



**The Contents**

Welcome and Hot Tips.....2

**AFFIRMATIVE**

1AC.....4-9

**Answers**

A2: Gentrification.....10-11  
A2: Politics DA.....12-13  
A2: States Counterplan.....14-17  
    California DA.....15-16  
    1AR Extensions.....17

**NEGATIVE**

**Gentrification**

Frontline.....19  
Extensions and Answers.....20

**Politics DA**

Frontline.....21-22  
Extensions and Answers.....23-24

**States Counterplan**

Frontline.....25-26  
Extensions and Answers.....27-28  
    A2: California DA.....29



## Welcome to Debate.

Debate is an opportunity for you to build your voice and be heard. When you debate, you will have the chance to speak your mind on topics from Iraq to poverty in the inner city, and to prove your skills against young people from all over the Bay. Debate is a sport: it calls on you to join a team, represent your school, and win trophies, championships, and prizes. If you commit yourself to this sport you will have much fun; most importantly, you will gain the tools to better yourself, to earn college scholarships, and to speak up for your entire community.

### **What is Debate?**

Debate is a competition between two teams, each with two debaters. One team is assigned to be Affirmative, who will propose a plan to change the world and explain why it is a good idea. The other team is the Negative, who will attack the plan and try to prove that it will do more harm than good.

In the debate, every person will give two of their own speeches: one 8-minute speech called a *constructive* and one 5-minute long speech called a *rebuttal*. There are eight speeches total in the round. After each constructive speech, the opposing side gets 3 minutes to *cross-examine* the speaker, asking them hard hitting questions to set up their own strategy or undermine their opponents case.

### **What's in the Evidence Pack?**

The Novice Evidence Pack is designed to get you started in debate. We recommend you read through the evidence, try to understand all the arguments, and come back to your coaches with questions about how to use this evidence to wreck your opponents. Practice reading the evidence with speed, style, and volume – be quick, be expressive, be *loud!* In this packet, you will find evidence and arguments for many of the core positions talked about at BAUDL Tournaments:

- **The Brownfields Plan** argues that the United States should clean up toxic waste sites called *brownfields* in the inner city. It argues that the existence of brownfields is *racist* because it mostly affects black and latino people, and causes health defects and a lack of economic opportunity in urban communities. This is the core position for the Affirmative team.
- **The Gentrification Turn** argues that cleaning up Brownfields will improve inner city neighborhoods so much that property values will rise and low-income and minority families will be forced out of their homes into worse neighborhoods.
- **The Politics Disadvantage** argues that Obama does not have the time, energy, and political support to get the affirmative plan passed without sacrificing all the other things he wants to do, like bringing troops home from Iraq. The Politics DA argues that passing the affirmative plan will keep us from ending the injustice of the occupation of Iraq.
- **The States Counterplan.** The federal government is not the only government that can help the inner city. The counterplan argues that instead of Obama having to spend his time working to clean up the inner city, Arnold Schwarzenegger and other state governors should do the job, leaving Obama free to get out of Iraq and help the economy.



# **EVIDENCE FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE**



## *IAC INTRODUCTION*

We believe that Americans should not be forced to live in dirty, unhealthy conditions no matter how much money they have or what color their skin is. It is wrong that we live in a society where being born with dark skin makes you much more likely to live in a polluted, run-down neighborhood. We stand before you to challenge the idea that certain people aren't worth the effort and money it takes to make their neighborhoods livable - it is time we rise up and force those in power to listen to the needs of those who need help the most

Therefore, we believe that:

The United States federal government should substantially increase incentives for brownfields projects by providing tax credits for clean up and alternative energy development on federally designated brownfield sites..

## *ADVANTAGE 1: ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM*

We must pass this plan to challenge the racist structure of our society. Environmental problems that hurt minority and low-income communities reflect a racist society that we have to change. Robert Bullard wrote in 2002:

Robert D. Bullard 2002, Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University.  
<http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html>

People of color around the world must contend with dirty air and drinking water, and the location of noxious facilities such as municipal landfills, incinerators, hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities owned by private industry, government, and even the military. These environmental problems are exacerbated by racism. Environmental racism refers to environmental policy, practice, or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups, or communities based on race or color. Environmental racism is reinforced by government, legal, economic, political, and military institutions. Environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide benefits for the countries in the North while shifting costs to countries in the South. Environmental racism is a form of institutionalized discrimination. Institutional discrimination is defined as "actions or practices carried out by members of dominant (racial or ethnic) groups that have differential and negative impact on members of subordinate (racial and ethnic) groups." The United States is grounded in white racism. The nation was founded on the principles of "free land" (stolen from Native Americans and Mexicans), "free labor" (African slaves brought to this land in chains), and "free men" (only white men with property had the right to vote). From the outset, racism shaped the economic, political and ecological landscape of this new nation. Environmental racism buttressed the exploitation of land, people, and the natural environment.



*IAC - ADVANTAGE I: ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM – PAGE 2*

Urban brownfields are a perfect example of environmental racism. Brownfields have huge impacts on millions of people, but politicians don't act to solve the problem because it only affects low-income and poor communities. Passing our plan would solve this injustice in our society. According to Bullard in 2008:

Robert D. Bullard et. al., Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, 2008 [with Paul Mohai, Robin Saha, and Beverly Wright. "Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty: Why Race Still Matters After All These Years," 38 Environmental Law, 371,]

**White communities see faster action, better results and stiffer penalties than communities where blacks, Hispanics and other minorities live.** The U.S. Government Accountability Office (formerly the U.S. General Accounting Office) estimates that **there are up to 450,000 brownfields** (abandoned waste sites) **scattered throughout the urban landscape from New York to California - most of which are located in or near low income, working class, and people of color communities.** n29 **More than 870,000 of the 1.9 million housing units for the poor, who are mostly minorities, sit "within about a mile of factories that reported toxic emissions to the Environmental Protection Agency."** n30 **More than 600,000 students in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and California attend nearly 1200 public schools - with [\*379] populations largely made up of African Americans and other children of color - that are located within a half mile of federal Superfund or state-identified contaminated sites.** n31 An astounding "68 percent of African Americans live within 30 miles of a coal-fired power plant - the distance within which the maximum effects of the smokestack plume are expected to occur" - compared with 56% of white Americans. n32 In September 2005, the Associated Press (AP) released results from its analysis of an EPA research project showing African Americans are "79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial pollution is suspected of posing the greatest health danger." n33 Using EPA's own data and government scientists, the AP study, **More Blacks Live with Pollution, revealed that "in 19 states, blacks were more than twice as likely as whites to live in neighborhoods where air pollution seems to pose the greatest health danger."** n34 Hispanics and Asians also are more likely to breathe dirty air in some regions of the United States. The AP study found that residents of the at-risk neighborhoods were generally poorer and less educated, and unemployment rates in those districts were nearly 20% higher than the national average.



