that much of China is now stuck with power plants that are dirty and inefficient."

A2: Warming- Defense- Alt Cause- China

China’s CO2 emissions means stabilizing atmospheric CO2 is impossible

GCC 8 Mar 11 -8, (http://www.greencarcongress.com/2008/03/new-analysis-co.html) ET

The growth in China’s carbon dioxide emissions is far outpacing previous estimates, making the goal of stabilizing atmospheric greenhouse gases much more difficult, [according](http://ucsdnews.ucsd.edu/newsrel/international/03-08ChinasCarbonDioxideEmissions.asp) to a new analysis by economists at the University of California, Berkeley, and UC San Diego. The authors of the study, Maximillian Auffhammer, UC Berkeley assistant professor of agricultural and resource economics, and Richard Carson, UC San Diego professor of economics, based their findings upon pollution data from China’s 30 provincial entities. Previous estimates, including those used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, say the region that includes China will see a 2.5 to 5% annual increase in CO2 emissions, the largest contributor to atmospheric greenhouse gases, between 2004 and 2010. The new UC analysis puts that annual growth rate for China to at least 11% for the same time period. The study is scheduled for print publication in the May issue of the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, but is now online. The researchers’ most conservative forecast predicts that by 2010, there will be an increase of 600 million metric tons of carbon emissions in China over the country’s levels in 2000. This growth from China alone would overshadow the 116 million metric tons of carbon emissions reductions pledged by all the developed countries in the Kyoto Protocol. (The protocol was never ratified in the United States, which was the largest single emitter of carbon dioxide until 2006, when China took over that distinction, according to numerous reports.) Put another way, the projected annual increase in China alone over the next several years is greater than the current emissions produced by either Great Britain or Germany. Based upon these findings, the authors say current global warming forecasts are “overly optimistic,” and that action is urgently needed to curb greenhouse gas production in China and other rapidly industrializing countries. Auffhammer said this paper should serve as an alarm challenging the widely held belief that actions taken by the wealthy, industrialized nations alone represent a viable strategy towards the goal of stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide. Making China and other developing countries an integral part of any future climate agreement is now even more important. It had been expected that the efficiency of China’s power generation would continue to improve as per capita income increased, slowing down the rate of CO2 emissions growth. What we’re finding instead is that the emissions growth rate is surpassing our worst expectations, and that means the goal of stabilizing atmospheric CO2 is going to be much, much harder to achieve.

A2: Warming- Defense- Alt Cause: Developing Nations

US can’t solve global warming alone

Brookings Institute 6 June 2006, “Case Closed: The Debate About Global Warming Is Over”, (http://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/easterbrook/20060517.pdf)

At current rates only Russia, Germany and the United Kingdom are close to complying with the Kyoto mandates, and most of the compliance by Russia and Germany is the result of backdated credits for the closing of Warsaw Pact-era power plants and factories that had already been shuttered before the Kyoto agreement was initialed in 1997. Meanwhile, developing nations especially India and China are increasing their greenhouse gas emissions at prodigious rates—so much so that in the short term developing nations will swamp any reductions achieved by the West. Since 1990, India has increased its emissions of greenhouse gases by 70 percent and China by 49 percent, versus an 18 percent increase by the United States. China is on track to pass the United States as the leading emitter of artificial greenhouse gases. If current trends continue, the developing world will emit more greenhouse gases than the West by around 2025. And here’s the real kicker: even if all the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol were enforced to perfection, atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases in the year 2050 would be only about 1 percent less than without the treaty.

Developing nations will not model the U.S. on climate change

Barton 7 (Rep. Joe Barton, April 23 2007, “What To Do About Global Warming (Hint It Isn’t Cap And Trade Policy)”, Barton is ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, (http://thehill.com /leading-the-news/what-to-do-about-global-warming-hint--it-isnt-cap-and-trade-policy-2007-04-23.html)

The irony is that when U.S. environmental policies chase companies out of America, the global environment doesn’t prosper. Developing countries always swap clean air for economic growth. China’s coal production, for example, is as explosive as its economic growth, and the Chinese add a 500-megawatt coal-fired powerplant every week. We also heard that decisions in China about where and what kind of power plants to build are decentralized, effectively uncontrolled, and we learned that less than 5 percent of China’s coal-fired electricity plants are even fitted with ordinary sulfur dioxide control equipment. Even for the ones with SO2 scrubbers, it’s an open question whether those with the equipment actually use it. Some say if America just sets the example, everybody else will follow. But a real pollutant, sulfur dioxide, is a fine indicator of how good-example strategy doesn’t work at all. America has been scrubbing sulfur dioxide out of smokestacks for more than 20 years because it’s a real pollutant, but China still refuses.

A2: Warming-Defense- Alt Cause: India

India Will Not Cut Carbon Emissions

News Post India 8 (6-5 -8, (<http://www.newspostindia.com/report-59039>) ET

India will not reduce greenhouse gas emission at the cost of development and poverty alleviation, Minister of State for Environment and Forests Namo Narain Meena said Thursday. India is struggling to bring millions of people out of poverty. We cannot accept binding commitments to cut down greenhouse gas emission,' Meena said at a function to mark the World Environment Day. hough India has no commitment to reduce the global warming gases under the Kyoto Protocol, in recent climate change conferences many developed countries have said India needs to reduce the greenhouse burden.

India will not cut emissions which will hurt its development

Transnational Institute 7

June 7 (A worldwide fellowship of committed scholar-activists, (http://www.tni.org/detail\_page.phtml?act\_id=16949) ET

India is likely to cut a sorry figure on climate change issues during and after the G8 summit at Heiligendamm in Germany. s the world's fifth largest emitter of greenhouse gases (GHG) and one of its fastest growing economies, India will come under intense pressure both from the European Union and the United States to cut its emissions. But India will doggedly refuse to make any time-bound commitment to reducing them, and strongly resist legally binding caps. t press briefings on the eve of Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's visit to Germany --ironically, on World Environment Day -- senior officials made it clear that New Delhi sticks to its stand that it is the developed world which caused climate change through its industrial activities; the onus to reverse the damage lies on the developed countries. Singhsaid: "Due care must be taken not to allow growth and development prospects in the developing world to be undermined or constrained." Singh emphasized the "principle of common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities between the developed and developing world". his is shorthand for demanding that the industrialized countries cough up the bulk of the costs for reversing climate change. Singhadded: "...more and not less development is the best way for developing countries to address themselves to the issue of preserving the environment and protecting the climate." his means India will demand special concessions for the developing countries like patent-free technology transfer in respect of "clean energy", and financial assistance, including venture capital funding, to make a transition towards reduced greenhouse gas emissions."With such a stonewalling and negative approach, India won't emerge from the G-8 meeting smelling of roses," says Himanshu Thakkar, South Asia coordinator of Dams, Rivers and People, which looks closely at climate change issues and which recently highlighted the contribution of India's large dams to releases of methane, a potent greenhouse gas

A2: Warming- Defense- IPCC Bad

The IPCC is a flawed organization – it was made to justify global warming

Solomon, executive director of Energy Probe and the Urban Renaissance Institute 7

 (Lawrence,*Financial Post*, October 26, http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=55387187-4d06-446f-9f4f-c2397d155a32&p=1) ET

