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## 1NC

### 1

#### A. Interpretation – Cash grants for consumers are restrictions, NOT financial incentives.

Menz, Faculty of Economics and Finance, School of Business, Clarkson University, ‘5

[Frederic, also from the Center for International Climate and Environmental Research, Oslo (CICERO), Norway, “Green electricity policies in the United States: case study,” Energy Policy, December, Science Direct]

There is considerable variation among states in both their regulatory environments and the policies that have been implemented to promote green electricity. In the following discussion, state and local policy instruments are categorized as financial incentives, rules and regulations, and voluntary measures.[7](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science/article/pii/S0301421504001648#fn7)Financial incentives include various subsidies and/or funding in direct support of green electricity projects, tax incentives (credits, deductions, or exemptions), and provisions for zero-interest or low-interest loans. Rules and regulations include requirements that utilities distribute a minimum share of electricity from renewable or green energy sources, green power purchase requirements for government entities, and net-metering requirements for consumers with small renewable generating facilities. Voluntary measures include green power products aimed at electricity consumers, green power certificate programs, and other programs to increase market support for renewable energy technologies.

#### Reduce means to make smaller, Dictionary.com

[http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reduce?s=t]

1. to bring down to a smaller extent, size, amount, number, etc.: to reduce one's weight by 10 pounds.

#### B. Violation – They increase restrictions by mandating reimbursement for consumers

#### C. Standards

#### 1. Bidirectionality – their interpretation moots the direction of the restrictions part of the topic which allows the affirmative to effectively double their ground. Even if you think that they might also increase an incentive, they also increase a restriction, and the ground advantage this generates outweighs any of their limits or education claims.

#### 2. Topic-specific education – they moot the debate about the market mechanisms of the topic. The predictable mechanism of the topic is to have the federal government either get out of the way of or incentivize the workings of the free market. They have the federal government participate in the market. The negative should always have a right to market bad solvency arguments.

#### D. Voter for fairness and education.

### 2

#### The US Congress should institute minimum federal standards for net metering including “full credit” for all kilowatt-hours produced, net billing, a minimum interconnection standard, and require that customer-generators receive compensation above the avoided cost rate for the power they place on the grid. Congress should also eliminate any existing technology-specific renewable energy subsidies.

#### Two net benefits – avoids politics because the CP doesn’t reinstate Cash Grants and avoids our picking-winners turns because the CP doesn’t isolate solar power.

#### Congressional minimum standards for net metering solves the whole aff by itself – it’s what their Baker-Branstetter 11 evidence is really advocating

Baker-Branstetter 11 [Shannon, policy counsel for Consumers Union and is a member of the California Bar. She earned her undergraduate degree from Yale University, Master's in Public Policy from the University of California, Los Angeles, and J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center, Villanova Environmental Law Journal, 22 Vill. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2011, p. 23]

Congress should institute minimum federal standards for net metering to set a floor of protection for customer-generators. Non-discrimination, streamlined requirements, and "full credit" for all kilowatt-hours produced would remove the hurdles some utilities and states have placed before would-be customer-generators. Net metering that uses non-monetary transactions to credit kilowatt-hours and does not reimburse the customer-generator for net excess generation is certainly more administratively efficient and palatable to IOUs. However, customer-generators should not be forced to give their net excess generation to the utility for free when the utility resells the power at market rate. Revenue streams to customer-generators for net excess generation are an important incentive for DRG, and the federal government should require that customer-generators receive just compensation for the excess power they place on the grid. State PUCs can further delineate "full credit" and "just compensation" on a utility-by-utility basis, but Congress should mandate the standard that customer-generators must receive at the maximum value for excess generation that does not burden other customer classes.

#### Net metering is the best way to promote solar power and renewable distributed generation AND utility companies love it

Baker-Branstetter 11 [Shannon, policy counsel for Consumers Union and is a member of the California Bar. She earned her undergraduate degree from Yale University, Master's in Public Policy from the University of California, Los Angeles, and J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center, Villanova Environmental Law Journal, 22 Vill. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2011, p. 7-10]

