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Energy Reform 1NC

Energy reform will pass—Obama push and momentum

Ferrechio 6/21(Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, 2010, <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/congress/Dems-ready-for-big-push-on-global-warming-96759054.html>) LL

Democratic leaders are pushing legislation aimed at fighting global warming, despite significant opposition in both parties to any proposal that puts a price or a cap on carbon emissions. Sen. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., told CNN's "State of the Union" he believes there are 50 senators who would vote for a compromise bill that would require the energy utilities to pay for carbon pollution and an additional 20 who are undecided. "You have got to get to 60 to pass anything in the Senate," Lieberman said. "We need half of the undecided, and we can do it." Momentum for passing such a bill has increased, Lieberman said, now that President Obama has made energy and climate legislation a priority in the wake of the Gulf oil spill disaster. Obama will hold a meeting with lawmakers from both parties Wednesday to discuss the next steps in passing an energy and climate change bill. "I think we have got a fighting chance at this," said Lieberman, who will attend the meeting. Obama didn't call for limiting carbon emissions when he talked about energy reform legislation in his Oval Office address last week, but his chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, said on ABC's "This Week" that Obama wants a bill that "deals fundamentally with the environmental degradation that happens from carbon pollution." Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., is weighing a number of energy reform proposals, including a plan by Lieberman and Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., that calls for the government to sell permits for companies to emit carbon dioxide, the so-called "cap and trade" policy, though Democrats have stopped using the term because it proved unpopular. One proposal gaining support, by Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind., calls for higher efficiency standards for cars and buildings and more domestic energy production but does not set a mandatory reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

Energy Reform 1NC

Republicans oppose ANY call for military withdrawal, de-railing energy reform

Kagan ‘10 (Robert, March 5, Senior associate@Carnegie Endowment, “On Foreign Policy, Obama and the GOP Find Room for Agreement”, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40298)

Perfect bipartisanship on foreign and defense policy is a lot to ask in an election year, and Republicans have a right, even an obligation, to be critical of policies they regard as dangerous. But there is more agreement today than usual. Never mind the divisive decades of the Bush and Clinton administrations. Democrats who look back fondly to the days of George H.W. Bush forget that they voted overwhelmingly against the Persian Gulf War and attacked that administration for paying too much attention to foreign policy. Today, by contrast, the administration and opposition largely agree on some of the most pressing issues. By historical standards, foreign policy is one area where the government is working. How to explain the surprising comity? Partly it is because the Democrats have changed in power. Being in opposition for many years tends to breed irresponsibility, as both parties have shown over the past two decades. Obama's team took office assuming that it should do the opposite of whatever Bush did or said, and the policy of "un-Bush" dominated the first months, just as "un-Clinton" shaped the early Bush years. But "un-" policies are no substitute for serious thinking. On most issues the Obama administration is now pursuing approaches closer to those of both Clinton and Bush than those favored by the virulently anti-Bush partisans. This is not surprising, since neither American interests nor the interests of other nations change with the American electoral cycle. There are larger forces at work, too, above all Sept. 11's lingering effects on the American psyche. Obama officials at first celebrated their abandonment of the "war on terror," seeing it as a Bush-era mistake and, rhetorically at least, placed more emphasis on righting legal wrongs done to captured terrorism suspects than on stopping terrorist attacks. The irony is that Obama has been fighting the war on terror at least as vigorously as his predecessor. He escalated the war in Afghanistan and greatly increased drone attacks on suspected terrorists in Pakistan. The fact is, no president can allow himself to be perceived as trading any degree of American security to better protect the rights of suspected terrorists. Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt countenanced far more egregious violations of individual rights when security interests were perceived to be at stake. It was predictable that whatever Candidate Obama promised, President Obama would be compelled to take a tough line on terrorism. So Guantanamo remains open and may stay open for the remainder of Obama's presidency. Khalid Sheik Mohammed will probably not be tried in New York. After the Christmas Day bomber was taken into custody, more people have been put on watch lists. The USA Patriot Act has been renewed. Obama has probably learned not to provide Republicans new opportunities to exploit his weakness in these areas. For Republicans, meanwhile, the ongoing effect of Sept. 11 has been to check isolationist tendencies that have periodically flared in the party since the 1920s. Most Republicans today don't believe there is safety to be found in a Fortress America and reject even more modest calls for a retrenchment of U.S. involvement overseas.

Energy reform relieves oil dependence.

Burwell ‘10 (David, May 23, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Senate Climate Bill and Steps to Reduce U.S. Dependence on Oil” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40824>)

The new energy and climate bill put forward by Senators Kerry and Lieberman seeks to reduce carbon pollution by 17 percent (from 2005 levels) by 2020 and by over 80 percent by 2050. Reductions will come from all sectors—commercial, residential, power generation, and transportation, with limits on industrial sources of carbon pollution being delayed until 2016. In order to reduce American dependence on oil, the bill specifically targets transportation carbon emissions because the transportation sector is responsible for over 70 percent of domestic oil consumption. The bill allocates more than $8 billion annually in new investments in transit—higher speed rail, green freight, and smart growth (bikeable/walkable) community grants—tax credits for creating a new generation of heavy duty trucks fueled by natural gas, and incentives for building electric and hybrid vehicles. It also embraces President Obama’s proposals for increased vehicle fleet efficiency. **Does the United States need new energy and climate policies?** Absolutely. The Deepwater Horizon oil spill catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico and the recent mine disaster in West Virginia that killed 29 miners underscore the need for new U.S. energy sources that are clean, green, and safer than our existing energy portfolio. The United States also exports over $300 billion annually to buy foreign oil–this money would be better spent stimulating the domestic economy.

Energy Reform 1NC

Oil dependence undermines U.S. Leadership

Lugar ‘6(Richard, U.S. Senator, June 7, “U.S. SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR (R-IN) HOLDS A HEARING ON OIL DEPENDENCE AND ECONOMIC RISK”, http://findarticles.com/p/news-articles/political-transcript-wire/mi\_8167/is\_20060609/senator-richard-lugar-holds-hearing/ai\_n50592750/?tag=content;col1, AD 6/21/10)

As Secretary Rice stated before this committee, Our diplomatic activities around the world are being, and she used the term "warped" by petro-politics. Important foreign policy goals from accelerating progress to the developing world and expanding trade to preventing weapons proliferation, and promoting democratic reform, are being undermined by international energy imbalances that have weakened our foreign policy leverage while strengthening the hand of oil-rich authoritarian governments. In a speech in March at the Brookings Institution, I attempted to outline these dynamics in greater detail. And I ask that those remarks be entered in the record. As recently as four years ago, spare production capacity exceeded world consumption by about 10 percent. As world demand for oil has rapidly increased in the last few years, spare capacity has declined to less than 2 percent. Any major disruption of oil creates scarcity that will drive prices up. Our vulnerability was made clear to Americans after the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. But even as supplies rebounded from those disasters, we experienced a continued upward trend in oil prices. Events such as the civil unrest in Nigeria, uncertainty over Iran's nuclear program and worries over Venezuela's supply kept the price of oil above $70 a barrel. Our capacity to deal with these energy vulnerabilities in a foreign policy context is shaped in part by the ability of our own economy to adjust to changing energy markets. Eventually because of scarcity, terrorist threats, market shocks and foreign manipulation, the high price of oil will lead to enormous investment in and political support for alternatives. The problem is that by the time sufficient motivation comes to the market, it may be too late to prevent the severe economic and security consequences of our oil dependence.

Nuclear War

Khalilzad ‘95 (Zalmay , US Ambassador to the United Nations. “Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War.” The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 18, No. 2. pg. 84 Spring 1995)

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. Precluding the rise of a hostile global rival is a good guide for defining what interests the United States should regard as vital and for which of them it should be ready to use force and put American lives at risk. It is a good prism for identifying threats, setting priorities for U.S. policy toward various regions and states, and assessing needs for military capabilities and modernization.

 UQ – Obama PC Push

Energy reform will pass—Obama and Reid are using the BP oil spill as momentum.

Power-Gen 6/8 (Power-Gen Worldwide, June 8, “Democratic Energy Builds for Energy Bill”, <http://www.powergenworldwide.com/index/display/wire-news-display/1200357588.html>)

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. And even though the current Senate proposal lacks GOP support, Reid is preparing to press ahead anyway: On Thursday, he called on his committee chairmen to develop recommendations for climate change legislation that he hopes to bring up "later this summer." Reid's letter, however, did not mention the word "climate," calling it a "clean energy" bill instead. A White House aide confirmed the expedited timeline for moving the climate change bill, saying it is next in line after the House and Senate complete work on Wall Street reform in early July. "We don't have the votes yet, but we intend to work with Leader Reid and Senators Kerry and Lieberman to find them," the aide said. A Senate Democratic aide working on the climate overhaul said Obama's ratcheting up of comments, along with Reid's new push to get a bill to the floor, have given the issue fresh momentum. "He's really doubling down on this," the aide said of Obama. "His statements have gone from 'We need to get this done' to 'We need to get this done this year' to 'We need to get this done now and I'm going to get the votes for it.'" Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), who has put together a broad package with Sen. Joe Lieberman (ID-Conn.), met before the Memorial Day recess with White House liaison Phil Schiliro to map out a strategy, the Senate aide said. "We think that they are really committed, and we think this is the real deal."

UQ – Obama PC Push

Obama is pushing for energy reform and calling for bipartisan cooperation

AFP 6/20(2010, <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hOCdiuQdKH-lSD4jMVRNQDMundMg>) LL

WASHINGTON — US President Barack Obama is committed to an energy bill that reduces carbon emissions, his top aide said Sunday, ahead of a key meeting with Republicans to break down obstacles to the legislation. White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel said Obama wanted the Senate to "pass a comprehensive energy bill that... deals fundamentally with the environmental degradation that happens from carbon pollution." Emanuel noted that the House of Representatives has already approved a bill that includes the "cap-and-trade" system, under which companies buy rights to emit greenhouse gases from firms that use less energy and pollute less. How to address with carbon emissions is the major sticking point in the legislation as Republicans reject the idea of any kind of carbon tax. Obama, who has tried to harness anger over the Gulf of Mexico oil spill to forge what he called a new "national mission" on clean energy, has called a bipartisan meeting to discuss the climate legislation on Wednesday. Emmanuel told ABC television the president was committed to a bill that "reduces our dependence on foreign oil" and "makes key investments in the areas of alternative energy so America leads in that space."

Obama will use everything he has to get an energy bill

Favole 6/2 (Jared A. Of DOW JONES NEWSWIRES, JUNE 2, 2010, 12:10 P.M. ET, “UPDATE: Obama Says He Will Find Votes For Energy Bill”, http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20100602-709386.html?mod=WSJ\_World\_MIDDLEHeadlinesEurope)

WASHINGTON (Dow Jones)--U.S. President Barack Obama vowed Wednesday to find votes to pass a clean energy bill in the "coming months" as uncertainty persists about how the Gulf oil catastrophe will shape the nation's energy future. In a speech at Carnegie Mellon University the president plans to advocate for rolling back "billions of dollars in tax breaks to oil companies," expanding the nation's fleet of nuclear power plants and tapping into natural gas reserves, according to his prepared remarks. "The votes may not be there right now, but I intend to find them in the coming months," Obama plans to say. He plans to add, "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." The House has passed an energy bill already but legislation has stalled in the Senate. Obama plans to reiterate that the U.S. Gulf oil disaster, where a deep-water well is spitting roughly half a million gallons of crude daily off the Louisiana coast, shows the pitfalls of the nation's reliance on traditional energy sources. "We have to acknowledge that there are inherent risks to drilling four miles beneath the surface of the Earth--risks that are bound to increase the harder oil extraction becomes," Obama plans to say. He plans to add, "The time has come, once and for all, for this nation to fully embrace a clean energy future."

Obama pushing energy reform, but it will be a battle

Tapper 6/6 (Jake, ABC News Senior White House Correspondent, June 06, 2010 11:45 AM, “Kerry: Time to Put America on Course for Energy Independence”, http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalpunch/2010/06/kerry-time-to-put-america-on-course-for-energy-independence.html)

Senator John Kerry (D-MA) renewed his push for an energy and climate bill this morning on “This Week.” Kerry introduced the "America Power Act" last month which would cap carbon emissions and invest in energy alternatives. Referring to those energy alternative investments Kerry told me that the U.S. is "behind in an enormous challenge globally where China,[and] India, and others are spending billions of dollars to take the discoveries that we made, and they're taking them to the market place. Wednesday President Obama pledged to "find the votes" to pass an energy bill in the Senate. But this morning Republican Senator John Cornyn repeated his party's opposition to a comprehensive bill. "I think rather than try to hit a grand slam home run, I'd like to work with Senator Kerry and other to…hit some singles and develop nuclear power, battery technology that will help us deal with our environmental concerns."

UQ – Obama PC Push

Despite Republican opposition, Obama has pledged to push for the bill

The New York Times 6/4(June 4, “The Spill and Energy Bill”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/05/opinion/05sat1.html>)

The nation’s political leaders have had a lot to say in recent years about America’s addiction to fossil fuels and the need to find cleaner, more climate-friendly alternatives. In recent weeks, they have had a lot to say about the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. On Wednesday, President Obama put them together. In a speech at Carnegie Mellon University, he invoked the spill to pound on Congress about its duty to pass a comprehensive energy bill that addresses oil dependency and global warming. The House has passed such a bill, but a companion measure in the Senate languishes, hostage to solid Republican opposition, exaggerated fears about its costs and timidity on the part of the Democratic leadership. “I will work with anyone from either party to get this done,” he said. Mr. Obama’s task is to follow up that vow with action. We are not optimistic that his implacable Republican opposition will work with him on anything. But perhaps the spreading nightmare on the waters of the gulf will get a few to break with the party line. The Senate bill is far from perfect. It coddles the coal companies, and its provisions for off-shore drilling will now have to be revised or at least tightened up with multiple safeguards. But for the first time, the bill would set a price on carbon-dioxide emissions, which are now dumped without penalty into the atmosphere. This is an essential prerequisite for shifting private and public investment to cleaner energy sources. The oil savings would be substantial. According to a new study by the Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics, the bill’s mandates for alternative fuels and more efficient vehicles would reduce oil imports one-third by 2035. But instead of embracing this positive bill, the Senate is expected to vote soon on a measure that would move the country in exactly the wrong direction — a resolution sponsored by Lisa Murkowski, the Alaska Republican, that would undercut the government’s authority to regulate greenhouse gases and reduce the anticipated oil savings from the tough new fuel economy standards the White House announced last April. As this page has noted before, persuading the Senate to act is not only a matter of leadership, but a matter of international obligation. At the Copenhagen climate conference in December, Mr. Obama committed the United States to a 17 percent reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020 — the minimum that scientists believe necessary to begin steering the world away from the worst impacts of a warming planet. Delivering on that pledge is even more urgent now than it was then. As he demonstrated at Carnegie Mellon, Mr. Obama knows how to hit all the right notes rhetorically. Passing a comprehensive bill would be good for the economy, by creating new jobs; good for the environment, by reducing emissions; and good for national security, by reducing our dependence on unstable oil-producing countries. The president’s task now is to convert that rhetorical fervor into actual, filibuster-proof votes.