## *IAC - ADVANTAGE 2: URBAN COMMUNITIES*

The second major advantage of our plan is that it will prevent major damages to inner-city communities. Brownfields are a huge *blight* on urban communities. Passing our plan is the first step toward saving our cities from poverty and crime. According to Edith Pepper in '98:

[Edith M., "Strategies for Promoting Brownfield Reuse in California A Blueprint for Policy Reform," October, <http://www.cclr.org/pdfs/PolPaper02.pdf>]

Left unaddressed, brownfields pose lingering public health threats, exacerbate neighborhood blight, and serve as magnets for drug dealing and other criminal activity. They typically generate little if any local tax revenues, causing area schools and public services to suffer greatly. When brownfields languish for years, the surrounding neighborhood eventually begins to erode as well – a process that is often characterized by the deterioration of older infrastructure, such as roads and water and sewer lines. The trend in California and elsewhere has been to leave these struggling areas behind and push outward to ever greener pastures, installing new infrastructure and schools in emerging communities while turning our back on existing ones. This pattern is not sustainable from an economic or environmental standpoint over the long haul. In recent years, the plight of brownfields has captured the national spotlight. At every level of government, it seems, there is a growing recognition that through brownfield redevelopment, we can begin to chip away at a host of pressing and seemingly entrenched urban problems – crime, poor housing, unemployment, poverty – while also helping to curb the pace of urban sprawl.

Brownfields are also a huge drain on local economies. Undeveloped brownfields cost millions of dollars for our cities, cause unemployment, and decrease property values. Eric Ding writes in '08:

(Eric L, Research Fellow, Harvard School of Public Health, "Brownfield Remediation for Urban Health: A Systematic Review and Case Assessment of Baltimore, Maryland", The Journal of Young Investigators, <http://www.jvi.org/research/re.php?id=630>)

While health impact may be a speculated consequence of brownfields, there is virtually no debate regarding the economic ramifications of idle brownfields. According to official EPA estimates ("Brownfields 2003 Grant Fact Sheet" 2003), Baltimore loses approximately \$26 million a year in lost tax revenues from abandoned and underused brownfield land. Such a tremendous loss of economic potential from brownfields takes into account the estimated loss of income from commercial property tax, loss of economic development investment, and loss of production of goods and services. Additionally, the economy in Baltimore also suffers from loss of employment and social revitalization as result of brownfield underdevelopment. Moreover, vacant lots and fallow brownfields without economic vitality also decrease local property values (England-Joseph 1995; Greenberg 2002). From an investment perspective, brownfields impose two additional barriers to redevelopment. First, the potential of dangerous contamination is enough to discourage companies from being willing to develop and reuse the brownfield land (Schoenbaum 2002). Second, even if companies are willing to invest in cleanup and redeveloping brownfield land, financial institutions, insurance companies and other creditors are unlikely to be willing to provide loans and funding for such projects out of fears of hazard liability (England-Joseph 1995). Thus, fallow brownfields likely have adverse implications on the economics of the local geography.



All of this feeds the growing inequality between rich white communities and poor communities of color, inequality that creates a global system of destruction that puts all life on earth at risk. Bryant wrote in 1995:

Bunyan Bryant, Professor in the School of Natural Resources and Environment, and an adjunct professor in the Center for Afro-American and African Studies at the University of Michigan, 1995, [Environmental Justice: Issues, Policies, and Solutions, p. 209-212]

A hundred years ago we polluted a small spatial area and it took the earth a short time to heal itself. Today we pollute large areas of the earth – as evidenced by the international problems of acid rain, the depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, nuclear meltdowns, and the difficulties in the safe storage of spent fuels from nuclear power plants. Perhaps we have embarked upon an era of pollution so toxic and persistent that it will take the earth in some areas thousands of years to heal itself. To curtail environmental pollutants, we must build new institutions to prevent widespread destruction from pollutants that know no geopolitical boundaries. We need to do this because pollutants are not respectful of international boundaries; it does little good if one country practices sound environmental protection while its neighbors fail to do so. Countries of the world are intricately linked together in ways not clear 50 years ago; they find themselves victims of environmental destruction even though the causes of that destruction originated in another part of the world. Acid rain, global warming, depletion of the ozone layer, nuclear accidents like the one at Chernobyl, make all countries vulnerable to environmental destruction.

**Bryant continues:**

The cooperative relations forged after World War II are now obsolete. New cooperative relations need to be agreed upon – cooperative relations that show that pollution prevention and species preservation are inseparably linked to economic development and survival of planet earth. Economic development is linked to pollution prevention even though the market fails to include the true cost of pollution in its pricing of products and services; it fails to place a value on the destruction of plant and animal species. To date, most industrialized nations, the high polluters, have had an incentive to pollute because they did not incur the cost of producing goods and services in a nonpolluting manner. The world will have to pay for the true cost of production and to practice prudent stewardship of our natural resources if we are to sustain ourselves on this planet. We cannot expect Third World countries to participate in debt-for-nature swaps as a means for saving the rainforest or as a means for the reduction of greenhouse gases, while a considerable amount of such gases come from industrial nations and from fossil fuel consumption.

**Bryant concludes that:**

Many of the policy ideas mentioned in this book have been around for some time, but they have not been implemented. The struggle for environmental justice emerging from the people of color and low-income communities may provide the necessary political impulse to make these [environmental justice] policies a reality. Environmental justice provides opportunities for those most affected by environmental degradation and poverty to make policies to save not only themselves from differential impact of environmental hazards, but to save those responsible for the lion's share of the planet's destruction.



### *IAC - CONTENTION 3: SOLVENCY – PAGE 1*

We now move to the issue of Solvency, where we prove that our plan to turn brownfields into brightfields - plants that produce clean energy - will help inner-city communities and solve problems of racism in our world.

First: brightfields substantially increase economic opportunity in surrounding communities.

**Minnesota Congressman James L. Oberstar 2003** (James L, MN Congressman, 3/27, 149 Cong Rec E 604, 108<sup>th</sup> Congress, Session 1, LN)

In addition, the bill authorizes the Economic Development Administration (EDA) to make grants for the development of brightfield sites. **Brightfields are brownfield sites**, i.e., abandoned or contaminated property sites, which are **redeveloped using solar energy technologies**. Brightfields are being successfully developed across the country. This bill allows the EDA to contribute to this development by **providing assistance to economically distressed communities so that they can redevelop contaminated or abandoned property. Making these properties viable for commercial use can significantly improve the economic opportunities in the area where the brightfield site is located.**

Second: Brightfields are the best way to solve the problem of urban brownfields. The project helps the community and provides clean, safe energy for our country. John Moskal in 2003:

John Moskal, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2003 [“Brockton Brightfields: Innovative Green Power Marketing Pilot,” <http://www.epa.gov/swerrims/docs/iwg/BrocktonBrightfieldsfinal.pdf>]

**In addition, Brightfields are** themselves **an innovative use of blighted brownfields that might not otherwise be redeveloped** because of their limited reuse potential.