Vincent Gray has begun a second career as a climate-change activist. His motivation springs from the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a body that combats global warming by advocating the reduction of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Dr. Gray has worked relentlessly for the IPCC as an expert reviewer since the early 1990s. But Dr. Gray isn't an activist in the cause of enforcing the Kyoto Protocol and realizing the other goals of the worldwide IPCC process. To the contrary, Dr. Gray's mission, in his new role as cofounder of The New Zealand Climate Science Coalition, is to stop the IPCC from spreading climate-change propaganda that undermines the integrity of science. "The whole process is a swindle," he states, in large part because the IPCC has a blinkered mandate that excludes natural causes of global warming. " The Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) 1992 defined 'climate change' as changes in climate caused by human interference with atmospheric composition," he explains. "The task of the IPCC, therefore, has been to accumulate evidence to support this belief that all changes in the climate are caused by human interference with the atmosphere. Studies of natural climate change have largely been used to claim that these are negligible compared with 'climate change.' " Dr. Gray is one of the 2,000 to 2,500 top scientists from around the world whom the IPCC often cites as forming the basis of its findings. No one has been a more faithful reviewer than Dr. Gray over the years -- he has been an IPCC expert almost from the start, and perhaps its most prolific contributor, logging almost 1,900 comments on the IPCC's final draft of its most recent report alone. But Dr. Gray, who knows as much about the IPCC's review processes as anyone, has been troubled by what he sees as an appalling absence of scientific rigour in the IPCC's review process. "Right from the beginning, I have had difficulty with this procedure. Penetrating questions often ended without any answer. Comments on the IPCC drafts were rejected without explanation, and attempts to pursue the matter were frustrated indefinitely. "Over the years, as I have learned more about the data and procedures of the IPCC, I have found increasing opposition by them to providing explanations, until I have been forced to the conclusion that for significant parts of the work of the IPCC, the data collection and scientific methods employed are unsound. Resistance to all efforts to try and discuss or rectify these problems has convinced me that normal scientific procedures are not only rejected by the IPCC, but that this practice is endemic, and was part of the organization from the very beginning." Dr. Gray has detailed extensively the areas in which global warming science falls down. One example that this New Zealander provides comes from his region of the globe: "We are told that the sea level is rising and will soon swamp all of our cities. Everybody knows that the Pacific island of Tuvalu is sinking. Al Gore told us that the inhabitants are invading New Zealand because of it. "Around 1990 it became obvious that the local tide-gauge did not agree -- there was no evidence of 'sinking.' So scientists at Flinders University, Adelaide, were asked to check whether this was true. They set up new, modern, tide-gauges in 12 Pacific islands, including Tuvalu, confident that they would show that all of them are sinking. "Recently, the whole project was abandoned as there was no sign of a change in sea level at any of the 12 islands for the past 16 years. In 2006, Tuvalu even rose." Other expert reviewers at the IPCC, and scientists elsewhere around the globe, share Dr. Gray's alarm at the conduct of the IPCC. An effort by academics is now underway to reform this UN organization, and have it follow established scientific norms. Dr. Gray was asked to endorse this reform effort, but he refused, saying: "The IPCC is fundamentally corrupt. The only 'reform' I could envisage would be its abolition."

A2: Warming- Defense- IPCC ≠ Consensus

The IPCC report is not a consensus – thousands of scientists disagree with its fundamental arguments and they don’t represent the views of everyone on the IPCC.

Raloff 8 (Writer for Science News, 5/19/2008 [Janet Raloff, May 19 2008, Science News, “<http://www.sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/32328/title/When_Is_a_Consensus_on_Climate_Not_a_Consensus%3F>) ET

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a series of consensus documents under the auspices of the United Nations. They claimed that accumulating data are now strong enough to conclude that human activities are warming the planet and that Earth’s slowly building fever threatens to alter life and geography as we know it. For the IPCC’s efforts, it shared last year’s Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore. But the idea that the IPCC’s conclusions represented a consensus is nothing short of bunk, according to Arthur Robinson, a protein chemist and co-founder of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine in Cave Junction. He matintains that the UN was wrong in suggesting to the public that the IPCC’s findings “settle the issue” of whether fossil-fuel combustion’s emissions can be linked to climate. Indeed, he argued, in the United States alone, a great many scientists don’t subscribe to this view. At a very sparsely attended press briefing, this morning, Robinson reported that his organization had compiled a list of more than 30,000 scientists who have signed onto a petition saying that “There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate. “Moreover,” the petition continues, “there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.” The petition’s signatories “urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan . . . and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.” Robinson doesn’t dispute that Earth’s temperature is rising. He only takes issue with the contention that increasing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases – especially CO2 – drive temperature. In fact, he argues, it’s the other way around: Temperature drives atmospheric increases of CO2. As temperature rises, the partial pressure of CO2 in water will cause increasing amounts to volatilize from the oceans and enter the atmosphere. He likened this to the way heating a carbonated soft drink causes its CO2 to quickly bubble out. Plenty of people trained the in the physical sciences have read climate-science papers or digested reviews of those papers and realize that the IPCC consensus statements’ conclusions are silly, at best, and dangerous at worst, Robinson said. If the IPCC’s conclusions are used to justify regulations that limit use of fossil fuels, this will deny many people across the globe of their “human rights” to a safe and affordable fuel to propel their societies’ growth and development, he charged. When I (one of perhaps eight to 10 reporters in the audience) asked whether there were any climatologists who had signed the petition, Robinson said yes, 40 of them. Another 341 were meteorologists, and 114 were atmospheric scientists, he said. Add in environmental scientists and the total in this composite category jumps to 3,697. Some 900 were trained in computer science, math, or statistics. Roughly 9,900 were trained as engineers or in general science (whatever that means). An additional 5,690 were trained as physicists, 4,800 as chemists, and 2,923 as biochemists. Several thousand more were trained in still other fields. Of the total, roughly one-third said they held PhDs. But there’s an important caveat. There’s been no vetting of the petition’s signers to confirm that they indeed trained in the field they claimed to have had. What’s more, Robinson’s group made no attempt to find out whether people worked in the field for which they trained. So someone educated as a physical chemist or computer scientist might actually be working today as a stock broker, pianist, or taxi driver. Before asking scientists to sign the petition, Robinson’s group sent many of the individuals a packet containing the document’s wording together with a 12-page paper that he, his son, and another scientist had written. It claims to have reviewed much of the same climate literature that the IPCC did. Also in the package sent out to potential petition signers: a letter from the late Frederick Seitz, president emeritus of Rockefeller University and former president of the National Academy of Sciences. His imprimatur was likely a weighty and influential part of the package. Seitz asked recipients to carefully read Robinson’s review paper – published in, of all places – the quarterly Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons. Why in a journal for doctors? Robinson says it had no copyright objections to his distributing the paper far and wide. Because climate journals would likely have offered up such an objection, he said he wanted to wait until after the petition drive was over before he reformulated the material and submitted it for publication in one of them. Although I don’t buy Robinson’s facile castigation of the IPCC process and its conclusions, he does have a point. The consensus statements that IPCC issued don’t represent the views of all scientists. But then I, for one, never thought they did. Let’s see who else has problems with Robinson’s opus and the nonvalidated qualifications of his petition’s signatories …

A2: Warming–Defense- IPCC Flawed- Unscientific

IPCC puts pressure on participants to slant results in favor of warming

Lindzen 92 (Richard S. ,92 ,Professor of Meteorology @ MIT, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html) ET