Obama’s Energy Bill push will cost him Political Capital

Wilson 5/27 (Scott , The Washington Post, Thursday, May 27, 2010 2:54 AM, “Obama pushes for energy reform”, http://www.dispatchpolitics.com/live/content/national\_world/stories/2010/05/27/copy/obama-pushes-for-energy-reform.html?adsec=politics&sid=101)

FREMONT, Calif. — President Barack Obama said yesterday he will work to pass energy-reform legislation this year, a push he called more urgent given the increased risks surrounding oil drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and other parts of the country. Speaking to employees at a solar-panel manufacturing plant here, Obama called the Gulf spill “ just heartbreaking,” saying it “only underscores the importance of developing” other sources of energy in the United States. He said the energy-reform legislation he favors would encourage that transition from fossil fuels to solar, wind and other types of power. But pushing the legislation through the Senate (it already has passed the House) will be a daunting political task in a midterm election year. The issue divides not only the two parties in Congress, but also splits the Democrats among those from coal states and coastal ones more eager to see energy reform. Congress’s legislative calendar also effectively ends at the August recess when the campaign season begins in earnest. Obama used his appearance at Solyndra, a solar-panel manufacturing company in the East Bay, to speak forcefully about the gulf spill and the lessons he said it has exposed about the perils of a fossil fuel-based economy. “With the increased risks and increased costs, it gives you a sense of where we’re going,” he said. “We’re not going to be able to sustain this kind of fossil fuel use.” Obama is facing growing frustration and political pressure over the Gulf spill, which occurred just weeks after he announced plans to allow offshore drilling in places previously off limits, including stretches of the Atlantic Coast. His plan, designed to draw Republican support for an energy-reform bill, has since been suspended pending an investigation into the disaster. “But even as we deal with this immediate crisis we have to remember that the risks oil poses to our coast is not the only peril,” Obama said, warning that China and Germany were “building factories like this one” to take the global lead in the green economy. “Nobody is playing for second place. These countries know the nation that leads the clean-energy economy will lead the global economy. If we fail to recognize that imperative, we risk falling behind.” The line received applause from the audience of 100 or so Solyndra employees, who gathered inside a plant being built with the help of federal stimulus money. The plant will help the company produce solar photovoltaic panels on a more commercial scale, a key part of the green economy Obama envisions.

UQ – Reid Push

Energy reform will pass – has the support of Majority Leader Reid

Shiner 6/3(Meredith, June 3, Politico, “Reid Calls for Sweeping Energy Bill”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0610/38095.html>)

Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) is calling on the Senate's key committee leaders to come up with a comprehensive energy strategy by July 4, accelerating the push for legislation in wake of the worst oil spill in American history. Reid demanded "swift" action from Democrats “to address both the existing situation and to reduce the risks of such a catastrophe happening again.” "It is extremely important that you each examine what could be included in a comprehensive energy bill that would address the unfolding disaster in the Gulf of Mexico," Reid wrote to chairmen who oversee the nation's energy policies. "The economic, social and environmental devastation occurring there now due to the oil pollution is unprecedented." Committee leaders Max Baucus, Jeff Bingaman, Barbara Boxer, Chris Dodd, Patrick Leahy, Joe Lieberman, Blanche Lincoln and John Rockefeller all received the majority leader's letter and have been asked to contribute their ideas to developing a blueprint for a comprehensive bill. A democratic aide close to the situation said Thursday's letter "is largely in response to the situation in the gulf" and that Reid will meet with the chairmen next week to discuss a way forward. Reid emphasized the particular need to hold oil companies more accountable in the case of disasters like the April 20 deepwater rig explosion that is leaking thousands of barrels of oil into the Gulf daily.

UQ – Public Support

Energy reform will pass; public support proves.

The Huffington Post 6/8 (June 8, “Poll: Voters want Energy Reform, More Regulation in Wake of Gulf Oil Spill”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/08/poll-voters-want-energy-r_n_604553.html>)

The Gulf Coast oil disaster is intensifying the public's desire for clean energy investments and increased regulation of corporate polluters, according to a new poll commissioned by the League of Conservation Voters. Americans voiced overwhelming support for energy legislation that goes beyond making BP pay for the damage it has caused, according to the poll released Tuesday. Findings suggest comprehensive energy reform could be a powerful election issue, with high support among key electoral groups. "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 in a statement. "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." Sixty-six percent of the 800 voters surveyed by Obama pollster Joel Benenson agreed with this statement: "British Petroleum must pay for the damage they've done. But our addiction to oil threatens our security and we need more than a band-aid for that. Senators need to pass real reforms to hold polluters accountable and invest in clean American energy." Only 23 percent agreed with this: "We need to ensure that British Petroleum pays every last dime of the damages they've caused, but Senators would be wrong to try to use this tragedy to pass some huge new Washington program and job-killing energy tax." The poll comes in the wake of greater organizing around the climate bill and outrage over an amendment introduced by Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) that would block the Environmental Protection Agency from addressing climate change through rule-making. But sixty-three percent of people surveyed said they want more regulation, supporting an energy bill that would "limit pollution, invest in domestic energy sources and encourage companies to use and develop clean energy. It would do this in part by charging energy companies for carbon pollution in electricity or fuels like gas." Among Democrats, 81 percent would support such an energy bill, only 14 percent would oppose it. Among Independents, those numbers are 63 percent and 27 percent, respectively. Republicans are against such legislation, but not by much -- 45 percent support it and 47 percent oppose it.

UQ – Will Pass - AT: EPA

The Energy Bill could still pass--the stoppage of the EPA Bill proves

Cowenhoven 6/16 (Nick, Managing Editor of the Journal Tribune, June 16, 2010, “Vote shows long odds against an energy bill”, <http://www.journaltribune.com/articles/2010/06/16/editorial/doc4c18de80db458965154906.txt>)

A Senate vote last week illustrated the political difficulties of taking meaningful steps toward the “clean energy future” envisioned by President Barack Obama. A narrow Senate majority upheld the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate greenhouse gases. The 53-47 vote rejected an effort to overturn the EPA rules, but it is far from a mandate for energy reform. Even six Democrats voted against the EPA’s new role. But the bottom line is that the EPA’s authority to set rules aimed at reducing emissions from power plants, vehicles and other major sources has been upheld by both the U.S. Senate and Supreme Court. Now the challenge is to enact an energy bill that will use economic leverage and other incentives to make real progress on reducing emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases that promote global warming. Such a bill passed last year in the U.S. House, but it has been stalled in the Senate ever since. As has been the case so often recently, it looks like the best possibility for meaningful reforms will be through Senate bipartisanship. And once again, it looks like a tough sell. Both Sen. Susan Collins and Sen. Olympia Snowe voted for the resolution to curtail EPA authority over greenhouse gas emissions. After the vote, they cited concerns about the impact of new regulations on Maine’s pulp and paper industry. Both of Maine’s senators emphasized the need to regulate carbon emissions and encourage clean energy through a comprehensive energy bill. Collins has proposed an approach in which the government would auction pollution allowances to industry and distribute the proceeds in “dividend” checks to every American. Other Republicans hope to encourage a reduction in emissions without the cap-and-trade approach laid out in the House bill, relying on better efficiency standards and the promotion of alternative fuels. Last week’s vote showed fewer than 60 votes supporting EPA regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, but the right energy bill might succeed this year. The oil spill in the Gulf is a continuing lesson on the hazards that accompany fossil fuels. Meanwhile, greenhouse gas emissions increased 26 percent from 1990 to 2005, according to the EPA. Average U.S. temperatures have been rising steadily and 2000-2009 was the warmest decade on record worldwide. Arctic sea ice is waning and ocean temperatures are rising. Statistics indicate that severe weather and droughts are more prevalent and sea levels worldwide are rising. The Senate has a chance to address the growing crisis, and it should seek a bipartisan approach that will enable it to do so.

UQ – Will Pass – AT: Murkowski

After Murkowski’s bill didn’t pass, the Dem’s Bill will

Clayton 6/10 (Mark, CSM Staff writer, June 10, 2010, “Resolution on greenhouse gases fails, could boost energy bill”, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0610/Resolution-on-greenhouse-gases-fails-could-boost-energy-bill>)

Democrats and environmentalists took satisfaction in the defeat in the US Senate Thursday of a resolution that would have stripped the Environmental Protection Agency of its authority to regulate greenhouse gases. Senate vote: Should EPA have authority to regulate greenhouse gases? Climate-energy bill debuts in Senate, but prospects are dim The defeat – 47 votes to 53 – was a boost for supporters of comprehensive energy-climate legislation. Sens. John Kerry (D) of Massachusetts and Joseph Lieberman (I) of Connecticut have floated such legislation, but it won't be considered until next month. “The Senate made the right decision today but the big question is what comes now,” Senators Kerry and Lieberman said in a joint statement. “Many supporters of the Murkowski resolution argued passionately that climate change is real but that addressing it is a job for Congress not the EPA. We hope they will now engage with us ....” environmentalists cheered the move, too. “Today the Senate voted down a misguided step backwards," Frances Beinecke, president of the Natural Resources Defense Council, said in a statement. "Now it needs to continue moving forward, this summer, to pass comprehensive legislation that curbs our dependence on oil, puts limits on carbon pollution, and puts America on the path to a clean energy future.” Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R) of Alaska – the sponsor of the resolution – said the vote was useful in making it clear where senators stood on the issue. In fact, that may have been the main aim, especially since midterm elections are approaching. "I had hopes, for the security of our economy, that we would prevail today," Senator Murkowski said in a statement. "But regardless of the outcome, I believe it's important that every member of the Senate is on the record on whether they think the EPA regulation is the appropriate way to address climate issues." Every Republican voted for the measure, while six swing-vote Democrats joined them. But with just one coal-state Democrat, John Rockefeller (D) of West Virginia, voting for it, some interpreted the result as positive for the Kerry-Lieberman energy-climate bill. "Today's vote provided two meaningful insights into prospects for climate legislation," Kevin Book, an energy analyst at ClearView Energy Partners, a Washington energy-policy consulting firm, wrote in an e-letter. In the vote result, he wrote, was the kernel of a "pro-drilling, pro-safety compromise that provides political ‘containment’ of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill." In turn, he writes, such a compromise bill could win support from coal-state Democrats, especially those that voted against the Murkowski measure. They and "other green-leaning Republicans [such as Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina] may find themselves with the opportunity to negotiate even greater provisions on behalf of their constituents in return for offering the decisive votes [out of 60 needed] in support of passage.".

Link – Republicans

Afghanistan proves withdrawal is unpopular—Republicans see withdrawal as abandoning allies

Mulrine ‘9(Anna, Staff Writer@US News and World Report, December 2, “GOP Questions Obama's Afghanistan Troop Withdrawal Deadline”, http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/2009/12/02/gop-questions-obamas-afghanistan-troop-withdrawal-deadline.html)

It was clear early today in a widely attended Senate Armed Services Committee hearing that one of the most controversial components of President Obama's new strategy for Afghanistan will be the July 2011 date he set for beginning the withdrawal of U.S. forces. The date announced in the president's speech last night was first and foremost an effort to reassure a skeptical American public, as well as the president's fellow Democrats, that large numbers of U.S. troops won't remain in Afghanistan indefinitely. Yet it riled Republicans who demanded to know whether the U.S. commitment to the country would be "conditional." Sen. [John McCain](http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/2009/12/02/gop-questions-obamas-afghanistan-troop-withdrawal-deadline.html), the ranking Republican on the committee, was the first to take issue with the timeline for withdrawal, in spots on some of the major networks last night and in the hearings this morning. He called the date "dispiriting" and one that makes it less likely that Afghan partners "will risk their lives to take our side in this fight." It's a date, he added, that America's "enemies can exploit to weaken and intimidate our friends." McCain emphasized this notion with Defense Secretary Robert Gates. "Will we withdraw based on conditions on the ground or an arbitrary date?" McCain asked. "Which is it? It's got to be one or the other." He was not the last of his fellow Republicans to try to pin down Gates on this point. Sen. Lindsey Graham, a South Carolina Republican, took up McCain's point as he wondered aloud to the assembled all-star panel of witnesses—who included not only Gates but also Secretary of State [Hillary Clinton](http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/2009/12/02/gop-questions-obamas-afghanistan-troop-withdrawal-deadline.html) and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen—precisely "who is the audience" for President Obama's decision to set a precise timetable for withdrawal.

Link – (Korea) Withdrawal Unpopular – Congress

Plan unpopular—sends signal of abandoning South Korea

Forrester ‘7 (http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/070504\_congressionalattitudes\_final.pdf)

The U.S.–South Korea relationship continues to benefit from the bonds forged during the Korean War. Many of the older members in Congress still believe, in the words of one Democratic staff member, that the “alliance [is] built on shared values, friendship, and blood.” For many of these members, their formative years were spent focused to some degree on the tense standoff between the North and South and the ongoing belief that the United States and South Korea have many shared interests. Also, for some members of the Armed Services Committees, their views of South Korea are shaped by the generally constructive military-to military relations between the two countries. A number of younger members of Congress have different perspectives. In the words of one Democratic Hill interlocutor: “the group of younger, ‘blue-dog’ [conservative], trade-oriented Democrats, see the relationship as more a way to confront the DPRK nuclear threat than anything else and also see the ROK as an economic engine that they don’t want to see damaged.” When asked about the evolution of U.S.-ROK relations over recent decades, very few interlocutors had informed views. As a general matter, most stated that with the passing of the older generations in the United States and South Korea the relationship will go through a period of readjustment and that a deeper dialogue is required between the United States and South Korea if the alliance is to be maintained, if not strengthened. On a bipartisan basis, those interviewed were very skeptical of South Korean policy toward North Korea, including the Sunshine Policy and subsequent ROK efforts to engage North Korea. Most interlocutors believed that South Korea’s policies toward North Korea were too generous, naïve, and/or dangerous. That said, Democratic interlocutors were generally more favorably disposed to an engagement-oriented approach to North Korea—but not an approach as forward leaning as ROK president Roh Moo-hyun has advocated. As a general matter, interlocutors believed that these differences in approach toward North Korea are not insurmountable. In the words of one Republican staff member: “I don’t know how to alleviate this divergence of views on North Korea except to talk about it. The more we talk the better.”

Link – (Korea) Withdrawal Unpopular - Defense Meetings

Support for South Korea is popular now – recent defense meetings prove

American Forces Press Service 6-03 (http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=59465)

WASHINGTON, June 3, 2010 – South Korea has the full support of the United States as it confronts North Korea’s sinking of its naval ship Cheonan, and the 60-year U.S. alliance with the republic is as strong as ever, President Barack Obama said last night. Obama made the remarks as part of a videotaped message to the Korea Society’s annual dinner in New York that commemorates the Korean War. Former Secretary of State and Defense Colin Powell spoke at the event. The society is a non-profit group dedicated to furthering understanding and cooperation between the United States and Korea. Obama said he appreciated the opportunity to reaffirm “the unbreakable bonds” of the two nations on the 60th anniversary of the communist invasion across the 38th parallel, and in light of the “unprovoked act of aggression” by North Korea in sinking the South Korean vessel, Cheonan, in March that killed 46 sailors. “To our friends from the Republic of Korea who join you tonight, I say this: you and President Lee [Myung-bak] have shown extraordinary patience and self-restraint,” Obama said. “You have shown the world what true strength and confidence looks like. And you have the full support of your friend and ally, the United States of America.” Obama said the two governments will continue to consult closely on the Cheonan incident, and that he looks forward to meeting with Lee in Toronto later this month. “Together, we will ensure our readiness and deter aggression,” he said. “We will work with allies and partners to hold North Korea accountable, including at the United Nations Security Council, making it clear that security and respect for North Korea will never come through aggression, but only by upholding its obligations. “And as I said during my visit to Seoul and Osan last fall,” Obama continued, “the commitment of the United States to the security and defense of the Republic of Korea will never waver.” Obama said South Korea will demonstrate its “rightful place as a leader on the world stage” by hosting the G-20 Summit in November and the Nuclear Security Summit in two years. Until then, he said, “We go together in these difficult days. And we will continue to go together in the months and years to come.”

The White House is committed to South Korea – Support is high

Washington Post 5-25 (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/24/AR2010052400140.html)

In twin announcements, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and the White House said U.S. forces in South Korea had been directed to "coordinate closely with their Korean counterparts to ensure readiness and to deter future aggression." "U.S. support for South Korea's defense is unequivocal," the White House statement said. Seoul has steered clear of threatening specific military retaliation since blaming the North for the March 26 attack on its warship -- which left 46 South Korean sailors dead. Still, moves by the South and the United States make clear that they are including a significant military component in their response. South Korean Defense Minister Kim Tae-young said Monday that his country would launch a joint anti-submarine military exercise with the United States and join a U.S.-led anti-proliferation program, known as the Proliferation of Security Initiative, that South Korea had previously been reluctant to take part in to avoid provoking the North. In addition, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak vowed that his country's military would learn from the mistakes that allowed what was thought to be a North Korean mini-submarine to approach the Cheonan and split it in two with a torpedo. "The discipline of the armed forces will be reestablished, military reform efforts will be expedited and combat capabilities will be reinforced drastically," Lee said in a speech to the nation Monday. He said that the U.S.-Korean military alliance -- almost 29,000 U.S. troops are deployed in South Korea -- would be strengthened.