**The project will develop a clean energy source on an abandoned industrial property** with few other development options, and no development options as sustainably desirable as the Brightfield (no emissions, noise or traffic). Further, **beautification efforts on the site perimeter will transform a blighted property into a community asset**. This model will enable Brockton to **expand its project by reinvesting in generation assets**. There are even greater benefits to the state and EPA in that **Brockton’s experience will help to grow the market for renewable energy while creating a replicable model for other communities. Growth of the green power market has clear environmental and public health benefits for all stakeholders.**



### *IAC - CONTENTION 3: SOLVENCY – PAGE 2*

Third: Brownfields are at the heart of the problem of racism and the environment – success at turning brownfields into brightfields would help build a movement that can make a serious difference on poverty, pollution, and race in our country. Kibel in '98:

(Paul Stanton Kibel, adjunct prof, Golden Gate U School of Law. [Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review](#), Spring 1998. Vol. 25, Iss. 3)

For centuries, the U.S. frontier was about breaking the land, pushing the geographic edges of development continuously outward. **As suburban sprawl, urban decay, and environmental pollution have made plain, however, that frontier has reached its end. Ecologically, economically, and politically, the paradigm of uncontrolled and continuous outward land development cannot be sustained. The frontier before us now is about forging new relationships among our cities, farmlands, and wildlands. It is about constructing policies and economies that promote the health and livelihood of all our citizens, not just the privileged. The effort to reconcile open space, brownfields, and justice issues is on the leading edge of this new frontier. The success or failure of this effort will impact not only the fate of our cities, but the fate of our ecology and economy as well.**

**Our plan takes a stand against dehumanization.** Treating people as less than human, as the government does when it fails to clean up brownfields, is the worst impact you can imagine – it is the root of all violence. We need to fight *dehumanization* in order to prevent the destruction of the human race. David Berube wrote in 1997:

(Ph.D. in Communications, “Nanotechnological Prolongevity: The Down Side”, NanoTechnology Magazine, June/July 1997, p. 1-6, URL: <http://www.cla.sc.edu/ENGL/faculty/berube/prolong.htm>)

This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matsou’s treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn “its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record – and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse... Behind the genocide of the Holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menecide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo’s nest of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matsou, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impacts dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil’s most powerful weapon.



## *AFF ANSWERS TO GENTRIFICATION TURN – PAGE 1*

The negative team claims that if we improve neighborhoods, people will be forced to move out. In reality, these people will stay, and benefit from a better community.

Oliver Libaw, 2002. "There Goes the Neighborhood? Gentrification May Be Good for Everyone, Some Experts Say." ABC News, 4.30.2002. From <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/gentrification020430.html>

Yuppies, and the gentrification they symbolize, have [has] long been a target of anger in poor communities, a supposed force driving out the longtime residents, but two recent studies suggest gentrification helps the poor almost as much — or perhaps even more — than it hurts them.

"Low-income households actually seem less likely to move from gentrifying neighborhoods than from other communities," said a recent report by the Citizens Housing and Planning Council, a New York nonprofit organization that analyzed demographic shifts in the city over the last few years.

If low-income residents remain in gentrifying areas, then they can enjoy the community improvement that gentrification generally brings.

"I think the benefit to urban areas is potentially very great," says Frank Braconi, co-author of the New York gentrification study who is also an economist and the executive director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council.

Clean-up hurts neighborhood residents less than the current state of decay. From Vigdor in 2006:

Jacob L Vigdor, Faculty Rsch Fellow, Nat'l Bureau of Economic Research, 2006 ["Does Urban Decay Harm the Poor?" <http://trinity.aas.duke.edu/~jvigdor/DUDHTP.pdf>]

Conventional wisdom suggests that urban revitalization can harm the poor, primarily by raising rents. It has also been argued that urban decline harms the poor by reducing job opportunities, the quality of local public services, and other neighborhood amenities. This seeming contradiction can be explained in a model incorporating moving costs and neighborhood quality change sufficiently large to change the rank-ordering of neighborhoods. Data from the American Housing Survey are used to estimate a discrete choice model identifying households' willingness-to-pay for neighborhood quality, using very basic proxies for quality. These willingness-to-pay estimates are then compared to the actual price changes that accompany observed changes in neighborhood quality. The results suggest that the correlation between neighborhood quality change and price changes is actually quite low, consistent with the theoretical notion that equilibrium price differentials are determined by the household with the least valuation for quality. The results imply that, in general, neighborhood revitalization is more favorable than neighborhood decline.



*AFF ANSWERS TO GENTRIFICATION TURN – PAGE 2*

The affirmative plan will be guided by the voices of people in the community. These people will not let gentrification happen in their neighborhoods. From Banzhaf in 2007:

Banzhaf, McCormick 2007 (Spencer and Eleanor, Associate Professor of Economics, Georgia State U and Rsch assistant, Jan 8, “Hazardous Waste; Renewable Resources and Conservation: Land Use; Distributional Effects”, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eed.nsf/WPNumberNew/2007-02?OpenDocument>)

The literature suggests several factors that might minimize the probability of any gentrification occurring or mitigate its effects. First, given the importance of aesthetic amenities, reuse projects that fit the existing character of the community are less likely to trigger gentrification. Consistent with this point, the NEJAC (2006) report on unintended consequences stresses the importance of community involvement in planning reuse projects.

Even if gentrification does happen, it will only affect a few people. The toxic waste from brownfields affects many more. From Banzhaf in 2007:

Banzhaf, McCormick 2007 (Spencer and Eleanor, Associate Professor of Economics, Georgia State U and Rsch assistant, Jan 8, “Hazardous Waste; Renewable Resources and Conservation: Land Use; Distributional Effects”, <http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eed.nsf/WPNumberNew/2007-02?OpenDocument>)

If gentrification occurs, its geographic extent is likely to be very local. Glass (1964) and Zukin (1987) stress that gentrified neighborhoods can exist side-by-side with deteriorating ones. Most hedonic price studies of Superfund sites have focused on very local areas, with effects extending to 2 miles or so at most. Studies with the most flexible functional forms (using rings around a LULU or splines, for example) find the strongest effects within about a mile (e.g. Ihlanfeldt and Taylor 2004, McCluskey and Rausser 2003). With respect to demographics, Banzhaf and Walsh find that income responses to TRI sites are still present one-half mile away, but weaker than one-quarter mile. The cleanup and reuse of smaller LULUs, such as brownfields, are likely to have even more local effects.



*AFF ANSWERS TO POLITICS DISADVANTAGE – PAGE 1*

1 – Our plan is more important – environmental racism is an injustice that is happening right now. The negative doesn't really know what is going on in Congress. The situation there changes every day. That is why we need to make the moral decision first.

2 – Our plan causes less conflict in Congress than Obama has already caused – his stimulus bill and requests for money for green energy have already lost him popularity more than the plan ever would.

