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### 1

#### A. Interpretation - Financial incentives are committed funds directly tied to production

Webb, 93 – lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.

By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive ***effects*** which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### B. Violation - they violate Incentives – the plan is a nonfinancial incentive and an *increase* in restrictions

Shapiro, associate – Energy, Environment & Public Utilities Practice Group @ Cozen O'Connor, publisher – Green Building Law Blog, 2011

(Shari, “Code Green: Is 'Greening' the Building Code the Best Approach to Create a Sustainable Built Environment?” Planning & Environmental Law 63:6, p. 3-12)

The explosion of state and local green building regulations has been extraordinary and has led to interesting regulatory experimentation. Many state and local governments begin by mandating green building practices for public buildings. Some local governments have expanded that mandate to require green building practices for both public and private development, often for new construction over a certain square footage. Others have sought to encourage green building practices through financial incentives. Still others have used non-financial incentives like expedited permitting or increased density to encourage the development of green buildings. Mandatory green building requirements work very much like traditional "command and control" environmental regulations, the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act being preeminent examples. Direct regulation may mandate specific green building practices or the achievement of a green building standard such as the USGBCs Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard.3 Green building codes such as CALGreen, discussed in detail below, fall into this regulatory category. Financial incentives have taken the form of direct grants from government entities,4 tax incentives, and rebates.5 Other forms of financial incentives for green buildings are rebates of the typical government-related costs of building, such as application fees.6 Local governments are also experimenting with nonfinancial incentives for green building practices. These incentives are often attractive to municipalities because they do not deplete public finances directly and are therefore easier to get passed in difficult financial times or with teluctant constituencies.7 Examples of nonfinancial incentives include increased floor-to-area ratios for green buildings8 and expedited permitting processes.

#### **C. Reasons to prefer**

#### 1. Limits – Justifies any indirect financial incentives like giving money to oil companies to clean up oil spills and reading an environment advantage, or buying oil for the SPR and reading an oil shocks advantage.

#### 2. Ground – not spending money guts crucial link arguments to spending DA, budget tradeoff DAs, and politics DA. Also, specifying only one country kills the substantive nature of the link to foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

#### 3. Precision – they blur the line between the definition of a financial incentive and non-financial incentive. That kills predictability in engaging the topic because the resolution is the starting point for all research.

#### Voter for fairness and education.

### 2

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should procure small modular reactors for military bases in the United States.

#### DOD is key – solves commercialization, overcomes restrictions and doesn’t link to politics.

Madia, Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, ‘12

[William, Spring, "Small Modular Reactors: A Potential Game-changing Technology", energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_by\_William\_Madia]

To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes.¶ If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### SMR key to help nuclear beat-out natural gas

Lamonica 12—Tech Review Writer. 20 years of experience covering technology and business (8/9/12, Martin, A Glut of Natural Gas Leaves Nuclear Power Stalled, [www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/](http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/))

The nuclear renaissance is in danger of petering out before it has even begun, but not for the reasons most people once thought. Forget safety concerns, or the problem of where to store nuclear waste—the issue is simply cheap, abundant natural gas.¶ General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt caused a stir last month when he told the Financial Times that it's "hard to justify nuclear" in light of low natural gas prices. Since GE sells all manner of power generation equipment, including components for nuclear plants, Immelt's comments hold a lot of weight.¶ Cheap natural gas has become the fuel of choice with electric utilities, making building expensive new nuclear plants an increasingly tough sell. The United States is awash in natural gas largely thanks to horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking" technology, which allows drillers to extract gas from shale deposits once considered too difficult to reach. In 2008, gas prices were approaching $13 per million BTUs; prices have now dropped to around $3. ¶ When gas prices were climbing, there were about 30 nuclear plant projects in various stages of planning in the United States. Now the Nuclear Energy Institute estimates that, at most, five plants will be built by 2020, and those will only be built thanks to favorable financing terms and the ability to pay for construction from consumers' current utility bills. Two reactors now under construction in Georgia, for example, moved ahead with the aid of an $8.33 billion loan guarantee from the U.S. Department of Energy. ¶ What happens after those planned projects is hard to predict. "The question is whether we'll see any new nuclear," says Revis James, the director of generation research and development at the Electric Power Research Institute. "The prospects are not good."¶ Outside the United States, it's a different story. Unconventional sources of natural gas also threaten the expansion of nuclear, although the potential impact is less clear-cut. Around the world, there are 70 plants now under construction, but shale gas also looms as a key factor in planning for the future. Prices for natural gas are already higher in Asia and Europe, and shale gas resources are not as fully developed as they are the United States.¶ Some countries are also blocking the development of new natural gas resources. France, for instance, which has a strong commitment to nuclear, has banned fracking in shale gas exploration because of concerns over the environmental impact.¶ Fast-growing China, meanwhile, needs all the energy sources available and is building nuclear power plants as fast as possible.¶ Even in United States, of course, super cheap natural gas will not last forever. With supply exceeding demand, some drillers are said to be losing money on natural gas, which could push prices back up. Prices will also be pushed upward by utilities, as they come to rely on more natural gas for power generation, says James.¶ Ali Azad, the chief business development officer at energy company Babcock & Wilcox, thinks the answer is making nuclear power smaller, cheaper, and faster. His is one of a handful of companies developing small modular reactors that can be built in three years, rather than 10 or more, for a fraction of the cost of gigawatt-size reactors. Although this technology is not yet commercially proven, the company has a customer in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which expects to have its first unit online in 2021 (see "A Preassembled Nuclear Reactor").¶ "When we arrive, we will have a level cost of energy on the grid, which competes favorably with a brand-new combined-cycle natural gas plants when gas prices are between $6 to $8," said Azad. He sees strong demand in power-hungry China and places such as Saudia Arabia, where power is needed for desalination.¶ Even if natural gas remains cheaper, utilities don't want to find themselves with an overreliance on gas, which has been volatile on price in the past, so nuclear power will still contribute to the energy mix. "[Utilities] still continue [with nuclear] but with a lower level of enthusiasm—it's a hedging strategy," says Hans-Holger Rogner from the Planning and Economics Studies section of the International Atomic Energy Agency. "They don't want to pull all their eggs in one basket because of the new kid on the block called shale gas."

#### SMRs solve warming – provides a bridge to renewable energy.

Clayton, ‘10

(Mark, Staff Writer, “Nuclear power: Obama team touts mini-nukes to fight global warming”, The Christian Science Monitor,

http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2010/0330/Nuclear-power-Obama-team-touts-mini-nukes-to-fight-global-warming, accessed 8-3-12, RSR)

To fight global warming, Energy Secretary Steven Chu is calling for the US to pursue solar, wind, clean coal, and nuclear power plants – including relatively tiny "bite-sized" nuclear reactors that critics argue are a proliferation risk. Rather than building expensive huge reactors, smaller utilities might find a better option in small, more affordable mass-produced nuclear reactors, Dr. Chu said Monday in a speech at Georgetown University in Washington, ClimateWire reported. The idea is to fill gaps in carbon-free power generation until nonnuclear renewable energy is widely available. Dr. Chu had previously made a pitch for "small modular reactors" in an opinion piece published last week in The Wall Street Journal. He envisions SMRs that would be less than one-third the size of existing plants. With compact designs, SMR reactors "could be made in factories and transported to sites by truck or rail. SMRs would be ready to 'plug and play' upon arrival," he wrote.

### 3

#### The United States federal government should institute a carbon tax per ton of emissions. The tax should be revenue neutral and the revenue should be used for offsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit.

#### A carbon tax solves better for warming and competitiveness

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.4-5

In this book I argue that the best energy policy for balancing the often-compet-¶ ing goals of cheap, clean, and secure energy would use the price system to fundamentally alter consumer behavior, business behavior, and the incentives to develop alternative-energy technologies. Currently, the price system fails to incorporate the true social cost of fossil fuels—the costs associated with climate¶ diange and oil security. Because these fossil fuels are artiﬁcially cheap, alternative clean and secure energy technologies are forced to compete on a very un-even playing ﬁeld. By taxing fossil fuels to reﬂect their true environmental and security costs, we can level the playing ﬁeld for these new technologies. Given a level playing ﬁeld, new technologies will ﬂourish, and energy conservation will regin in the overall growth of energy consumption. There will be no need for special subsidies, tax credits, and so forth for alternative technologies deemed winners of the congressional beauty pageant for alternative fuels. Instead, the marketplace will identify the winners and winnow out failed technologies.¶ There is currently no way for policymakers to identify the ultimate winners and¶ losers. We have no idea what technologies will dominate in thirty or ﬁfty years.¶ Instead of policymakers attempting to socially engineer the outcome, as in the¶ case ofcom-based ethanol, it is far better to create the market conditions under¶ which unknown and unknowable technologies will ﬂourish. Using the price system to modify human behavior is not a novel idea. “Sin¶ taxes” on alcohol and cigarettes, for example, have be shown to substantially¶ reduce consumption of both. in the Scandinavian counuies, high¶ taxes on alcohol have proved to be an eﬁecﬁve means of curtailing consurnp-¶ tion, after experimts with a variety of command-and-conu'ol policies, such as¶ prohibidon, generated much public discontent. But in the case of fossil fuels,¶ taxes would not only discourage the consumpﬁon of fossil fuels, but they¶ would also provide a level playing ﬁeld on which new energy technologies¶ could compete and ﬂourish. Speciﬁcally,¶ Congress should enact security a security tax per barrel of oil and a carbon tax per ton of carbon, thus raising the of all carbon-mntainingﬁnlr to ngﬂect tbeir true social cost.¶ Such a strategy has several advantages over the policy of awarding subsidies¶ and protective tariﬁ to industries represented by strong, entrenched lobbies¶ such as the Renewable Fuels Association (com-based ethanol producers) and¶ subjecting consumers to various command-and-conuols:¶ ° All new technologies would enjoy a more level playing ﬁeld.¶ ° The market, not the government, would determine which of the new tech-¶ nologies are the winners.¶ ° This approach is more uansparent. It is exuernely diﬂicult to assess the costs¶ (in terms of lost tax revenues) and the eﬁectiveness of the current patchwork¶ of subsidies and tax credits. In contrast, imposing carbon and security taxes would force us to ask how much we are willing to pay for clearner air and added oil security.¶ ° A focus on the prices right for fossil fuels would limit the opportunity¶ for Congress to pass legislation designed to enrich pardcular private-interest¶ groups.

### 4

#### 1. CIR will pass now

LA Times 2/21 (http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-labor-and-business-immigration-agreement-20130221,0,5405955.story)

Key business and labor leaders said Thursday that they have hammered out the broad outline of a compromise on one of the hardest issues in reforming the nation's immigration system -- how to handle future needs for foreign workers in the U.S.¶ Although both sides say key details remain to be negotiated, the deal could clear away a significant roadblock to further action in Congress.¶ "For the first time, labor and business have agreed publicly to commit to immigration reform," said Eliseo Medina, secretary-treasurer of the Service Employees International Union, one of the labor groups involved along with the AFL-CIO in the negotiations with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.¶ A bipartisan group of eight senators who have been crafting an immigration bill plan to meet next week to discuss the issue and have been waiting to see the results of the talks between the business and labor groups.¶ U.S. immigration law: Decades of debate¶ Failure to agree on how to handle future flows of foreign workers into the U.S. was a key factor in scuttling the last effort to reform the nation’s immigration laws, under President George W. Bush in 2007. Critics of the previous big immigration law, the amnesty passed under President Reagan in 1986, say that one of that measure's greatest failings was that it did not deal adequately with future needs, leading to a huge inflow of illegal immigrants in the 1990s and early 2000s.¶ To prevent that from happening again, the agreement worked out by the union and business representatives would create a legal system to allow a certain number of foreign workers to enter the country legally each year. Companies that could not find U.S. workers would be allowed to hire those workers if they first advertised jobs to Americans.

#### 2. Obama’s political capital is key.

Hesson 1/2 (Ted, Immigration Editor at ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTq55JIAho)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.¶ 2. Clear Space on the Agenda¶ Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

#### 3. Aff causes a firestorm---drains capital

Mulkern 9 (Anne, "Some daylight at last for US feed-in tariffs," New York Times, March 24,[www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/03/24/24greenwire-some-see-daylight-at-last-for-us-feedin-tariff-10271.html?pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/03/24/24greenwire-some-see-daylight-at-last-for-us-feedin-tariff-10271.html?pagewanted=all" \t "_blank))

Congress does not appear likely to embrace a feed-in tariff anytime soon, however.  "There is no interest on the Energy Committee's part to examine the concept of feed-in tariffs," said Bill Wicker, spokesman for the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the most likely starting place for such discussions. "We believe a better way to accomplish the same goal -- creating a market for renewables -- is with a renewable electricity standard."  That standard would require utilities to generate a portion of their power from green sources. Congress is expected to consider such a mandate as part of an energy or climate bill. Wicker said that passing a renewable electricity standard is a top priority for Energy and Natural Resources Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.).  But a congressman with a bill proposing a feed-in tariff believes momentum is building, although the concept will take time to sell.  "We still need to get folks to a basic concept of what it is," said Rep. Jay Inslee (D-Wash.). "Ten percent of the Congress could probably not even tell you what a feed-in tariff is."  Inslee calls the feed-in tariff "the 800-pound gorilla of policies when it comes to really driving the development of these markets."  "It's an idea whose time, I believe, will come," Inslee said. Pressed on the timing, he said it could happen this year, but "I wouldn't bet the farm on it, because it's a new idea, and new ideas take time."  The solar industry has no illusions about winning approval for a feed-in tariff anytime soon, Efird said.  "This is something that has to be proposed, gestated and rejected," Efird said, noting that it took 18 attempts to pass an extension of the renewable-energy tax credit.  "The timing seems right to throw it into the pot for discussion," Efird said. "There is some support for it in Congress."  There would be much to debate should Congress consider a feed-in tariff.  The most important question likely would be the rate at which a national tariff is set. Solar producers say it has to be high enough to provide an incentive to install solar systems that cost tens of thousands of dollars for homes and hundreds of thousands of dollars for businesses.