Link – (Korea) Withdrawal Unpopular – Christians

Withdraw is unpopular South Korea maintains strong Christian ties to the US

Asian Times 05 (http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/GD08Dg01.html)

So why the inertia in moving troops out when South Korea's leaders seem to opening the exit door wide? The thickest knot to cut may be the US-South Korean Christian alliance. While Korean political leaders are definitely "Rohing" in a different direction, there remain enduring ties between the US and South Korea's ubiquitous Christian groups, including the 700,000-member Yoido Full Gospel (YFG) in southern Seoul. In sharp contrast to most other segments of Korean society, YFG and other churches have organized "pro-America" rallies, events that mostly elderly parishioners take to the heart of downtown, waving US flags in oddly staged demonstrations of pro-Americanism. Beyond cars, ships and electronics, South Korea is a formidable exporter of missionaries. Twelve thousand go forth into the world every year, second only to the United States. And it is Korean Christians who are most active in helping move North Korean refugees through treacherous territory in China into third countries and freedom. Those North Koreans who make it out tell of seeking shelter in "buildings with a cross" and asking Koreans they meet "if they know the word of Jesus". And of course, it was the lobbying of evangelical Christians such as US Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas and Democratic Senator Evan Bayh of Indiana, and the activities of the National Association of Evangelicals and the Korean-American Christian Church Coalition (KCC) in Los Angeles, that helped ensure the passage of the North Korean Human Rights Act in the United States. That law helps those who help North Korean refugees and asylum seekers - and those who help them flee. At least 26% (though some maintain that the percentage is closer to 50) of South Koreans are Christian - the vast majority of them Protestant. The freedom of South Korea's Christians stands in stark contrast to the regional norm. United Nations and Freedom House reports regularly document the persecution and intimidation of the estimated 70 million Christians in China. Meanwhile North Korea is reported to have created a special circle of hell for those anti-state agents found to be in contact with Christians, or be Christian themselves. In 2000, Korean-American pastor Kim Dong Shik was abducted near the North Korea border by agents of Pyongyang for his work helping refugees to safety. His condition is not known. With the Cold War over, South Korea may again be on the front lines of another war - a new front line in Christendom's regional struggle - this time on the Korean Peninsula.

**The Religious Right have incredible sway on the agenda**

Salon Online 06 (lexis)

Newspaper archives are full of election-year stories about peevish pastors complaining that their priorities have been neglected and warning that they may not be able to motivate their folks to vote. While there is always something on the agenda that the president, Congress and the party leaders have failed to accomplish, the deeper truth is that the present Republican power structure has pandered to the religious right like no government since the Puritans ran New England. From the first weeks of Bush's presidency, when they exercised a veto over the appointment of the attorney general, to the past year, when they rejected Harriet Miers and approved not one but two nominations to the Supreme Court, the religious rightists have flexed unprecedented power in Washington. They control the GOP agenda that endorses constitutional amendments to ban abortion and gay marriage. They control the congressional leadership that jumped at their command to pass the extraordinary (and unconstitutional) Terri Schiavo statute. They control the increasingly sectarian rhetoric of party leaders, who publicly pay homage to their "Christian nationalist" ideology. And they control a vast patronage apparatus, from judicial and agency appointments to "faith-based" federal funding worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

I/L Booster – GOP Key

Republican support key—it’s the only way to overcome the filibuster

NYT 6/4 (New York Times Editorial, June 4, 2010, “The Spill and Energy Bill”, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/05/opinion/05sat1.html)

The nation’s political leaders have had a lot to say in recent years about America’s addiction to fossil fuels and the need to find cleaner, more climate-friendly alternatives. In recent weeks, they have had a lot to say about the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. On Wednesday, President Obama put them together. Editorial Series In a speech at Carnegie Mellon University, he invoked the spill to pound on Congress about its duty to pass a comprehensive energy bill that addresses oil dependency and global warming. The House has passed such a bill, but a companion measure in the Senate languishes, hostage to solid Republican opposition, exaggerated fears about its costs and timidity on the part of the Democratic leadership. “I will work with anyone from either party to get this done,” he said. Mr. Obama’s task is to follow up that vow with action. We are not optimistic that his implacable Republican opposition will work with him on anything. But perhaps the spreading nightmare on the waters of the gulf will get a few to break with the party line. The Senate bill is far from perfect. It coddles the coal companies, and its provisions for off-shore drilling will now have to be revised or at least tightened up with multiple safeguards. But for the first time, the bill would set a price on carbon-dioxide emissions, which are now dumped without penalty into the atmosphere. This is an essential prerequisite for shifting private and public investment to cleaner energy sources. The oil savings would be substantial. According to a new study by the Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics, the bill’s mandates for alternative fuels and more efficient vehicles would reduce oil imports one-third by 2035. But instead of embracing this positive bill, the Senate is expected to vote soon on a measure that would move the country in exactly the wrong direction — a resolution sponsored by Lisa Murkowski, the Alaska Republican, that would undercut the government’s authority to regulate greenhouse gases and reduce the anticipated oil savings from the tough new fuel economy standards the White House announced last April. As this page has noted before, persuading the Senate to act is not only a matter of leadership, but a matter of international obligation. At the Copenhagen climate conference in December, Mr. Obama committed the United States to a 17 percent reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020 — the minimum that scientists believe necessary to begin steering the world away from the worst impacts of a warming planet. Delivering on that pledge is even more urgent now than it was then. As he demonstrated at Carnegie Mellon, Mr. Obama knows how to hit all the right notes rhetorically. Passing a comprehensive bill would be good for the economy, by creating new jobs; good for the environment, by reducing emissions; and good for national security, by reducing our dependence on unstable oil-producing countries. The president’s task now is to convert that rhetorical fervor into actual, filibuster-proof votes.

Warming Impact Module

Energy reform cuts pollution and moves toward Copenhagen climate goals

Reuters ‘10 (May 10, National Post News Services, “US Sentat Bill on Climate Change”, [http://www.vancouversun.com/news/senate+bill+climate+change/3020950/story.html](http://www.vancouversun.com/news/senate%2Bbill%2Bclimate%2Bchange/3020950/story.html))

U.S. Senator John Kerry ratcheted up the fight to pass legislation to combat global warming yesterday, unveiling a bill as the Gulf of Mexico oil disaster complicates the measure's already difficult prospects. WHOSE BABY? John Kerry, a Democrat, and Joseph Lieberman, an independent, took the wraps off their long-awaited climate change bill in the U.S. Senate yesterday. Republican Senator Lindsey Graham, who worked with the two men on the new legislation, was not present. He reiterated in a statement this is not the time to press on a climate bill because of the massive oil leak in the Gulf of Mexico and talk of moving ahead on immigration reform. OFFSETTING POLLUTION Polluters can participate in an "offset" program to help with overall carbon reduction. They would get credit for some emission-reductions if they helped out with other projects such as helping capture emissions from coal mines and protecting grasslands and landfills. Up to two billion tons in offsets each year would be available with 75% aimed at domestic programs and 25% for international environmental efforts. STILL DRILLIN ' Provisions to encourage offshore drilling are included, but U.S. states could prohibit offshore oil activity within 120 kilometres of their coasts. It also allows coastal states to reap some revenues from drilling. Obama welcomed the new bill, saying he hoped to pass it this year as the continuing oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico underlined the need for energy reform. "The challenges we face -- underscored by the immense tragedy in the Gulf -- are reason to redouble our efforts to reform our nation's energy policies," the U.S. President said. WHAT'S THE TARGET? The bill hopes aims to cut planet-warming emissions in the United States by a modest 17% by 2020, rising to more than 80% by 2050. The cuts are in the range that Barack Obama, the U.S. President, pledged at an international climate conference in Copenhagen in December. Rich and poor countries are divided on how to share the burden of taking action on climate, and if Obama signs the bill it could help close the gap. CAP AND CARROT The bill establishes what has become known as a cap and trade system for reducing carbon pollution by electric utilities and factories. Starting in 2013, electric power utilities would have to obtain pollution permits, initially provided free by Washington, changing to full auctions by 2030. The permits could be traded on a regulated market. The government would hand out the permits to utility companies based on a formula of 75% related to their emissions and 25% on their deliveries. That is a revision from the 50%-50% formula coal-fired utilities complained was unfair. ON THE ROADS US$25-billion in subsidies will be offered to increase efficiency and cut oil consumption in the transportation sector. Tax credits for truck and heavy-duty vehicle fleets are intended to encourage conversion to natural gas. Manufacturers of cleaner vehicles would also get an extra US$5-billion in tax credits.

Increased emissions will accelerate warming

Sanders 5 (Roberts, Professor at UC Berkeley, Fossil Fuel Emissions can Overwhelm Planet’s ability to absorb carbon, Earth Observatory, 8-3-5, http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Newsroom/view.php?id=27638)

One in a new generation of computer climate models that include the effects of Earth’s carbon cycle indicates there are limits to the planet’s ability to absorb increased emissions of carbon dioxide. If current production of carbon from fossil fuels continues unabated, by the end of the century the land and oceans will be less able to take up carbon than they are today, the model indicates. “If we maintain our current course of fossil fuel emissions or accelerate our emissions, the land and oceans will not be able to slow the rise of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere the way they’re doing now,” said Inez Y. Fung at the University of California, Berkeley, who is director of the Berkeley Atmospheric Sciences Center, co-director of the new Berkeley Institute of the Environment, and professor of earth and planetary science and of environmental science, policy and management. “It’s all about rates. If the rate of fossil fuel emissions is too high, the carbon storage capacity of the land and oceans decreases and climate warming accelerates.”

Warming Impact Module

Warming culminates in extinction

Stein 6 (David, Science Editor for the Guardian, “Global Warming Xtra: Scientists Warn about Antarctic melting, http://www.agoracosmopolitan.com/home/Frontpage/2008/07/14/02463.html, AD: 7-8-9)

Global Warming continues to be approaches by governments as a "luxury" item, rather than a matter of basic human survival. Humanity is being taken to its destruction by a greed-driven elite. These elites, which include 'Big Oil' and other related interests, are intoxicated by "the high" of pursuing ego-driven power, in a comparable manner to drug addicts who pursue an elusive "high", irrespective of the threat of pursuing that "high" poses to their own basic survival, and the security of others. Global Warming and the pre-emptive war against Iraq are part of the same self-destructive prism of a political-military-industrial complex, which is on a path of mass planetary destruction, backed by techniques of mass-deception." The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction", reported Bill Henderson in CrossCurrents. If strict global environmental security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of humankind's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

Energy Reform Good – Warming

Energy reform is key to limiting emissions and combating global warming and other types of environmental degradation.

Burwell ‘10 (David, May 23, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Senate Climate Bill and Steps to Reduce U.S. Dependence on Oil” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40824>)

The new energy and climate bill put forward by Senators Kerry and Lieberman seeks to reduce carbon pollution by 17 percent (from 2005 levels) by 2020 and by over 80 percent by 2050. Reductions will come from all sectors—commercial, residential, power generation, and transportation, with limits on industrial sources of carbon pollution being delayed until 2016. In order to reduce American dependence on oil, the bill specifically targets transportation carbon emissions because the transportation sector is responsible for over 70 percent of domestic oil consumption. The bill allocates more than $8 billion annually in new investments in transit—higher speed rail, green freight, and smart growth (bikeable/walkable) community grants—tax credits for creating a new generation of heavy duty trucks fueled by natural gas, and incentives for building electric and hybrid vehicles. It also embraces President Obama’s proposals for increased vehicle fleet efficiency.The bill’s sponsors claim it will create millions of new jobs that will not easily be exported because building the new, low-carbon energy grid must happen within U.S. borders. The bill also aims to reduce the potential economic costs for industries focused on fossil fuel production and industrial workers by both delaying the imposition of limits on these industries and funding worker training programs for new clean energy jobs. **Does the United States need new energy and climate policies?** Absolutely. The Deepwater Horizon oil spill catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico and the recent mine disaster in West Virginia that killed 29 miners underscore the need for new U.S. energy sources that are clean, green, and safer than our existing energy portfolio. The United States also exports over $300 billion annually to buy foreign oil–this money would be better spent stimulating the domestic economy.Carbon emissions represent more than 80 percent of America’s greenhouse gases and the United States currently produces over 20 percent of global carbon emissions. These emissions are the primary driver of global warming and in the long term, the problems caused by climate disruption—including the loss of coastal areas and desertification of arid lands in the western United States—will cause major and on-going problems to America’s economy.Globally, if current trends continue, the impacts will be even worse, with hundreds of millions of environmental refugees moving across borders and exacerbating social and resource conflicts. Health risks will increase as tropical diseases move into communities that lack natural immunity to these diseases. And up to 35 percent of all species will be lost as the habitats needed for their survival disappear. Kerry and Lieberman’s bill is a step in the right direction, but more is needed to minimize the negative effects of climate change. **What are the key elements included in the text?** The critical element of the legislation is that it puts a price on carbon and thus discourages carbon emissions, which cause global warming. Carbon pricing is applied to all sectors of the economy in different ways and in a phased process to reduce any potentially negative impacts for the U.S. economy, household finances, and the national budget.

Energy Reform Good – Warming

Energy reform serves as an international model to spur efforts to combat global warming.

The Washington Post ‘10 (May 19, “The Senate Needs to Act Now on the Climate Bill”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/18/AR2010051804440.html>)

SENS. JOHN F. Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joseph I. Lieberman (I-Conn.) have provided Congress with an opportunity. Their [climate bill](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/12/AR2010051202913.html), released last week, is imperfect. But it offers a start, very much in the right direction. Contrary to popular wisdom, acting on global warming is not going to get easier after this year's election. Legislators should seize this moment. The burning of oil, natural gas and coal for industry, transportation and modern life generally gives off gases that get trapped in the atmosphere, keeping heat in and warming the Earth. The consequences of this human-induced influence on global climate are difficult to predict with precision but are likely to be disruptive, possibly catastrophically. Scientists are clear enough on this to make it obvious that people should begin to reduce their dependence on these carbon-based fuels. Every big country will have to play a role -- but many won't get started unless the United States gets serious. The most rational action, as we've said before, would be to put a gradually rising tax on carbon emissions and let the market find the cheapest alternatives. The Kerry-Lieberman bill doesn't go that route. But it does, through a system of tradable emission permits, create a gradually rising price on carbon emissions that, if properly administered, could have a similar effect. This is crucial, because left to their own devices, legislators will merely subsidize some of the most expensive alternatives to carbon-burning: new nuclear plants (Republicans), solar plants (Democrats), carbon sequestration (coal-state legislators of both parties). If the market is allowed to work, on the other hand, cheaper and more efficient methods -- conservation, converting the dirtiest coal plants to natural gas -- will probably be used while the rising price of carbon spurs research into currently more expensive solutions, with time bringing down the price of at least some of them. The longer Congress waits to pass a comprehensive climate bill, the less time America will have to cut its emissions -- and the more expensive the process will be. According to the [International Energy Agency](http://www.iea.org/), every year the world fails to seriously deal with climate change raises the price tag by $500 billion -- a lot of which, no doubt, Americans will be on the hook for. And then there's the politics. The House already has passed a climate bill. President Obama has said he supports action this year. And the next Congress, possibly with a sizable caucus of newly elected climate-change skeptics, could make any sensible environmentalist nostalgic for 2010. There's a lot we would change about Kerry-Lieberman, starting with the way it would hand out valuable emissions permits. The legislation can and should improve via amendment. But the bottom line is that Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) should get the process started now.

Now is the key time for energy reform; if we put it off, we sacrifice our chances of addressing global warming.