3 - The plan will be an easy victory for Obama. This will make him look powerful and make it easier for him to push his plans through congress. Orenstein writes in 1993:

Norman **Orenstein**, Political Scientist, 1993 (May 27, p. Lexis-Nexis)

Winning comes to those who look like winners. This only sounds redundant or clichish. If power is the ability to make people do something they otherwise would not do, real power is having people do things they otherwise wouldn't do without anybody making them - when they act in anticipation of what they think somebody would want them to do. If a president develops a reputation as a winner, somebody who will pull out victories in Congress even when he is behind, somebody who can say, "Do this!" and have it done, then Members of Congress will behave accordingly. They will want to cut their deals with the president early, getting on the winning team when it looks the best and means the most. They will avoid cutting deals with the opposition.

4 – The plan is not a big enough proposal to prevent Obama from doing his plan in Iraq. They do not have evidence that says specifically that our brownfields plan would upset the rest of Obama's agenda.



*AFF ANSWERS TO POLITICS DISADVANTAGE – PAGE 2*

5 - Obama's plan for Iraq is not a real withdrawal – he will leave troops in the country and continue the evil policies of Bush

**Chris Floyd**, February 09. Journalist and Author – Counterpunch - <http://www.counterpunch.org/floyd02252009.html>

It would be superfluous in us to point out that a plan to "end" a war which includes the continued garrisoning of up to 50,000 troops in a hostile land is, in reality, a continuation of that war, not its cessation. To produce such a plan and claim that it "ends" a war is the precise equivalent of, say, relieving one's bladder on the back of one's neighbor and telling him that the liquid is actually life-giving rain.

**Floyd continues:**

But the plan clearly envisions a substantial and essentially permanent American military presence in Iraq, dominating the politics and policy of this key oil nation – which was of course one of the chief war aims of the military aggressors in the Bush Administration all along. By implementing his war continuation plan, Obama will complete the work of Bush and his militarist clique. No indeed, that is "not going to happen." One of the most remarkable aspects of Obama's "war lite" plan is its brazen and absolute disregard for the agreement signed between the United States and the supposedly sovereign Iraqi government guaranteeing the complete withdrawal of all American troops by the end of 2011. Of course, this "agreement" was always considered a farce by everyone – except for the American corporate media, which kept reporting on the "tough negotiations" as if the pact would have any actual meaning in the real world. The agreement contained escape clauses allowing the Iraqi government to "request" a continued American military presence after the 2011 deadline – and considering that any Iraqi government in place in 2011 will be helplessly dependent on American guns and money to maintain its power, such a "request" has always been a dead certainty. So I suppose we must admire the Obama Administration's candor in dropping all pretense that U.S. forces are going to leave Iraq at any time in the foreseeable future. But the hypocrisy – the literally murderous hypocrisy – of claiming that this plan "leaves Iraq to its people and responsibly ends this war," as Obama asserted in his State of the Union speech, is sickening. It does no such thing, and he knows it.

Instead, it entrenches the United States more and more deeply in a "counter-insurgency" war on behalf of whichever clique or faction of sectarian parties in Iraq is most effective in adhering to America's dominationist agenda in the region. It sends an apparently endless stream of American troops to die -- and, in even greater numbers, to kill -- in a criminal action that has helped bankrupt our own country while sending waves of violent instability and extremism around the world. It will further enfilth a cesspool of corruption and war profiteering that has already reached staggering, world-historical proportions.

All of this is what the Obama-Petraeus plan will do. But what it won't do is "end this war" -- "responsibly" or otherwise. When Obama says it will -- as he said last night to a rapt national audience -- he is, quite simply, and very deliberately, lying.



## AFF ANSWERS TO STATES COUNTERPLAN – PAGE 1

1 - The states counterplan ignores how the FEDERAL government continues to hurt people of color. We must force our nation's leaders to change in order to prevent *dehumanization* in the future. Bullard et al wrote in 2007:

(Robert D., Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, Paul Mohai, Ph.D., Robin Saha, Ph.D., Beverly Wright, Ph.D. "Toxic wastes and Race at Twenty 1987-2007, Grassroots Struggles to Dismantle, Environmental Racism in the United States."  
<http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/2007%20UCC%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>)

**Slow government response to environmental contamination and toxic threats unnecessarily endangers the health of the most vulnerable populations in our society. Government officials have knowingly allowed people of color families** near Superfund sites and other contaminated waste sites **to be poisoned** with lead, arsenic, dioxin, TCE, DDT, PCBs and a host of other deadly chemicals. **Having the facts and failing to respond is tantamount to an immoral "human experiment."** Clearly, the environmental justice movement over the last two decades has made a difference in the lives of people of color and low-income communities that are overburdened with environmental pollution. After years of intense study, targeted research, public hearings, grassroots organizing, networking and movement building, environmental justice struggles have taken center stage. Yet, **all communities are still not created equal. People of color neighborhoods are still the dumping grounds for all kinds of toxins. Federal agencies such as the EPA have dropped the ball in implementing environmental justice and civil rights policies and programs that could truly make a difference to affected communities.**

Community leaders who have been on the front line for justice for decades know that the lethargic, and too often antagonistic, government response to environmental emergencies in their communities is not the exception, but the general rule. They have come to understand that waiting for the government to respond can be hazardous to their health and the health of their communities. Many of these leaders are not waiting, but are mobilizing to force all levels of government to do the right thing—and do it in a timely manner before disaster strikes.

While communities all across the nation celebrate the twentieth anniversary of Toxic Wastes and Race and the new report, they know all too well that there is still much work to be done before we achieve the goal of environmental justice for all. **While much progress has been made in mainstreaming environmental protection as a civil rights, human rights and social justice issue, the key is getting government to enforce the laws and regulations equally across the board—without regard to race, color or national origin.**

2 - States will make their actions for the environment as weak as possible to attract businesses – the counterplan will cause a *race to the bottom* that keeps neighborhoods dirty.

**Konisky 2007** [Daniel, University of Missouri-Columbia – Regular Attitudes and the Environmental Race to the Bottom Argument]

**Concerns that interstate economic competition will lead states to relax their environmental regulation, potentially resulting in a race to the bottom, remain commonplace in both academic and public policy debates about state environmental policy.** Most of the existing empirical work examining the race to the bottom argument tests the behavioral predictions of the argument. In this article, I focus on the attitudinal predictions. Specifically, I examine whether state regulators express beliefs consistent with what we would expect to observe if a race to the bottom dynamic operates within state regulatory decision making. Studying data from the State Environmental Managers Survey, I find that **state regulators are sensitive to the effects that their regulatory decisions have on industry investment decisions and that their agencies are influenced by the regulatory decision making of economic competitor states.**



## AFF ANSWERS TO STATES COUNTERPLAN – PAGE 2

3 - CALIFORNIA DISADVANTAGE. California is broke! If the state passes a brownfields plan, its economy will crash.

BBC, December 2, 2008. ["California faces budget crisis." <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7760249.stm>]

The governor of California, Arnold Schwarzenegger, has declared a fiscal emergency, amid fears the state could run out of cash by early next year. He has ordered lawmakers to hold a special session to tackle the \$11.2bn (£7.5bn) deficit in California, one of the world's biggest economies.