#### 4. Immigration reform is key to food security

Fitz 12 (Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, Time to Legalize Our 11 Million Undocumented Immigrants, November 14th, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/11/14/44885/time-to-legalize-our-11-million-undocumented-immigrants/)

Nowhere is the tension between immigrant labor and the economy more obvious than in agriculture. By most estimates, undocumented immigrants make up more than half of the workers in the agriculture industry. Likewise the U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that each farm job creates three “upstream” jobs in professions such as packaging, transporting, and selling the produce, meaning that what happens in the agricultural sector affects the economy as a whole.¶ Agriculture is particularly susceptible to the whims of the labor market, since crops become ripe at a fixed time and must be picked quickly before they rot. Migrant laborers often travel a set route, following the growing season as it begins in places such as Florida and works its way north. Disrupting this flow of pickers can be devastating to local economies and the nation’s food security.¶ After the passage of Georgia’s anti-immigrant law, H.B. 87, for example, the Georgia Agribusiness Council estimated that the state could lose up to $1 billion in produce from a lack of immigrant labor. A survey of farmers conducted by the Georgia Department of Agriculture found 56 percent of those surveyed were experiencing difficulty finding workers—a devastating blow to the state. Even a program by Gov. Nathan Deal (D-GA) to use prison parolees to fill the worker shortage quickly fell apart, with most walking off the job after just a few hours.¶ Creating a process for legalizing these undocumented workers would help stabilize the agricultural workforce and enhance our nation’s food security. It would also diminish the incentive of states to go down the economically self-destructive path that Georgia, Alabama, Arizona, and others have pursued.

#### 5. Food shortages lead to extinction.

Brown, founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, ‘9

[Lester, “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

### 5

#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. Only through rejecting challenging forth and embracing bringing forth can we avoid this hollowing out of Being

Waddington 5 A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding 'The Question concerning Technology' more by David Waddington Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 37, No. 4, 2005 http://concordia.academia.edu/DavidWaddington/Papers/538046/A\_Field\_Guide\_to\_Heidegger\_Understanding\_The\_Question\_concerning\_Technology

Most essays on technology focus primarily on practical issues surrounding the use of particular technologies . Heidegger’s essay, however, does not—instead, it focuses on the ways of thinking that lie behind technology. Heidegger (1977, p. 3) thinks that by coming to understand these ways of thinking, humans can enter into a ‘free relationship’ with technology. After dismissing the conventional account of technology, which supposedly states that technology is simply a means to an end, Heidegger commences a discussion on ancient craftsmanship. He suggests that the ancient craftsmanship involves the four Aristotelian causes: material, formal, ﬁnal, and efﬁcient. Intuitively, one might think that the efﬁcient cause of a given craft-item (the craftsman) was the most signiﬁcant of the four. However, although the craftsman has an important role in that she unites the four causes by considering each of them carefully, each of the four causes is equally co-responsible for the particular craft-item that is produced. Heidegger comments, ‘The four ways of being responsible bring something into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing’ (1977, p. 9). Appropriately enough, Heidegger names this process bringing-forth . Notably, bringing-forth is not merely a descriptive genus under which the four causes are subsumed—rather, it is a uniﬁed process, ‘a single leading-forth to which [each of the causes] is indebted’ (Lovitt, 1972, p. 46).Heidegger writes that bringing-forth ‘comes to pass only insofar as something concealed comes into unconcealment’ (1977, p. 11). Thus, instead of the craft-item being created by the craftsman, as one would think, it was revealed or unconcealed .In ‘The Thing’, Heidegger comments on the making of a jug, The jug is not a vessel because it was made; rather, the jug had to be made because it is this holding vessel. The making … lets the jug come into its own. But that which in the jug’s nature is its own is never brought about by its making. (1971, p. 168)Clearly, revealing/unconcealing in the mode of bringing-forth contains strong hints of Platonism. Bringing-forth is the mode of revealing that corresponds to ancient craft. Modern technology, however, has its own particular mode of revealing, which Heidegger calls challenging-forth . Thinking in the mode of challenging-forth is very different from thinking in the mode of bringing-forth: when challenging-forth, one sets upon the elements of a situation both in the sense of ordering (i.e. setting a system upon) and in a more rapacious sense (i.e. the wolves set upon the traveler and devoured him). In bringing-forth, human beings were one important element among others in the productive process; in challenging-forth, humans control the productive process. Efﬁciency is an additional important element of thinking in the mode of challeng-ing forth; the earth, for example, is set upon to yield the maximum amount of ore with the minimum amount of effort. Essentially, challenging-forth changes the way we see the world—as Michael Zimmerman pointedly remarks, ‘To be capable of transforming a forest into packaging for cheeseburgers, man must see the forest not as a display of the miracle of life, but as raw material, pure and simple’ (1977, p. 79).Production in the mode of challenging-forth reveals objects that have the status of standing-reserve . Objects that have been made standing-reserve have been reduced to disposability in two different senses of the word: (1) They are disposable in the technical sense; they are easily ordered and arranged. Trees that once stood chaotically in the forest are now logs that can be easily counted, weighed, piled, and shipped. (2) They are also disposable in the conventional sense; like diapers and cheap razors, they are endlessly replaceable/interchangeable and have little value. For the most part, challenging things forth into standing-reserve is not a laudable activity, and thus it makes sense to wonder what drives human beings to think in this way. Heidegger’s answer to this motivational question is unconventional— instead of suggesting that the origins of this motivation are indigenous to human beings, he postulates the existence of a phenomenon that ‘sets upon man to order the real as standing-reserve’ (1977, p. 19). Heidegger calls this mysterious phenomenon enframing ( Ge-stell in German). The word ‘Ge-stell’ gathers together several meanings of the -stellen family of German verbs: in Ge-stell, humans are ordered ( bestellen ), commanded ( bestellen ), and entrapped ( nachstellen ) (Harries 1994,p. 229). Heidegger thinks that our default state is that of being trapped by Ge-stell; this is what he means when he writes, ‘As the one who is challenged forth in this way, man stands within the essential realm of [Ge-stell]. He can never take up a relationship to it only subsequently’ (1977, p. 24; Sallis, 1971, p. 162). According to Heidegger (1977, p. 25), there are different ‘ordainings of destining’ for human beings. Although the default destining is that of Ge-stell, it is possible to choose an alternate road. Heidegger thinks that human beings have been granted the special role of ‘Shepherds of Being’—we have been granted the power to reveal the world in certain ways (Ballard, 1971, p. 60). Trapped in Ge-stell, we tend to reveal things in the mode of challenging-forth, but we can also choose to reveal things in the mode of bringing-forth. Heidegger comments, ‘Placed between these possibilities, man is endangered from out of destining’ (1977, p. 26). However, by carefully considering the ways of thinking that lie behind technology, we can grasp the ‘saving power’. We can realize that we, the Shepherds of Being, have a choice : we can bring-forth rather than challenge-forth. Thus, once we understand the thinking behind technology, we become free to choose our fate—‘… we are already sojourning in the open space of destining’ (Heidegger, 1977, p. 26).

### Solvency

#### FITS not utilized - Palo Alto proves

Wesoff 12 (Eric Wesoff, writing for Green Tech Media “Palo Alto, Calif. Had a Solar Feed-In Tariff and Nobody Came” August 2, 2012 http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Palo-Alto-Calif.-Had-a-Solar-Feed-in-Tariff-and-Nobody-Came)

One of the problems with solar feed-in tariffs is that if the price is set too high, there's a frantic gold rush to claim the richly subsidized projects. If the price is too low, there's not too much enthusiasm by developers to build marginal projects.That's what appears to have occurred in Palo Alto in the heart of Silicon Valley, California.Jon Abendschein, Resource Planner at the City of Palo Alto Utilities, just sent out a letter which said: *Tuesday*, July 31 was the deadline for submitting an application to receive a Palo Alto CLEAN contract in August. No applications were received, *so there is still 4 megawatts of capacity remaining in the program. The City is now accepting applications for September contract issuance. We encourage interested property owners and developers to submit an application by Friday, August 31 to receive a contract at the beginning of September.*[Craig Lewis, Director of the CLEAN Coalition](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/has-vermont-solved-the-solar-permitting-problem1/), a distributed generation advocacy group, said, "Although disappointing, this is not entirely unexpected, given that Palo Alto's objective was to set the price based on avoided cost and to test whether the market could deliver wholesale solar at a ratepayer-neutral price."The city is looking to pay $0.14 per kilowatt-hour for 20-year contracts. Jon Abendschein, Palo Alto's Resource Planner, had commented earlier that $0.14 per kilowatt-hour is a price that will attract developers to the program.  [Palo Alto initiated this program in March of this year](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Its-Official-Palo-Alto-Calif.-Has-a-Feed-In-Tariff-for-PV-/) with a unanimous vote by the Palo Alto City Council. Palo Alto looked to join Germany, Italy, Gainesville, Florida, and Sacramento, California as regions with solar [feed-in tariffs](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/can-the-u.s.-or-california-institute-a-feed-in-tariff/) (FIT).Palo Alto called its program a CLEAN program (Clean Local Energy Accessible Now) rather than what they considered the awkward term 'feed-in tariff,' or FIT

#### No solvency - Silicon shortages

[Wenzel](http://www.cnet.com/profile/elsa.wenzel/) 8 (Elsa, CNET News Staff Writer, May 9, “Barriers to solar energy's blockbuster promise,” <http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-9939715-54.html>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

As 26 U.S. states including California are requiring some renewable energy in utilities' portfolios, more utilities are jumping on the solar bandwagon.¶ The limited availability of silicon has partly stalled the growth of the solar sector.¶ "We're struggling to provide one-third of what people want from us, and we're No. 1," according to Kristina Peterson, director of structured finance at solar module maker Suntech.¶ However, [supplies could increase](http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-9919442-54.html) by 33 percent this year and 23 percent in 2009, according to research firm Gartner. From the world's modest 8 suppliers of silicon, 100 new providers could emerge by 2009, Peterson said.¶ No matter how renewables improve in efficiency and price, Kuga of PG&E said he foresees a continued reliance on the grid, especially for peak demand.¶ Renewables make up less than 3 percent of U.S. energy, according to the Department of Energy. They can be less reliable than tried-and-true yet carbon-intensive sources like coal. Both solar and wind depend upon the whims of weather.¶

#### Solar power fails - low energy capacity

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, April 19, “Zycher testimony to joint House subcommittee hearing on subsidies for renewable energy,” <http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/zycher-testimony-to-joint-house-subcommittee-hearing-on-subsidies-for-renewable-energy/>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

The same general problem afflicts solar power. The energy content of sunlight,¶ crudely, is about 150-400 watts per square meter, depending on location, of which about¶ 20-30 percent is convertible to electricity, depending on the particular technology.¶ Accordingly, even in theory a square meter of solar energy receiving capacity is enough¶ to power roughly one 100-watt light bulb, putting aside such issues of sunlight intensity¶ and the like. This problem of land requirements for solar thermal facilities is of sufficient¶ importance that most analyses assume a maximum plant capacity of 50-100 MW, which,¶ conservatively, would require approximately 1250 acres, or 2 square miles.¶ In short: Transformation of the unconcentrated energy content of wind and¶ sunlight into a form useable for modern applications requires massive capital investment¶ in the form of both land and wind turbines and solar receiving equipment. This means¶ that the energy that can be extracted from renewable

### Warming

#### U.S. coal exports to China are low, but downward pressure on domestic demand expands them massively

Bryan Walsh 12, Senior Editor at TIME, May 31, 2012, “Drawing Battle Lines Over American Coal Exports to Asia,” online: http://science.time.com/2012/05/31/drawing-battle-lines-over-american-coal-exports-to-asia/

But across the Pacific Ocean, the demand for coal has never been hotter, with China burning 4.1 billion tons in 2010 alone, far more than any other country in the world. That insatiable demand forced China in 2009 to become a net coal importer for the first time, in part because congested rail infrastructure raised the cost of transporting coal from the mines of the country’s northwest to its booming southern cities. In April, Chinese coal imports nearly doubled from a year earlier. Right now Australia and Indonesia supply much of China’s foreign coal. U.S. coal from the Powder River Basin could be a perfect addition to the Chinese market. Montana and Wyoming are just short train trips to ports on the Pacific Northwest coast, and from there it’s a container ship away from Asian megacities where coal doesn’t have to compete with cheap natural gas and air-pollution regulations are far weaker than in the U.S. To a wounded Big Coal, China is a potential savior.¶ As I write in the new edition of TIME, there’s just one problem: right now, ports on the West Coast lack the infrastructure needed to transfer coal from railcars into container ships. (Just 7 million of the 107 million tons of U.S.-exported coal left the country via Pacific Ocean ports last year.) That’s why coal companies like Peabody and Ambre Energy are ready to spend millions to build coal-export facilities at a handful of ports in Washington and Oregon. If all those plans go forward, as much as 150 million tons of coal could be exported from the Northwest annually—-nearly all of it coming from the Powder -River -Basin and headed to Asia. Even if the U.S. kept burning less and less coal at home, it would have a reason to keep mining it.