Klein ‘10 (Ezra, June 7, The Washington Post, “Climate Bill Pessimism” <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/2010/06/climate_bill_pessimism.html>)

To say another word on Chuck Schumer's [prediction](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/2010/06/is_reids_energy_bill_worse_tha.html) that the Senate is going to do an energy bill rather than a climate bill, we're really in a do-or-die period for climate legislation. The House passed Waxman-Markey last year. That passage, however, is only good until the end of this Congress. That is to say, it's only good until January 2011. After that, a climate bill would not only have to pass the Senate, but it would also have to pass the House again. And it's hard to believe that the House will have the votes to pass a climate bill after November. At that point, what are the conditions in which a climate bill seems possible? The normal answer would be a national catastrophe that focuses attention on the issue. An "exogenous event," as the social scientists say. Something like, I don't know, the largest oil spill in U.S. history. But actually, it seems like that wouldn't be nearly enough. And it would be ever further from enough after the legislative math gets harder. So either the Senate manages to move on a climate bill this year or you can pretty much give up on any hope of seriously addressing global warming in the foreseeable future.

Energy Reform Good – Oil Dependence

Energy reform will lead to more efforts to ease reliance on oil

CQ Politics ‘10 (June 7, Yahoo News, “Oil Spill Fuels New Energy Bill Push”, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856>)

Comprehensive energy and [climate change legislation](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) may get new life thanks to the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. Taking a page from the playbook he used to assemble a health care overhaul bill that passed the Senate in December, Majority Leader Harry Reid is asking committee chairmen for ideas that he can pull together into an [energy bill](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##). Reid said he plans to meet this week with his chairmen and wants proposals by the Fourth of July break. While various factions in both parties have promoted energy and [climate legislation](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##), it remains to be seen whether Reid can pull them together and whether there is enough time left on the legislative calendar to get such a major bill done. But the [oil washing](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) up on Gulf Coast beaches has brought renewed public focus to the issue -- and perhaps some momentum to Reid's effort. At various times, supporters of climate change legislation have portrayed it as a way to achieve [energy independence](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##), promote national security and create a new generation of "green" jobs. In the face of the gulf oil spill, Reid, D-Nev., is trying to rebrand [energy legislation](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) once again, this time as a way to hold the oil industry accountable. In a statement and letter released last week, Reid signaled that he sees the oil spill caused by the April 20 explosion aboard BP's Deepwater Horizon rig as a rallying point for legislation to promote alternative energy and reduce [carbon emissions](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##). "The economic, social and environmental devastation occurring there now due to the oil pollution is unprecedented," Reid's letter said. "Among the actions I think we need to explore are ensuring that the [oil companies](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) are held accountable for their actions and the damages caused by their operations." Reid said this means Congress "must move much more quickly to help the country kick the oil habit as soon as possible and push harder for the production of affordable [alternative fuels](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) and advanced vehicles." Daniel J. Weiss, an energy expert and senior fellow at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, said Reid's letter suggests he wants to design a bill that would "include making [oil rigs](http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/politics3677856##) safer, reducing oil use and reducing oil pollution." "Addressing oil pollution includes global warming pollutants produced by burning oil," Weiss added, noting that the Senate leader's comments echoed sentiments that President Obama expressed in a June 2 speech at Carnegie Mellon University

Energy Reform Good – Oil Dependence

**Energy Bill could reduce oil dependence by 40%.**

Bolton ‘10 (Alex, June 3, The Hill, “Reid pushes to move energy bill in July”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/101307-reid-pushes-to-move-energy-bill-in-july>)

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) alerted Senate committee chairmen Thursday that he plans to move comprehensive energy legislation in July.  Reid asked the chairmen to recommend legislation to deal with the Gulf oil spill before July 4 so that leaders can include those ideas in the comprehensive energy package.  “I think it is extremely important that you each examine what could be included in a comprehensive energy bill that would address the unfolding disaster in the Gulf of Mexico,” Reid wrote in the letter. “Among the actions I think we need to explore are ensuring that the oil companies are held accountable for their actions and the damages caused by their operations,” Reid wrote.  Reid suggested changing the law to “ensure swift and fair compensation of people and communities for their oil pollution-related losses.” The law now limits oil companies’ liability for spills to $75 million. Reid has voiced support for eliminating the cap altogether, noting the damage caused by Deepwater Horizon accident was estimated last month to reach $14 billion. Reid has proposed his chairmen consider changes in “criminal and civil penalty structures.” He also urged his chairmen to “make sure that effective federal safety standards are in place and effectively enforced.” He argued Congress must ensure the nation is better equipped to avert and respond to similar disasters in the future. Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), the authors of the Senate’s leading energy and climate proposal, applauded Reid’s call to action.  “The disaster in the Gulf has intensified the feeling of urgency on all sides, and Senator Reid’s letter is crystal clear that he expects the Senate to step up to the challenge this year,” the lawmakers said in a joint statement. “The time is ripe for action on the American Power Act. Our approach creates 200,000 jobs a year, all while reducing our oil dependence by 40 percent.”  Earlier Thursday, Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.) called on President Barack Obama to contain the massive oil slick in the Gulf, which is expected to wash up on Florida’s beaches in the next few days. Nelson said the president should mobilize additional military assets, such as Navy personnel, to work on sub-sea mapping. Sen. Lindsey Graham (S.C.), who has served as the lead GOP negotiator on energy and climate change legislation, said last week that the oil spill would imperil passage of broad energy legislation. Graham has argued that expanding offshore drilling would be essential to winning Republican support for an energy and climate bill. He said he suspects the oil spill has made expanded drilling less politically viable. Senate Democrats, however, see the Gulf crisis as giving energy reform new momentum. A senior Senate Democratic aide told The Hill last week that Democrats would use the oil industry as a political foil to pressure Republicans to support reform. Reid cited the Gulf disaster Thursday as strong evidence for why Congress should act to reform the nation’s means of energy production. “We are grossly over-dependent on oil for our energy needs, in part because the oil companies have chosen not to invest their massive profits in the domestic production of clean and renewable alternative fuels that would make our nation more secure and reduce the risks of environmental disaster,” Reid wrote.

Energy Reform Good – Oil Dependence

Energy reform will help the US transition away from fossil fuels.

Viser ‘10 (Matt, June 3, Globe Wire Reports, “As well spews in Gulf, Obama makes climate bill a priority”, <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/06/03/as_well_spews_in_gulf_obama_makes_climate_bill_a_priority/>)

PITTSBURGH — Signaling that the Gulf of Mexico oil disaster has propelled climate change legislation toward the top of his priority list, President Obama called on Congress yesterday to roll back billions of dollars in tax breaks for oil companies and help the nation end its dependence on fossil fuels. Obama predicted he would find the political support for legislation that could dramatically alter the way Americans fuel their homes and cars, including by placing a price on carbon pollution. A bill crafted by Senator John F. Kerry to do just that remains mired in the Senate. “Pittsburgh, I want you to know, the votes may not be there right now, but I intend to find them in the coming months,’’ Obama told an audience at Carnegie Mellon University. “I will make the case for a clean energy future wherever I can, and I will work with anyone to get this done, and we will get it done. “The next generation will not be held hostage to energy sources from the last century.’’ It was the fourth time in 12 days that Obama urged the Senate to take up the energy and climate change bill. The call to action was hailed by Kerry, a Democrat of Massachusetts, and Senator Joseph Lieberman, independent of Connecticut, who together filed the legislation last month. “President Obama is clearly putting his shoulder to the wheel to pass comprehensive climate and energy legislation this year,’’ Kerry and Lieberman said in a joint statement. “Nothing could be more definitive than his explicit commitment today to find the remaining votes needed to pass this vital legislation.’’ Their legislation has faced several hurdles, including a lack of Republican support and a busy calendar before Congress leaves for its summer recess in two months. Senate majority leader Harry Reid, Democrat of Nevada, is expected to decide soon on whether to bring the legislation to the floor this year or push for a smaller package. He has also pledged to take up an immigration overhaul this year, but the president’s speech yesterday indicated he believes addressing climate change and energy policy is more important. The House of Representatives approved legislation last year to limit greenhouse-gas pollution. While critics have suggested that the oil leak has only added to the political uncertainty of passing the Senate legislation this year, Kerry has argued that the disaster bolsters the case that alternative sources of energy must be promoted. Obama also made that argument. “Without a major change in our energy policy, our dependence on oil means that we will continue to send billions of dollars of our hard-earned wealth to other countries every month — including countries in dangerous and unstable regions,’’ Obama said. “In other words, our continued dependence on fossil fuels will jeopardize our national security. It will smother our planet. And it will continue to put our economy and our environment at risk.’’ The president spoke as Americans remain deeply frustrated by the worst oil spill in the nation’s history, which is still spewing crude in the Gulf of Mexico more than a month after a BP drilling rig sank. He sought anew to connect to that public angst while promising that “we’re waging this battle every minute of every day’’ to plug the gushing deep-water well. The proposal to roll back company tax breaks is included in the president’s most recent budget proposal. Now with the spill casting big oil in a bad light, calling for the elimination of such subsidies is one more way for Obama to show the public he wants to hold the industry accountable. “The time has come, once and for all, for this nation to fully embrace a clean energy future,’’ the president said.

Energy Reform Good – Oil Dependence

**Energy reform is a key step in moving away from oil**

Meadows ‘10 (Bill, June 8, Huffington Post, “[Keep the Greenhouse Gas Blowout Preventer - Lose the "Dirty Air Act"http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-meadows/keep-the-greenhouse-gas-b\_b\_604281.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-meadows/keep-the-greenhouse-gas-b_b_604281.html))

The oil that continues to gush from the seafloor of the Gulf of Mexico is a grim reminder of what our addiction to oil is costing us. Lost jobs in the fishing industry, lost protection of coastal marshes and the wildlife they harbor, and a lost way of life for thousands of Americans along the Gulf coast all result from the dogged pursuit of a fuel source that pollutes our coasts, our communities, our water, and our air. Some in Congress feel that this fossil fuel addiction is not only acceptable, but should be promoted and accelerated. Sen. Lisa Murkowski (Alaska) is scheduled to force a vote in the Senate that would [strip the Environmental Protection Agency](http://wilderness.org/content/murkowski-resolution-would-leave-greenhouse-gusher-uncapped%20)of its ability to regulate greenhouse gases, like those from the burning of oil and oil products. Some estimates show that this resolution could increase domestic oil consumption by hundreds of millions of barrels of oil. This is like offering a carton of Marlboro's to a patient suffering from lung disease. The Environmental Protection Agency is currently the only "blowout preventer" we have for greenhouse gas pollution. Without it, there would be nothing preventing tons of carbon pollution from entering our atmosphere, and worsening the changing climate that is leaving permanent scars across our forests, beaches, and communities. However, as we have seen in the Gulf, blowout preventers aren't the only solution. That is why it is critical that in addition to stopping Murkowski's resolution, the Senate needs to take up and vote on a comprehensive climate and energy bill. By addressing climate change now we can restore our environment, save money and [create jobs](http://wilderness.org/content/green-jobs-include-more-you-might-think%20)in the process. Our treasured places are already feeling the effects of a warming world. Glacier National Park has already lost a third of its iconic glaciers. The Everglades are already subject to sea-level rise from the warming ocean. Our public lands deserve better. Tragic tales like this will become more and more common as climate change gets worse. The Senate must act immediately. First, it must vote down Sen. Murkowski's ["Dirty Air Act."](http://wilderness.org/content/murkowski-what-turns-would-be-climate-champ-fossil-fuel-crony)Second, it must pass a comprehensive climate and energy bill that decreases the amount of carbon going into the atmosphere. We can create jobs, improve the health of air and water, and lead the world in clean, green energy by passing a climate bill. We can do it by looking forward toward clean energy, not backwards toward oil. The disaster in the Gulf has shown that our country desperately needs a better energy path - it's time to wean ourselves off dirty fuels, not increase our dependence on them.

Energy Reform Good – Oil Dependence

**Energy reform will accelerate movement away from reliance on oil.**

Lashof ‘10 (Dan, June 3, Natural Resources Defense Council, “Timing is Everything: The Battle for Comprehensive Energy and Climate Legislation has Just Begun”, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/timing_is_everything_the_battl.html>)

But it has only been one day since President Obama turned his legislative focus to pushing comprehensive energy and climate legislation across the finish line. The President’s [speech in Pittsburgh](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-economy-carnegie-mellon-university) yesterday was the [lead story](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/02/AR2010060200380.html?hpid=topnews&sid=ST2010060104078) in today’s Washington Post. And for good reason. Using the Gulf oil disaster as proof that we need to end our dependence on fossil fuels, President Obama made his strongest case yet for enacting comprehensive energy reform that includes limits on carbon pollution. And he committed to round up the votes in the Senate to “get this done.” The key section of his speech is: “We’re also investing in the ideas and technologies that will lead to new jobs and entire new industries.  Consider what we’ve done with clean energy.  The tax credits and loan guarantees in the Recovery Act alone will lead to 720,000 clean energy jobs in America by 2012.  To take just one example, the United States used to make less than 2% of the world’s advanced batteries for hybrid cars.  By 2015, we’ll have enough capacity to make up to 40% of these batteries.   And this brings me to an issue that’s on everyone’s mind right now – namely, what kind of energy future can insure our long-term prosperity. The catastrophe unfolding in the Gulf right now may prove to be a result of human error – or of corporations taking dangerous short-cuts that compromised safety, or a combination of both.  And I’ve launched a National Commission so that the American people will have answers on exactly what happened. But we have to also acknowledge that there are inherent risks to drilling four miles beneath the surface of the Earth – risks that are bound to increase the harder oil extraction becomes.  Just like we have to acknowledge that an America run solely on fossil fuels should not be the vision we have for our children and grandchildren.  We consume more than 20% of the world’s oil, but have less than 2% of the world’s oil reserves.  So without a major change in our energy policy, our dependence on oil means that we will continue to send billions of dollars of our hard-earned wealth to other countries every month – including countries in dangerous and unstable regions.  In other words, our continued dependence on fossil fuels will jeopardize our national security.  It will smother our planet.  And it will continue to put our economy and our environment at risk. Now, I understand that we cannot end our dependence on fossil fuels overnight.  That’s why I’ve supported offshore oil production as one part of our overall energy strategy.  But we can pursue such production only if it’s safe; and only if it’s used as a short-term solution while we transition to a clean energy economy. The time has come to aggressively accelerate that transition.  The time has come, once and for all, for this nation to fully embrace a clean energy future.  That means continuing our unprecedented effort to make everything from our homes and businesses to our cars and trucks more energy efficient.  It means tapping into our natural gas reserves, and moving ahead with our plan to expand our nation’s fleet of nuclear power plants.  And it means rolling back billions of dollars in tax breaks to oil companies so we can prioritize investments in clean energy research and development.   But the only way the transition to clean energy will succeed is if the private sector is fully invested in this future – if capital comes off the sidelines and the ingenuity of our entrepreneurs is unleashed.  And the only way to do that is by finally putting a price on carbon pollution.    Many businesses have already embraced this idea because it provides a level of certainty about the future.  And for those that face transition costs, we can help them adjust.  But if we refuse to take into account the full cost of our fossil fuel addiction – if we don’t factor in the environmental costs and national security costs and true economic costs – we will have missed our best chance to seize a clean energy future.

Economy Impact Module

Energy reform key to stabilize the economy

Burwell ‘10 (David, May 23, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Senate Climate Bill and Steps to Reduce U.S. Dependence on Oil” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40824>)

The new energy and climate bill put forward by Senators Kerry and Lieberman seeks to reduce carbon pollution by 17 percent (from 2005 levels) by 2020 and by over 80 percent by 2050. Reductions will come from all sectors—commercial, residential, power generation, and transportation, with limits on industrial sources of carbon pollution being delayed until 2016. In order to reduce American dependence on oil, the bill specifically targets transportation carbon emissions because the transportation sector is responsible for over 70 percent of domestic oil consumption. The bill allocates more than $8 billion annually in new investments in transit—higher speed rail, green freight, and smart growth (bikeable/walkable) community grants—tax credits for creating a new generation of heavy duty trucks fueled by natural gas, and incentives for building electric and hybrid vehicles. It also embraces President Obama’s proposals for increased vehicle fleet efficiency. The bill’s sponsors claim it will create millions of new jobs that will not easily be exported because building the new, low-carbon energy grid must happen within U.S. borders. The bill also aims to reduce the potential economic costs for industries focused on fossil fuel production and industrial workers by both delaying the imposition of limits on these industries and funding worker training programs for new clean energy jobs.  **Does the United States need new energy and climate policies?** Absolutely. The Deepwater Horizon oil spill catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico and the recent mine disaster in West Virginia that killed 29 miners underscore the need for new U.S. energy sources that are clean, green, and safer than our existing energy portfolio. The United States also exports over $300 billion annually to buy foreign oil–this money would be better spent stimulating the domestic economy. Carbon emissions represent more than 80 percent of America’s greenhouse gases and the United States currently produces over 20 percent of global carbon emissions. These emissions are the primary driver of global warming and in the long term, the problems caused by climate disruption—including the loss of coastal areas and desertification of arid lands in the western United States—will cause major and on-going problems to America’s economy. Globally, if current trends continue, the impacts will be even worse, with hundreds of millions of environmental refugees moving across borders and exacerbating social and resource conflicts. Health risks will increase as tropical diseases move into communities that lack natural immunity to these diseases. And up to 35 percent of all species will be lost as the habitats needed for their survival disappear.