Across the US, state tax revenues are down because of the economic slump. State governors have been meeting President-elect Barack Obama to press the case for federal help. Governor Schwarzenegger on Monday invoked powers allowing him to declare a fiscal emergency as the new state legislature was sworn in. "Without immediate action, our state is headed for a fiscal disaster," Mr. Schwarzenegger said, saying that the current \$11.2bn shortfall could swell to "a staggering \$28bn" over the next 18 months.

"I compare the situation that we are in right now to finding an accident victim on the side of the road that is bleeding to death," the Republican governor told a news conference in Los Angeles.

"We wouldn't spend hours debating over which ambulance we should use, or which hospital we should use...No, we would first stop the bleeding, and that's exactly the same we have to do here." He said the state was already drawing up plans to lay off public employees.

Under the fiscal emergency, lawmakers have 45 days to pass legislation addressing the budget crisis. If they miss the deadline, 15 January, they have to stay in session without considering any other business until agreement is reached.

The previous state legislature failed to reach agreement on a series of spending cuts and tax increases. However, the elections in November produced little change in the legislature's political make-up, with the Democrats three seats short of the two-thirds majority needed to pass fiscal measures.

"It's our job as legislators working with the governor to try to make a major dent in the problem, and we can only do so by cutting expenses and by raising additional revenue," the Senate president, Democrat Darrell Steinberg, told the BBC.

California is key to the US economy. If the counterplan hurts it, the whole national economy could fall apart.

Ray Haynes, California Assembly member representing Riverside and Temecula, 9-2-2003; "Who's Dragging Down Who?", <http://theamericashow.net/archives/Columns/Haynes/20030902HaynesDragging.html>

I think it is important people know what is happening in California government. One in seven people who live in the United States live in California. California constitutes ten per cent of the entire national economy, and it is the fifth (or sixth or seventh or eighth) largest economy in the world (our ranking shrinks each year Davis stays in office). When California's economy hiccups, it causes a national economic earthquake. A large, diverse, and powerful economic actor is important not just to those of us who live here, but to those who walk the halls of Washington power as well.

Jobs are lost, people are hurt, and the economy shrinks. Given these facts, it would be important to cover any government function that affects ten per cent of the economy. Sacramento should be the focus of a lot of media attention.



*AFF ANSWERS TO STATES COUNTERPLAN – PAGE 3*

*IMPACT FOR CALIFORNIA DA - ECONOMIC COLLAPSE AND WAR*

Economic collapse causes great power wars and nuclear extinction.

Bearden, 2000 (Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army, 2000, The Unnecessary Energy Crisis: How We Can Solve It, 2000)

Bluntly, we foresee these factors - and others { } not covered - converging to a catastrophic collapse of the world economy in about eight years. As the collapse of the Western economies nears, one may expect catastrophic stress on the 160 developing nations as the developed nations are forced to dramatically curtail orders. History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China - whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States - attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.



***ANSWERS TO STATES COUNTERPLAN – IAR EXTENSION***

On the states counterplan: the states counterplan does not solve the problems presented by the affirmative plan.

First, it does not address the problem that the FEDERAL government continues to harm people of color in America. Our Bullard evidence in the 1AC and 2AC says that the federal government hurts people based on the color of their skin. It also says that even if state governments help them, environmental justice will never be a reality. This means they should lose, because unless we achieve environmental justice, our Berube and Bullard evidence says that our society will continue to see low-income people of color as trash – this dehumanization is the root of all violence, the worst impact in the round.

Second, state governments are falling apart. We are in a financial crisis, and making states spend money on a brownfields plan is seriously dangerous. It would crash the economy of California and other states, putting millions of people out of their jobs. This will lead to economic collapse and wars.



# **EVIDENCE FOR THE NEGATIVE**



## *GENTRIFICATION TURN – FRONTLINE (INC)*

We now offer the Gentrification Turn:

The affirmative plan to clean up the inner city leads to environmental gentrification. Cleaning up neighborhoods makes them more attractive to wealthy white residents, and forces low-income people of color out of their homes. From Banzhaf and Walsh in 2004:

H. Spencer Banzhaf and P. Walsh. Fellow, Resources for the Future; Department of Economics and Institute for Behavioral Studies University of Colorado, 2004 (“Testing for Environmental Gentrification: Migratory Responses to Changes in Environmental Quality,” 2004 AERE Workshop)

There is also a second, more subtle, policy implication. In this environment, **the bulk of the benefits of a policy that successfully cleans up dirtier neighborhoods where the poor live may actually be captured by richer households. As the neighborhood amenity improves, wealthier households move in, driving up rents.** If the poor do not own their homes, landlords would capture the capital appreciation of the local housing, while the poor pay higher rents. This “**environmental gentrification,**” as coined by Sieg et al. (2004), **may actually more than offset the direct gain of the environmental improvement, so that the original residents are actually worse off.** Such outcomes have been demonstrated in simulation models of air quality improvements in Los Angeles (Sieg et al. 2004) and increases in protection of open space in Raleigh, NC (Walsh 2003)

Gentrification is a dangerous nationwide epidemic.

Kari Lydersen, 1999. “SHAME OF THE CITIES: Gentrification in the New Urban America.” From [http://lipmagazine.org/articles/featlydersen\\_7\\_p.htm](http://lipmagazine.org/articles/featlydersen_7_p.htm)

**All over the country, the cycle of gentrification is displacing lower-income residents.** In most American cities, as sociologist William Julius Wilson has argued, de-industrialization and the ascendancy of the information age have inverted traditional structures of urban life. With most factory jobs shipped abroad or lost to automation, professional white-collar jobs and low-paid service jobs with few benefits are taking their place. Meanwhile, white-collar workers eager for convenience and a happening neighborhood are flocking back to the central cities. **The poor have very little political or economic defense against developers who want to buy up their crumbling apartments and rehab them into luxury condos and lofts, and city and state governments are only too pleased to ease the way for this transition. They do all they can to weaken rent-control laws, tear down public housing and subsidize higher-level developers.**

Gentrification causes displacement and violence.