#### Solar trades off with U.S. coal consumption

Quilty 2012 (David, writer for Georgia Solar Utilities Online, “New Georgia Utility Building Solar Plant to Replace Retired Coal Plants.”, <http://www.gasolarutilities.com/index.php/news/90-new-georgia-utility-building-solar-plant-to-replace-retired-coal-plants>) PY

A new solar utility company in Georgia has big plans to replace several coal-fired power plants being retired in the state. When Georgia Power Company announced it was set to take two coal-burning units offline at its Plant Branch facility in order to reduce the area’s dependence on coal energy, Georgia Solar Utilities Inc. offered to build a solar plant on-site and sell them the plant and power through a power-purchasing agreement. Georgia Power declined the offer so Georgia Solar is now going it alone.¶ ¶ Located near Milledgeville, Georgia right next door to Georgia Power’s coal plant, the new solar plant will cover 2,200 acres and cost approximately $320 million. It will be capable of generating 90 megawatts of power, double that of the solar system that Georgia Power already has in place. That is, the laws governing utility companies in Georgia changes and it can get built.

#### U.S. exports lock in expanded Chinese coal capacity---causes warming over the tipping point---it’s unique because absent U.S. exports the rising cost of coal will cause a shift to renewables – turns the advantage

Thomas M. Power 12, Research Professor and Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics, University of Montana; Principal, Power Consulting; February 2012, “The Greenhouse Gas Impact of Exporting Coal from the West Coast: An Economic Analysis,” <http://www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Power-White-Paper.pdf>

The cumulative impact of these coal port proposals on coal consumption in Asia could be much larger than even that implied by the two pending proposals. If Arch, Peabody, and other western U.S. coal producers’ projections of the competitiveness of western coal in Asia are correct, facilitating the opening of the development of West Coast coal ports could have a very large impact on the supply of coal to China and the rest of Asia. ¶ 6.4 The Long-term Implications of Fueling Additional Coal-Fired Electric Generation ¶ Although the economic life of coal-fired generators is often given as 30 or 35 years, a permitted, operating, electric generator is kept on line a lot longer than that, as long as 50 or more years through ongoing renovations and upgrades. Because of that long operating life, the impact of the lower Asian coal prices and costs triggered by PRB coal competing with other coal sources cannot be measured by the number of tons of coal exported each year. Those lower coal costs will lead to commitments to more coal being burned for a half-century going forward. ¶ That time-frame is very important. During exactly this time frame, the next half-century, the nations of the world will have to get their greenhouse gas emission stabilized and then reduced or the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may pass a point that will make it very difficult to avoid massive, ongoing, negative climate impacts. Taking actions now that encourage fifty-years of more coal consumption around the world is not a minor matter. Put more positively, allowing coal prices to rise (and more closely approximate their full cost, including “external” costs) will encourage extensive investments in improving the efficiency with which coal is used and the shift to cleaner sources of energy. This will lead to long-term reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that will also last well into the next half-century. 57

#### Too late to solve - CO2 stays in the atmosphere for hundreds of years.

Hillman, Senior Fellow at the Policy Studies Institute, ‘7

[Mayer, The Suicidal Planet: How To Prevent Global Climate Catastrophe, p. 25-6]

The effects of climate change cannot quickly be reversed by reducing or even eliminating future emissions of greenhouse gases. There are two reasons for this. First, greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere linger for decades (in the case of relatively short-lived gases like methane), or hundreds of years (for carbon dioxide), or even thousands of years (for the long-lived gases like perfluorocarbons). Carbon dioxide and methane concentrations in the atmosphere are respectively one-third and more than twice as high as those at any time over the last 650,000 years. Even if no additional carbon dioxide were emitted from now on, atmospheric concentrations would take centuries to decline to pre-Industrial Revolution levels. While elevated levels of greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, additional warming will occur.

#### Alt causes -

#### A. Deforestation

Howden 7(Daniel Howden, The Independent “Deforestation: The Hidden Cause of Global Warming” 14 May 2007. DOA August 15, 12 sphinx.tsf.hu/new/iny/files/1645.doc)

**Most people think of forests** only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of **as the lungs of the planet.** But **the destruction of those forests will in the next four years** alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, **pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025.¶** Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China.¶ What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo.¶ According to the latest audited figures from 2003, **two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere** every year **from deforestation.** That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled **annually.¶** The remaining standing forest is calculated to contain 1,000 billion tons of carbon, or double what is already in the atmosphere.¶ As the GCP's report concludes: **"If we lose forests, we lose the fight against climate change."**

#### B. India

**IEA 12** (International Energy Agency “Global carbon-dioxide emissions increase by 1.0 Gt in 2011 to record high” 24 May 2012 [http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/news/2012/may/name,27216,en.html](http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/news/2012/may/name%2C27216%2Cen.html) DOA 8/28/12)

**Global** carbon-dioxide (**CO2**) **emissions** from fossil-fuel combustion **reached a record high of 31.6**gigatonnes (**Gt**) **in 2011**, according to preliminary estimates from the International Energy Agency (IEA). This represents an increase of 1.0 Gt on 2010, or 3.2%. **Coal accounted for 45% of total energy-related CO2 emissions in 2011, followed by oil (35%) and natural gas (20%).**¶ The 450 Scenario of the IEA’s *World Energy Outlook 2011*, which sets out an energy pathway consistent with a 50% chance of limiting the increase in the average global temperature to 2°C, requires CO2 emissions to peak at 32.6 Gt no later than 2017, *i.e.* just 1.0 Gt above 2011 levels. The 450 Scenario sees a decoupling of CO2 emissions from global GDP, but much still needs to be done to reach that goal as the rate of growth in CO2 emissions in 2011 exceeded that of global GDP. “The new data provide further evidence that the door to a 2°C trajectory is about to close,” said IEA Chief Economist Fatih Birol.¶ **In 2011, a 6.1% increase in CO2 emissions in countries outside the OECD was only partly offset by a 0.6% reduction in emissions inside the OECD**. China made the largest contribution to the global increase, with its emissions rising by 720 million tonnes (Mt), or 9.3%, primarily due to higher coal consumption. “What China has done over such a short period of time to improve energy efficiency and deploy clean energy is already paying major dividends to the global environment”, said Dr. Birol. China’s carbon intensity — the amount of CO2 emitted per unit of GDP — fell by 15% between 2005 and 2011. Had these gains not been made, China’s CO2 emissions in 2011 would have been higher by 1.5 Gt.¶ **India’s emissions rose by** 140 Mt, or **8.7%, moving it ahead** of Russia **to become the fourth largest emitter** behind China, the United States, and the European Union. Despite these increases, per-capita CO2 emissions in China and India still remain just 63% and 15% of the OECD average respectively.

#### C. Live stock

FAO 6 ("Spotlight: Livestock Impacts on the Environment." FAO: FAO Home. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Nov. 2006. Web. 15 August 12. <<http://www.fao.org/ag/magazine/0612sp1.htm>>.)

The livestock sector is by far the single largest anthropogenic user of land. Grazing occupies 26 percent of the Earth's terrestrial surface, while feed crop production requires about a third of all arable land. Expansion of grazing land for livestock is a key factor in deforestation, especially in Latin America: some 70 percent of previously forested land in the Amazon is used as pasture, and feed crops cover a large part of the reminder. About 70 percent of all grazing land in dry areas is considered degraded, mostly because of overgrazing, compaction and erosion attributable to livestock activity.¶ At the same time, the livestock sector has assumed an often unrecognized role in global warming. Using a methodology that considered the entire commodity chain *(see box below)*, FAO estimated that livestock are responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, a bigger share than that of transport. It accounts for nine percent of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions, most of it due to expansion of pastures and arable land for feed crops. It generates even bigger shares of emissions of other gases with greater potential to warm the atmosphere: as much as 37 percent of anthropogenic methane, mostly from enteric fermentation by ruminants, and 65 percent of anthropogenic nitrous oxide, mostly from manure.

### Natural Gas

#### Natural gas prices will stay low and plenty of shale now

Philips ‘13 (Matthew, Bloomberg Businessweek, “Why Natural Gas Will Stay Cheap in 2013,” 2013, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-01-10/why-natural-gas-will-stay-cheap-in-2013)

Six weeks ago, natural gas bulls were riding high. By Thanksgiving, prices had more than doubled since hitting a decade low of $1.90 per million BTUs in April. Heading into what was supposed to be a cold winter for the U.S.—at least compared with last year—the consensus view was that natural gas prices would be higher in 2013, since about half of all U.S. households heat their homes with natural gas. By the end of December, the median forecast of 22 analysts surveyed by Bloomberg was that natural gas would average $3.75 for 2013. A few weeks of warm weather later, and a lot of those forecasts look way too optimistic. Prices have fallen more than 20 percent since peaking at $3.90 per million BTUs in late November. With the National Weather Service predicting above-normal temperatures over the next 10 days for the eastern third of the U.S., that downward pressure is likely to continue. “We’re going to see a lot of guys coming in and changing their forecasts,” says Laurent Key, an energy analyst at Societe Generale (SCGLY) in New York. Key expects prices to bottom out around an average of $3.16 in the second quarter before climbing. “If we end up repeating 2012, those expectations need to come down by about a buck,” says Scott Hanold, an energy analyst at RBC Capital Markets (RY) in Minneapolis. Goldman Sachs (GS) just lowered its 2013 price target by 50 cents, from $4.25 per million BTUs, to $3.75, still above the current price of $3.12. Natural gas is notoriously volatile, so prices could surge if the weather turns cold and people crank up their heat, but it’s hard to see that demand making up for what’s already been lost. Even if there is a February freeze across the country, that cold snap probably wouldn’t be sufficient to compensate for a mild December, Goldman analyst Johan Spetz wrote in a Jan. 7 research note. Bloomberg News reported Wednesday that Mike Fitzpatrick, editor of the Energy OverView newsletter, thinks natural gas prices could drop as low as $2.20 if the weather stays mild. The more likely scenario seems to be something akin to what happened last year, when prices fell through the spring and didn’t rise appreciably until people started turning on their air conditioners in May. Part of what helped lift natural gas prices off their lows last April was increased demand from utilities switching from coal to natural gas to generate electricity. But that effect might be more muted in 2013. After getting crushed by cheap natural gas over the last few years, coal appears set to recapture some of that market share in 2013. “Coal has become more competitive against natural gas,” says Lucas Pipes, an analyst at Brean Murray, Carret & Co. Coal prices have gotten so cheap that if natural gas rises to just $3.40 this year, Pipes estimates that would cause 50 million tons of coal demand to come on the market as utilities fire up their coal plants. The Department of Energy is forecasting that coal will account for 39 percent of all electricity generated in 2013, up from 37.6 percent last year. Meanwhile, natural gas’s continued run of increasing its share of the electricity market may be over. The DOE predicts that natural gas will lose ground this year and next, falling from 30.3 percent of all electricity generated in 2012, to 27.9 percent in 2013, and 27.5 percent in 2014. On top of that, natural gas production is set to rise by 0.5 percent this year, according to the DOE. After spending the previous 15 months reducing the number of rigs drilling for natural gas, U.S. producers finally started adding to that total in November, spurred perhaps by the prospect of sustained $4 prices. While production has slowed in some places, the Marcellus Shale in western Pennsylvania is still attracting new investment. “Marcellus is an animal. There are still 1,000 wells that haven’t been put online yet,” says Hanold. “That’s going to push production even higher.” Marcellus is also more immune to lower prices. The geology is so good, and the royalty rates so low, that producers can drill profitably even at $2 natural gas prices, he says. In the end, the fundamental issue that’s kept natural gas prices so low for the last few years—too much supply, inadequate demand—appears here to stay for the foreseeable future**.** ”Natural gas prices will be dead for at least two more years,” says Fadel Gheit, a senior oil and gas analyst at Oppenheimer (OPY). By dead he means well below $4. “The industry shot itself in the foot by overdrilling,” he says. “Now anybody and their brother can get gas out of the ground and into the system.”