The notion of "scientific unanimity'' is currently intimately tied to the Working Group I report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued in September 1990. That panel consists largely of scientists posted to it by government agencies. The panel has three working groups. Working Group I nominally deals with climate science. Approximately 150 scientists contributed to the report, but university representation from the United States was relatively small and is likely to remain so, since the funds and time needed for participation are not available to most university scientists. Many governments have agreed to use that report as the authoritative basis for climate policy. The report, as such, has both positive and negative features. Methodologically, the report is deeply committed to reliance on large models, and within the report models are largely verified by comparison with other models. Given that models are known to agree more with each other than with nature (even after "tuning''), that approach does not seem promising. In addition, a number of the participants have testified to the pressures placed on them to emphasize results supportive of the current scenario and to suppress other results. That pressure has frequently been effective, and a survey of participants reveals substantial disagreement with the final report. Nonetheless, the body of the report is extremely ambiguous, and the caveats are numerous. The report is prefaced by a policymakers' summary written by the editor, Sir John Houghton, director of the United Kingdom Meteorological Office. His summary largely ignores the uncertainty in the report and attempts to present the expectation of substantial warming as firmly based science. The summary was published as a separate document, and, it is safe to say that policymakers are unlikely to read anything further. On the basis of the summary, one frequently hears that "hundreds of the world's greatest climate scientists from dozens of countries all agreed that.|.|.|.'' It hardly matters what the agreement refers to, since whoever refers to the summary insists that it agrees with the most extreme scenarios (which, in all fairness, it does not). I should add that the climatology community, until the past few years, was quite small and heavily concentrated in the United States and Europe.

The IPCC is corrupt- controlled by political agendas

Novak 2k (Gary, Microbiologist, http://nov55.com/ipcc.html) ET

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is supposedly the last word on global warming. Those who promote global warming hype declare IPCC reports to be peer reviewed science, and peer reviewed science to be infallible. On that basis, critics are attacked for putting themselves above the unquestionable word of science. But the IPCC is controlled by political hacks who reshape the science for their agenda. There is no place in science for arbitrary authority—least of all a subject as complex as climate change. I'm an independent scientists, not a journalist. Alexander Cockburn is a journalist who describes the position of the critics fairly well. So I'll let him do the journalism, while I do the science. He says, "To identify either the government-funded climate modelers or their political shock troops, the IPCC's panelists, with scientific rigor and objectivity is as unrealistic as detecting the same attributes in a craniologist financed by Lombroso studying a murderer's head in a nineteenth-century prison for the criminally insane."

IPCC report isn’t scientifically credible- don’t weigh their impacts

D’Aleo 7 (Joseph, Meteorologist @ Weather Services Internatn’l Corporation, Jul 9, http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm?aid=544#) ET

Despite the 90 percent certainty that man is behind recent global warming trends, the word “uncertainty” appears 494 times in the recent “Summary for Policymakers,” produced by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Though the actual research scientists generally did a commendable job, the more alarmist interpretation was provided by a smaller cadre of agenda-driven scientists and statesmen. Then the media took the most extreme of the messages to hype them further. So what is the real story? The report’s final summaries had several failings. First, it blindly accepts a 20th-century carbon dioxide rise of 36 percent, when direct measurements(1) suggest the change is closer to 15 percent. Their models assume an annual increase of 1 percent, although over the last 50 years the long-term annual average consistently has been less than half that, 0.43 percent. Their models treat the oceans as distilled water when in reality they are an infinite buffer for atmospheric CO2. Burning all the earth’s fossil fuels would amount to no more than a 20 percent increase. It could never double(2). In any event, ice cores tell us carbon dioxide lags, not leads, the temperatures by as much as 800 years

A2: Warming- Defense- Models Bad

IPCC admits - GCMs aren’t reliable

Horack and Spencer 97

NASA Scientist, the Senior Executive Service – and Spencer - a climate change research scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville (John and Roy, “Accurate ‘Thermometers’ in Space: The State of Climate Measurement Science”, NASA: Marshall Space Flight Center, October 2nd, http://spacescience.spaceref.com/newhome/headlines/essd06oct97\_1.htm)//CNDI - GP

A computer model is only as reliable as the physics that are built into the program. The physics that are currently in these computer programs are still insufficient to have much confidence in the predicted magnitude of global warming, because we currently don't understand the detailed physical processes of clouds that will determine the extent and nature of water vapor's feedback into the Earth's temperature. And the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) agrees: *``*Feedback from the redistribution of water vapour remains a substantial uncertainty in climate models*...Much of the current debate has been addressing feedback from the tropical upper troposphere, where the feedback appears likely to be positive. However, this is not yet convincingly established;* much further evaluation of climate models with regard to observed processes is needed."

GCMs can only tell so much and are far too inaccurate to base policy off of

Michaels and Balling 2k

Prof Environmental Sciences @ U Virginia, and Prof Climatology @ ASU The Satanic Gasses Pg. 62) ET

This kind of gross calculation ‑ relating geological‑scale events such as mountain‑building to the ice ages ‑ is really about as accurate as ‑a GCM can be. As for specific predictions about the climate of a given point (see Figure 4.1 in insert), GCMs were and are largely inadequate. Even the IPCC rates its confidence in such predictions as "low." Asking GCMs how the local climate changes for relatively small changes in the atmospheric greenhouse effect (which is all that human beings could ever induce on the atmosphere compared with the 33°C [59°F] natural greenhouse effect resulting largely from planetary water vapor) is asking too much, too soon.

A2: Warming- Defense- Warming Slow

Global warming slowing – not caused by fossil fuels- no impact

Hansen 2k (James Hansen, et al, professor in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University, 8-29-2000, “ http://www.pnas.org/content/97/18/9875.full) ET

A common view is that the current global warming rate will continue or accelerate. But we argue that rapid warming in recent decades has been driven mainly by non-CO2 greenhouse gases (GHGs), such as chlorofluorocarbons, CH4, and N2O, not by the products of fossil fuel burning, CO2 and aerosols, the positive and negative climate forcings of which are partially offsetting. The growth rate of non-CO2 GHGs has declined in the past decade. If sources of CH4 and O3 precursors were reduced in the future, the change in climate forcing by non-CO2 GHGs in the next 50 years could be near zero. Combined with a reduction of black carbon emissions and plausible success in slowing CO2 emissions, this reduction of non-CO2 GHGs could lead to a decline in the rate of global warming, reducing the danger of dramatic climate change. Such a focus on air pollution has practical benefits that unite the interests of developed and developing countries. However, assessment of ongoing and future climate change requires composition-specific long-term global monitoring of aerosol properties.

No impact to climate change – the rate of warming is slowing

Science Daily May 5 (Science Daily, May 5 8, “<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/05/080502113749.htm>])ET

To date climate change projections, as published in the last IPCC report, only considered changes in future atmospheric composition. This strategy is appropriate for long-term changes in climate such as predictions for the end of the century. However, in order to predict short-term developments over the next decade, models need additional information on natural climate variations, in particular associated with ocean currents. Lack of sufficient data has hampered such predictions in the past. Scientists at IFM-GEOMAR and from the MPI for Meteorology have developed a method to derive ocean currents from measurements of sea surface temperature (SST). The latter are available in good quality and global coverage at least for the past 50 years. With this additional information, natural decadal climate variations, which are superimposed on the long-term anthropogenic warming trend, can be predicted. The improved predictions suggest that global warming will weaken slightly during the following 10 years. “Just to make things clear: we are not stating that anthropogenic climate change won’t be as bad as previously thought”, explains Prof. Mojib Latif from IFM-GEOMAR. “What we are saying is that on top of the warming trend there is a long-periodic oscillation that will probably lead to a to a lower temperature increase than we would expect from the current trend during the next years”, adds Latif. “That is like driving from the coast to a mountainous area and crossing some hills and valleys before you reach the top”, explains Dr. Johann Jungclaus from the MPI for Meteorology. “In some years trends of both phenomena, the anthropogenic climate change and the natural decadal variation will add leading to a much stronger temperature rise.”