Most electricity customers need incentives or financing to install renewable generation at their homes or businesses due to large upfront capital costs. n50 Under a net metering policy, utilities provide credit, or cash payment under "net billing," to a customer-generator for any electricity produced in excess of consumption. n51 Most state statutes define a net-metered system as "intended to offset part or all of the customer-generator's electricity requirements." n52 Net metering policies vary, but a common example would be that of a residential ratepayer who generates 120 kilowatt-hours (kWh) in a month, but only uses 100 kWh. n53 In this case, the [\*8] meter would run backwards, and the utility would credit the ratepayer 20 kWh usable on a future billing cycle until the end of the year, at which time any unused credits would expire. n54 Under some programs, the ratepayer would receive a cash payment for the excess credits at the end of the year. n55 While some states mandate net metering, others ban the practice entirely, and a host of policies exist in between these two extremes. n56¶ Net metering is one of the most important incentives for electricity consumers to install DRG. n57 Increasing adoption of DRG through well-crafted net metering programs will accomplish many policy goals simultaneously. n58 The primary benefits include lowering electric bills; decreasing transmission and distribution costs; decreasing the need for new transmission capital; bringing renewable sources on-grid quickly; reducing environmental impacts of concentrated energy infrastructure; conserving water; and decreasing GHG emissions. n59¶ Net metering is a key driver of solar installation in particular. n60 As shown by the graphs below, most of the solar photovoltaic (PV) installations in the United States are non-residential systems connected to the grid, although residential systems outpower utility-run solar farms. n61 While non-residential systems produced more power than residential systems because the former are much larger, residential systems account for 90% of the number of installations in recent years. n62¶ The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) supports expanding DRG and notes numerous public benefits. These benefits include cost control; improvements to the efficiency and reliability of the distribution system; increased competition in transmission and distribution-constrained regions; reduced total electric generation costs; enhanced customer choice; increased output from sunk costs such as transmission and distribution equipment; environmental benefits; and increased speed of new power production. n63 Benefits of DRG for all stakeholders include peak demand reduction and reduced transmission and distribution [\*10] line loads and losses. n64 NARUC also recognizes that net metering provides "a direct, inexpensive, and easily-administered mechanism for encouraging the customer installation of small-scale renewable energy facilities." n65 Net metering reimburses customer-generators for the value of all or most of the power produced without the huge expense of batteries for storage. n66 Accordingly, NARUC has worked with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and individual state public utility commissions (PUCs) to improve interconnection standards and remove barriers to entry for DRG, with significant success in the past few years. n67

### 3

#### 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. Section 1603 cash grants are extremely controversial

Cardwell 2012 [Diane, Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies, The New York Times, January 26]

Assisted by technological innovation and years of subsidies, the cost of wind and solar power has fallen sharply — so much so that the two industries say that they can sometimes deliver cleaner electricity at prices competitive with power made from fossil fuels.¶ At the same time, wind and solar companies are telling Congress that they cannot be truly competitive and keep creating jobs without a few more years of government support.¶ Their efforts received a boost on Thursday from President Obama, who called for a package of tax credits for renewable power as part of a broader energy plan that he outlined while on a campaign swing through Nevada and Colorado.¶ But the lobbying by the wind and solar industries comes at a time when there is little enthusiasm for alternative-energy subsidies in Washington.¶ Overall concerns about the deficit are making lawmakers more skeptical about any new tax breaks for business in general. And taxpayer losses of more than half a billion dollars on Solyndra, a bankrupt maker of solar modules that defaulted on a federal loan, has tarnished the image of renewable power in particular.¶ “Most of the folks I think recognize that this is not a Solyndra effort here,” said Representative David G. Reichert, Republican of Washington, who introduced a bill to extend a renewable tax credit last year. Solyndra was financed under a now-expired program, part of the 2009 stimulus package, that provided government loan guarantees for clean-energy projects, some of which administration officials expected to be risky.¶ The wind and solar companies argue that the tax breaks they are seeking are different. The tax credits can be taken only by businesses that are already up and running, so taxpayers are less likely to be stuck subsidizing a failing company, proponents say.¶ “This is a program that doesn’t pick winners or losers,” said Rhone Resch, president and chief executive of the Solar Energy Industries Association. “It’s hard to argue against a program like this that is creating jobs.”¶ Without the new breaks, industry executives warn, they will be forced to scale back production and eliminate jobs in a still-weak economy.¶ The American division of Iberdrola, a big Spanish producer of wind turbines, is already feeling the impending loss of one tax break that expires this year. “We’ve seen the prospects for new wind farms really fall off,” said Donald Furman, a senior vice president at Iberdrola Renewables, which announced this week that it was laying off 50 employees. “We’re not getting out of the business and we’re not in any financial trouble, but we are doing the prudent thing so that we don’t have issues.”¶ The tax break that Iberdrola and other wind companies rely on, called the production tax credit, has been in place since 1992 but after repeated extensions is now scheduled to expire at the end of 2012. It allows for a credit of 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour of electricity generated for the first 10 years of a project’s operation, which the industry says is sometimes enough to eliminate the price difference between wind power and fossil fuels.¶ The Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation recently estimated that the production tax credit would cost the government $6.8 billion from 2011 to 2015 for projects in place before the end of this year.¶ The other tax break, which expired at the end of last year and was especially popular with solar companies, allows renewable energy companies to get 30 percent of the cost of a new project back as a cash grant once construction is complete. Without the cash grant program, a company can still take the 30 percent credit, but must spread the benefit over a period of years. The industry says the grant program is more effective because it encourages a broader range of private investors to help finance its projects.¶ As of early this year, the cash-grant program, known as the 1603 program, had awarded $1.76 billion for more than 22,000 solar projects, according to the Treasury Department.¶ Mr. Obama, who has been a steadfast supporter of clean-energy programs, has already begun making a case for new government investment in clean energy projects as a way to foster both energy independence and employment at a time when Capitol Hill evaluates new laws in terms of job creation as well as budget cost or savings.¶ “Because of federal investments, renewable energy use — sources like wind and solar — has nearly doubled,” Mr. Obama said at a stop at Buckley Air Force Base in Aurora, Colo., where he promoted the increasing use of renewable power by the military and repeated a call for Congress to approve the tax credits. “Thousands of Americans have jobs because of those efforts.”¶ Mr. Obama used his trip to press for increased use of liquid natural gas in transportation, appearing at a United Parcel Service center in Las Vegas that received a stimulus grant to support natural gas-fueled trucks. He also said that the Interior Department would open up about 38 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico to gas and oil exploration and development, selling leases in June. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management estimates drilling there could yield one billion barrels of oil and four trillion cubic feet of natural gas.¶ According to the American Wind Energy Association, wind projects account for more than a third of all the new electric generation installed in recent years, while over the last six years, domestic wind turbine production has grown twelvefold, to more than 400 facilities in 43 states. A recent study by Navigant Consulting found that this year the industry would support 78,000 jobs, but that the number would fall to 41,000 in 2013 without an extension of the production tax credit.¶ Solar, too, is growing quickly in the United States. According to the Solar Energy Industries Association, more solar was installed in the third quarter of 2011 than in all of 2009 combined. A one-year extension of the 1603 tax-grant program would create an additional 37,000 solar industry jobs in 2012, according to a report by EuPD Research.¶ Lobbyists for both industries say the new tax breaks need to be passed quickly and are trying to get Congress to include them in a bill to extend the payroll tax cut.¶ That bill, like all tax cuts these days, has Congress at loggerheads. “But true performance-based incentives, where incentives are only provided when actual production occurs, seem to be maintaining their support,” said Robert Gramlich, senior vice president for public policy for the American Wind Energy Association.¶ How this will play out in Congress is anybody’s guess, lawmakers say. Mr. Reichert said the credits were not yet part of the negotiations over the payroll tax cut, which is due to expire at the end of February.¶ Republican leaders may look to revive the Keystone XL oil pipeline — as proposed, the pipeline would run 1,700 miles from oil sands in Canada to refineries on the Gulf Coast — as part of a compromise to approve the renewable energy credits, according to lobbyists and lawmakers involved in the discussions.¶ But there is a lot of ideological opposition to more tax credits, said Senator Jeff Bingaman, Democrat of New Mexico and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, who supports the extension.¶ “The rhetoric is that the government should get out of the way,” he said. “That gets translated into opposition to a lot of these things.”