#### Plan hurts the economy – increased electricity costs cause massive unemployment

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, March 27, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” <http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

Because renewable electricity generation is more costly than conventional¶ generation, policies driving a shift toward heavier reliance upon the former would¶ increase aggregate electricity costs, and thus reduce electricity use below levels that¶ would prevail otherwise. The 2007 EIA projection of total U.S. electricity consumption¶ in 2030 was about 5.17 million gWh.29 The latest EIA projection for 2030 is about 4.31¶ million gWh, a decline of about 16.6 percent.30 The change presumably reflects some¶ combination of assumptions about structural economic shifts, increased conservation, substitution of renewables for some conventional generation, and a price increase from¶ about 8.8 cents per kilowatt-hour to 9.0 cents (in 2009 dollars).¶ It would be surprising if that reduction in total U.S. electricity consumption failed¶ to have some employment effect. Figure 1 displays data on percent changes in real GDP,¶ electricity consumption, and employment for the period 1970 through 2009.31 It is obvious from the aggregate trends that electricity use and labor employment¶ are complements rather than substitutes; the simple correlation between the percent¶ changes for the two is 0.61, meaning, crudely, that a percent change in one tends to be¶ observed with a 0.61 percent change in the other, in the same direction. The simple¶ GDP/electricity and GDP/employment correlations are 0.67 and 0.85, respectively.

#### Tariffs make the industry uncompetitive AND no jobs from production

Bensinger 12 (Ken, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer, April 23, “U.S. tariffs on Chinese solar cells fuel debate about green jobs,” <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/23/business/la-fi-solar-jobs-20120423>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

A simmering trade dispute is highlighting a debate about the kinds of jobs America can sustain in a greening economy.¶ The Obama administration's recent decision to slap import tariffs on Chinese solar cells was hailed by some domestic solar manufacturers as a victory for job creation, leveling the field while also sending a powerful message to Beijing about monopolistic behavior in crucial industries.¶ But a close look at the U.S. solar industry suggests that the tariffs may actually be a job killer because the vast majority of positions in the sector aren't on the assembly line. Instead, upward of 70% of U.S. solar employment is in installation, sales and distribution — and companies that hire those workers argue solar cells must get significantly cheaper to remain competitive with other energy sources.¶ "What China is doing to boost its manufacturers is unfair, but tariffs could actually reduce jobs," said Gordon Johnson, a green tech analyst at Axiom Capital Management. "The price of solar panels goes up and looks unaffordable compared to alternatives."¶ Although the U.S. pioneered photovoltaic solar cells decades ago, it has fallen increasingly behind lower-cost manufacturers of the technology, including China, South Korea and Malaysia. But the U.S. is among the world's fastest-growing solar consumers, opening vast opportunities for service-sector jobs in the sunlight-extraction business.¶ The matter comes to a head next month, when the Commerce Department will announce a determination on a possible second round of tariffs on Chinese-made silicon-based photovoltaic cells, which convert sunlight into electricity and are by far the most popular solar technology.¶ While tariff advocates say that protecting a solar manufacturing base is crucial to the nation's energy security, others argue the U.S. has already lost that footrace. Instead of swooping in to rescue remaining plants, they say, the focus should be on reducing the cost of solar to speed liberation from fossil fuels, which dovetails with the goal of reducing unemployment.¶ "Installation is where all the jobs are," said John Smirnow, vice president of trade and competitiveness at the Solar Energy Industry Assn. "There are 5,600 companies in the healthy, vibrant and growing solar-services sector."¶ The Commerce Department's May 17 ruling, in response to allegations of dumping by the U.S. unit of a German solar panel maker, could fundamentally alter the solar landscape in the U.S. Dumping is when a company or industry sells its products below cost to capture the market. If additional tariffs are applied, they will probably be much higher than the relatively light first round announced in March, which ran from 2.6% to 4.7%.¶ The smaller tariffs — designed to balance out Chinese subsidies of its solar factories — could squeeze margins for installers, but most experts agree they aren't enough to radically reduce consumption. Anti-dumping duties, however, could run above 20%, dramatically increasing the cost of switching to solar.¶ Cost is a key factor in getting businesses and homeowners to convert to solar power. A typical residential roof setup costs about $25,000, which federal, state and local rebates and tax incentives can cut to about $13,000 in the city of Los Angeles. At that price, it still could take about a dozen years for the systems to pay back the upfront costs through lower electricity bills.

#### Economy strong now – Best indicators prove risk of recession is 0.20%

Perry 13 [Mark, Chart of the day: US recession probability is down to 0.20%, AEIdeas, The public policy blog of the American Enterprise Institute, http://www.aei-ideas.org/2013/02/chart-of-the-day-us-recession-probability-is-down-to-0-20/]

The chart above shows University of Oregon economics professor Jeremy Piger’s “Recession Probability Index” from January 1990 to November 2012, based on the 4 monthly variables used by the NBER to determine U.S. recessions: 1) non-farm payroll employment, 2) the index of industrial production, 3) real personal income excluding transfer payments, and 4) real manufacturing and trade sales.¶ According to Professor Piger, “Historically, three consecutive months of recession probabilities exceeding 0.8 (see graph) has been a good indicator that an expansion phase has ended and a new recession phase has begun, while three consecutive months of recession probabilities below 0.2 has been a good indicator that a recession phase has ended and a new expansion phase has begun.”¶ Based on an update yesterday, the Recession Probability Index has been trending downward for the last three months and fell to 0.20% in November, the lowest level since June and July when the probability was also 0.20%. Based on this historically accurate measure of the probability of a US recession, the US economy is not even close to being in the early stages of an economic contraction.

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

## 2NC

### CP

#### Carbon tax is comparatively better than FITs at reducing emissions

McIIveen et al 10 (Robert McIlveen is a Research Fellow in the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He completed his PhD in Political Science at the University of Sheffield in 2008., Dieter Helm is an economist specialising in utilities, infrastructure, regulation and the environment, and concentrates on the energy, water and transport sectors primarily in Britain and Europe. He is a Professor at the University of Oxford, Simon Less is head of the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He was previously a Director at Ofwat, July 10th, http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases/category/item/greener-cheaper)

The recommendations in this report propose a better way towards cutting the UK’s carbon emissions. “We have set out measures that will help the UK go greener more cheaply than the current set of¶ policies – at a smaller cost to businesses and ordinary families facing rising energy bills.¶ “Current policies are complicated, overlap each other and wasteful. This report shows how we can cut the cost of tackling climate change through measures like a streamlined carbon tax that will be more effective, more efficient and better for Britain.”¶ Some policies are simply wasting money and should be abolished – the feed-in tariff scheme for micro- renewables is a very expensive way to subsidise a marginal contribution to decarbonisation. While there is nothing wrong with small-scale renewables, the report finds no justification of the generous subsidy it enjoys under this scheme, which costs on average £460 for every tonne of carbon dioxide saved – compared to around £12 under the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EUETS). The report recommends abolishing the feed-in tariff scheme due to its excessive cost and poor value for money - £8 billion over twenty years could be spent much more effectively on other approaches to tackling climate change.¶ The report also calls for the Carbon Reduction Commitment to be simplified. The basic idea behind the policy – requiring large but non-energy intensive businesses and public sector bodies to monitor and report their emissions – is sound, but has been turned into something much more complicated than it needs to be. The cap-and-trade element is unnecessary and just makes it more complex and burdensome, so the report recommends removing this element from what is otherwise a worthwhile policy.¶ The second part of the report lays out how a carbon tax would be another way of cutting costs and achieving more carbon reduction. Professor Dieter Helm CBE, Professor of Energy Policy at Oxford University and author of the second section of the report writes: “Carbon taxes are efficient – and hence their main rationale is that they will achieve the same results as other policies at lower costs. There is therefore a direct implication for the politics of climate change mitigation: carbon taxes are a cheaper option.”

#### Carbon tax leads to solar installation – makes it cost competitive

Electrical Connection 12 (Carbon Tax making solar look even cheaper, July 2nd, http://electricalconnection.com.au/article/10016654/carbon-tax-making-solar-look-even-cheaper)

With the carbon tax now operating and energy price rises kicking in, the economics around solar power are making it look even cheaper.¶ People in New South Wales already know that electricity prices are allowed to go up 18% over the next year from 1 July.¶ The two main reasons for this are the carbon tax and the cost of distributing electricity, the poles and wires. Households in NSW currently pay between 20 and 30 cents a kilowatt hour, reaching 43 cents at peak.¶ According to Jeff Bye, from ASX listed CBD Energy, the effect of the carbon tax is just making the gap even bigger between low cost solar power and more expensive traditional generation.¶ “If you have your own solar power station on your roof you not only avoid these costs but your source of power, the sun, is free and your low cost is locked in for 25 years,” Jeff says.¶ Solar energy is now costing between 5 and 7 cents a kilowatt hour to produce, with this level applicable over the lifetime of a solar system of around 25 years.¶ Unlike the increasing cost of building new coal fired power stations, the cost of solar panels has been falling, helped principally by the lower cost of their main ingredient of silicon which has fallen in price from $450/kg in 2008 to around $25/kg today.

#### Carbon Tax solves the aff – their authors say it’s the best way to spur the market for passive solar

Garrett and Koontz, aff authors, 2008

[Vicki and Tomas M; School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University; “Breaking the cycle: Producer and consumer perspectives on the non-adoption of passive solar housing in the US” Energy Policy 36; Elsevier; scholar]

Addressing this fragmented innovation system could be beneficial for both passive solar and many alternative energy measures. As new energy sources and conservation measures are developed, the challenge of bringing them to market often calls for careful policy interventions. For example, in the US, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 required government agencies to purchase alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs). Alternative fuel (ethanol, natural gas, etc.) was not available in most locations, however, so the expenditure on AFVs did not result in reductions in petroleum use or the accompanying emissions (Helwig and Deason, 2007). New policies (Renewable Fuel Standard, restrictions on MTBE, Production Tax Credit, in addition to state policies addressing infrastructure for ethanol) have addressed both supply and demand issues, resulting in the highest production of ethanol in history (Solomon et al., 2007). On the other hand, tracking wind industry growth concurrent with government policies reveals a different pattern. During the years 2000, 2002, and 2004 the wind production tax credit was allowed to lapse, and US wind industry growth fell dramatically, to around 5% of worldwide growth and lower. Years when the credit was in effect, growth stayed above 20% (Wiser and Bolinger, 2007). These examples illustrate why support of energy innovations should continue beyond the research phase, into the diffusion stage. In its role as change agent, government policy can foster diffusion through professional networks and spur the private sector to take on innovation system functions. A new development with promise is the US Department of Energy's recently announced “Entrepreneur in Residence” program at three national laboratories (DOE, 2007). However, with total program funding capped at $300,000, the government is accepting a small role. It is worth noting that policies targeted at energy problems often have ancillary environmental benefits. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. The links between energy conservation, renewable energy, and climate change are well established. In the case of passive solar or other conservation technologies, starting with carbon taxes and considering policies such as feed-in tariffs to promote alternative energies could be the beginning of a federal climate change policy. Public policies such as these are needed if we are to realize the potential of new energy-saving technologies such as passive solar housing features. Relying on markets alone to promote the use of passive solar in the US has yielded extremely slow adoption over the past three decades. Understanding the key factors, both supply- and demand-side, that prevent wider use of passive solar features enables us to make better policy choices to foster their use. Through a concerted effort to break the cycle of non-adoption, we can address energy issues that, over time, have detrimental impacts through climate change, pollution, and dependence on imported oil.