That prevents nuclear war

Friedberg and Schoenfeld ‘8(Aaron, Professor of Politics and IR@Princeton, and Gabriel, Senior Editor@The Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html)

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability.

Energy Reform Good – Economy

**Energy reform will accelerate movement away from reliance on oil.**

Lashof ‘10 (Dan, June 3, Natural Resources Defense Council, “Timing is Everything: The Battle for Comprehensive Energy and Climate Legislation has Just Begun”, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/timing_is_everything_the_battl.html>)

But it has only been one day since President Obama turned his legislative focus to pushing comprehensive energy and climate legislation across the finish line. The President’s [speech in Pittsburgh](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-economy-carnegie-mellon-university) yesterday was the [lead story](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/02/AR2010060200380.html?hpid=topnews&sid=ST2010060104078) in today’s Washington Post. And for good reason. Using the Gulf oil disaster as proof that we need to end our dependence on fossil fuels, President Obama made his strongest case yet for enacting comprehensive energy reform that includes limits on carbon pollution. And he committed to round up the votes in the Senate to “get this done.” The key section of his speech is: “We’re also investing in the ideas and technologies that will lead to new jobs and entire new industries.  Consider what we’ve done with clean energy.  The tax credits and loan guarantees in the Recovery Act alone will lead to 720,000 clean energy jobs in America by 2012.  To take just one example, the United States used to make less than 2% of the world’s advanced batteries for hybrid cars.  By 2015, we’ll have enough capacity to make up to 40% of these batteries.   And this brings me to an issue that’s on everyone’s mind right now – namely, what kind of energy future can insure our long-term prosperity. The catastrophe unfolding in the Gulf right now may prove to be a result of human error – or of corporations taking dangerous short-cuts that compromised safety, or a combination of both.  And I’ve launched a National Commission so that the American people will have answers on exactly what happened. But we have to also acknowledge that there are inherent risks to drilling four miles beneath the surface of the Earth – risks that are bound to increase the harder oil extraction becomes.  Just like we have to acknowledge that an America run solely on fossil fuels should not be the vision we have for our children and grandchildren.  We consume more than 20% of the world’s oil, but have less than 2% of the world’s oil reserves.  So without a major change in our energy policy, our dependence on oil means that we will continue to send billions of dollars of our hard-earned wealth to other countries every month – including countries in dangerous and unstable regions.  In other words, our continued dependence on fossil fuels will jeopardize our national security.  It will smother our planet.  And it will continue to put our economy and our environment at risk. Now, I understand that we cannot end our dependence on fossil fuels overnight.  That’s why I’ve supported offshore oil production as one part of our overall energy strategy.  But we can pursue such production only if it’s safe; and only if it’s used as a short-term solution while we transition to a clean energy economy. The time has come to aggressively accelerate that transition.  The time has come, once and for all, for this nation to fully embrace a clean energy future.  That means continuing our unprecedented effort to make everything from our homes and businesses to our cars and trucks more energy efficient.  It means tapping into our natural gas reserves, and moving ahead with our plan to expand our nation’s fleet of nuclear power plants.  And it means rolling back billions of dollars in tax breaks to oil companies so we can prioritize investments in clean energy research and development.   But the only way the transition to clean energy will succeed is if the private sector is fully invested in this future – if capital comes off the sidelines and the ingenuity of our entrepreneurs is unleashed.  And the only way to do that is by finally putting a price on carbon pollution.    Many businesses have already embraced this idea because it provides a level of certainty about the future.  And for those that face transition costs, we can help them adjust.  But if we refuse to take into account the full cost of our fossil fuel addiction – if we don’t factor in the environmental costs and national security costs and true economic costs – we will have missed our best chance to seize a clean energy future.

Energy Reform Good – Economy

Energy reform spurs investment and creates new jobs.

Christian Science Monitor ‘10 (May 27, “Sen. Kerry makes his case for an energy bill”, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2010/0527/Sen.-Kerry-makes-his-case-for-an-energy-bill>)

With all the nervousness about possible conflict on the Korean Peninsula, one might have expected Sen. John Kerry to zero in on this topic at[a Monitor breakfast with reporters](http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/monitor_breakfast/2010/0526/Sen.-John-Kerry-Halt-to-offshore-oil-drilling-not-going-to-happen) this week. After all, he’s the Democrats’ Mr. Foreign Policy and he chairs the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Nope. It was energy, energy, energy for most of the eggs and bacon discussion. That’s because the Democrat from Massachusetts is also co-writer of the energy bill, [the American Power Act](http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2010/0513/Senate-energy-bill-is-at-the-mercy-of-political-climate-change). The bill that he and Independent Sen. Joe Lieberman crafted would cap carbon emissions and invest in alternatives to oil and coal, but it’s in deep trouble. For starters, it appears to be sinking in the oily waters of the Gulf. Instead of the BP spill spurring on the bill’s push for alternative fuels, it’s slowing down progress because of the legislation’s provision to expand offshore oil drilling – a deal made to secure backing from the oil industry. Meanwhile, the legislation lost its main Republican supporter, Sen. Lindsey Graham, when the Democratic leadership decided to put immigration reform ahead of landmark energy legislation. Immigration will be much harder to pass than the Kerry-Lieberman bill, if not impossible. But that issue is all about the November elections and securing the Hispanic vote. Senator Kerry made three basic arguments for the bill, and they deserve to be heard. The first is jobs and the economy. He says the bill will create 200,000 jobs annually over 10 years, and return America to leadership in the “mother of all markets.” The technology boom of the 1990s was a $1 trillion market with 1 billion users, he said; the market for energy is $6 trillion, with 6 billion users. Not one American business is among the world’s top 10 solar producers, he laments. Meanwhile, China is investing $400 billion in alternative and renewable energy. Second, national security. The bill will lead to a 40 percent to 50 percent drop in dependence on OPEC, he claims. “We send $100 million a day to [oil-producing] Iran. Does that make sense?” Third, health and environmental reasons: melting glaciers, “climate refugees” of displaced people around the world, diminished wildlife habitat from a warming planet. Interestingly, he put these reasons last. It’s at the core of climate change legislation, but as even Al Gore found out, the environment doesn’t poll among voters the way the economy does.

Energy reform will create 203,000 jobs in the next 10 some years.

Reuters ‘10 (May 12 , “Senate Climate Bill a Jobs Creator: Study”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE64J5Q620100520?type=politicsNews>)

 (Reuters) - A climate change bill unveiled last week in the Senate would create hundreds of thousands of jobs as the country moves away from fossil fuels toward more nuclear energy and renewable sources of power, according to a nonpartisan study released on Thursday. "Between 2011 and 2020, average annual employment in the U.S. increases by 203,000," concluded the study by the Peterson Institute for International Economics. The study is the first to assess the economic impact of legislation sketched out by Democratic Senator John Kerry and independent Senator Joseph Lieberman. The Kerry-Lieberman bill, like one passed by the House of Representatives nearly a year ago, aims to cut U.S. emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases blamed for global warming by encouraging use of alternative fuels such as natural gas, nuclear, wind, biomass and solar power. U.S. government agencies are in the midst of their own economic analyses, which might not be completed until mid-June. Some private studies last year concluded the House-passed bill could generate up to 1.9 million jobs over 10 years.

Environment Impact Module

**Oil Dependence makes environmental collapse inevitable – BP proves, oil companies only care about profits, not about mitigating harms**

Heim 6-13 (<http://www.thepilot.com/news/2010/jun/13/americas-oil-dependence-just-delays-inevitable/>, Jim Heim is chairman of the Moore County Democratic Party\_)

“What the hell did we do to deserve this?” That’s the question BP CEO Tony Hayward posed to fellow executives in London. Perhaps it could be explained by the 760 safety violations his company received during the past three years. (By comparison, ExxonMobil received just one.) Maybe it was rushing the Deepwater Horizon project in the face of troubling test results. It’s possible that deepwater drilling is still too dangerous and current technology inadequate to safely conduct. Or it could be that it was a mistake to expect techniques for spill mitigation that have failed for the past 30 years to work this time. By BP’s admission, oil from a spill in the area could be expected to reach shore in 30 days. Yet they had no booms or other diversion equipment in the area to deploy readily. Whatever answers eventually emerge, we have serious choices to make. Experts agree that the easy, cheap oil has been found and extracted. Now oil companies are moving into arctic areas and deep water locations where expensive new technologies must be developed and perfected. Petroleum companies have shown great interest in recovering and profiting from that oil, but next to none in the technologies needed to limit the damage from spills and blowouts. Surprisingly, considering their opposition to federal bailouts, Republicans are arguing to continue limits on the oil companies’ liability for the damage their negligence causes. That would put taxpayers on the hook.

Environmental Collapse outweighs Nuclear War.

Tobin 90 (Richard, Associate Prof. Pol. Sci. @ SUNY Buffalo, “The Expendable Future: U.S. Politics and the Protection of Biological Diversity”, p. 14)

 In fact, when compared to all other environmental problems, human-caused extinctions are likely to be of far greater concern. Extinction is the permanent destruction of unique life forms and the only irreversible ecological change that humans can cause. No matter what the effort or sincerity of intentions, extinction species can never be replaced. “From the standpoint of permanent despoliation of the planet,” Norman Myers observes, no other form of environmental degradation “is anywhere so significant as the fallout of species.” Harvard biologist Edward O. Wilson is less modest in assessing the relative consequences of human-caused extinctions. To Wilson, the worst thing that will happen to earth is not economic collapse, the depletion of energy supplies, or even nuclear war. As frightful as these events might be, Wilson reasons that they can be repaired within a few generations. The one process ongoing … that will take millions of years to correct is the loss of genetic and species diversity by destruction of natural habitats.” David Ehrenfeld succinctly summarizes the problem and the need for a solution: “We are masters of extermination, yet creation is beyond our powers…. Complacency in the face of this terrible dilemma is inexcusable.” Ehrenfeld wrote these words in the early 1970s. Were he to write today he would likely add a note of dire urgency. If scientists are correct in their assessments of current extinctions and reasonably confident about extinction rates in the near future, then a concentrated and effective response to human-caused extinctions is essential. The chapters that follow evaluate that response in the United States.

Energy Reform Good – Competitiveness

Energy reform allows the US to maintain global leadership in technology

Burwell ‘10 (David, May 23, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Senate Climate Bill and Steps to Reduce U.S. Dependence on Oil” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40824>)

The new energy and climate bill put forward by Senators Kerry and Lieberman seeks to reduce carbon pollution by 17 percent (from 2005 levels) by 2020 and by over 80 percent by 2050. Reductions will come from all sectors—commercial, residential, power generation, and transportation, with limits on industrial sources of carbon pollution being delayed until 2016. In order to reduce American dependence on oil, the bill specifically targets transportation carbon emissions because the transportation sector is responsible for over 70 percent of domestic oil consumption. The bill allocates more than $8 billion annually in new investments in transit—higher speed rail, green freight, and smart growth (bikeable/walkable) community grants—tax credits for creating a new generation of heavy duty trucks fueled by natural gas, and incentives for building electric and hybrid vehicles. It also embraces President Obama’s proposals for increased vehicle fleet efficiency. The bill’s sponsors claim it will create millions of new jobs that will not easily be exported because building the new, low-carbon energy grid must happen within U.S. borders. The bill also aims to reduce the potential economic costs for industries focused on fossil fuel production and industrial workers by both delaying the imposition of limits on these industries and funding worker training programs for new clean energy jobs. **Does the United States need new energy and** climate **policies?** Absolutely. The Deepwater Horizon oil spill catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico and the recent mine disaster in West Virginia that killed 29 miners underscore the need for new U.S. energy sources that are clean, green, and safer than our existing energy portfolio. The United States also exports over $300 billion annually to buy foreign oil–this money would be better spent stimulating the domestic economy. Carbon emissions represent more than 80 percent of America’s greenhouse gases and the United States currently produces over 20 percent of global carbon emissions. These emissions are the primary driver of global warming and in the long term, the problems caused by climate disruption—including the loss of coastal areas and desertification of arid lands in the western United States—will cause major and on-going problems to America’s economy. Globally, if current trends continue, the impacts will be even worse, with hundreds of millions of environmental refugees moving across borders and exacerbating social and resource conflicts. Health risks will increase as tropical diseases move into communities that lack natural immunity to these diseases. And up to 35 percent of all species will be lost as the habitats needed for their survival disappear. Kerry and Lieberman’s bill is a step in the right direction, but more is needed to minimize the negative effects of climate change. **What are the key elements included in the text?** The critical element of the legislation is that it puts a price on carbon and thus discourages carbon emissions, which cause global warming. Carbon pricing is applied to all sectors of the economy in different ways and in a phased process to reduce any potentially negative impacts for the U.S. economy, household finances, and the national budget. A second important element is that the bill calls for two-thirds of all revenues generated by carbon pricing to either be paid back to consumers or be used to reduce the national deficit. Since wealthier households have higher carbon emissions than low-income households, the rebate program has the effect of turning a flat, regressive carbon tax into a progressive tax that allows medium- and low-income households to benefit from carbon pricing. And finally, the bill’s focus on investing in low-carbon technologies will ensure that the United States remains competitive in a changing global economy. The United States, which has long been the global leader in investing in new technology, now lags behind China in terms of its investment in green and clean technology—and by a substantial margin. Pollution is waste and waste is economically inefficient. By reducing carbon pollution and thus reducing waste, the United States can maintain its position as an economic leader.

AFF – Won’t Pass – Vote Count

Climate issue is politically divisive; 60 votes seems unlikely

AP 6/20(2010, <http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5h5iS14YOIUrpdmPuNylwKcVpSnmAD9GF682O0>) LL

WASHINGTON — A Senate sponsor of a climate and energy bill says supporters are still short of the 60 votes they need to advance the legislation. Independent Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut says about 50 senators support the bill while 30 others oppose it. That leaves 20 or so senators undecided. A major sticking point has been the bill's approach to carbon emissions, which are blamed for global warming. Lieberman says capping carbon pollution and putting a price on it is at the heart of the bill. Republicans reject the idea of a carbon tax.

Senate is stalled; getting 60 votes is extremely unlikely

McFeatters 6/20(Dale, Scripps Howard News Service, News Chief, 2010, <http://www.newschief.com/article/20100620/NEWS/6205000/1053?p=2&tc=pg>) LL

In his Oval Office address, President Barack Obama termed the Gulf oil spill "the most painful and powerful reminder that the time to embrace a clean-energy future is now." He urged lawmakers to "seize the moment" to enact a comprehensive energy and climate-change law. Predictably, the Republicans accused the president of exploiting the crisis, in the words of House GOP leader John Boehner, to "impose a job-killing energy tax." Environmentalists and many Senate Democrats probably thought to themselves, "If only the president had been that specific." The president didn't single out any of the energy bills being weighed by the Senate; nor did he endorse a carbon-emissions cap. Even before Obama's specifics-free call for energy legislation, a comprehensive bill was probably dead in the Senate. The problem is that there aren't the 60 votes necessary to override the inevitable Republican filibuster of a bill containing cap-and-trade, a carbon tax or any kind of carbon-pricing mechanism. Even without the filibuster, passing a bill with a pricing plan would be a tight squeeze. The Senate is under some pressure to act because the House already has, passing a comprehensive bill that did include cap-and-trade. House members are irritated that, in their view, they have been going first on controversial legislation, like health-care reform, only to have the Senate dither. In any case, there's a sense that Congress is suffering from big-issue fatigue, that it doesn't want to take on any more heavy lifting than cleaning up the work it has to do, and then heading home to run for re-election.