John M. Hagedorn, 2003. “Building a way to stop murder.” Chicago Tribune, June 1, 2003. <http://www.gangresearch.net/Archives/Guggenheim/housing/tribhousmur.html>

Now the projects are coming down, and thousands of public-housing tenants are being displaced into all-black areas farther south and west. **Displacement means new, not always friendly, surroundings; children negotiating new schools; and a loss of established networks of friends, jobs and support. For gangs, displacement often means violent attempts to take over drug markets in a new turf.**



## *GENTRIFICATION TURN – NEGATIVE EXTENSIONS AND ANSWERS*

Extend our gentrification argument. Community clean-up projects like the affirmative gentrify the neighborhoods they try to help, making problems even worse. The affirmative plan says it helps the poor, but it really just kicks them out of their homes into worse neighborhoods. Moore in 2006:

Richard Moore Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice of the EPA 2006  
(<http://www.scribd.com/doc/1611016/Environmental-Protection-Agency-redevrevitalrecomm92706>)

**The local impact of gentrification, displacement and equity loss is of critical concern to environmental justice** communities and their advocates. NEJAC also is concerned about **the implications of local decisions** that **have a predictable, negative effect on environmental justice** communities nationwide. Market forces appear to be the primary drivers of this phenomenon. **Spurred by local government attempts to reclaim underutilized and derelict properties for productive uses, residents and businesses who once abandoned the urban core to the poor and underemployed now seek to return from the suburbs.** By taking advantage of federal policies and programs, municipalities, urban planners and developers are accomplishing much of this largely beneficial “revitalization.” However, **from the perspective of gentrified and otherwise displaced residents and small businesses, it appears that the revitalization of their cities is being built on the back of the very citizens who suffered, in-place, through the times of abandonment and disinvestment.** While these citizens are anxious to see their neighborhoods revitalized, they want to be able to continue living in their neighborhoods and participate in that revitalization. **In addition to facing tremendous displacement pressure, African Americans and other people of color also face difficult challenges in obtaining new housing within the same community** (or elsewhere) **after displacement.** For example, **when these populations are displaced they must often pay a disproportionately high percentage of income for housing.** Moreover, they suffer the loss of important community culture.

Gentrification promotes colonialism in the city. This means that the rich people who move into communities after clean-ups treat the old residents as worth less than them. This is *dehumanization* - a true injustice. From Sykora in 2004:

Sykora 4 (L : Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague, Prague: Brownfield Gentrification in Amsterdam, <http://web.inter.nl.net/users/Paul.Treanor/gentrification.html>)

In other words, 'white-flight' suburbs are an indication of the end result of the gentrification process: right-wing upper-middle-class concentrations. In fact **right-wing attitudes seem to be inherent in gentrification. The gentrifiers are usually aware of their own status, especially the pioneers of the first phase: they have conscious attitudes of 'urban colonisation'. They see themselves as better than the indigenous population - because they are better educated, more socially active, more culturally aware. There may be a conscious attempt to 'upgrade' the population, and that idea is finding its way into official policy.** Pro-gentrification attitudes are usually combined with pro-workfare attitudes. **The logic is to view the poor as an inferior group, who must give up their homes to the rich - and then work for them in menial jobs.** This underlying mentality is in itself an ethical objection to gentrification.



*POLITICS DA – FRONTLINE (INC) – PAGE 1*

We now offer the politics disadvantage. We will prove that Obama can only make real change – like ending the occupation of Iraq – if he is careful and slow. The affirmative plan is too much, too fast. It will ruin Obama's plans and allow the violence in Iraq to continue.

First: Bringing American troops home from Iraq is Obama's top priority, but he needs all the support he can get from Congress to make it happen.

Jim Tankersley, Chicago Tribune 11-09-2008 ["Harsh economic, political realities will test Obama's mettle and ideas," [http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-obama-expectations\\_bdnov09,0,3779757.story](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-obama-expectations_bdnov09,0,3779757.story)]

Other foreign policy questions appear more pressing to voters, starting with the Iraq War. Obama has pledged to withdraw troops, but how quickly he does that could divide his own party between more liberal and more centrist members.

Rifts could also appear over taxes and spending. Some Capitol Hill Democrats appear inclined to roll up more government debt—for stimulus or other major proposals, such as health-care reform. Others, including the large "Blue Dog" coalition that preaches fiscal conservatism, would prefer to keep deficits down.

Obama could learn from Clinton and former President Jimmy Carter, who both entered with Democratic majorities in Congress but struggled to advance some of their top priorities.

Ritter, the Colorado governor, said the most important lesson he could offer Obama was to make a good plan for dealing with legislators. He recalled one of the first pieces of legislation that Colorado Democrats sent to his desk after his 2006 election, a bill that made union organizing easier, and which Ritter didn't like. He vetoed it.

Obama, Ritter said, "certainly wants to avoid having that happen."

Second: Major changes in energy policy, like the one proposed by the plan, cause conflicts in Congress and destroy the support that Obama needs to bring the troops home. The Chicago Tribune wrote in 2008:

Chicago Tribune. "In the U.S., environmental change gets green light." Nov 19, 2008, p. 1

Whoever is chosen will face protracted battles in Congress about climate change legislation. Since measures outlined by Obama and by Republican presidential candidate John McCain would affect virtually every part of the economy, business interests already are angling for provisions that would benefit specific industries. On water issues, activists who focus on the Great Lakes are optimistic that the Obama administration will push for more money to clean up contaminated sites, restore coastal wetlands and improve fisheries. Three years ago, the Bush administration outlined a \$20 billion plan to restore and protect the world's largest source of freshwater, but it later withdrew support. As a U.S. senator, Obama introduced or backed several measures to clean up the lakes, and his presidential chief of staff, Rep. Rahm Emanuel of Chicago, has been a leading voice in Congress on Great Lakes issues. Almost every proposed rule change and every environmental bill will be subjected to intense debate and compromise, which likely will open Obama's administration to sharp criticism from all sides—including from the environmental groups that backed his campaign.



*POLITICS DA – FRONTLINE (INC) – PAGE 2*

Finally: The occupation of Iraq must end. It is illegal, murderous, and against democracy. The violence in Iraq can only be called genocide. By preventing Obama from focusing on ending the occupation, the affirmative plan makes the world a worse place, not a better one.

Ghali [Hassan](http://www.countercurrents.org/hassan290508.htm), independent writer, May 29, 2008 [“Iraq’s Occupation: A Form of Terrorism.” Countercurrents <http://www.countercurrents.org/hassan290508.htm>]

Since the 2003 U.S.-Britain illegal aggression against the Iraqi people, reliable sources estimate that nearly 1.5 million innocent Iraqi civilians have been killed, the majority of the victims are women and children. Meanwhile, as a result of the Occupation-generated violence at least 4.7 million Iraqis were displaced, according to UNHCR estimates. Of these, more than 2.6 million Iraqis are displaced internally displaced persons (IDPs), while more than 2 million have fled to neighbouring countries, particularly Syria and Jordan. Iraq’s entire civilian infrastructure and services, including health care services and the education system have been destroyed. The Occupation has transformed Iraqi society from a peaceful pluralistic society into a sectarian society characterised by fratricidal killing and political violence.

Immediately after the invasion, U.S. forces and U.S.-trained death squads launched a deliberate and systematic reign of terror (dubbed ‘de-Ba’athification’) designed to terrorize the Iraqi population and destroy the Iraqi nation. Thousands of Iraqi professionals, including scientists, academics, teachers and doctors were murdered in cold blood. Mass graves of innocent Iraqis are unearthed regularly around the country with hundreds of unidentified bodies. Recently, Hearth al-Unaided, a member of the so-called Human Rights Commission in the Iraqi Parliament, told the Iraqi daily, Azzman: “On our lists there are 4,000 people who have gone missing. And these people, according to their relatives, were taken away by armed groups wearing Iraqi military or police uniform”. In addition, every day since the invasion, hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent Iraqi civilians are killed in a series of intensified and indiscriminate U.S. bombing on densely-populated population centers.