Runaway warming impossible—oceans prevent excess warming; no impact

Junk Science 8(http://junkscience.com/Greenhouse/forcing.html) ET

Additionally, this form introduces another layer of complexity, that of oceanic absorption. Bear in mind that every 10 meters of water column is equivalent to one entire atmosphere (10 cubic meters of water has a mass of 10,000 Kg), meaning that the oceans are an enormous heat sink. There is a theory that we can not find atmospheric warming because the oceans are absorbing it and 300 atmosphere's worth of oceans make the temperature change far too small to measure. Now, we have no specific problem with the possibility that Earth's warmth is distributed through the oceans as well as the atmosphere. Our response, however, remains the same. If additional or "excess" warmth is being spread over so many more atmospheres, at least atmosphere's worth of oceans, then we are looking at as little as one-third of one percent of estimated warming to achieve equilibrium temperature with enhanced greenhouse forcing. This would make the IPCC's touted 1.5-6 °C atmospheric warming an immeasurably small 0.005-0.02 °C for a doubling of pre-Industrial atmospheric carbon dioxide -- not a particularly worrisome prospect. So, recent data acquisition fails to show warming in the top 750 meters of the oceans (equivalent to 75 atmospheres) but there is a suggestion of warming in the deep ocean (below 1,000 meters, although historic data is sparse, to say the least -- the warming of so much of the ocean would be so small from enhanced greenhouse that the figures are of little relevance here). We are providing a field for you to select ocean depth to disperse additional forcing so you can see the effect ocean absorption has. As an exercise try maxing out the atmospheric carbon dioxide at 1200 ppmv (four times pre-IR levels) and share the additional Joules through the full allowable 3,000 meters of ocean depth and see that it would take more than 100 years to raise the temperature of the system just 1 °C. If the assertions that heat is being added to the system at the claimed rate but we can not detect it because it is being "hidden" by dispersal in the oceans then again we are unconcerned -- distributing the additional heat through so many more atmospheres' worth of heat sink makes mean warming trivial.

A2: Warming- Offense- Agriculture turn

800 million people will lack food.

Chang ’08

(Jack, McClathy News Service, Jun 19, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/economics/story/41640.html) ET

These three episodes, all on Thursday, are interconnecting pieces of what's emerged as one of the biggest challenges facing the planet: how to feed humanity in this age of skyrocketing food and energy prices. The problem is a global one, in which a breakdown anywhere in the food chain sets dire consequences in motion and in which the root causes range from rising consumption in Asia to growing biofuel production in the United States and Europe to dwindling supplies of water in the Middle East. "The world is running now to keep up with demand," said Abdolreza Abbassian, a grain analyst with the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. "Any interruption in the global picture affects supplies." Already, some 800 million people around the world suffer from chronic food shortages, and millions more could go hungry because of the widening food crisis.

C02 is the lifeblood of plants – it increases their water use efficiency, enhances stomatas, allows for plants and animals to live in uninhabitable places, prevents soil erosion, solves all sorts of environmental stress, and solves worldwide starvation

Idso, Idso, and Idso 3 (Sherwood Idso, Keith Idso, and Craig Idso] [*C02 science magazine Volume 6, Number 3*7 9/10/03) ET

In a broad review of the scientific literature, [Idso (2001)](http://www.co2science.org/edit/v4_edit/v4n50edit.htm) describes a number of biological consequences of elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations.  The best known of these important impacts is probably CO2's *aerial fertilization effect*, which works its wonders on plants that utilize all three of the major biochemical pathways of photosynthesis (C3, C4 and CAM).  In the case of herbaceous plants, this phenomenon typically boosts their productivities by about a third in response to a 300 ppm increase in the air's CO2 content, while it enhances the growth of woody plants by 50% or more (see our website's [Plant Growth Data](http://www.co2science.org/co2tables/plantgrowth.htm) section). Next comes plant water use efficiency, which may be defined as the amount of organic matter produced per unit of water transpired to the atmosphere.  This parameter is directly enhanced by the aerial fertilization effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment, as well as by its anti-transpirant effect, which is produced by CO2-induced decreases in the number density and degree of openness of leaf stomatal apertures that occur at higher atmospheric CO2 concentrations.  Here, too, CO2-induced percentage increases as large as, or even larger than, those exhibited by plant productivity are commonplace. One of the important ramifications of this CO2-induced increase in plant water use efficiency is the fact that it enables plants to grow and reproduce in areas that were previously too dry for them.  With consequent increases in ground cover in these regions, the adverse effects of wind- and water-induced soil erosion are also reduced.  Hence, there is a tendency for desertification to be reversed and for vast tracts of previously unproductive land to become supportive of more abundant animal life, both above- and below-ground, in what could appropriately be called a "greening of the earth." In addition to helping vegetation overcome the stress of limited water supplies, elevated levels of atmospheric CO2 help plants to better cope with other environmental stresses, such as low soil fertility, low light intensity, high soil and water salinity, high air temperature, various oxidative stresses and the stress of herbivory.  When confronted with the specter of global warming, for example, many experiments have revealed that concomitant enrichment of the air with CO2 tends to increase the temperature at which plants function at their optimum, often making them even better suited to the warmer environment than they were to the cooler environment to which they were originally adapted.  Under the most stressful of such conditions, in fact, extra CO2 sometimes is the deciding factor in determining whether a plant lives or dies. These benefits of atmospheric CO2 enrichment apply to both agricultural and natural ecosystems; and as Wittwer (1995) has noted, "the rising level of atmospheric CO2 could be the one global natural resource that is progressively increasing food production and total biological output in a world of otherwise diminishing natural resources of land, water, energy, minerals, and fertilizer."  This phenomenon is thus a means, he says, "of inadvertently increasing the productivity of farming systems and other photosynthetically active ecosystems," and that "the effects know no boundaries and both developing and developed countries are, and will be, sharing equally."

A2: Warming- Offense- Agriculture I/Ls

CO2 boost crop yields – the CO2 effect outstrips the warming effect.

Idso, Idso, & Idso ’03

(Sherwood, Craig, and Keith, President, Chairman, and Vice president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change and climatologists, http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/150.pdf) ET

Proponents of what we shall call the CO2-induced global warming extinction Hypothesis seem to be totally unaware of the fact that atmospheric CO2enrichment tends to ameliorate the deleterious effects of rising temperatures on earth’s vegetation. They appear not to know that more CO2in the air enables plants to grow better at nearly all temperatures, but especially at higher temperatures. They feign ignorance of the knowledge (or truly do not know) that elevated CO2 boosts the optimum temperature at which plants grow best, and that it raises the upper-limiting temperature above which they experience death, making them much more resistant to heat stress. The end result of these facts is that if the atmosphere’s temperature and CO2 concentration rise together, plants are able to successfully adapt to the rising temperature, and they experience no ill effects of the warming. Under such conditions, plants living near the heat-limited boundaries of their ranges do not experience an impetus to migrate poleward or upward towards cooler regions of the globe. At the other end of the temperature spectrum, however, plants living near the cold-limited boundaries of their ranges are empowered to extend their ranges into areas where the temperature was previously too low for them to survive. And as they move into those once-forbidden areas, they actually expand their ranges, overlapping the similarly expanding ranges of other plants and thereby increasing local plant biodiversity.