AFF – Won’t Pass – Vote Count

Energy Bill doesn’t have the votes

Lerer and Lomax 6/16 (Lisa and Simon, BusinessWeek, June 16, 2010, “Democrats Say Climate Bill Lacks Momentum After Spill”, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-06-16/democrats-say-climate-bill-lacks-momentum-after-spill-update3-.html>)

The House voted last June to create the first national limits on greenhouse-gas emissions. The measure would regulate carbon dioxide from power plants, refineries and factories through a cap-and-trade program in which companies buy and sell a declining number of pollution rights. Senator Mary Landrieu, a Louisiana Democrat, said Obama didn’t not specifically back a climate bill in his speech. “I didn’t find it overly political,” she told reporters today. “He did not endorse cap-and-trade.” Senator John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat who introduced legislation similar to the House bill in his chamber last month, said yesterday that it doesn’t have the votes yet needed to overcome a Republican filibuster. “We don’t have the 60 votes yet, I know that,” Kerry told reporters. “But we’re close enough to be able to fight for it.” House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, a California Democrat, said today that lawmakers who voted for last year’s cap-and-trade bill may not accept Senate legislation that doesn’t impose limits on the greenhouse gases linked to climate change. Among House Democrats, “the fuse is a short one in terms of protecting our environment,” Pelosi told reporters. She also said keeping heat-trapping gases out of the atmosphere is a “moral responsibility.” Political Concerns Some Democratic lawmakers have raised concerns that voting on the climate plan could create a political backlash in the November elections. “There’s not a great call for it in the Democratic caucus,” said West Virginia Democratic Senator Jay Rockefeller, who has argued against taking up the bill. Feinstein said last week she believed climate legislation could be passed next year. As an alternative, Democrats are working on an energy plan that would increase safety regulations on offshore drilling, raise or eliminate the cap on oil companies’ economic liability, promote energy efficiency and mandate more use of renewable electricity. “The front wheel of anything we do on energy is going to be addressing regulations and safety with respect to offshore drilling, particularly deep-well drilling,” said Senator Byron Dorgan, a Democrat from North Dakota. Energy Provisions Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat, has asked committee leaders to draft energy provisions to bring to the floor next month. Democrats plan to meet tomorrow to discuss what should be included. Reid would be unlikely to include a climate provision in the bill unless it had significant Republican support, Reid spokesman Jim Manley said in an e-mail. Republican backing would be needed to offset likely opposition from Democrats representing some rural and industrial states, who fear capping greenhouse gases would raise electric bills for consumers and business. To counter those concerns, Kerry and Lieberman yesterday released a study by the Environmental Protection Agency that said the plan would cost the average U.S. household less than dollar a day. Still, Senate Republicans and some Democrats from rural states say they see little connection between the oil spill and legislation to cap greenhouse-gas emissions. ‘Unrelated’ “It’s unrelated,” said Senator Ben Nelson, a Democrat from Nebraska. “Obviously the emissions that we are talking about are primarily coal-fired electricity generation from Nebraska. That doesn’t have much to do with the Gulf.” No Republicans have supported Kerry-Lieberman legislation thus far. South Carolina Republican Senator Lindsey Graham, who worked on a climate bill with the pair for months, dropped his support in late April. Republicans said yesterday that Obama shouldn’t use the Gulf spill to rally support for cap-and-trade legislation. The cost of carbon dioxide allowances is effectively a “new national energy tax” that will do nothing to “stop this spill and clean it up,” said Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky. The “justifiable public outrage” over the oil spill shouldn’t be employed “as a tool for pushing a divisive new climate change policy,” he said.

Democrats lack the will and cohesion to get 60 votes for energy reform

Shiner 6/7 (Meredith, June 7, Politico, “Senate Dems Look for Consensus on Energy Bill”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0610/38239.html>)

 Senate Democrats, flustered by the Gulf crisis and divided over climate legislation, are struggling to find consensus on a new energy bill. Majority Leader Harry Reid said Monday the "spill underscores our need for a new energy policy," echoing up a letter he sent late last week to committee chairmen requesting proposals for comprehensive energy legislation. Reid is slated to meet with key Senate committee chairmen on Thursday to discuss the energy issue, and will bring some of their best ideas before the full Democratic caucus next Tuesday. But while the final end product is up in the air, it’s unclear whether Democrats have the political will – or the votes – to deal with some of the most controversial proposals like a carbon tax or a cap and trade system. The demand for a totally new bill also puts an existing climate proposal introduced by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) in jeopardy, a sign that Democratic leaders are skeptical that Lieberman and Kerry have the votes for their bill. Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) said early Monday morning he believed the Kerry-Lieberman bill would be offered as an amendment to an energy bill once it reaches the Senate floor, but Senate sources insist that no decisions have been made.

AFF – Won’t Pass – Vote Count

Energy reform doesn’t have the votes

Samuelsohn 6/3 (DARREN, of Greenwire, June 3,2010 “Power Companies Lie Back as Push Begins for Senate Bill”, http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2010/06/03/03greenwire-power-companies-lie-back-as-push-begins-for-sen-7632.html)

Several utility industry sources explained that the uncertainties over whether President Obama and Congress can really accomplish anything this year on climate change are driving the latest round of complacency. In particular, officials are doubtful of the Senate bill's chances of notching the all-important 60 votes after Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) abandoned negotiations with Kerry and Lieberman in April over a separate political spat involving immigration. "There's no clear path on what the congressional leadership is going to make time for before the elections," Menezes said. "The industry is willing to go along with a reasonable plan to get it done. But they don't believe it's their responsibility to engender the grass-roots effort necessary to get climate change enacted." "We've always said we want to be in it," said Tom Williams, a spokesman at Duke Energy. "I don't see that changing, certainly. As to when and how, we just got to see where it's going to go. Is it going to go straight to the floor? Or to various committees? We will wait until that's determined and then weigh in as that path is set out." Duke was among a handful of big power companies that did join more than three dozen other businesses -- including FPL, General Electric Co., American Electric Power, AES, National Grid, NRG Energy, Constellation Energy, PG&E Corp., DTE Energy, PNM Resources and Exelon Corp. -- last week with a letter to the White House and Senate leaders urging passage of a comprehensive climate bill. Jim Connaughton, an executive with Baltimore-based utility Constellation Energy and former President George W. Bush's top environmental adviser, said part of the slowdown also comes from the sheer size of the nearly 1,000-page Senate proposal and the ongoing number crunching at U.S. EPA, the Energy Information Administration and beyond. "Everyone is in a position of regrouping as they're evaluating the bill and waiting to see both the external and internal analysis," he said. The EPA data are expected to be released next week, and EIA's figures by the middle of the month. Dan Lashof, a climate change expert with the Natural Resources Defense Council, said he's concerned the utility industry is sitting on the sidelines at a critical juncture in the Senate debate as Democrats try to count votes and the White House makes its push for the proposal with a connection to the Gulf of Mexico oil spill.

AFF – Won’t Pass – Cap and Trade

Cap and Trade dilemma prevents energy reform

Bravender 6/18 (Robin of ClimateWire, June 18, 2010, “Senate Democrats Getting More Pessimistic on Cap and Trade in Energy Bill”, <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/06/18/18climatewire-senate-democrats-getting-more-pessimistic-on-29916.html>)

Senate Democrats may have emerged from their much-hyped caucus meeting without a clear plan for this summer's energy bill, but they appeared to agree on one point: Cap and trade doesn't have the votes. Several senators say the chamber is unlikely to pass a measure that sets a price on carbon emissions this year, despite President Obama's support for such an approach and a push from many Democrats who say pricing carbon is needed to stop the adverse effects of climate change. "I don't see 60 votes for a price on carbon right now," Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) said yesterday. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), an ardent supporter of setting carbon limits, said he does not think the Senate can get 60 votes this year on a "strong" climate bill. "For a variety of reasons, with virtually no Republicans supporting us, it would mean that every Democrat has to step up to the plate," Sanders said yesterday. "Do I think we have 60 votes to come up with strong global warming legislation? No. I think that's a tragedy, but that's the way it is." Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) said he does not think there are 60 votes in the Senate for a cap-and-trade bill like the "American Power Act (pdf)" advanced by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), which would cap greenhouse gas emissions across multiple sectors of the economy. "There's a better chance of having 60 votes with a straight energy bill," said Sen. Ben Nelson (D-Neb.). And Sen. Kent Conrad (D-N.D.) said he has always thought cap and trade "was a long shot this year, given all the other things that are before Congress -- the short nature of the session and because of the election." It is unclear whether Obama and Senate Democratic leadership intend to push aggressively for cap and trade or any mechanism to price carbon this year. Obama failed to call for it directly in his Oval Office address this week and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) yesterday declined to promise to include a price on carbon in an energy package slated for floor debate next month. Reid said yesterday that his goals for energy legislation are dealing with the crisis in the Gulf of Mexico, creating jobs and cutting pollution. "There are many strong passions and arguments about the best way to achieve these goals," Reid said yesterday after the Democratic caucus met to discuss an energy bill. "And I'm always focused on what is possible." But what is possible remains a contentious issue within Reid's party. Reid said he would work with committee leaders to come up with a bill that sets "reasonable goals with a reasonable timeframe" and will "overcome whatever hurdles opponents put in our way." But he would not say whether that bill would include a price on carbon. One of those chairmen said it is not a lock that the Senate can even get 60 votes on an "energy only" bill like the measure (S. 1462 (pdf)) the Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed last summer. "I can't say yes," Commerce Chairman Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) said when asked whether the Senate could pass an energy bill this year. That is due to the "hesitation factor" in the Senate, he said, "knowing you have absolutely no Republican votes at all."

AFF – Won’t Pass – GOP Block

The GOP is blocking the Energy bill

Condon 6/10 (Stephanie, “GOP Pushes Back on EPA Emission Regulation, Dem Climate Change Policy” June 10, 2010, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20007358-503544.html>)

As Democrats continue to deliberate their approach to energy and climate change policy, Republicans are pushing their own proposals for a different, more incremental course -- including a plan to block the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating greenhouse gas emissions. The Senate is debating today a resolution from GOP Sen. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska that would stop the Obama administration's EPA from regulating emissions under the Clean Air Act. The Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that the EPA was obligated to decide whether carbon gas and other greenhouse gas emissions are a threat to human health and that the EPA has authority to regulate emissions. Murkowski and many other lawmakers, however, argue regulating emissions is the under the purview of Congress. President Obama has said it would be preferable for Congress to pass climate change and energy legislation to regulate emissions but that the EPA should regulate emissions if Congress fails to act. The administration issued a statement of policy promising a veto of Murkowski's bill if it passes. The bill, the statement says, "would undermine the administration's efforts to reduce the negative impacts of pollution and the risks associated with environmental catastrophes, like the ongoing BP oil spill." However, Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell charged that the administration opposes the bill because, "now that it's clear Congress won't pass this new national energy tax this year, the administration... is now trying to get done through the back door what they haven't been able to get through the front door." Typically, with only 41 votes in the Senate, Republicans would need the support of numerous Democrats to get the 60 votes needed to overcome a filibuster. However, Murkowski is using the Congressional Review Act to expedite her resolution, the Hill reports, which allows Congress to overturn executive branch regulations with a simple majority. Still, the measure is unlikely to pass in the House, and Republicans do not have the votes to overturn a veto. It's unclear how today's debate in the Senate will turn out; some Democrats support Murkowski's measure. Today's vote is seen as something of a test as to where lawmakers stand on the general issue of climate change legislation. The Democrats' main climate change bill, unveiled last month by Democratic Sen. John Kerry (Mass.) and Independent Sen. Joe Lieberman (Conn.), lost some of its luster when Sen. Lindsey Graham (S.C.) -- the one Republican backing the measure -- withdrew his support for it. Meanwhile, Republican Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) put forward his own proposal for climate change legislation yesterday, which seeks to lower emissions and bring down energy use without creating a carbon market like the Kerry-Lieberman bill does. The bill requires higher vehicle mileage and increased use of alternative fuels, as well as greater efficiency in power generation and energy use in buildings. It does not include any mandatory emission reductions and falls short of the emissions reductions goals set by the administration. Graham on Wednesday announced he would co-sponsor Lugar's proposal, even though just the day before, he told reporters that "nothing [with respect to energy] will get 60 votes," including Lugar's bill, Politico reports. Democratic leaders are meeting later today to discuss energy and climate change, according to Politico. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has said he wants a plan to move forward by next month. Meanwhile, Mr. Obama is meeting this afternoon with business leaders like Microsoft founder Bill Gates to discuss energy reform.

AFF – Won’t Pass – Murkowski Bill

**Murkowski’s bill is going to hurt the dem’s Energy bill**

Lomax 6/10 (Simon, BusinessWeek, Editors David Marino, and Joe Link, June 10, 2010, “Republicans Try to Sink EPA Carbon Rules Before Energy Debate”, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-06-10/republicans-try-to-sink-epa-carbon-rules-before-energy-debate.html>)

June 10 (Bloomberg) -- Senate Republicans will try a long- shot maneuver today to derail greenhouse-gas regulations for cars, power plants, refineries and factories that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency plans to enforce next year under existing law. Senator Lisa Murkowski, the Alaska Republican leading the effort, said yesterday her motion to disapprove the EPA’s regulations must clear a “very high hurdle” to succeed. If the motion gets the necessary 51 votes to pass the Senate and then makes it through the U.S. House, White House officials have said President Barack Obama would likely veto the measure. While the Murkowski disapproval motion probably won’t stop the EPA’s regulations, today’s vote threatens to set back a bigger plan to charge polluters a price for releasing carbon dioxide and other gases linked to climate change into the atmosphere, K. Whitney Stanco, a Washington-based analyst with Concept Capital, said in a telephone interview. “The closer Murkowski gets to 51 votes, the harder it gets to pass a carbon-pricing bill with the little time that’s left this year,” Stanco said. The EPA’s authority to regulate greenhouse gases under existing law stems from a 2007 Supreme Court decision on the scope of the Clean Air Act. This approach is the Obama administration’s back-up plan if the cap-and-trade legislation it prefers doesn’t pass Congress this year. Cap-and-Trade Under cap-and-trade, the government issues a declining number of carbon dioxide allowances which power plants, factories and oil refineries buy and sell. Legislation that narrowly passed the House last year stalled in the Senate. Senators John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, and Joseph Lieberman, a Connecticut independent, released a revamped cap- and-trade bill last month and are lobbying with Obama’s help to get the new carbon-pricing proposal included in energy legislation that may get a vote as soon as July. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Nevada Democrat who plans to meet today with the leaders of several committees to discuss climate-change legislation, said this week he hasn’t decided whether the energy bill will include carbon caps. While Murkowski’s resolution only requires 51 out of 100 votes to pass, major legislation in the Senate usually requires 60 votes. This means a group of 41 or more senators could block, or filibuster, a climate-change bill. Influence on Bill Democrats currently hold 59 seats in the Senate and the Republicans have 41. The number of Democrats who join Murkowski in “saying no to EPA regulation of carbon” will influence Reid’s decision on whether to include carbon caps in the energy bill, Senator Lindsey Graham, a South Carolina Republican, said in an interview. “That population of Democrats are the ones who would be very suspect on climate-change legislation,” said Graham, who helped Kerry and Lieberman write their bill before backing out of the effort in late April. Graham, who yesterday backed an energy bill that doesn’t include carbon caps, said he plans to vote with Murkowski to prevent EPA setting rules that he says should only come from Congress. Four Democrats have so far voiced support for the disapproval motion. There are 38 Republican co-sponsors of the resolution, including Murkowski, bringing the total number of supporters to 42. While Murkowski said yesterday she expects more Democrats to vote with her today, Reid has predicted it won’t pass. Carbon Cap Even a close vote on the Murkowski resolution would hurt the chances of carbon caps or other constraints on greenhouse gases being included in an energy bill this year, Sarah Binder, a congressional specialist at the Washington-based Brookings Institution, said in a telephone interview. “From Reid’s perspective you don’t want too large a vote in favor of the disapproval resolution,” Binder said. “The more votes she gets for it, the stronger a signal there is that it’s going to be difficult to pass anything through the Senate that directly regulates greenhouse gases.” The vote on Murkowski’s disapproval motion is purely about “posturing and symbolism” for senators who want to tell voters they “stood up to the EPA” heading into this year’s elections, Dan Lashof, director of the Natural Resources Defense Council’s climate center in Washington, said in a phone interview. The vote tally for the disapproval motion won’t affect the chances of climate-change legislation getting passed this year because some senators are just objecting to the EPA setting carbon limits instead of Congress, Lashof said. “One doesn’t predict the outcome of the other,” he said