The Washington Post (May 22, 2008) revealed that a surge in “cowardly American bombings” of civilians designed to terrorize the Iraqi population and keeps ground troops inside their fortified military bases protected from legitimate Resistance attacks. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis are languishing in a web of Gulag-like prisons and torture centers run by U.S. occupying forces and their Iraqi militias throughout Iraq. Iraqi prisoners, including women and children are held without charge and without due process in flagrant violation of international human rights law. They are subjected to mental and physical torture and sexual abuses at the hand of U.S. forces and their collaborators. In addition, countless neighbourhoods of Iraqi cities have become open-air prisons and Ghettos surrounded by concrete walls and checkpoints. Using international law and UN Conventions, scholars such as Ian Douglas and David Model have established that the U.S. is deliberately committing genocide in Iraq while at the same time manipulating and diverting the world away from its crimes.



*POLITICS DA – NEGATIVE EXTENSIONS AND ANSWERS – PAGE 1*

**ARGUMENT OVERVIEW**

Our argument on the politics disadvantage is simple. Obama only has so much time, support and energy he can spend to do the things he wants to do. Right now, his main priority is getting the troops home from Iraq. The affirmative team ignores the careful dance Obama needs to perform to get his plans passed and asks for other plans, like green energy, too soon. Because environmental issues usually spark a lot of arguments, this will hurt Obama's chances of getting us out of Iraq.

We think getting out of Iraq is more important than the affirmative plan for three reasons:

1 – Thousands of people are dying right now in Iraq, and things will only get worse. Our evidence says that there is an ongoing genocide happening that we must stop before moving on to other issues.

2 – We are wasting money in Iraq that could be used to help the environment. If we do not get out of Iraq first, we will not have enough money to do the affirmative plan.

3 – Obama is already planning to solve environmental problems, he just realizes that he has to do it AFTER other programs because it will cause the biggest fights in congress. If we trust Obama's political strategy, he will solve the affirmative harms AND end the genocide in Iraq.

**Uniqueness:** Withdrawal from Iraq is at the top Obama's list of priorities. If we don't pass the affirmative plan, we will be able to bring the troops home.

U.S. News & World Report, November 17, 2008, p. 22

Ending the war. Just as telling, Obama's foreign policy challenges will be fully as serious as the domestic ones. "The next president is going to inherit a significant series of conflicts and challenges from President Bush on the international scene, and they've only been made more complex by the global financial crisis," a senior Obama adviser says. First on the list, the aide says, is Obama's desire to "begin the process of responsibly redeploying the U.S. forces from Iraq at a pace that is safe for our forces." To that end, Obama is looking for ways to put pressure on the Baghdad regime and offer it incentives to take on more of the security and governing burdens. "Senator Obama's view is that after five years, in a war that has lasted longer than World War II, we ought to be more catalytic as opposed to passive," the adviser says. "Instead of waiting for them to get their act together, let's give them some encouragement and incentive to get their act together." The details are yet to be worked out. Obama also wants to strengthen U.S. and allied forces in Afghanistan, where the war has not gone very well in recent weeks, and he will try to improve operations with allies against anti-American fighters in Pakistan.



*POLITICS DA – NEGATIVE EXTENSIONS AND ANSWERS – PAGE 2*

Obama cannot afford to bring up issues that will cause conflict or he won't be able to get anything done. The Boston Globe wrote in 2008:

The Boston Globe, November 6, 2008, p. A18

To avoid mistakes of past presidents, Panetta said, Obama should put at the top of his agenda some early issues he is confident he can win, and delay other more controversial measures that are bound to fracture Congress. The new president must be also be willing to upset some supporters by delaying action on their priorities, including healthcare reform, until he has some successes in his effort to improve the economy, Panetta said. Indeed, amid the euphoria expressed by Obama supporters after his victory came a note of caution from the US Chamber of Commerce. Bruce Josten, the chamber's executive vice president, said yesterday that Obama's decisive defeat of John McCain is "hardly a strong mandate." He urged Obama not to squander precious political capital on hot-button issues that would alienate the business community, such as a proposal to make it easier for workers to form unions.

If Obama passes the plan instead of getting out of Iraq, the impacts would be huge. Conflicts in the Middle East will escalate into global nuclear war.

Steinbach 2002 [John, Analyst, Center for Research on Globalization, "Israeli Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Threat to Peace" - Center for Research on Globalization, 2002, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/STE203A.html>]

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability." and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional." Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familiar pattern (Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration."



*STATES COUNTERPLAN – FRONTLINE (INC) – PAGE 1*  
*COUNTERPLAN TEXT*

Obama should spend his time on more important **national** issues. Solving brownfields at the local level is best. Thus, we offer the following counterplan:

All 50 state governments in the United States should implement the affirmative plan, substantially increasing incentives for brownfields projects by providing tax credits for clean up and alternative energy development on federally designated brownfield sites.



## STATES COUNTERPLAN – FRONTLINE (INC) – PAGE 2

### COUNTERPLAN SOLVENCY

State governments have already taken the lead on alternative energy. They are the best ones to do the plan.

**Pierce**, reporter for the Washington post, 2006 [Neil, ‘Energy Federalism:’ Has it’s time come?’, <http://www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=136&languageId=1&contentId=88768>]

States are starting to come to the nation’s rescue, passing a range of energy-saving measures to counteract official Washington’s myopia on the perils of global warming and our overwhelming dependence on foreign oil. That’s the message from the state PIRGs – public interest research groups active in 30 states. They make a strong case that notwithstanding President Bush’s newfound recognition of America’s “addiction to oil,” it’s in states that the most hopeful, scientifically sound energy-saving programs are taking shape. If the Bush administration is serious about moving in a new direction on energy, say the critics, there are breakthrough state strategies it can support and emulate. First, push a strong switch to such renewable energy sources as wind, solar, biomass, geothermal and other “clean” energy alternatives. By 2017, the renewable energy requirements that 20 states and the District of Columbia have already passed will save enough fossil fuel to provide electricity for 20 million homes. The Western Governors’ Association has set a goal of 30,000 megawatts of new clean energy in its region by 2015 from such sources as renewables and advanced natural-gas technologies. California has leapt to national leadership on solar energy in particular with Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s initiatives to reach “a million solar roofs” by 2017, the \$3 billion cost covered by a modest surcharge on energy bills. The second and, advocates say, fastest and cheapest way to save energy: higher efficiency standards on machines and appliances. Frustrated by tortuously slow federal action, 10 states have set more stringent standards. Massachusetts recently led the nation with tough new efficiency standards for furnaces and boilers. If the U.S. followed suit, say the PIRGs, we’d save \$4.5 billion and 1 percent of today’s natural gas consumption. Third potential: major cuts in greenhouse gas emissions from power plants. Led by New York’s Gov. George Pataki, eight Northeastern states (Maine to Maryland, Massachusetts excepted) have adopted a cap on carbon releases into the atmosphere, allowing for trading to find the least-cost ways to reduce emissions. Schwarzenegger has set a goal to cut California’s emissions to less than 2000 levels in the next five years. Oregon and Washington are moving in the same direction. Govs. Janet Napolitano (Arizona) and Bill Richardson (N.M.) have agreed to a parallel regional accord. Fourth: “clean cars” through significant reductions in carbon dioxide from auto tailpipe emissions. Ten states – California, Oregon, Washington, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont and Maine – have recently gone well beyond existing federal requirements on this issue. Although automakers continue to fight the tougher requirements, the 10 states have such a huge cumulative population that their new rules are likely to remove the pollution created by 500-megawatt coal-fired plants in a year, or the national global warming emissions from all but 47 of the world’s countries today.