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Carbon cap key get China on board

Morgan 11 (Dan Morgan, fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, U.S. Shelves "Cap and Trade" -- Policy Shift (And Congressional Opposition) Sink EU-Style Climate Exchange-Market In U.S. By Dan Morgan, http://www.europeaninstitute.org/EA-February-2011/us-shelves-qcap-and-tradeq-policy-shift-and-congressional-opposition-sink-eu-style-climate-exchange-market-in-us.html)

No accident, the omission merely confirmed a development that has become obvious: the big idea of a U.S. “cap and trade system” to limit greenhouse-gas emissions is dead for this administration and even more clearly, anathema to the new Republican-leaning Congress. For the remaining two years of the President’s mandate, the Obama administration has clearly concluded that the pursuit of a national carbon ceiling – in effect, a price tag on pollution – has to be abandoned as a policy approach that is currently unworkable. In the U.S, the opposing view is too strong: that pollution limits will constrain economic growth. The Result? Without any prospect of a government-mandated “cap,” there can be no U.S. national system of emissions-trading as a way to ratchet down carbon-caused greenhouse gases.¶ Its demise does not bury hopes that the U.S. will still work for “clean energy” to curb carbon pollution, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat climate change. But, it does deliver a severe blow to longstanding hopes for transatlantic convergence on “cap-and-trade” as a potentially global model for “decarbonizing” economies.¶ For a decade, this approach has been a point of common transatlantic purpose among U.S. and European climate-change negotiators, who saw it as the most flexible and pragmatic approach to global cooperation in curbing greenhouse gases. The EU has pioneered this approach: its Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) started in 2005 and is the world’s largest market of this kind. Even though the ETS has suffered severe teething problems, its operations have been steadily improving, making it a paradigm for other nations to join.¶ Now the concept has been orphaned. While the EU will continue operating the ETS, there is no realistic prospect of seeing the U.S. join this initiative, certainly not before new elections in 2012, and perhaps never. As the EU persists alone, European industrialists can be expected to complain that the system makes them less competitive internationally. And, of course, the absence of a common transatlantic stance will ease diplomatic pressure on China and other nations that are growing global sources of carbon pollution. In practice, the impact of the EU’s ETS as a world exemplar always depended on being joined by a similar U.S. system with real teeth. The ETS excludes agriculture and many other non-industrial sources of carbon pollution, many of which would have been captured by the proposed U.S. system. A big exception would still have been American agriculture, whose emissions were ignored in the U.S. draft bill. Even so, the U.S. version of the cap-and-trade bill was still strongly opposed by the American farm lobby: this block of largely Democratic legislators worked tirelessly in the Democratic-conrolled Senate to keep the bill from coming up. Indeed, the measure died there. The U.S. farm sector lobbied so strongly because the sector is highly sensitive to any rise in electricity and gas prices and feared that cabon caps, especially on refineries in the Middle West, would drive up these costs. In contrast, EU farm groups had little to fear, at least at this stage, from the weaker ETS system when it was adopted.

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Doesn’t link to politics – revenue neutral and conservative support

Davenport 12 (Coral, energy and environment correspondent for the National Journal, prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly.December 6th, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/how-obama-and-congress-could-find-common-ground-on-energy-20121206)

Still, a combination of events—including more droughts, floods, and extreme weather like superstorm Sandy—has increased the sense of urgency. The recent explosion in domestic oil and natural-gas production has helped to create jobs and prop up the recovery while bringing together oil companies and the Obama White House in alliances that could pave the way for new agreements on energy policy. And as Washington grapples with the deficit, many in the capital are more open to the carbon tax as a way to raise revenue.¶ CLIMATE CHANGE¶ Over the past two years, Republican candidates increasingly denied the science of climate change, spurred by fossil-fuel-funded super PACs that attacked members of Congress for expressing belief in climate change and a desire to stop it. But the assault doesn’t seem to have worked. Despite all the money spent by the fossil-fuel industry in this cycle, the president won the election handily and Democrats gained two seats in the Senate. Meanwhile, a “Flat Earth Five” campaign run by the League of Conservation Voters to unseat climate deniers helped to defeat all but one of its targets.¶ That may be in part because voters are less likely to support candidates who deny global warming. In a September poll, the Yale Project on Climate Change Communication found that Americans’ belief in global warming increased from 57 percent in January 2010 to 70 percent in September 2012. The number of Americans who doubt climate change declined from 20 percent in January 2010 to only 12 percent today. The group also found that 77 percent of Americans say that global warming should be a “very high,” “high,” or “medium” priority, and 88 percent believe the United States should accept the economic costs to reduce global warming.¶ In the poll, 61 percent said they would vote for a candidate who supports a revenue-neutral carbon tax if it created more U.S. jobs in the renewable-energy and energy-efficiency industries. “Denial doesn’t work for us on climate change, immigration, people loving who they want to love, not on the fiscal cliff,” says Bob Inglis, a former Republican House member from South Carolina who has launched a campaign to build support among conservative voters and lawmakers for a revenue-neutral tax swap. “And that change is soaking into some conservatives.”

#### Doesn’t link to politics – conservatives like it

Trabish 12 (Herman K., Contributor to Wired and Greentechmedia Trabish: December 7, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Why-is-DC-Talking-about-a-Carbon-Tax-Again)

Washington insiders at both ends of the political spectrum have begun talking about a carbon tax.¶ The document "A Progressive Carbon Tax Will Fight Climate Change and Stimulate the Economy" by Richard Caperton of the Democrat-aligned Center for American Progress (CAP) is a little surprising because the assumption since 2009 has been that some version of a market-based cap-and-trade program was the only politically viable way to put a price on carbon emissions.¶ Advocacy for a carbon tax by academics at the Republican-aligned American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is astonishing because the word "tax," thanks to Grover Norquist, seemed to have been synonymous with the word "unpatriotic" on that side of the aisle.¶ But with both parties struggling with how the federal government can put its fiscal house in order, things may have changed.¶ At an AEI-hosted conference in July, AEI researchers Kevin Hassett and Aparna Mathur and Brookings Institution researcher Adele Morris jointly proposed the idea as part of a broad fiscal reform program because it could be a “significant source of revenue.” ¶ A tax “starting at about $20 per ton of CO2 in 2015 and rising at 4 percent over inflation would raise over $100 billion in the first year, rising to over $400 billion per year by 2040,” they estimated. And, they added, a tax “that funds deficit reduction or offsets other distortionary taxes would be a lot less costly to the economy than one that doesn’t.”¶ They recommended a progressive structure so that a rebate program would not be needed to protect vulnerable businesses and those with low incomes.¶ “A greenhouse gas tax can reduce the need for both more burdensome regulation and other federal outlays and tax expenditures,” they said, putting them in agreement with other AEI presenters who noted that a carbon tax has advantages over the traditional regulation conservatives disdain at least as much, adding that it provides an incentive to reduce consumption, drives emissions reductions via the lowest-cost options, and is more transparent.

#### Doesn’t link - corporate support for a carbon tax

Ebell 12 (Say It Isn’t So! Exxon Supports a Carbon Tax , December 3rd, http://www.globalwarming.org/2012/12/03/say-it-isnt-so-exxon-supports-a-carbon-tax/)

Big Oil is coming out of the closet. Exxon Mobil confirmed earlier this month in a Bloomberg Businessweek article that they support a carbon tax. Shell and BP have signed a Climate Price Communiqué that was distributed on 29th November at the eighteenth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is meeting in Doha, Qatar, this week and next.¶ The most obvious reason why big oil and gas companies would support a huge new tax on their own products is that it would kill coal first. Burning coal emits roughly twice as much carbon dioxide as producing the same amount of energy by burning natural gas. A $20 a ton of CO2 tax would roughly double the current price of coal used for producing electricity. That would provide a huge incentive for utilities to switch to natural gas. Exxon Mobil owns the world’s largest privately-owned reserves of natural gas. Shell and BP also own huge gas reserves.¶ The Climate Price Communiqué states that, “Putting a clear, transparent and unambiguous price on carbon emissions must be a core policy objective.” They mean a global price, but a U. S. domestic carbon tax could fit comfortably into their plans.¶ The communiqué was organized by the Prince of Wales’s Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change and is managed by the University of Cambridge’s Programme for Sustainability Leadership. One-hundred forty companies have signed on, but Shell and BP are among just a handful of major corporations.¶ Amusingly, an article posted on the Center for American Progress’s ThinkProgress web site claimed that the signers were “leading global companies.” Here’s the list of North American companies: Actio, Aimia, Bullfrog Power, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Wedge, Delphi Group, Eco-kraft, EOS Climate, Horizon Capitol Holdings, Events Outside the Box, Mountain Equipment Co-Op, Offsetters, Pacific GPS, Westport, and Wildlife Works.

Yet while the majority in most countries supports action on climate change, surveys suggest that attitudes to cap-and-trade are more ambivalent. Yet an HSBC survey last year showed that carbon trading simply doesn’t rate highly on people’s radars, when thinking about government action on climate change:

### Solvency

#### Solar power fails – unreliable in providing electricity to the grid in peak hours, which means coal, natural gas and nuclear plants can’t be replaced

Institute for Energy Research 12 (August 13th, a not-for-profit organization that conducts intensive research and analysis on the functions, operations, and government regulation of global energy markets, California’s Flex Alert: A Case Study in Intermittent Energy, http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/48788)

California has long been a leader in promoting wind and other renewables to power the electricity grid. Recently, California has gone even further and in 2011, Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law to force an increase in the amount of renewables utilities must use to 33 percent of the state’s electricity by 2020.¶ Currently, the state is experiencing a stressed electricity grid because of high demand and because some nuclear and natural gas plants are offline. Mandated renewable energy is proving itself incapable of filling the void. This situation show how little actual value wind, solar and other politically correct renewables have in the real world work of supplying people with electricity when they need and want it.¶ California is currently experiencing a “flex alert” which strongly urges Californians to use less electricity. According to the California ISO, the operator of the region’s power grid, it is “critical” to conserve electricity today to make sure there aren’t blackouts. Here’s the graphic representing the alert:¶ Because California is rushing headlong toward more and more renewables in the electricity grid it is important to look at how renewables are contributing to keeping the electricity grid stable. For example, California has 4.297 gigawatts of installed wind capacity which could really help California balance the grid if the wind blew at the right times (spoiler alert—the wind doesn’t blow at the right times).¶ The first chart below shows the supply and demand for August 9, 2012 in the California ISO electrical grid. The actual demand is in blue and the available generation is in orange. The second chart shows the renewable generation in California at that time.¶ There are some very important things to note with respect to the renewable generation. Wind’s production peaked just before 1 am, when electricity demand was dropping as people went to bed and nighttime temperatures reduced the need for air conditioning. At the time, wind was producing 6 percent of California’s electricity, but after 1 am, wind began to falter and wind production fell by 90 percent by 11 am. At that time, wind was producing less than 100 megawatts of electricity—a mere 0.2 percent of the electricity in California.¶ This shows how wind fails to produce electricity when needed most. At 11 am, as electricity demand was rapidly increasing and electricity producing was needed most, wind was at a low ebb. Fortuitously, wind production increased in the afternoon, but by 5:30 pm, wind was only producing a little more than 1 percent of California’s total electricity.¶ Solar helped meet demand more than wind, because solar has the advantage of producing electricity when the sun is shining and households are using more power. But even solar failed to produce much electricity during the period of highest demand, producing just 2 percent of the state’s electricity at its peak. Solar production peaked at nearly 1 gigawatt at 11 am and continued to produce about 1 gigawatt until 3 pm. The problem is that the state’s highest period of demand occurred at about 5 pm, when solar’s production had fallen by over 50 percent from its peak.¶ This data shows how little value wind and solar have in producing electricity when people really need it, and should be a wake-up call to California—one of the many states with mandates—as well as the Obama administration and other promoters of wind and solar. Even though wind and solar production might be growing in California, it isn’t helping to balance the grid and keep the lights on. Electricity production has to balance electricity demand and wind and solar aren’t doing a good job contributing. Moreover, it does not matter how many wind and solar installations are built because natural gas and other reliable power plants will be required to be built to meet peak electricity demand.

#### Solar power fails - low energy capacity

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, April 19, “Zycher testimony to joint House subcommittee hearing on subsidies for renewable energy,” <http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/zycher-testimony-to-joint-house-subcommittee-hearing-on-subsidies-for-renewable-energy/>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

The same general problem afflicts solar power. The energy content of sunlight,¶ crudely, is about 150-400 watts per square meter, depending on location, of which about¶ 20-30 percent is convertible to electricity, depending on the particular technology.¶ Accordingly, even in theory a square meter of solar energy receiving capacity is enough¶ to power roughly one 100-watt light bulb, putting aside such issues of sunlight intensity¶ and the like. This problem of land requirements for solar thermal facilities is of sufficient¶ importance that most analyses assume a maximum plant capacity of 50-100 MW, which,¶ conservatively, would require approximately 1250 acres, or 2 square miles.¶ In short: Transformation of the unconcentrated energy content of wind and¶ sunlight into a form useable for modern applications requires massive capital investment¶ in the form of both land and wind turbines and solar receiving equipment. This means¶ that the energy that can be extracted from renewable sources, relative to that from¶ conventional forms, by its very nature is limited and expensive.¶

#### Doesn’t solve fossil fuel use – subsidies spur increased energy demand

Zehner 12 (Ozzie, University of California Berkeley Visiting Scholar, June 04, “Green Illusions: The Dirty Secrets Of Clean Energy,” <http://thegwpf.org/the-climate-record/5880-green-illusions-the-dirty-secrets-of-clean-energy-.html>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