Even rapid warming doesn’t outweigh the CO2 fertilization effect.

Idso, Idso, & Idso ’03

(Sherwood, Craig, and Keith, President, Chairman, and Vice president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change and climatologists, http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/150.pdf) ET

So what could we logically expect to happen to the biosphere in a world of both rising air temperature and atmospheric CO2 concentration? We could expect that earth’s plants would extend the current cold-limited boundaries of their ranges both poleward in latitude and upward in elevation, but that the heat-limited boundaries of the vast majority of them would remain pretty much as they are now, i.e., unchanged. Hence, the sizes of the ranges occupied by most of earth’s plants would increase. We additionally hypothesize that many of the animals that depend upon those plants for food and shelter would exhibit analogous behavior. Hence, with respect to both plants and animals, we would anticipate that nearly everywhere on earth, local biodiversity or species richness would increase in a world of rising air temperature and atmospheric CO2 concentration, as the expanding ranges of the planet’s plants and animals overlapped those of their neighbors to an ever-increasing degree. The implications of these observations are clear: if the planet continues to warm, even at what climate alarmists call “unprecedented rates,” we need not worry about earth’s plants and animals being unable to migrate to cooler regions of the globe fast enough to avoid extinction, as long as the air’s CO2content continues to rise at its current rate. So obvious is this conclusion, in fact, that Cowling (1999) has bluntly stated that “maybe we should be less concerned about rising CO2 and rising temperatures and more worried about the possibility that future atmospheric CO2 will suddenly stop increasing, while global temperatures continue rising.”

Carbon dioxide increases crop yields enough to solve the food shortage.

Budyko ’96

[Mikhail, founder of physical climatology, *Adapting to Climate Change*, p. 24]

The current CO2 concentration increase of 25% of its preindustrial value has already resulted in a noticeable increase in total bioproductivity, particularly of crops. Data show that productivity may increase by as much as 5% solely because of the effect of increases CO2. Thus, an increase in CO2 concentration can provide food for about 250 million people. If the CO2 concentration doubles compared with the preindustrial epoch and carbon fuel consumption is no restricted, crop productivity may increase sufficiently to provide food for an additional 1 billion people. Quantitatively assessing the effect of climate change is more difficult. An additional global increase in crop yield due to increased precipitation and temperature may be comparable with a crop yield increase due to the direct effect of increased CO2 concentration. If progress in agrotechnology leads to a total crop yield increase of 60% over the next 50 years, an increased CO2 concentration would help to provide approximately 2 billion people with food in 2025-2050.

A2: Warming- Offense- Crop Yield

Increasing CO2 is necessary to grow adequate amounts of food for the expanding global population – absent CO2 increase “wild nature” goes extinct.

Idso, Idso, and Idso 8( Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change. Keith E. Idso is Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, 5-28-08, http://co2science.org/articles/V11/N22/EDIT.php// ) ET

For comparative purposes, the researchers had also included one C3 species in their study -- Hordeum spontaneum K. Koch -- and they report that it "showed a near-doubling in biomass compared with [the] 40% increase in the C4 species under growth treatments equivalent to the postglacial CO2 rise." In light of these several findings, it can be appreciated that the civilizations of the past, which could not have existed without agriculture, were largely made possible by the increase in the air's CO2 content that accompanied deglaciation, and that the peoples of the earth today are likewise indebted to this phenomenon, as well as the additional 100 ppm of CO2 the atmosphere has subsequently acquired. With an eye to the future, we have long contended that the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content will similarly play a pivotal role in enabling us to grow the food we will need to sustain our still-expanding global population in the year 2050 without usurping all of the planet's remaining freshwater resources and much of its untapped arable land, which latter actions would likely lead to our driving most of what yet remains of "wild nature" to extinction. Rising CO2 has served both us and the rest of the biosphere well in the past; and it will do the same in the future ... unless we turn and fight against it.

Decrease in crops yields cause resource wars, mass starvation, atrocity, and World War III.

Calvin 98 (William H.- Theoretical Nuerophysicist @ U of WA, 1/98The Atlantic Monthly 281:47-64)ET

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields will cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands — if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, will go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries will attempt to use their armies, before they fall apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This will be a worldwide problem — and could easily lead to a Third World War — but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic. There is another part of the world with the same good soil, within the same latitudinal band, which we can use for a quick comparison. Canada lacks Europe's winter warmth and rainfall, because it has no equivalent of the North Atlantic Current to preheat its eastbound weather systems. Canada's agriculture supports about 28 million people. If Europe had weather like Canada's, it could feed only one out of twenty-three present-day Europeans. Any abrupt switch in climate would also disrupt food-supply routes. The only reason that two percent of our population can feed the other 98 percent is that we have a well-developed system of transportation and middlemen — but it is not very robust. The system allows for large urban populations in the best of times, but not in the case of widespread disruptions. Natural disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes are less troubling than abrupt coolings for two reasons: they're short (the recovery period starts the next day) and they're local or regional (unaffected citizens can help the overwhelmed). There is, increasingly, international cooperation in response to catastrophe — but no country is going to be able to rely on a stored agricultural surplus for even a year, and any country will be reluctant to give away part of its surplus. In an abrupt cooling the problem would get worse for decades, and much of the earth would be affected. A meteor strike that killed most of the population in a month would not be as serious as an abrupt cooling that eventually killed just as many. With the population crash spread out over a decade, there would be ample opportunity for civilization's institutions to be torn apart and for hatreds to build, as armies tried to grab remaining resources simply to feed the people in their own countries. The effects of an abrupt cold last for centuries. They might not be the end of Homo sapiens — written knowledge and elementary education might well endure — but the world after such a population crash would certainly be full of despotic governments that hated their neighbors because of recent atrocities. Recovery would be very slow. A slightly exaggerated version of our present know-something-do-nothing state of affairs is know-nothing-do-nothing: a reduction in science-as-usual, further limiting our chances of discovering a way out. History is full of withdrawals from knowledge-seeking, whether for reasons of fundamentalism, fatalism, or "government lite" economics. This scenario does not require that the shortsighted be in charge, only that they have enough influence to put the relevant science agencies on starvation budgets and to send recommendations back for yet another commission report due five years hence.

A2: Warming- Offense- Crop Yield Key I/L

Warming good- CO2 can double international crop yields while counter acting the negative effects of pollutants

CO2 science magazine 1

Staff writer, October 2001, [“Anthropogenic CO2 Emissions Could Dramatically Increase Agricultural Production by Thwarting the Adverse Effects of Ozone Pollution, [www.co2science.org/edit/v4\_edit/v4n43edit.htm](http://www.co2science.org/edit/v4_edit/v4n43edit.htm) // e.berggren]