AFF – Won’t Pass – A2: Obama Push

**Obama’s efforts to push energy reform will not persuade the Senate**

McManus (Doyle, LA Times 10, June 20, [http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-mcmanus-bp-obama-20100620,0,3654002.column](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-mcmanus-bp-obama-20100620%2C0%2C3654002.column)) LL

Last week, Obama finally found a way to do that. He summoned BP's top executives to the White House, told them he needed their help, and nudged them into ponying up. Obama didn't raise his voice or pound on his desk when he talked to the men from BP. He didn't need to. The lineup on Obama's side of the table included Ken Salazar, the interior secretary who will decide whether BP ever drills in U.S. waters again, and Eric H. Holder Jr., the attorney general who will decide whether to pursue criminal charges against the company. President Obama had finally embraced the wisdom of his fellow Chicagoan, Al Capone: You get much further with a kind word and a gun than with a kind word alone. So was it a shakedown? Sure — although the polite word for it in Washington isn't "shakedown," it's "jawboning." And when the beneficiaries of a shakedown are taxpayers and the Gulf Coast, most Americans don't mind a little strong-arming. That's something Barton didn't understand. After criticizing the "shakedown," he went on to apologize to BP for the rough treatment it had endured. Then, under pressure from terrified Republican colleagues, he had to apologize for his apology. Presidents have long used the federal government's clout to press private industries to do their bidding, most often to settle strikes or forestall price increases. They don't always succeed; Bill Clinton summoned baseball owners and players to the White House in 1995 in an attempt to settle a strike, but they blew him off. Obama tried to shame Wall Street into trimming bonuses last year, and got negligible results. But BP, which needs federal permits to drill and has contracts to sell $2.2 billion of fuel to the U.S. military, had more to lose than the ballplayers and investment bankers did. In fact, the deal Obama gave BP wasn't all that onerous. The president claimed credit for lifting a $75-million ceiling on the company's liability set by a 1990 oil drilling law, but BP had already said it would voluntarily agree to spend beyond that limit. (The company wasn't likely to have much choice; the ceiling is void if the company broke any regulations, and evidence is mounting that BP violated plenty.) Obama also got the company to make a "voluntary" donation of $100 million to a fund for oil workers laid off by his moratorium on deep-water drilling. But BP benefitted from the deal as well: Obama publicly stated that it was in the United States' interest to keep the company from going bankrupt — something the markets had begun to worry about. After the deal was announced, BP's stock recovered from a low of $29 and closed the week near $32. The political question now is: Has Obama done enough? Obama's aides acknowledge the president was too slow to recognize the impact of the disaster. It wasn't until five weeks into the crisis that he sent Coast Guard Adm. Thad Allen to the gulf to take charge of the containment effort, removed the director of the failed Minerals Management Service and declared a moratorium on deep-water drilling. A politician who built his career on soaring words was learning that actions spoke louder. The biggest factor in Obama's favor has been his good luck in adversaries — not only the hapless Rep. Barton, but Republicans in general, who have offered discordant messages on the crisis. Gov. Bobby Jindal (R-La.) and former Gov. Sarah Palin (R-Alaska) demanded that the federal government do more even as Gov. Haley Barbour (R-Miss.) and Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.) criticized federal action as intrusive. Now, at length, the administration has found some footing on the issue. Aides say they're confident that the public isn't blaming Obama for the crisis, and polls suggest that the president's approval rating, which remains at an anemic 46%, hasn't been affected much by the oil spill. With luck, aides say, the containment effort will soon begin to work — and this won't be Obama's Katrina after all. The events of last week even gave the president and his aides encouragement to renew their pitch for a comprehensive energy bill — one they once hoped could include a "cap and trade" system to reduce the nation's use of petroleum and other polluting fuels. But members of Congress, unlike BP executives, aren't worried about landing on Obama's bad side. They fear hostile voters more than they fear a vengeful White House. Obama jawboned a giant oil company out of $20 billion, but getting an ambitious energy bill through Congress? Not even the president is that powerful.

AFF – Won’t Pass – A2: Momentum

Democrats lack momentum for energy bill passage

New York Times 10 (June 20, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/21/opinion/21mon1.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>) LL

To anyone watching the oil spew into the Gulf of Mexico, the argument for curbing this country’s appetite for fossil fuels could not be clearer. President Obama was right last week when he called on America to unify behind a “national mission” to find alternative energy sources, sharply reduce its dependence on oil and cut its greenhouse gas emissions. We were disappointed, however, that Mr. Obama’s address failed to insist that the best way to do all of these things is to establish a broadly based, economy wide cap-and-trade system that would put a price on carbon emissions. He opened the door far too wide to alternative policies that aren’t real alternatives — and to more stalling. A House bill approved last year would set up such a system. Action in the Senate has been delayed for months, as Republicans, and some Democrats, have argued without any real proof that capping and pricing carbon emissions would cripple the economy by driving up the cost of energy. On Wednesday, Democratic leaders, who have promised to bring an energy bill to the Senate floor after the Fourth of July recess but are nowhere near agreement on what should be in it, will troop down to the White House. This time, Mr. Obama must stress, explicitly and emphatically, that a conventional energy bill will not do — and that attaching real costs to older, dirtier fuels now dumped free of charge into the atmosphere is the surest way to persuade American industry to develop cleaner fuels.

**AFF – Won’t Pass – A2: Momentum**

**Election year fears, solid Republican opposition, and lack of Democratic unity will prevent energy reform**

Harwood 10 (John, The New York Times: The Caucus, June 20, <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/20/for-democrats-internal-dissent-could-stop-an-agenda-cold/>) LL

As Democrats try again this week to fight through their election-year storm, Job No. 1 is settling on a common destination. For instance, they will need to make order out of chaos on energy, the issue [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per) elevated from the Oval Office last week. Two days later, three Senate Democrats presented different plans to a party caucus that failed to settle on one approach. “We are not going today to tell you what we’re going to have in this legislation,” the Senate majority leader, [Harry Reid](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/r/harry_reid/index.html?inline=nyt-per), acknowledged afterward, “because that’s a work in progress.” So is a major tax and spending bill, which has split Senate Democrats over conflicting imperatives to aid Americans suffering from a weak economy and to prevent higher deficits. In the House, Speaker [Nancy Pelosi](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/nancy_pelosi/index.html?inline=nyt-per) delayed action on campaign finance legislation after a compromise struck with the [National Rifle Association](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/national_rifle_association/index.html?inline=nyt-org) to win over moderates upset the Black Caucus. All Democratic factions exulted in the Republican public relations disaster of Representative Joe L. Barton of Texas, who apologized to BP before retracting his words under orders from party leaders. Yet that provided only temporary respite from intra-Democratic battles after a 17-month roller-coaster ride in which their reward for advancing Mr. Obama’s agenda is near-10-percent unemployment and ominous pre-election polls. “This is a difficult moment for Democrats,” said William A. Galston, who was domestic policy chief in the Clinton White House. “Under this kind of pressure in an election year, it’s inevitable.” Competing Priorities For much of the 20th century, when the [Democratic Party](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/d/democratic_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org) contained white Southern conservatives, Northern liberals and African-Americans, the party had a reputation for fractiousness and ideological diversity. That diversity faded in recent decades as conservatives moved toward the Republicans. Democratic gains in 2006 and 2008 swept in a raft of new members from conservative-leaning states and districts. But internal fissures in the Obama era have generally paled alongside those of earlier times. On issues like economic stimulus, health care and new [financial regulations](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/credit_crisis/financial_regulatory_reform/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), Democratic lawmakers have displayed remarkable unity of purpose. That is why the Democratic infighting now rising with the summer temperatures poses such problems for the White House. With Republicans maintaining near-unanimous opposition, even a moderate amount of internal dissent could stop Mr. Obama’s agenda cold. “You have one party that has taken a pass on governing,” said [Dan Pfeiffer](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/daniel_h_pfeiffer/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the White House communications director. “Our system’s not set up for that.” Most vexing are the colliding priorities on the economy. Many Democrats consider it self-evident that spending billions of dollars more on unemployment benefits, [Medicaid](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/medicaid/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) assistance and state aid to avoid teacher layoffs makes economic and political sense. But more deficit-conscious Democrats, including vulnerable first-term members elected with Mr. Obama, consider it equally obvious that Congress must curb federal borrowing and answer public concerns about debt and deficits. Mr. Obama’s answer for reconciling those impulses, short-term spending and long-term austerity, has been hard to sell. “The challenge is doing both without sending conflicting messages,” said Representative Chris Van Hollen, the Maryland Democrat who is chairman of the party’s House campaign committee. “That’s the balance you see members struggling with.” Avoiding Risks Energy presents another huge challenge as midterm elections draw closer. Mr. Obama says only capping and putting a price on carbon dioxide emissions can accomplish three fundamental goals: lessening America’s dependence on [oil](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/o/oil_spills/gulf_of_mexico_2010/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), turning renewable alternatives into viable sources of energy and jobs, and curbing [global warming](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). But energy-state Democrats fear the economic effects, and vulnerable Democratic candidates fear Republican attacks on the administration’s “cap and tax” proposal. Even Democrats with common policy goals diverge on strategy. Some environmentalists want to use outrage over the Gulf of Mexico oil spill in a last-ditch push for Mr. Obama’s [carbon cap](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/g/greenhouse_gas_emissions/cap_and_trade/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), which has passed the House but stalled in the Senate. Others say the idea has already proved politically untenable; they want Democrats to settle for energy-efficiency legislation, then let Mr. Obama use his executive authority to regulate carbon through the [Environmental Protection Agency](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/environmental_protection_agency/index.html?inline=nyt-org).

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Watered Down

Energy reform fails—watered down bill

Bloom 6/9 (Jeremy, Wednesday June 9, 2010, “Graham Won’t Vote for his Own Climate Bill”, <http://seminal.firedoglake.com/diary/53682>)

The Washington Independent reports that Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) won’t support his own climate bill, that he’s spent months developing with John Kerry (D-MA) and Joe Lieberman (?-CT). Why not? He says it’s because it’s too restrictive on drilling! “What I have withdrawn from is a bill that basically restricts drilling in a way that is never going to happen in the future,” Graham said. “I wanted it to safely occur in the future; I don’t want to take it off the table.” What’s really going on? Remember the health care debate? In which negotiations dragged on for months and months and months between Democrats and "moderate Republicans" in order to achieve some sort of bi-partisan consensus, only to break down at the last minute? In which Democrats watered down the bill, giving in time after time to "moderate Republicans", only to have them vote against the very compromises they had demanded? I think we’re seeing the same thing again here. Delay, delay, delay, then in the end obstruct. And of course, after all those months of discussion, what did they call for? "Start over from scratch." So what does Graham say now? Graham said his advice to lawmakers is to “start over and scale down your ambitions.” This includes allowing electric utilities more time to meet their emission reduction targets and completely removing energy-intensive manufacturers and other industries from a carbon control plan. The technology does not yet exist for them to be able to capture and store carbon emissions, he argued. …He said he will offer up later this year a “hodgepodge of ideas out there that I think form a potential pathway forward.” Because we all know that the one thing Washington needs is more time to talk about it. The Independent added, It seems pretty clear at this point that Graham has been looking for a way out of his support for climate legislation for some time; now, he’s found it.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Environment

The American Power Act reduces regulation and incentivizes more pollution—can’t solve the environment

Kessler ’10 (Barbara, May 13, Staff writer@Green Right Now, “Kerry-Lieberman bill arrives, limp but breathing”, http://www.greenrightnow.com/wls/2010/05/13/kerry-lieberman-bill-arrives-limp-but-breathing/)

We knew there would be mixed feelings. This American Power Act may be a classic case of trying to please everyone and failing to please anyone. It tries to do it all: curb emissions, appease hostile Republicans, mete out the requisite treats for industries both clean and dirty, and weave in support for new jobs. That’s quite a high wire act, certain to teeter with so many special interests hitching a ride. It’s got the same meager carbon reduction targets it always had — aiming to reduce U.S. carbon emissions by 17 percent by 2020 compared with 2005 levels. That’s what Obama threw out in Copenhagen and it’s no surprise, though to ardent climate advocates this has been a festering thorn. It sets the U.S. on a dangerously slow road to climate mitigation, they say, flouting warnings that we have only a short few years to reel in greenhouse gas emissions. “The American Power act doesn’t meet the test of atmospheric science since the [emission reduction] targets are very weak, and the offsets mean even they won’t be met in time to prevent climate catastrophe,” says [350.org](http://www.350.org), a global group that wants strong greenhouse gas emission curbs. The group opposes the offsets in the APA as too lenient toward polluters because they allow dirty industries to continue emissions if they invest in “offsetting” activities like reforestation. [Friends of the Earth](http://www.foe.org/), another environmental group, opposes the APA because it fails to change the energy landscape much at all, and may even do more harm than good. FOE president Erich Pica likens the bill to BP’s amateurish “junk shot” plan to blast debris into its leaking oil well. The APA, writes Pica in [an article](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/erich-pica/the-american-power-act-ke_b_575037.html) today, is wrong in so many ways, from its support of further offshore oil drilling to the proposed wasteful spending on clean coal. “The American Power Act isn’t about reducing pollution, it’s about expanding production. It’s not about conservation, it’s about ramping up domestic production of fossil fuels and other energy sources that are dirty, dangerous, and unsustainable,” Pica says. And yet, most major mainstream environmental groups support the new draft of the APA, though their lack of enthusiasm is palpable. They laud the senators for getting something on track, no matter how wobbly. It’s better than the stalmate that has ensued; an “important first step” in the words of the Alliance to Save Energy. The bill’s shortcomings are stark. It insists on conscripting the EPA’s authority to regulate air pollution under the Clean Air Act, an attempt to smooth over Republican concerns about strong federal oversight. The idea of loosening the government’s grip on air pollution controls horrifies the American Lung Association, which sees they see this compromise to keep the bill oxygenated as an assault on everyone else’s breathing. Their ALA’s strong statement against provisions in the bill should make environmental defenders who’ve not flagged these problems blush in shame: “We at the American Lung Association were shocked to read language included in the draft American Power Act introduced today by Senators John Kerry and Joseph Lieberman that would unleash a dangerous process to attack life-saving rules on coal-fired power plants and threaten to permit much more air pollution around the nation. The outrageous proposal creates an open door through which millions of tons of life-threatening pollution could be allowed to flow. We oppose these provisions. The American Lung Association cannot support legislation that includes changes to the Clean Air Act that undermine the protection of public health. The Sierra Club’s Executive Director Michael Brune calls out this problem as well in his group’s response:  “We are pleased that this draft allows EPA to move forward with performance standards for existing power plants including coal, but we are disappointed that the bill still waives some key safeguards from the Clean Air Act.” Brune also articulates another concern shared by many groups, that the bill has too many pre-packaged concessions to fossil fuel providers. “…we regret that bitter opposition from the dirty energy sources of the past like coal, oil and nuclear has watered down this proposal in order to unduly subsidize energy technologies which already receive an unfair public bailout.  The proposal must do more to acknowledge the need for America to serve as a world leader in protecting forests and helping the world prepare for climate disruption.” This has been an ongoing concern as advocates awaited the final draft of the bill. How can America break its fossil fuel addiction while continuing to fund the pushers? You can imagine the head banging over this last point. We’ve got almost unlimited untapped wind and solar energy potential, enough wind alone to power the entire nation of electric cars; and yet Congress dithers over tax incentives for new power sources, and fails to tax dirty energy sufficiently to force changes or even pay for its present-day harm to the environment.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Environment

Kerry-Lieberman Fails—causes worse environmental destruction

Snape ‘10(Bill, 5/12, Writer@Center for Biological Diversity, “Kerry-Lieberman Climate Proposal a Disaster for Climate”, http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press\_releases/2010/kerry-lieberman-05-12-2010.html)