Hexafluoroethane has a global warming potential that is 12,000 times higher than CO2, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It is 100 percent manufactured by humans, and survives 10,000 years once released into the atmosphere. Nitrogen trifluoride is 17,000 times more virulent than CO2, and SF6, the most treacherous greenhouse gas, is over 23,000 times more threatening.¶ The solar photovoltaic industry is one of the fastest-growing emitters of these gases, which are now measurably accumulating within the earth's atmosphere according to the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). A NOAA study shows that atmospheric concentrations of SF6 have been rising exponentially. A paper published in the peer-reviewed journal Geophysical Research Letters documents that atmospheric NF3 levels have been rising 11 percent per year.¶ "If photovoltaic production grows, so will the associated side effects," claims Zehner. "Even worse, there's no evidence that solar cells offset fossil fuel use in the American context." Zehner explains that alternative energy subsidies keep retail electricity costs incrementally lower, which then spurs demand. "It's a boomerang effect," remarks Zehner. "The harder we throw alternative energy into the electrical grid, the harder demand comes back to hit us on the head. Historically, we've filled that demand by building more fossil fuel plants, not fewer."¶ Instead, Zehner advocates shifting to energy taxes and other conservation measures. He claims that even some of the most expensive options for dealing with CO2 would become cost competitive long before today's solar cell technologies.¶ "If limiting CO2 is our goal, we might be better off directing our time and resources to those options first; solar cells seem a wasteful and pricey strategy," says Zehner. "It is hard to conceive of a justification for extracting taxes from the working class to fund installations of Stone Age photovoltaic technologies high in the gold-rimmed suburbs of Arizona and California."¶

#### Solar doesn’t reduce emissions – empirics

Marques et al. 12 (António Cardoso Marques and José Alberto Fuinhas, University of Beira Economics Department, University of Beira Interior, Management and Economics Department and NECE, "Is renewable energy effective in promoting growth?," Energy Policy, Vol. 46, July 2012, p. 434-442, Science Direct)

With regard to the connection between reducing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) and economic growth, the literature also reaches unexpected results. Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010) found no evidence about causality running from RE to CO2, whereas the authors found unidirectional causality from CO2 to RE. Likewise, Apergis et al. (2010) conclude that the consumption of RE does not contribute to reducing CO2 emissions. Their explanation is the well-known difficulty of storing energy associated with the intermittency of renewables. Moreover, the inability to store, for example wind or solar energy, implies the simultaneous use of traditional pollutant sources of energy, such as coal and natural gas. This may be at the basis of different effects. On the one hand, it implies the maintenance of productive capacity that becomes idle in most time periods. This fact generates inefficiencies in the economy to the extent that large investments become idle over long periods. On the other hand, this intermittency may not even contribute to the reduction of countries’ energy dependence goals, as suggested by Frondel et al. (2010).

### Warm

#### Too late

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming. 58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

### Compete

#### Natural gas not key

Plumer, Former Associate Editor at the New Republic, ‘12

[Brad, May 2012, “Will cheap shale gas revive U.S. manufacturing? Not so fast”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/will-cheap-natural-gas-revive-us-manufacturing/2012/05/21/gIQAOORZfU\_blog.html]

That last claim comes via a recent report from PricewaterhouseCoopers. But over at the Council on Foreign Relations, Michael Levi casts a more skeptical eye on arguments that the age of cheap natural gas from shale will really lead to a dramatic revival of U.S. manufacturing. There are reasons to think the overall impact will be fairly muted. Energy costs are still a small factor for many manufacturers. Levi points to a 2009 paper (pdf) by Joseph Aldy and William Pizer finding that “only one tenth of U.S. manufacturing involved energy costs exceeding five percent of the total value of shipments.” Aldy and Pizer estimated that a carbon tax, which raises energy prices, would affect manufacturing employment slightly — less than 3 percent — in the most energy-intensive industries like aluminum, cement, glass, and steel. The flipside is that lower energy costs, thanks to cheap natural gas, would have a similarly marginal impact.

#### US economy growing now, multiple indicators prove

Sherter 2012 [Alain, U.S. economy growing faster than forecast, CBS MoneyWatch, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123\_162-57556104/u.s-economy-growing-faster-than-forecast/]

(MoneyWatch) The U.S. economy got an early holiday gift Thursday when the U.S. Commerce Department announced that growth in the third quarter was 2.7 percent, topping a previous forecast. ¶ While the latest economic snapshot is good news for Americans, it raises the heat on Congress and President Barack Obama to reach a deal to avoid taking the nation off the so-called "fiscal cliff," a package of mandated government spending cuts and expiring tax breaks scheduled to take effect in January. That could throw the economy in reverse just as it appears to be gaining speed.¶ The new GDP figures are an update of the agency's estimate last month of 2 percent growth in the July-to-September period. The revised numbers, which are adjusted seasonally, offer a more accurate picture of growth than the government's initial forecast. The economy grew 1.9 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively, in the first and second quarters.¶ Propelling the growth in GDP was stronger consumer spending, federal outlays, expanding business inventories and a renewed housing sector, the Commerce Department said. ¶ Yet the latest report also suggests the economy may be slowing slightly in the fourth quarter. Drags on growth include exports, which slid 1.6 percent for the quarter, compared with a 5.3 percent rise in the previous quarter, and shrinking investment in non-residential real estate. Gains in household income also fell, which could reduce consumer spending in future months. ¶ Much of the growth for the quarter, at 0.8 percent, came from businesses building up inventories. Because they may not need to re-stock in the current quarter, that could effectively steal growth from the last three months of the year. "The bigger the build-up in the third quarter, the more likely we are to see a run down in the fourth," said Paul Ashworth, chief U.S. economist with Capital Economics, in a research note. ¶ Another 0.7 percent of GDP growth stemmed from increased federal spending, mostly for defense. The government is likely to curb such spending in the current quarter, which also could reduce growth. ¶ Perhaps most critically for the recovery, housing around the U.S. continues to show steady, if unexceptional, gains. For the third quarter, home prices around the nation were up 3.6 percent from the year ago-period, according to the Case-Shiller index, and sales of existing houses have grown roughly 10 percent from a year ago. Driving that rebound: Low mortgage rates, which are luring home buyers back into the market and a declining stock of new and existing homes.¶ Rising real estate prices allow homeowners who owe more on their mortgages than their properties are worth to recoup equity. In shedding debt and recovering some of the wealth that vaporized during the housing crash, people are freer to spend, which fuels broader economic expansion.¶ On the supply side, rising housing values and sales give homebuilders an incentive to put up new homes. As a result, construction expanded across most of the Federal Reserve's 12 districts, the central bank said Wednesday, with new starts roughly 40 percent above year-ago levels.¶ For now, that momentum looks likely to continue.9888 A growing number of Americans plan to buy a home within the next six months, according to the Conference Board, a trade association representing businesses. Patrick Newport, U.S. economist with IHS Global Insight, also said in a report this week that the research firm expects home prices to continue rising over the next five years, although not much faster than inflation.¶ The other major engine for the economy this year has been consumer spending. That fell slightly in the quarter, to 1.4 percent, down from 2 percent in the previous estimate, Commerce reported. Yet many economists expect that to rebound next year. One good sign is that the key holiday shopping season is off to a good start, fueled by strong Black Friday sales, and expectations for the final month of the year are generally upbeat. ¶ Consumer spending accounts for roughly 70 percent of economic activity. As Americans have continued to spend, even amid mounting public attention on the fiscal cliff, more businesses have started hiring.¶ The number of Americans applying for jobless benefits fell 23,000 last week to 393,000, the U.S. Labor Department said today. The labor market has strengthened in recent months, with the government revising upward previous job-creation estimates. Unemployment fell last month in more than half of the 372 biggest U.S. cities, according to the government.

#### Royal cites a few warrants

#### First - Diversionary theory --- it’s wrong

Boehmer 7 (political science professor at the University of Texas (Charles, Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict”)

This article examines the contemporaneous effect of low economic growth and domestic instability on the threat of regime change and/ or involvement in external militarized conflicts. Many studies of diversionary conflict argue that lower rates of economic growth should heighten the risk of international conflict. Yet we know that militarized interstate conflicts, and especially wars, are generally rare events whereas lower rates of growth are not. Additionally, a growing body of literature shows that regime changes are also associated with lower rates of economic growth. The question then becomes which event, militarized interstate conflict or regime change, is the most likely to occur with domestic discord and lower rates of economic growth? Diversionary theory claims that leaders seek to divert attention away from domestic problems such as a bad economy or political scandals, or to garner increased support prior to elections. Leaders then supposedly externalize discontented domestic sentiments onto other nations, sometimes as scapegoats based on the similar in-group/out-group dynamic found in the research of Coser (1956) and Simmel (1955), where foreign countries are blamed for domestic problems. This process is said to involve a “rally-round-the-flag” effect, where a leader can expect a short-term boost in popularity with the threat or use of force (Blechman, Kaplan, and Hall 1978; Mueller 1973). Scholarship on diversionary conflict has focused most often on the American case1 but recent studies have sought to identify this possible behavior in other countries.2 The Falklands War is often a popular example of diversionary conflict (Levy and Vakili 1992). Argentina was reeling from hyperinflation and rampant unemployment associated with the Latin American debt crisis. It is plausible that a success in the Falklands War may have helped to rally support for the governing Galtieri regime, although Argentina lost the war and the ruling regime lost power. How many other attempts to use diversionary tactics, if they indeed occur, can be seen to generate a similar outcome? The goal of this article is to provide an assessment of the extent to which diversionary strategy is a threat to peace. Is this a colorful theory kept alive by academics that has little bearing upon real events, or is this a real problem that policy makers should be concerned with? If it is a strategy readily available to leaders, then it is important to know what domestic factors trigger this gambit. Moreover, to know that requires an understanding of the context in external conflict, which occurs relative to regime changes. Theories of diversionary conflict usually emphasize the potential benefits of diversionary tactics, although few pay equal attention to the prospective costs associated with such behavior. It is not contentious to claim that leaders typically seek to remain in office. However, whether they can successfully manipulate public opinion regularly during periods of domestic unpopularity through their states’ participation in foreign militarized conflicts—especially outside of the American case—is a question open for debate. Furthermore, there appears to be a logical disconnect between diversionary theories and extant studies of domestic conflict and regime change. Lower rates of economic growth are purported to increase the risk of both militarized interstate conflicts (and internal conflicts) as well as regime changes (Bloomberg and Hess 2002). This implies that if leaders do, in fact, undertake diversionary conflicts, many may still be thrown from the seat of power —especially if the outcome is defeat to a foreign enemy. Diversionary conflict would thus seem to be a risky gambit (Smith 1996). Scholars such as MacFie (1938) and Blainey (1988) have nevertheless questioned the validity of the diversionary thesis. As noted by Levy (1989), this perspective is rarely formulated as a cohesive and comprehensive theory, and there has been little or no knowledge cumulation. Later analyses do not necessarily build on past studies and the discrepancies between inquiries are often difficult to unravel. “Studies have used a variety of research designs, different dependent variables (uses of force, major uses of force, militarized disputes), different estimation techniques, and different data sets covering different time periods and different states” (Bennett and Nordstrom 2000, 39). To these problems, we should add a lack of theoretical precision and incomplete model specification. By a lack of theoretical precision, I am referring to the linkages between economic conditions and domestic strife that remain unclear in some studies (Miller 1995; Russett 1990). Consequently, extant studies are to a degree incommensurate; they offer a step in the right direction but do not provide robust cross-national explanations and tests of economic growth and interstate conflict. Yet a few studies have attempted to provide deductive explanations about when and how diversionary tactics might be employed. Using a Bayesian updating game, Richards and others (1993) theorize that while the use of force would appear to offer leaders a means to boost their popularity, a poorly performing economy acts as a signal to a leader’s constituents about his or her competence. Hence, attempts to use diversion are likely to fail either because incompetent leaders will likewise fail in foreign policy or people will recognize the gambit for what it is. Instead, these two models conclude that diversion is likely to be undertaken particularly by risk-acceptant leaders. This stress on a heightened risk of removal from office is also apparent in the work of Bueno de Mesquita and others (1999), and Downs and Rocke (1994), where leaders may “gamble for resurrection,” although the diversionary scenario in the former study is only a partial extension of their theory on selectorates, winning coalitions, and leader survival. Again, how often do leaders fail in the process or are removed from positions of power before they can even initiate diversionary tactics? A few studies focusing on leader tenure have examined the removal of leaders following war, although almost no study in the diversionary literature has looked at the effects of domestic problems on the relative risks of regime change, interstate conflict, or both events occurring in the same year.3

#### Next is collapse of trade --- but trade doesn’t solve war

May 5Professor Emeritus (Research) in the Stanford University School of Engineering and a senior fellow with the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University. Former co-director of Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation. Principal Investigator for the DHS. (Michael, “The U.S.-China Strategic Relationship,” September 2005, http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/2005/Sep/maySep05.asp)

However important and beneficial this interdependence may be from an economic point of view, it is not likely to be a significant factor for strategic stability. Famously, economists before World War I sounded clear warnings that Europe had become economically interdependent to an extent that war there would ruin Europe. The war was fought nevertheless, Europe was duly ruined, and the ensuing political consequences haunted Europe to the end of World War II. Other cases exist. Modern war has been an economic disaster. Economic realities, including economic interdependence, play little role in whether a country goes to war or not. Economic myths certainly do and they usually affect strategic stability quite negatively. This is another reason why domestic perceptions matter: they determine which myths are believed.