In a recent study of the effects of ozone pollution in the Punjab region of Pakistan, Wahid et al. (2001) periodically applied a powerful ozone protectant to soybean plants growing in three different locations in the general vicinity of the city of Lahore - a suburban site, a remote rural site, and a rural roadside site - throughout two different growing seasons (one immediately post-monsoon and one the following spring or pre-monsoon). The results were truly astounding. At the suburban site, application of the ozone protectant increased the weight of seeds produced per plant by 47% in the post-monsoon season and by 113% in the pre-monsoon season. At the remote rural site, the corresponding yield increases were 94% and 182%; and at the rural roadside site, they were 170% and 285%. Averaged across all three sites and both seasons of the year, the mean increase in yield caused by countering the deleterious effects of this one major air pollutant was nearly 150%. Due to their somewhat surprising finding that "the impacts of ozone on the yield of soybean are larger in the rural areas around Lahore than in suburban areas of the city," the authors concluded "there may be substantial impacts of oxidants on crop yield across large areas of the Punjab." In addition, they noted that earlier studies had revealed similar large ozone-induced losses in the productivity of local cultivars of wheat and rice. Hence, it is clear that whatever could be done to reduce these massive crop losses - or, ideally, eliminate them altogether - would be a godsend to the people of Pakistan and the inhabitants of many other areas of the globe. Fortunately, such a savior is silently working its wonders throughout the entire world. That of which we speak, of course, is the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content, which counteracts the negative effects of ozone - and those of many other air pollutants (Allen, 1990; Idso and Idso, 1994) - by restricting the noxious molecule's entry into plant leaves via induced reduction of leaf stomatal apertures (Reid and Fiscus, 1998), and by ameliorating its adverse biochemical activities when it does penetrate vegetative tissues (Reid et al., 1998). In a number of studies of these beneficial consequences of atmospheric CO2 enrichment for the crop studied by Wahid et al., i.e., soybeans, it has been found that a nominal doubling of the air's CO2 concentration is sufficient to greatly reduce - and in some cases completely eliminate - the yield-reducing effects of ozone pollution (Heagle et al., 1998a and 1998b; Miller et al., 1998; Reid and Fiscus, 1998; Reid et al., 1998). The same conclusion follows from the results of several studies that have looked at wheat in this regard (Heagle et al., 2000; McKee et al., 2000; Pleijel et al., 2000; Tiedemann and Firsching, 2000). In fact, the work of Volin et al. (1998) suggests that these CO2-induced benefits will likely be experienced by all plants. As the researchers directly state in the title of their paper: "species respond similarly regardless of photosynthetic pathway or plant functional group." Think about the implications of these findings. A doubling of the air's CO2 content could well double agricultural production in many areas of the world by merely eliminating the adverse effects of but one air pollutant, i.e., ozone. Then, consider the fact that by the mid-point of the current century, we will likely face a food production crisis of unimaginable proportions (see our Editorials of 21 February 2001 and 13 June 2001). Finally, ask yourself what the Precautionary Principle has to say about this state of affairs (see our Editorial of 4 July 2001). We conducted such an exercise in our review of the paper of Hudak et al. (1999), concluding that perhaps our new mantra should be: Free the Biosphere! Let the air's CO2 content rise. And we still feel that way. CO2 is the elixir of life. It is one of the primary raw materials - the other being water - out of which plants construct their tissues; and it is essential to their existence and our existence. Without more of it in the air, our species - as well as most of the rest of the planet's animal life - will not survive the 21st century intact. The biosphere will continue to exist, but not as we know it; for most of its wild diversity of life will have been extinguished by mankind's mad rush to appropriate ever more land and water to grow the food required to feed itself (Tilman et al., 2001).

A2: Warming- Offense- Crop Yield I/L

CO2 enrichment stimulates crop growth and makes them more easily sustainable

Idso 7 (Sherwood, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change. Previously he was a Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service and recipiant of The Authur S. Flemming award for innovative research, 9-5-07, http://co2science.org/articles/V10/N36/B1.php //) ET

The authors used "the A2 (medium-high GHG emission pathway) and B2 (medium-low) climate change scenarios produced by the Regional Climate Model PRECIS, the crop model CERES, and socio-economic scenarios described by IPCC SRES, to simulate the average yield changes per hectare of three main grain crops (rice, wheat, and maize) at 50 km x 50 km scale" for the entire country of China. What was learned: The four researchers from the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture of the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences in Beijing report finding that "the yield per hectare for the three crops would fall consistently as temperature rises beyond 2.5°C." However, they also found that "when the CO2 fertilization effect was included in the simulation, there were no adverse impacts [our italics] on China's food production under the projected range of temperature rise (0.9-3.9°C)." What it means: if air temperatures continue to rise throughout the next few decades - for whatever reason - it would appear to be imperative that the air's CO2 concentration continue to rise right along with them; for only under such conditions will China, as well as most of the rest of the nations of the world, be able to adequately feed the larger numbers of people that will reside within their boundaries just a few decades hence, without usurping unconscionable amounts of land and freshwater resources from what could be called wild nature, which actions would inevitably lead to the extinctions of innumerable species of both plants and animals.

A2: Warming- Offense- Drought Resistant Crops

CO2 enables plants to grow faster and larger and live in drier climates – with out more CO2 the earth will be in jeopardy

Solomon 8 (Solomon, executive director of Energy Probe and author of The Deniers and other multiple peer reviewed science journals, 6-7-8) ET

Why the increase? Their 2004 study, and other more recent studies, point to the warming of the planet and the presence of CO2, a gas indispensable to plant life. CO2 is nature's fertilizer, bathing the biota with its life-giving nutrients. Plants take the carbon from CO2 to bulk themselves up -- carbon is the building block of life -- and release the oxygen, which along with the plants, then sustain animal life. As summarized in a report last month, released along with a petition signed by 32,000 U. S. scientists who vouched for the benefits of CO2: "Higher CO2 enables plants to grow faster and larger and to live in drier climates. Plants provide food for animals, which are thereby also enhanced. The extent and diversity of plant and animal life have both increased substantially during the past half-century." Lush as the planet may now be, it is as nothing compared to earlier times, when levels of CO2 and Earth temperatures were far higher. In the age of the dinosaur, for example, CO2 levels may have been five to 10 times higher than today, spurring a luxuriantly fertile planet whose plant life sated the immense animals of that era. Planet Earth is also much cooler today than during the hothouse era of the dinosaur, and cooler than it was 1,000 years ago during the Medieval Warming Period, when the Vikings colonized a verdant Greenland. Greenland lost its colonies and its farmland during the Little Ice Age that followed, and only recently started to become green again. This blossoming Earth could now be in jeopardy, for reasons both natural and man-made. According to a growing number of scientists, the period of global warming that we have experienced over the past few centuries as Earth climbed out of the Little Ice Age is about to end. The oceans, which have been releasing their vast store of carbon dioxide as the planet has warmed -- CO2 is released from oceans as they warm and dissolves in them when they cool -- will start to take the carbon dioxide back. With less heat and less carbon dioxide, the planet could become less hospitable and less green, especially in areas such as Canada's Boreal forests, which have been major beneficiaries of the increase in GPP and NPP.

Billions will starve without more food

Jerusalem Post 1 (*Jerusalem Post*, no author available, 11/15/01)

Klaus Toepfer, Executive Director of UNEP, said: "Billions of people across the tropics depend on crops such as rice, maize and wheat for their very survival. These new findings indicate that large numbers are facing acute hunger and malnutrition unless the world acts to keep emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases." "The population of Asia is expected to increase by 44 percent in the next 50 years and yields must at least match that growth rate if famine is to be avoided. Currently more than half the people in South East Asia have a calorie intake that is inadequate for an active life, and ten million children die annually from diseases related to malnutrition.