#### **Pierce continues:**

Internationally, reports suggest the world may be approaching an irreversible global warming “tipping point” with incalculable damage to environments and economies. Americans have begun to understand the threat. State governments have started to act. With federal action already long overdue, it seems that the states for now must be our key innovators. It’s heartening that more and more of them are starting to work collectively on key energy issues. We have, in fact, little time to waste.



*STATES COUNTERPLAN – NEGATIVE EXTENSIONS AND ANSWERS – PAGE 1*  
*COUNTERPLAN SOLVENCY*

State programs can turn brownfields into brightfields; we should leave the plan to them.

Dana, Professor, Northwestern University School of Law, 2005 (David A. Dana.. New York University Environmental Law Journal: “STATE BROWNFIELDS PROGRAMS AS LABORATORIES OF DEMOCRACY?”)

Innovative state programs to support brownfield financing help to level the economic playing field between brownfield sites and undeveloped property. These “non-cash” tools and strategies build on practical opportunities to link programs and leverage additional resources. About half a dozen state programs accomplish this in various ways—by limiting risk or offsetting critical costs. These approaches are getting more attention in tight budget climates.

The states have already proven themselves to be better than federal government at solving for brownfield redevelopment projects.

Crain’s Detroit Business 2008 (“Midwest states among leaders in redevelopment” By Marti Benedetti online: <http://www.crainsdetroit.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080505/SUB/805050310/-1>)

The creative approaches by Midwestern states to completing successful brownfield redevelopment projects have made them models for the rest of the country, according to brownfield redevelopment leaders. “These states have a very diverse and rich set of offerings to address brownfield issues,” said Charlie Bartsch, senior fellow at ICF International, a Washington-based consulting company. Joe Dufficy, chief of the brownfield section for the Environmental Protection Agency's Region 5, said that Illinois and Minnesota had legislation in place for brownfield cleanup as early as 1987. It wasn't until 1995 that the EPA made its first big push to provide money for brownfield redevelopment. Region 5 (which includes Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin) is ahead of the federal government in addressing brownfield issues. Projects in these states get done by piecing together a variety of state and federal programs. Tom Darden, CEO of Raleigh, N.C.-based Cherokee Investment Partners L.L.C., a private-equity company that has invested in more than 500 brownfields since 1990, said projects need to make sound economic sense but have an additional benefit of community service.



*STATES COUNTERPLAN – NEGATIVE EXTENSIONS AND ANSWERS – PAGE 2*

***2NC ANSWER TO: Race to the Bottom***

The affirmative team has it backwards: they say states will have a race to the bottom on environmental programs, but in reality, states will race to the top.

Alice [Kaswan](#), Professor of Law, University of San Francisco School of Law, [2007](#). *University of San Francisco Law Review, Summer 2007, p. 66-71*

States may be taking more action than expected under a race to the bottom model because of the perceived economic benefits of taking early action. Governor Schwarzenegger emphasized that California's climate change initiatives will not just impose economic costs, they could also create economic opportunities for companies investing in new technologies. At the conference, Devra Wang, the Director of the California Energy Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council and one of the original architects of AB 32, stressed the economic benefits to California of leading the way in climate change reductions. Reduction requirements are inevitable, and if California regulates sooner rather than later, California businesses will become the exporters of cutting-edge technology, rather than, at a later point, having to import innovations developed in other states. Some states may thus be racing to the top - racing to develop their response to climate change - rather than racing to the bottom.



## STATES COUNTERPLAN – NEGATIVE ANSWERS TO CALIFORNIA DA

California's economy is already going to crash. The counterplan will not make things worse than they already are.

**Fresno Bee** 3/21/09 [Even Weak Economic Recovery May Be Too Strong a Forecast - <http://www.fresnobee.com/columnists/walters/story/1277261.html>]

It's now clear that during those two months, the state's economic prospects had deteriorated even further. This has led **the Legislature's budget analyst**, Mac Taylor, to **project that the state still faces an \$8 billion deficit**. But **even Taylor's dark scenario may be too optimistic**, and **the state faces a truly historic, semi-permanent economic downsizing**.

Consider, for example, this dark, but perhaps realistic, projection by University of California at Santa Barbara economists:

**"The ... economy will likely continue to decline for another two years, perhaps longer. We expect the number of California jobs ... economic output ... retail sales [and] tourism revenues will fall throughout the forecast horizon. There is no measure of economic strength that provides even a glimmer of hope for California's economy in the near term, none."**

Green development – like the turning of brownfields into brightfields in our counterplan – is the one thing that can save California's economy, creating thousands of jobs.

**Area Development Online** – January 2009  
[<http://www.areadevelopment.com/stateResources/California/California-alternative-energy-high-tech019.shtml>]

**"The gold rush started California's economic climb, and the 'green rush' will take us and the world into this new century,"** says **Bill McGowan, California's deputy secretary for economic development and commerce**. **He notes that the bulk of growth in the green technology niche is rooted in the categories of solar, alternative fuels, energy efficiency, green building, and water technology.**

California can use money the Federal government has already given it through the stimulus bill to push through our counterplan – there are hundreds of millions of dollars available.

**Scientific American** 3/18/09 [Stimulus Will Be Used to Spur Alternative Energy Projects in California - <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=stimulus-for-energy-projects>]

**California plans to spend nearly \$300 million in federal stimulus cash on a wide range of energy projects,** a key state official said yesterday. **The California Energy Commission is prepared to invest in efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, boost energy efficiency or renewable energy and create "green" jobs,** said **Panama Bartholomy, an adviser to commission Chairwoman Karen Douglas**. As states rush to meet federal deadlines for applying for stimulus assistance – the deadline for preliminary applications to the U.S. Energy Department is March 23 – they are also struggling to figure out how to distribute the money as quickly as possible. All funds must be used by September 2010. **Of more than \$50 billion that California is expecting to receive overall, about \$295 million will go to energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.**