## 1NR

#### Turns economy – CIR is key.

Jeb Bush, former governor of Florida, Edward Alden, Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, specializing in U.S. competitiveness, and Thomas F. McLarty III, former White House Chief of Staff for US President Bill Clinton, 2009, “U.S. Immigration Policy,” Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Immigration\_TFR63.pdf

4 U.S. Immigration Policy America’s attractiveness to immigrants is essential to its prosperity, and will be especially important in helping the United States recover and emerge stronger from the current global economic downturn. In a world in which many of the barriers to free trade have been eliminated, and high-wage countries are in direct competition with lower-wage countries, innovation is the essence of maintaining economic advantage. Innovation requires, more than anything else, an abundance of smart people with diverse knowledge and experience. No single country, however impressive its educational system, contains within its borders a preponderance of the world’s most talented individuals. The Task Force believes that one of the central reasons the United States achieved and has been able to retain its position of global leadership is that it is constantly replenishing its pool of talent, not just with the ablest and hardest working from inside its borders, but with the best from around the world. Maintaining American economic and political leadership depends on maintaining that flow of talent. The United States, a country shaped by generations of immigrants and their descendants, is badly mishandling its immigration policy, with serious consequences for its standing in the world. The urgency of this issue has led the Council on Foreign Relations to convene an Independent Task Force to deal with what is ordinarily regarded as a domestic policy matter. America’s openness to and respect for immigrants has long been a foundation of its economic and military strength, and a vital tool in its diplomatic arsenal. With trade, technology, and travel continuing to shrink the world, the manner in which the United States handles immigration will be increasingly important to American foreign policy in the future. The Task Force believes that the continued failure to devise and implement a sound and sustainable immigration policy threatens to weaken America’s economy, to jeopardize its diplomacy, and to imperil its national security. Why is the country facing this crisis? Immigration should be seen as one of America’s great success stories. The United States has for generations welcomed large numbers of immigrants, found productive employment for them, and successfully integrated them into its population. Unlike many other advanced countries, high levels of immigration have largely maintained what would otherwise be a shrinking population of working-age adults, a huge economic advantage for the United States. This country has been especially good at attracting ambitious, skilled people. For talented immigrants across the world, the United States has long been the destination of first choice. Many innovative and successful new American companies—Google, Intel, eBay, and countless others—have been built by recent immigrants. At the same time, the abundant opportunities for immigrants to advance and succeed here have largely spared the United States from the kinds of internal security threats that have faced European countries, where some immigrants are more marginalized.

#### Political capital easily overcomes this.

Roarty 2/21 (Alex, politics writer for the National Journal, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/theres-reason-to-be-optimistic-about-congress-seriously/273393/)

The makeup of the 113th Congress and the occupant of the White House make conditions riper for bipartisan legislation than at any time since President George W. Bush's first years in office. Since then, Washington has been in the grip of one of two dynamics: Either one party has held Congress and the presidency, or one party, possessing limited power, has had little interest in passing consequential legislation.¶ The latter was the case last session, when Republicans controlled only the House. In most cases, they used this chamber to approve legislation, such as Rep. Paul Ryan's eponymous budget, that helped define the party's agenda but had no chance of gaining approval in the Senate (much less withstanding a veto from the White House). They were trying to wait out a president whom they believed would be sent packing in 2013.¶ Democrats were in a similar position from 2007 to 2009, when they controlled Congress but wanted to wait out Bush's tenure. The lack of bipartisanship, of course, didn't prevent major legislation from becoming law over the past 10 years. But when Democrats controlled Washington and passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, or similarly empowered Republicans approved Medicare Part D in 2003, they didn't need the backing of the other party -- and by and large didn't get it.¶ This session is different. Neither party has unilateral control, and yet there is an appetite, in the first year of Obama's second term, to make a serious attempt to legislate. The last time Capitol Hill saw something similar came in 2001 and 2002. Republicans suddenly lost the Senate when Sen. Jim Jeffords of Vermont defected from the GOP in the early summer, but Congress still overwhelmingly approved the No Child Left Behind Act months later (although the first round of Bush's tax cuts passed with only a dozen or so Democrats on board in each chamber). Later, the parties worked together to approve a slew of national security issues after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.¶ But drawing comparisons to that period is difficult because of 9/11; and, besides, most of Bush's term is hardly associated with bipartisan comity. The better parallel -- and the experience current optimists point to -- is 1996 and 1997, which bridges the end of President Clinton's first term and the beginning of his second. That two-year span saw agreements on a series of important issues, ranging from two big-ticket items (welfare reform and a balanced-budget agreement) to lesser-known achievements (such as raising the minimum wage).¶ The similarity between that period and now extends beyond the split control of government. Only a year earlier, Republicans had ridden the "revolution" of 1994 into control of Congress, when they promised to push their agenda whether Clinton approved or not. But the party ultimately dealt with political setbacks, none more damaging than the government shutdown of 1996. The public blamed Republicans, and afterward Clinton never again trailed GOP presidential nominee Bob Dole (who was Senate majority leader at the time of the shutdown) in a head-to-head matchup, according to preelection polls.¶ NJ2.jpeg¶ Boehner's Challenge¶ Public opinion might once again be pulling against Republicans, burnt as they were by Obama's reelection and their unexpected losses in the Senate. In a January poll by The Wall Street Journal and NBC News, 49 percent of adults disapproved of the GOP -- and only 26 percent approved. It was the worst rating for Republicans since 2008. Just as the Republicans in Clinton's time decided their political survival depended on coming to the table, the GOP of today might do the same. "Republicans overplayed the government shutdown, and President Clinton won that battle," said Dan Glickman, a former House member who was Clinton's Agriculture secretary. "And, with that, he effectively used the bully pulpit to control the agenda. He gave a lot of cover for people to vote for him. It's not the only factor, but members of Congress are much [more] likely to support a president when the people at home are inclined to support the president."¶ How much Obama's broad popularity matters to most GOP House members is debatable. With many of the president's supporters packed into heavily Democratic urban districts, most Republicans represent safely red districts. (In November, Mitt Romney won 227 congressional districts, a majority, despite losing by 4 percentage points in the national vote.)¶ But Obama's standing could weigh more heavily on House Speaker John Boehner and Majority Leader Eric Cantor than on their followers; Cantor has recently attempted to rebrand the party with a softer image. While their charges' interests are more parochial, they have the national party's image to worry about. Popular opinion could prod the two leaders to reach agreements with Obama, especially on emotional issues such as gun control and immigration. Or, at the very least, public pressure could work to ease the disagreements that make even basic government action difficult -- a factor that might have been at work when House Republicans engineered a three-month delay of the debt ceiling. "They're hearing the message outside the Beltway that 'we elected you people to make things work,'" said John Breaux, the former longtime Democratic senator from Louisiana.¶ The onus falls particularly hard on Boehner, whose struggles to control his conference are well documented. More than any other player in Washington, he will determine whether anything gets done this year. How he decides to proceed could rest on how frequently he's willing to leave conservative colleagues out in the cold and, consequently, how far he's willing to risk his speakership.¶ The good of the party, and not his seat of power, propelled Boehner's decision to bring the superstorm Sandy relief bill to a vote earlier this year, when it passed with just a minority of support from Republicans. That combination -- Democrats and the moderate wing of the House GOP -- is the pathway to enacting a sweeping set of bipartisan agreements.¶ A week after the storm vote, a large bipartisan majority passed a three-month extension of the debt ceiling. "It is hard to see this Congress being viewed as a bipartisan one, but we have seen a glimmer of light on the recent bipartisan vote to extend the debt ceiling," said Ron Bonjean, a onetime aide to the Republican leadership.¶ Obama's Duty¶ Maintaining that momentum in the House won't be easy, and it could require Obama's personal leadership. Getting Boehner to take such a perilous route could depend in large part on successful cajoling from the president. And on this subject -- the relationships among Washington's top leaders -- discussion of a deal being cut becomes sharply pessimistic.¶ The two men's relationship is described as personally friendly, but professionally it has produced nothing but dysfunction. What began with the debt-limit negotiations of 2011 culminated in last year's failed fiscal-cliff talks. Boehner has vowed never to negotiate with Obama one-on-one again.¶ Washington has had a litany of successful speaker-president relationships through the years. Think Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton -- or Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill in the 1980s. But Obama and Boehner haven't been able to find a workable formula. "There is zero trust between Boehner and the president, and trust is what's necessary to get deals done," said Mike Hacker, a former Democratic leadership aide. "It's not just mutual interest."¶ The belief among the GOP that the president won't act on good faith in the current negotiations is further straining the broken relationship between the two men. Rather than trying to cut a deal with Republicans, Obama might work only toward defeating them in next year's midterms, to try to re­-take the House. At that point, assuming his party retains the Senate, congressional Democrats would be poised to pass legislation as they did during Obama's first two years in office. "In the matrix they're crafting to take back the House, there's no function for bipartisanship," said Mike Ference, a former aide to Cantor.¶ Obama's recent actions haven't put GOP worries to rest. His inaugural speech was long on urging the country to adopt a progressive agenda but short on emphasizing the need for compromise. After completely ignoring House Democrats in 2012, the president announced plans to hold eight fundraisers for them this cycle. Obama, in the eyes of the GOP, seems less interested in working with Republicans than in rolling over them.¶ The atrophying of strong relationships on Capitol Hill is only one of many reasons polarization is so entrenched. Certainly the proliferation of powerful political organizations, such as the free-market Club for Growth, and the influence of partisan media have also played a role. In the bigger picture, the decades-long popular sorting out between the parties and their ideology has probably mattered most: Conservative Southern Democrats and liberal Northeastern Republicans are now nearly extinct.But another suggested cause of increased polarization, gerrymandered districts, remains hotly disputed in the political-science community. Research shows that members' voting behavior changes only slightly, if at all, with the partisan makeup of their district; lawmakers support whatever their party decides, according to this argument.¶ The disrepair of personal relationships in Washington plays only a minor role in the absence of party comity. But more so than other long-term factors, this is something the current players can control. As legislators try to craft difficult bipartisan compromises, a willingness to cross party lines, even at the risk of criticism from colleagues, is crucial. It's why Republican Sen. Marco Rubio's inclination to work with Democrats on immigration reform or Democratic Rep. Ron Wyden's collaboration with Ryan on health care were so widely praised; such efforts attract positive attention because they are so rare.¶ Political enemies have worked together for the common good before. Boehner and the late Sen. Edward Kennedy collaborated on No Child Left Behind. And Gingrich got along famously with Clinton, Breaux said, because the two men respected each other. "Even when he was trying to impeach [Clinton], they were still able to overcome that and get things done," Breaux said.¶ He added: "I think that lack of personal relationships in the legislative body is absolutely the most harmful thing, exceeding any philosophical differences. It can overcome stringent disagreements."¶ Hill Democrats are openly encouraging Obama, whom they saw as failing to reach out during his first term, to rebuild those relationships. "What kind of commitment from the White House will there be to work the Congress aggressively, daily and continuously?" wondered Glickman, who is now a senior fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center. "It can be painful to do that, because presidents don't like that part of the job. I'm not sure this president likes it either."¶ Unless the tone improves, Hill-watchers are doubtful about any legislation's opportunity for success. "These are very contentious times," Ference said. "There are significant policy areas where some bipartisanship can be achieved, but I don't know how we do any of it in the environment we have right now."¶ What eventually passes and what doesn't will come down to the individual pieces of legislation. Observers believe that immigration reform, already being crafted by a bipartisan group of eight senators in the upper chamber, has the greatest chance for passage, because of the high stakes involved for the GOP. But many caution that success will still hinge on the yet-to-be determined details. Murkier still are the chances of passing gun-violence measures -- particularly banning assault rifles or high-capacity magazines, and strengthening background checks -- not to mention a grand bargain on deficit reduction.

#### Leaked bill proves that it has no impact.

Robinson 2/20 (Eugene, Washington Post Writers Group, Obama’s decoy plan could deliver a winner on immigration reform, http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/02/20/2695035/obamas-decoy-plan-could-deliver.html)

WASHINGTON — Republicans spent the weekend trumpeting shock and outrage over President Obama’s leaked “backup plan” on immigration. In dysfunctional Washington, this means that prospects for comprehensive reform – including what amounts to an amnesty for the undocumented – are getting brighter.¶ “Dead on arrival” was the verdict from Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., who has taken on the thankless task of leading his party back within shouting distance of reasonable on the immigration issue. The president’s plan, obtained by USA Today, would leave the nation with “unsecured borders and a broken legal immigration system for years to come,” Rubio charged.¶ Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., said the White House proposal – which hasn’t actually been proposed – shows that Obama is “really not serious” about reform. Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., said Obama’s plan “tells us that he’s looking for a partisan advantage and not a bipartisan solution.”¶ Translation: Things are looking up!¶ Here’s the state of play: In the November election, Obama carried both the nation’s largest minority – Hispanics – and its fastest-growing minority – Asian-Americans – by nearly 3-to-1. Rubio, the son of Cuban immigrants, has been trying to explain to his party that immigration is a “threshold” issue for communities with fresh memories of arrival. Mitt Romney’s notion of reform, which he summed up as “self-deportation,” communicated hostility rather than empathy. Voters returned the favor.¶ So a bipartisan group of eight senators, led by Rubio, has been working to develop a comprehensive reform package that would provide some kind of legal status for the 11 million migrants who are here without papers.¶ The outlines of a solution are obvious. There would be a clear path to citizenship for those who were brought here as children. There would be provisional legal status, and a route to permanent legal status, for those who came as adults. There would be measures to tighten security along the border with Mexico. There would probably be some kind of guest-worker program for those who seek only to come for seasonal employment. And there would be changes to streamline the legal immigration system, especially for high-tech workers and potential entrepreneurs.¶ The problem is that Republicans have spent years demonizing undocumented immigrants as a way of appealing to xenophobic, jingoistic sentiment. So how can members of Congress switch from “these people are a plague” to “these people are welcome to stay” without facing the ire of the party’s activist base?¶ Enter the president’s draft proposal, which administration officials described as a “backup” plan that Obama may put forward if Congress is not able to reach agreement.