In the midst of what appears to be the worst offshore oil disaster in American history, U.S. Senators John Kerry (D-Mass.) and Joseph Lieberman (I-Conn.) will today put forth a [draft climate bill](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/climate_law_institute/legislating_for_a_new_climate/pdfs/PowerActDraft_051110.pdf) that will not solve the problems of global warming and continues pandering to the fossil fuel industry – including expanded offshore oil drilling – that created the problems in the first place. The proposal, leaked one day before its official release, reflects months of back-room negotiations between the senators, major polluters, and other Washington insiders, and would: provide only a fraction of the greenhouse gas pollution reductions scientists have said are necessary to avoid catastrophic climate disruption; ban successful Clean Air Act programs from reducing greenhouse pollution; ban existing state and local efforts to tackle climate change; catalyze increased oil and gas drilling – including offshore drilling; and subsidize dangerous and costly nuclear energy. In response, Center for Biological Diversity Executive Director Kierán Suckling urged rejection of the proposal unless these problems are addressed. He issued the following statement: “The climate proposal put forth today by Senators Kerry and Lieberman represents a disaster for our climate and planet. This proposal moves us one baby step forward and at least three giant steps back in any rational effort to address the climate crisis. “The senators’ proposal would entrench our addiction to fossil fuels by offering incentives for increased oil and gas drilling just days after what appears to be the worst offshore oil disaster in American history. Large domes, small domes, golf balls, garbage, chemical dispersants, fire – none have succeeded in stopping the enormous flow of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Clearly, there are no 'safeguards' Senators Lieberman and Kerry could put into this bill to make offshore oil safe. “This proposal echoes greenhouse pollution reduction targets that scientists recently called ‘paltry’ and inadequate to prevent the worst impacts of climate change. Scientists have determined that reducing carbon pollution to 350 parts per million is necessary to preserve life as we know it. 350 ppm must be the bottom line for all climate and energy policies. The senators’ weak targets will not reduce carbon pollution to below 350 ppm from its current level of 391 ppm. “In his recent Earth Day proclamation, President Barack Obama specifically celebrated the gains of the Clean Air Act; nonetheless, this proposal appeases polluters by gutting the Act, which has protected the air we breathe for 40 years, reaping economic benefits more than 40 times its cost. The Clean Air Act already provides a mechanism to establish science-based pollution caps for greenhouse pollutants, yet the Kerry-Lieberman proposal would ban proven successful Clean Air Act programs from cutting greenhouse emissions. “The Kerry-Lieberman proposal is not the answer because it asks the wrong questions. A successful climate bill must build upon, and not roll back, our existing foundation of environmental protections, and it must achieve the greenhouse pollution reductions necessary to avert dangerous climate disruption.”

Kerry-Lieberman fails—status quo cuts emissions more

Lipow ‘10(Gar, May 19, Journalist and Environmental Activist, “Kerry-Lieberman is worse than nothing, no matter how loudly supporters clap.”, <http://www.grist.org/article/kerry-lieberman-is-worse-than-nothing-no-matter-how-loudly-supporters-clap>)

Just as the supporters of Clinton's welfare bill claimed it would create conditions that would make it easier to fight poverty and create jobs, the Kerry-Lieberman supporters of today claim it will make it easier to tighten caps and cut emissions - while its actual provisions will make the climate problem worse. The nominal target has already been more than halfway met just by emissions reductions from the current recession and existing "command & control" legislation. Most of the remaining target could be met by offsets, legal counterfeit do-it-yourself emission permits. So at best the bill would produce few, if any, real cuts - nowhere near the reduction claimed in the nominal cap. Worse, many types of offsets could end increasing emissions even before they served as permission to continue burning coal. For example, we may see ethanol (which has higher greenhouse gas emissions per mile than gasoline) credited as a carbon offset. Or we may see types of forestry which might release centuries of banked carbon from trees and soil credited as carbon reductions. The protection of offset additionality is phrased in stern generalities with specifics left to regulators. So we don't really know what would or would not be allowed. In an age of regulatory capture, that is not good news. Even worse, the KL bill repeals the EPA's authority to regulate greenhouse gases. The usual reply from KL supporters: "That old thing? We weren't using it anyway. And that broom is missing a few too many bristles to sweep clean." That misses two points. However weak or strong that authority is, it is the only leverage to get climate legislation through a 60-vote Senate. Pass weak legislation that eliminates the EPA, and what will you use as leverage to strengthen it? Especially after you start seeing big agriculture and forestry garnering massive profits from the counterfeit permit industry (otherwise know as offsets). And while EPA authority does not include the ability to reduce emissions in as optimum a path a we would like, the EPA certainly has authority to reduce emissions by more than the KL bill does.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Environment

Any energy reform that passes will not hold up to EPA standards

Brown 10 (Lance, executive director of Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy, The Daily Caller, June 21, <http://dailycaller.com/2010/06/21/a-one-size-fits-all-renewable-energy-standard-will-cause-more-problems-than-it-solves/#ixzz0rSSjQkMj>) LL

Last week, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released its review of the American Power Act proposed by Sens. John Kerry (D-MA) and Joe Lieberman (I-CT). The analysis is conveniently rosy, and the sponsors are eagerly promoting the EPA’s finding that the average household will face an average estimated cost increase of only $79, to $146. The truth, however, is that the bill that the EPA examined is far different from the bill that will eventually be voted on in Congress. The current draft of the American Power Act focuses on cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 by setting a price on carbon that would increase with inflation, in addition to restricting carbon use. The bill also includes consumer protections, transportation energy standards, and tax credits for construction of nuclear power plants, among other provisions. The bill does not include a renewable energy standard, which would require states to obtain a certain percentage of energy from government-mandated “renewable” sources. Studies overwhelmingly show that a renewable energy standard would raise electricity bills and cost jobs across America. But Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has indicated time and again that the American Power Act will be amended to include a renewable energy standard. He has vocally supported the idea of incorporating Sen. Jeff Bingaman’s (D-NM) stand-alone renewable energy standard legislation into Sen. Kerry’s and Sen. Lieberman’s bill. Sen. Bingaman’s proposal calls for 15 percent of each state’s energy to come from government-mandated renewable sources by 2021. The problem with this proposal, as I’ve written here many times, is that many states don’t have adequate access to the resources that would fall under the “renewable” classification, like wind and solar energy. Though wind energy works for some states, like North Dakota and Texas, it is unreliable in the majority of states as it requires wind to constantly blow. Even North Dakota, the state with the highest potential wind capacity, only gets about 5 percent of its energy from wind, and relies on traditional sources like coal and natural gas for much of its supply. In addition to the reliability issue, these renewable sources are astronomically expensive in comparison to traditional sources. The electricity produced by wind and sunlight is 90 times more expensive than the electricity produced by fossil sources like coal. States that don’t have ready access to renewable sources will see their electricity prices go through the roof when they have to pay to import the expensive sources, too. In the wake of the Gulf Coast tragedy, it is increasingly apparent that we must create a diverse portfolio of energy sources for our country. We cannot continue on our current path of dependency on a few resources, especially when those resources have so much potential to harm us and our environments. By favoring a few energy sources over others, we’ll create more dependency and cost issues at a time when we cannot afford to remain dependent or pay higher energy bills. It’s thus increasingly apparent that a one-size-fits-all renewable energy standard will cause more problems than it solves. Above all, it will cause energy costs to rise as many states struggle to gain access to the renewable sources cherry-picked by the government.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Econ

Kerry-Lieberman kills the economy—kills jobs and skyrockets energy costs

Taylor ‘10(James, May 17, senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute, “Kerry-Lieberman Energy Restrictions Would Strangle Economy”, http://www.heartland.org/full/27659/KerryLieberman\_Energy\_Restrictions\_Would\_Strangle\_Economy.html)

The Kerry-Lieberman bill imposes the same draconian carbon reduction mandates sought under prior global warming bills. The legislation calls for a 17 percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (from 2005 levels) by 2020 and a more than 80 percent reduction by 2050. Forcing American consumers to abandon inexpensive energy sources such as coal, oil, and natural gas and replace them with expensive, unreliable sources such as wind and solar power will play havoc with our already reeling economy. President Obama acknowledged this in a 2008 interview with the San Francisco Chronicle when he said, “Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.” Kerry-Lieberman proponents argue that eliminating inexpensive conventional power sources will not cost consumers any money because the government will charge carbon emitters a fee for each unit of carbon they emit and refund a portion of those fees to consumers. This promise by Washington politicians to—for the first time in history—refrain from raiding an available money stream for pet projects, special interests, and pork-barrel spending lacks credibility on its face. Nevertheless, even if Washington politicians honored it, the promise itself is nothing more than a misleading head-fake. If carbon dioxide emissions decline by more than 80 percent, as the bill envisions, government will be issuing very few carbon emission credits and thus collecting few carbon emission fees. Instead, consumers will be purchasing inefficient wind and solar power, for which consumers will face sharply higher energy bills while receiving no carbon emission fee rebates. Just how much will carbon dioxide restrictions cost American consumers? A recent Tufts University study found the production costs of nuclear power are 57 percent higher than the costs of coal power. Wind power costs 75 percent more to produce than coal power. Solar thermal is 570 percent more expensive than coal, and solar photovoltaic is 887 percent more expensive than coal. (Environmental activists prefer solar photovoltaic over solar thermal because solar thermal consumes tremendous amounts of water.) Given these economic realities, the Obama Treasury Department concluded last September that carbon dioxide restrictions could cost the average U.S. household roughly $3,000 each and every year. Talking points accompanying the American Power Act assert the bill will create millions of jobs in the United States. True, forcing people to purchase expensive solar and wind power will create jobs in the solar and wind power industries. But a far greater number of jobs will be destroyed in other sectors of the economy because consumers will have less available money for food, clothing, shelter, health care, and durable consumer goods—items that improve living standards and benefit human welfare. Forcing consumers to purchase more-expensive energy “grows” the economy and “creates millions of jobs” in the same shortsighted and counterproductive manner that encouraging mafia activity would “grow the economy” by creating millions of jobs in the extortion industry. With our economy already in tatters, the last thing the United States needs is an American Power Act that puts a mafia-style hit on American living standards and productive economic activity.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Econ

Kerry-Lieberman kills growth—kills jobs and lowers GDP

The Detroit News ‘10(May 20, “Detroit Fears: Climate Bill Would Strangle Economic Recovery”, http://www.thegwpf.org/opinion-pros-a-cons/984-detroit-fears-climate-bill-would-strangle-economic-recovery-.html)

The betting in Washington is that the cap-and-trade carbon bill introduced in the Senate by Democrat John Kerry of Massachusetts and Independent Joe Lieberman of Connecticut hasn't got a chance of passing this year. That may explain why public outcry against yet another economy-choking piece of legislation has been fairly muted. But we're not taking anything for granted, remembering that in January, after Scott Brown scored his stunning victory in the Massachusetts race for the U.S. Senate, the smart money said that health care reform was dead, too. And look what happened. This bill ought to be labeled "The Kill Any Hope for Economic Recovery Act." Its negative impact on jobs and economic development in this country will be enormous, as will be its contribution to job creation and economic growth in China, Brazil and India. What's left of America's manufacturing base will pack up and head for places where energy is still cheap and environmental regulations are less onerous. You think making cars in Detroit is tough now, watch what happens if the Kerry-Lieberman bill passes. The bill would cap carbon emissions at 20 percent of 2005 levels by 2020, and at 83 percent of 2005 levels by 2050. There are two ways the country can meet the stringent targets: With phenomenal technological breakthroughs, or by putting severe limits on economic growth. We'll put our chips on the latter. Hitting the target, according to a Heritage Foundation analysis, will take nearly $10 trillion out of gross domestic product. It will lead to $4.6 trillion in higher energy taxes, and job losses of 2.5 million. Households will pay $1,000 more per year in energy costs, including $1.20 more per gallon of gasoline. Net worth for a family of four will decline by $40,000, while its share of the national debt will increase by $27,000 per family member. Supporters of the bill argue that it will force the development of a new green economy with millions of new jobs. But they can't point to a jobs explosion anywhere in the world after the adoption of similar mandates. What the bill will create is a complex carbon trading marketplace where companies will be able to buy and trade carbon credits. If this bill progresses the way the health care bill did, expect that to result in exemptions and special deals for favored industries and interest groups. Meanwhile, the air will be just as dirty, unless we can figure out how to build carbon walls high into the atmosphere to keep out the emissions that will still be churning from smokestacks in China and India. Allowing this bill to remain alive in the Senate will add to the uncertainty of investors and job creators. The Senate should kill it, and quickly.

AFF – Energy Reform Fails – Oil Dependence

Reforms won’t solve—will take decades to have an impact

Klare 2009(Michael, professor of peace and world security@Hampshire College, September 24, “

Our Oil Addiction Is About to Make Life a Lot Nastier”, http://www.alternet.org/story/142834/our\_oil\_addiction\_is\_about\_to\_make\_life\_a\_lot\_nastier/, AD: 6/21/10)jtn

But here's the bad news: even if all these initiatives were to pass, and more like them many times over, it would still take decades for this country to substantially reduce its dependence on oil and other non-renewable, polluting fuels. So great is our demand for energy, and so well-entrenched the existing systems for delivering the fuels we consume, that (barring a staggering surprise) we will remain for years to come in a no-man's-land between the Petroleum Age and an age that will see the great flowering of renewable energy. Think of this interim period as -- to give it a label -- the Era of Xtreme Energy, and in just about every sense imaginable from pricing to climate change, it is bound to be an ugly time.

AFF – Link Turn – Isolationism

Plan is Popular with the Public – Isolationism is a growing trend.

CSMonitor ‘9 (http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Foreign-Policy/2009/1203/p02s16-usfp.html)

If President Obama is looking for something that transcends the national divisions over healthcare reform and Afghanistan policy, he might try isolationism. Roughly half of Americans now say the United States should "mind its own business" and let other countries hash out problems on their own, according to a new poll by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. The survey, conducted every four years with the Council on Foreign Relations among CFR members and the general public, finds America's perennial inward-looking strain at its highest level since pollsters first queried Americans about isolationist tendencies in 1964. Back then, just 18 percent of Americans supported a "mind our own business" approach. Today, it's 49 percent. The sour economy is one explanation for the isolationist spike, but so is disappointment and fatigue over the results of eight years of aggressive foreign policy under President Bush, analysts of the public's views of the world say. "The American public is focused on the bad economy, and is feeling badly about the world," with US troops in two wars and concerns about terrorism, says Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center. At the same time, Mr. Kohut says, "we are coming off eight years of an aggressive foreign policy, and that [approach] was judged unsuccessful." That, he adds, "would lead some Americans to believe we are becoming less important."

Public Opinion Key to Obama’s agenda– key to garner swing votes, which are the people needed for Energy reform.

Silver ‘8 (Nate, Political Analyst published in the Guardian, the New Republic and CNN, and cited by the New York Times, “Who Are the Swing Senators?” December 4, http://www.fivethirtyeight.com/2008/12/who-are-swing-senators.html)

In practice, there will be a group of four or five senators in each party who line up just to either side of the 60-seat threshold and will find that they're suddenly very much in demand. If Obama's approval ratings are strong, he should have little trouble whipping the couple of Republican votes he needs into shape, and should clear 60 comfortably on key issues. But, if Obama proves to be unpopular, there remain enough conservative, red-state Democratic senators to deny him a simple majority on key issues, much less 60 votes.

AFF – Link Thumper – South Korea

Senate already pissed at South Korea – Beef Fiasco and Auto Trade

Balita 6/2 (http://balita.ph/2010/06/02/senate-calls-on-s-korea-others-to-allow-full-market-to-u-s-beef/)

The U.S. Senate on Tuesday passed a resolution calling on South Korea and several other countries to allow full market access to American beef. The plenary session of the Senate unanimously approved the bill sponsored by Max Baucus (D-Mont), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. The restricted shipment of beef is one of two major hurdles to the ratification of the free trade agreement with South Korea, signed in 2007. The other is lopsided auto trade. South Korea imports beef only from cattle less than 30 months old due to fear over mad cow disease. The United States recorded three cases