A2: Warming- Offense- Drought Resistant Crops

Data shows that warming increases drought resistance- solves shortages

Idso 2( Sherwood Idso , Pres. Center for Study of CO2 and Global Change, 7-31-02, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V5/N31/EDIT.php> ) ET

In discussing these several observations, Kimball et al. note that "growth stimulations were as large or larger under water-stress compared to well-watered conditions." They also note that "roots were generally stimulated more than shoots," and that "woody perennials had larger growth responses to elevated CO2, while at the same time their reductions in stomatal conductance were smaller." Also, although "growth stimulations of non-legumes were reduced at low-soil nitrogen," they note that "elevated CO2 strongly stimulated the growth of the clover legume both at ample and under low nitrogen conditions." All of the above observations are consistent with what has been observed in other types of CO2 enrichment experiments over the years, with one significant exception. The CO2-induced decreases in stomatal conductance observed in the FACE studies are about 50% greater than those observed in prior non-FACE experiments, which suggests that the water use efficiency of these particular crops - and perhaps other plants as well - may be increased considerably more by the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content (perhaps by as much as 50% more) than what had previously been thought likely. In conclusion, we can safely say that the wealth of FACE data that has been obtained since 1989 has only served to strengthen our positive view of the historical and still-ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content. Earth's biosphere, of which we are an integral part, has already benefited immensely from the 100-ppm increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration brought to us as an unanticipated consequence of the Industrial Revolution; and we and all of nature will benefit still more from increases yet to come.

Food shortages cause extinction.

Plumb ’08(George, Environmental Activist, may 18, http://www.timesargus.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080518/FEATURES05/805180310/1014/FEATURES05) ET

Once again the world's food situation is bleak. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the price of wheat is more than 80 percent higher than a year ago, and corn prices are up by 25 percent. Global cereal stocks have fallen to their lowest level since 1982. Prices have gone so high that the United Nations World Food Program, which aims to feed 73 million people this year, reported it might have to reduce rations or the number of people it will help. Food riots are happening in many countries and threaten to bring down some countries as starving people demand better from their government. However, this time the problem will not be so easy to solve. There are some 75 million more people to feed each year! Consumption of meat and other high-quality foods — mainly in China and India — has boosted demand for grain for animal feed. Poor harvests due to bad weather in this country and elsewhere have contributed. High energy prices are adding to the pressures as some arable land is converted from growing food crops to biofuel crops and making it more expensive to ship the food that is produced. According to Lester Brown, president of the World Policy Institute, "This troubling situation is unlike any the world has faced before. The challenge is not simply to deal with a temporary rise in grain prices, as in the past, but rather to quickly alter those trends whose cumulative effects collectively threaten the food security that is a hallmark of civilization. If food security cannot be restored quickly, social unrest and political instability will spread and the number of failing states will likely increase dramatically, threatening the very stability of civilization itself."

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices

CO2 increase agricultural production – fertalizes plants, lengthens growing seasons, and increases precipitaion – decreasing food prices

Moore 2k

(Thomas Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution/ Standford University, 9-8-00,<http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/ClEffects.pdf> //e.berggren) ET

In many parts of the world, warmer weather should mean longer growing seasons. Should the world warm, the hotter climate would enhance evaporation from the seas and lead probably to more precipitation worldwide. Moreover, the enrichment of the atmosphere with CO2 would fertilize plants and make for more vigorous growth. Agricultural economists studying the relationship of higher temperatures and additional CO2 to crop yields in Canada, Australia, Japan, northern Russia, Finland, and Iceland found not only that a warmer climate would push up yields but also that the added boost from enriched CO2 fertilization would enhance output by 15 percent (NCPO 1989). The United States Department of Agriculture in a cautious report reviewed the likely influence of global warming and concluded that the overall effect on world food production would be slightly positive and that agricultural prices would be likely to decrease.

Blips in food prices kill billions

Tampa Tribune 96 (*Tampa tribune,* 1-20-1996) ET

On a global scale, food supplies - measured by stockpiles of grain - are not abundant. In 1995, world production failed to meet demand for the third consecutive year, said Per Pinstrup-Andersen, director of the International Food Policy Research Institute in Washington, D.C. As a result, grain stockpiles fell from an average of 17 percent of annual consumption in 1994-1995 to 13 percent at the end of the 1995-1996 season, he said. That's troubling, Pinstrup-Andersen noted, since 13 percent is well below the 17 percent the United Nations considers essential to provide a margin of safety in world food security. During the food crisis of the early 1970s, world grain stocks were at 15 percent. "Even if they are merely blips, higher international prices can hurt poor countries that import a significant portion of their food," he said. "Rising prices can also quickly put food out of reach of the 1.1 billion people in the developing world who live on a dollar a day or less." He also said many people in low-income countries already spend more than half of their income on food.

High food prices kills billions

Brown 97 (Lester- founder of the Worldwatch Institute and founder and president of the Earth Policy Institute, 1997 , *State of the World* 1997, p. 43) ET

On the demand side, there will also be adjustments. The supply and demand of grain always balance in the marketplace, even in times of scarcity, but at a much higher price. The key question is, what will be the social and economic effects of these price rises? Those most affected obviously will be the poorer segments of the world population, specifically the 1.2 billion people who now live on $1 a day. For these individuals who spend 70 cents of that dollar just for a minimal subsistence-level diet, a doubling of grain prices could quickly become life-threatening.

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices 🡪 Economy

High food prices will cause economic instability and state collapse.

CNN 8 [CNN, Apr 14 -8, <http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/americas/04/14/world.food.crisis /) ET

Riots from Haiti to Bangladesh to Egypt over the soaring costs of basic foods have brought the issue to a boiling point and catapulted it to the forefront of the world's attention, the head of an agency focused on global development said Monday. This is the world's big story," said Jeffrey Sachs, director of Columbia University's Earth Institute. "The finance ministers were in shock, almost in panic this weekend," he said on CNN's "American Morning," in a reference to top economic officials who gathered in Washington. "There are riots all over the world in the poor countries ... and, of course, our own poor are feeling it in the United States." World Bank President Robert Zoellick has said the surging costs could mean "seven lost years" in the fight against worldwide poverty. "While many are worrying about filling their gas tanks, many others around the world are struggling to fill their stomachs, and it is getting more and more difficult every day," Zoellick said late last week in a speech opening meetings with finance ministers. "The international community must fill the at least $500 million food gap identified by the U.N.'s World Food Programme to meet emergency needs," he said. "Governments should be able to come up with this assistance and come up with it now." The White House announced Monday evening that an estimated $200 million in emergency food aid would be made available through the U.S. Agency for International Development. "This additional food aid will address the impact of rising commodity prices on U.S. emergency food aid programs, and be used to meet unanticipated food aid needs in Africa and elsewhere," the White House said in a news release. "In just two months," Zoellick said in his speech, "rice prices have skyrocketed to near historical levels, rising by around 75 percent globally and more in some markets, with more likely to come. In Bangladesh, a 2-kilogram bag of rice ... now consumes about half of the daily income of a poor family." The price of wheat has jumped 120 percent in the past year, he said -- meaning that the price of a loaf of bread has more than doubled in places where the poor spend as much as 75 percent of their income on food. "This is not just about meals forgone today or about increasing social unrest. This is about lost learning potential for children and adults in the future, stunted intellectual and physical growth," Zoellick said. Dominique Strauss-Kahn, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, also spoke at the joint IMF-World Bank spring meeting. "If food prices go on as they are today, then the consequences on the population in a large set of countries ... will be terrible," he said. He added that "disruptions may occur in the economic environment ... so that at the end of the day most governments, having done well during the last five or 10 years, will see what they have done totally destroyed, and their legitimacy facing the population destroyed also."