#### Dems are unified behind Obama now

Brownstein, 2/21 (Ronald, 2/21/2013, National Journal, “What Unites Obama's Coalition -- and What Could Divide It,” Factiva))

One conclusion that jumps from the Pew Research Center/USA Today national survey released today is that the coalition that reelected President Obama last fall remains in step behind him -- and is largely unified behind the key elements of his increasingly aggressive second-term agenda. But the poll also suggests that failure to generate more rapid economic recovery could nonetheless strain the powerful coalition Obama has assembled.

#### PC gets dems on board.

Josh Lederman, staff writer, 2-6-2013, “Obama Strategizing With Senate Democrats Over Gun Control, Immigration, Fiscal Issues,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/06/obama-senate-democrats\_n\_2629534.html

Senate Democratic unity will be critical to Obama's prospects for enacting the ambitious agenda he's laid out for the start of his second term. Almost all the items on his to-do list face opposition from Senate Republicans – not to mention the even stronger opposition Obama is likely to run up against if and when the GOP-controlled House takes up those items. Senate and White House aides are offering few details about Obama's appearance Wednesday at the Democrats' annual retreat at a hotel in Annapolis, Md., but Obama is expected to address senators before engaging in a candid discussion about the toughest issues ahead. Obama is letting the Senate take the lead on crafting comprehensive immigration legislation, including a path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants. But he is using all the power that the presidency affords to implore lawmakers to act without delay. A bipartisan Senate group has reached agreement on the broad outlines of such an overhaul, but a few thorny issues remain, including a possible guest-worker program and whether to delay steps toward citizenship until certain border-security measures are in place.

#### Pathway to citizenship is not relevant – bipartisanship will overcome it.

Aguilar, 2-23

[Julian, “Immigration rally at state Capitol signals growing demand for reform”, Lubbock Avalanche Journal, 2-23-13,

<http://lubbockonline.com/filed-online/2013-02-23/immigration-rally-signals-growing-demand-reform#.USlPB6W-2uI>, RSR]

Despite differing opinions on what the immigration proposal should like, there is a general consensus that Republicans — the party whose lawmakers carried recent measures aimed at banning “sanctuary cities” in Texas and repealing in-state tuition for undocumented public high school graduates — are embracing some incarnation of reform.¶ “There is more openness now to conservative solutions on immigration than ever before, so in that sense, I don’t think this rally in particular changes anything,” said Josh Treviño, vice president for communications at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, an Austin-based conservative think tank. “But through conversations with interested groups, I think we now have more opportunity of yielding good policy, especially in Texas, than ever before.”¶ But Treviño said the demand for a pathway to citizenship is not “the relevant fight.” While what to do with the population already living here is important, he said, the underlying issue is how to facilitate the movement of labor across borders. ¶ "For the past half century there hasn’t been a way to do that. That is the original policy flaw that has created the problem," he said. "That’s what conservatives ought to discuss. The unskilled labor guest-worker program is very, very tiny. And it doesn’t meet market demands.”¶ The coming weeks are certain to be filled with more conversation about what lawmakers can offer up as an agreeable solution. Bipartisan groups in Congress are currently working on drafts, as is the Obama administration. That not only increases the likelihood of prolonged debate, but also the chance that some form of reform will ultimately pass.

#### Top priority

Slater 2/20 (Wayne, senior political writer for Dallas news, http://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/headlines/20130220-conservative-evangelical-christians-sign-on-for-immigration-overhaul-pitch.ece)

In his recent State of the Union speech, President Barack Obama made immigration reform a top priority for his second term. Both members of Congress and the White House have advanced ideas for providing a pathway to legal status, creating a guest-worker program and further securing the border.

#### Obama will get blamed for agency action.

Wallison 3 (Peter Wallison, Resident Fellow @ American Enterprise Institute, 1/12/’3 (Washington Post, l/n)

Control over independent regulatory agencies has traditionally resided with Congress, which created all of them. The recent controversy over the Securities and Exchange Commission suggests, however, that now Congress, the White House, and the public all take for granted that the independent agencies are the president's responsibility. The political frenzy surrounding Enron's collapse and other corporate scandals may have produced--or at least exposed--a significant shift in the relationship between Congress and the White House. The efforts of congressional Democrats to pin some of the blame for the scandals on the president and the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission--and President Bush's willingness to act as though the SEC is his responsibility--may signal the end of more than a century of experimentation with independent regulatory agencies as a so-called "fourth branch" of government. History of Independent Agencies Independent agencies such as the SEC have always been regarded as "arms of Congress," outside the control of the executive branch. The president appointed the members and the chairman, but the terms for these officials overlapped presidential administrations, allowing--and encouraging--them to act without policy direction from the White House. The political fallout from the recent scandals has turned all this on its head. These independent agencies are creatures of Congress, not the Constitution. The first, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), was established in 1887 to control the powerful railroad industry. Later, especially during the Progressive and New Deal eras, a number of other agencies were created, several of which still exist--including the SEC, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. Several others, such as the Federal Power Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, went out of business a quarter-century ago. The ICC closed its doors in 1995. There was no clear reason, or constitutional rationale, why the duties of these bodies could not have been performed by regular executive branch departments. Presidents have expressed their unhappiness with this diminution of their authority, and some have tried to influence agency policies through the appointments process, but they have not confronted Congress on the issue. And Congress--always jealous of its prerogatives in the face of the executive branch's growing power--has never conceded that the independent regulatory agencies could take policy direction from the president. Then, in 1971, the status quo was called into question. The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization--known as the Ash Council after its chairman, Roy L. Ash of Litton Industries--recommended that almost all of the functions of these bodies be transferred to single administrators, appointed by the president and accountable to him. The Ash Council's rationale for this reform was simple: If the president's policy control did not extend to these independent agencies, then his responsibility for them could not be clearly fixed and voters could not hold him accountable. Moreover, the president's policies, even if adopted by Congress, could be frustrated through contrary actions by the independent agencies. The Ash Council's proposal, like many reform ideas, went nowhere. There was no support in Congress for enhancing the president's power, and the Nixon administration--beset first by economic problems and then by the Watergate scandal--had no stomach for challenging Congress. (The Ash Council's report did lead, however, to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, headed by an administrator who answers to the president.) During the Reagan administration, however, the executive branch became more assertive. The Justice Department took the Constitution's separation of powers seriously, which by implication challenged the very legitimacy of the independent regulatory agencies. Nevertheless, because of congressional sensitivities and the continuing sense that these bodies were quasi-judicial in nature, White House officials were warned that all contacts with the independent regulatory agencies had to be approved in advance--or actually carried out--by the White House counsel's office. The Reagan administration never seriously considered taking on Congress through a legislative proposal that would bring these independent agencies within the constitutionally established structure. The Presidential Role All this history appears to have been forgotten in the politics of 2002. The Democrats, hoping to make an election issue out of the SEC's "failure" to stop "corporate corruption," proceeded to blame a Republican president for events that were solely within the authority of the SEC. There was no indication that departments or agencies unquestionably controlled by the president had any role for policing either the securities industry or the companies under scrutiny. So if President Bush was somehow responsible for what happened at Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, and the rest, it had to be as a consequence of some presidential authority over the SEC. To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of all parties--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was fully accountable for an agency that has always been viewed as independent. The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can hardly be overstated. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become electorally responsible for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the die is now cast. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the attitude of Congress. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be difficult to convince them otherwise. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."

#### Plan would be spun as Obamacare 2.0 – state would backlash to unfunded mandates and GOP would seize the opportunity

Newsmax 2010 (March 22nd, “States Move to Block Obamacare's Unfunded Mandate”, http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/healthcare-lawsuits-states-florida/2010/03/22/id/353475)

Less than 24 hours after the House gave final approval to a sweeping overhaul of healthcare, attorneys general from several states on Monday said they will sue to block the plan on constitutional grounds.¶ Republican attorneys general in 11 states warned that lawsuits will be filed to stop the federal government overstepping its constitutional powers and usurping states' sovereignty.¶ States are concerned the burden of providing healthcare will fall on them without enough federal support.

#### Budgetary concerns of the plan with the public means backlash *at the constituent level*

Von Schirach 12 (Paolo, International Economic Development Consultant

May 11, “[Renewable Energy In The US – Subsidies Politically Unpopular – Natural Gas A Much Cheaper Alternative – USG Should Focus On R&D](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/),”

<http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/>, d/a 7-20-12)

American enthusiasm for renewable energy, not too deep [to begin](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/)with, has gone away. In part this has to do with loss of interest in “climate change” and its dire consequences. Unfortunately, climate change has been and is mostly an issue of political belief, rather than upholding science. And as the intensity of the political fervor somehow waned, in large part replaced by more immediate economic fears, so did political support for all the renewable energy technologies that were supposed to create, relatively quickly it was thought, workable alternatives to carbon based energy. An additional reason for waning support is that keeping renewable energy alive means also subsidizing it for a few more years. And this is less and less politically palatable at a time of budgetary constraints at every level. Paying more for electricity simply because this kind is clean looks like an unaffordable luxury, whatever the consequences of burning more (cheaper) fossil fuels may be.

**FITS too controversial- viewed as tax increases**

**Carus, 12** -- Guardian environmental reporter

[Felicity, "Bill Clinton: fan of solar feed-in-tariffs thinks we should “get” the clean energy tattoo," PV Tech, 8-21-12, www.pv-tech.org/editors\_blog/bill\_clinton\_fan\_of\_solar\_feed\_in\_tariffs\_thinks\_we\_should\_get\_the\_clean\_en, accessed 12-31-12, mss]

Feed-in-tariffs are a controversial subject in the US where the energy industry likes to pretend that free market economics applies to this sector. You might expect clean energy antagonists to baulk: "Let the government set the price for electricity — are you crazy? Let the market decide." But **even** clean energy **protagonists are divided** about the true value of FiTs in sustainable markets: "Set the mandated rate too high and we'll have a Spanish boom and bust scenario on our hands. We don't want that." Set it too low, and nobody will want to invest. Palo Alto's Clean Local Energy Accessible Now (CLEAN) programme still has its full 4MW of capacity available and has extended its deadline. Added to which, tariffs also **sound** a bit **like** the dreaded ‘T’ word — taxes. So attempts to introduce them at the distributed commercial level have required a creative rebranding to the dramatically under-descriptive CLEAN programmes designed by the Clean Coalition.

#### Solar energy incentives are politically dangerous – past failures has given similar programs a bad reputation

Bloomberg 12 (June 28, “Abound Failure Revives Debate Over Obama Solar Policies”, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-29/abound-failure-revives-debate-over-obama-solar-policies.html)

The failure of a second solar manufacturer that received loan guarantees from the U.S. Energy Department adds to pressure on President Barack Obama to justify incentives for the clean-energy industry that’s being undercut by Chinese competition. Abound Solar Inc., a U.S. solar manufacturer that was awarded a $400 million loan guarantee in 2010, said yesterday it will suspend operations and file for bankruptcy next week. Enlarge image Abound Failure Raises Questions Anew About Obama Solar Policies Abound Solar Inc. solar panels in Germany. Source: Abound Solar Imc. Abound said its thin-film panels couldn’t compete against Chinese products, the same reason cited by Solyndra LLC, which closed its doors in August after receiving a $535 million guarantee from the same program. Half of the four solar manufacturers that received loan guarantees have failed, supporting the argument that backing clean-energy is a mistake, according to Representative Cliff Stearns. “We know why they went bankrupt. We warned them they would go bankrupt,” Stearns, a Florida Republican, told reporters yesterday. “The larger question is why the administration was pursuing a green-energy policy in which companies are going bankrupt and wasting taxpayer money.” Stearns is chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee’s oversight panel that has held hearings on the Energy Department’s loan guarantee program. Representative Jim Jordan, an Ohio Republican and chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s stimulus oversight panel that has investigated loan guarantees to solar companies, said Abound’s failure is further proof the Energy Department program was a mistake. “It just adds to the weight of how ridiculous this was,” Jordan told reporters.