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security

And, food security given by Co2 outweighs bad impacts

Wittwer 92 (Sylvan H., Professor of Horticulture at Michigan State University, Fall, Issue 62, Policy Review) ET

For the present, the direct effects of an increasing atmospheric CO2 on food production and the outputs of rangelands and forests are much more important than any effects thus far manifest for climate. A recent review of over 1,000 individual experiments with 475 plant crop varieties, published in 342 peer-reviewed scientif­ic journals and authored by 454 scientists in 29 countries, has shown an average growth enhancement of 52% with a doubling of the cur­rent level of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Yet some scientists, especially those with ecological orientations, take delight in glamorizing, along with a sympathetic press, the few exceptions which, in turn, become widely quoted in the sci­entific literature. These include tussock arctic tundra; some grasslands where undesirable species may, under restricted conditions, outgrow the more desirable; and in some ecosystems where competition among species may create a lack of balance. (See "Rising Carbon Dioxide Is Great for Plants," CR, December 1992.) Globally, it is estimated the overall crop productivity has been already increased by 10% because of CO2 and may account for much of what has been attributed to the Green Revolu­tion. Meanwhile, changes in climate in specific fields where crops actually grow and are culti­vated remain defiantly uncertain. Conversely, the effects of an enriched CO2 atmosphere on crop productivity in large measure are positive and leave little doubt as to the benefits for glob­al food security. With this note, it is a sad commentary that most of the current and modern textbooks on plant nutrition omit, inadvertently or otherwise, any mention of the role of carbon dioxide as a fertilizer or essential nutrient. This was true 35 years ago and remains so to this day. Textbooks still ignore the fact that different levels of CO2 may have pronounced effects on plant growth and may interrelate and complement various levels of other nutrients applied to crops in the rooting media. The complementary effects are also manifest with respect to water require­ments and positive interrelations with tempera­ture, light, and other atmospheric constraints. (See -"Environmental 'Science' In The Class­room," CR, April 1997.) Today, in the greenhouses of the Westlands of Holland, where the first use of elevated levels of greenhouse carbon dioxide for enrichment of food crops occurred 40 years ago, there are glass green houses covering over 10,000 hectares. These are all enriched with atmospheric levels of 1,000 ppm of CO2 during daylight hours. This practice is fol­lowed during the entire year when crops are pro­duced. Increases of marketable yields of tomatoes, cucumbers, sweet peppers, eggplant, and orna­mentals range between 20% to 40% with an annu­al return of $3 billion. There is currently a blind spot in the political and informational systems of the world. This is accompanied by a corruption of the underlying biological and physical sciences. It should be con­sidered good fortune that we are living in a world of gradually increasing levels of atmospheric CO2. The satellite data on global temperature changes are now in. There has been no appreciable warm­ing. Accordingly, the rising level of atmospheric CO2 does not make the United States the world's worst polluter. It is the world's greatest benefac­tor. Unlike other natural resources (land, water, energy) essential for food production, which are costly and progressively in shorter supply, the ris­ing level of atmospheric CO2, is a universally free premium gaining in magnitude with time on which we can all reckon for the future. The effects of the increasing atmospheric level of CO2 on photosynthetic capacity for the enhancement of food production and the output of rangelands and forests, appear far more important than any detectable change in climate. Elevated levels of atmospheric CO2 also provide a cost-free environment for the conservation of water which is rapidly becoming another of the world's most limiting natural resources, the majority of which is now used for crop irrigation.

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security Extra Impacts

Food insecurity causes 18000 deaths a day

Magdoff 8 (Fred, Professor emeritus of plant and soil science @ U of Vermont,8 *The World Food Crisis Sources and Solutions, Monthly Review*,http://www.monthlyreview.org/080501magdoff.php) ET

Of the more than 6 billion people living in the world today, the United Nations estimates that close to 1 billion suffer from chronic hunger. But this number, which is only a crude estimate, leaves out those suffering from vitamin and nutrient deficiencies and other forms of malnutrition. The total number of food insecure people who are malnourished or lacking critical nutrients is probably closer to 3 billion—about half of humanity. The severity of this situation is made clear by the United Nations estimate of over a year ago that approximately 18,000 children die daily as a direct or indirect consequence of malnutrition (Associated Press, February 18, 200

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Stress Scenario

Food shortages coming now

Sydney Morning Herald 8

[Jun 20, “Food shortages curb global appetite for free trade,” http://business.smh.com.au/food-shortages-curb-global-appetite-for-free-trade-20080620-2trb.html]

Global food prices have spiked 60% since the beginning of 2007, sparking riots in more than 30 countries that depend on imported food, including Cameroon and Egypt. The surge in prices threatens to push the number of malnourished people in the world from 860 million to almost 1 billion, according to the World Food Programme in Rome. Leaders of developing nations including the Philippines, Gambia and El Salvador now say the only way to nourish their people is to grow more food themselves rather than rely on cheap imports. The backlash may sink global trade talks, reduce the almost $US1 trillion ($A1 trillion) in annual food trade and lead to the return of high agricultural tariffs and subsidies around the world.

Co2 good- without it Overpopulation means water and food stress is inevitable- global starvation and war

Center for Science and Public Policy, 6

(Jan 12, http://ff.org/centers/csspp/library/co2weekly/20060112/20060112\_02.html) ET

Wallace (2000) illustrates the source and magnitude of the problem by noting that the projected increase in the number of people who will join our ranks in the coming half-century (a median best-guess of 3.7 billion) is more sure of occurring than is any other environmental change currently underway or looming on the horizon; and these extra people will need a whopping amount of extra food that will take an equally whopping amount of extra water to produce, the problem being that *there is no extra water*. "Over the entire globe," therefore, says Wallace, "a staggering 67% of the future population of the world may experience some water stress," which translates into food insufficiency; and food insufficiency means malnutrition and, in the most extreme cases, starvation and war. So what's the solution? There's only one answer, according to Wallace. We must produce much more food per unit of available water, which leads to the most important question of all. How can it be done? Wallace suggests we must greatly augment water conservation measures wherever possible and implement every conceivable efficiency-enhancing procedure in irrigated and rain fed agriculture. Second, we must do everything we can, as he says, "to fix more carbon per unit of water transpired." That is, we must strive to dramatically increase plant water use efficiency. Human ingenuity will surely enable great strides to be made in all of these areas over the coming decades. But will the improvements be large enough? At the present time, no one can answer this question with any confidence. In fact, pessimism permeates most thinking on the subject; for as Wallace correctly reports, "the global scientific community is not currently giving this area sufficient attention." So where is our attention currently focused? Unfortunately, it is focused on reducing anthropogenic CO2 emissions to the atmosphere, which is truly lamentable; for the continuation of those emissions is, ironically, our only real hope for averting the near-certain future global food and water shortfalls that are destined to occur if the Kyoto Protocol Crowd gets its way with the world. But how would allowing anthropogenic CO2 emissions to take their natural course help to ameliorate future thirst as well as hunger? The answer resides in the fact that elevated levels of atmospheric CO2 tend to reduce plant transpiration while simultaneously enhancing plant photosynthesis, which two phenomena acting together enable earth's crops to produce more food per unit of water used in the process. Literally thousands of laboratory and field experiments - and that is no exaggeration - have verified this fact beyond any doubt whatsoever. Indeed, this atmospheric CO2-induced blessing is as sure as death and taxes, and as dependable as a mother's love. But what do climate-alarmist ideologues do about it? They spurn it. They deny it. They even try to make people believe the opposite (see our Editorial 13 Dec 2000). And they do it to the detriment of all mankind. Arial fertilization of C02 both reduces plant transpiration and increases photosynthesis, making plants more efficient and solving for water wars.