**4. The bill will open immigration and increase highly skilled immigrants.**

Amanda Peterson **Beadle 12/10**/12, Reporter/Blogger at ThinkProgress.org http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/12/10/1307561/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-needs-comprehensive-immigration-reform-that-includes-a-path-to-citizenship/

**The nation needs a comprehensive immigration plan,** and it is clear from a recent poll that most Americans support reforming the U.S.’s immigration system. In a new poll, nearly two-thirds of people surveyed are in favor of a measure that allows undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship over several years, while only 35 percent oppose such a plan. And President **Obama is expected to “begin an all-out drive for comprehensive immigration reform, including seeking a path to citizenship”** in January. Several top Republicans have softened their views on immigration reform following November’s election, but in the first push for reform, House Republicans advanced a bill last month that would add visas for highly skilled workers while reducing legal immigration overall. Providing a road map to citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the U.S. would have sweeping benefits for the nation, especially the economy. **Here are the** top 10 **reasons why the U.S. needs comprehensive immigration reform:** 1. **Legalizing the 11 million undocumented immigrants** in the United States would boost the nation’s economy. It would add a cumulative $1.5 trillion to the U.S. gross domestic product—the largest measure of economic growth—over 10 years. That’s because immigration reform that puts all workers on a level playing field would create a virtuous cycle in which legal status and labor rights exert upward pressure on the wages of both American and immigrant workers. Higher wages and even better jobs would translate into increased consumer purchasing power, which would benefit the U.S. economy as a whole. 2. Tax revenues would increase. The federal government would accrue $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in additional net tax revenue over just three years if the 11 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. And states would benefit. Texas, for example, would see a $4.1 billion gain in tax revenue and the creation of 193,000 new jobs if its approximately 1.6 million undocumented immigrants were legalized. 3. Harmful state immigration laws are damaging state economies. States that have passed stringent immigration measures in an effort to curb the number of undocumented immigrants living in the state have hurt some of their key industries, which are held back due to inadequate access to qualified workers. A farmer in Alabama, where the state legislature passed the anti-immigration law HB 56 in 2011, for example, estimated that he lost up to $300,000 in produce in 2011 because the undocumented farmworkers who had skillfully picked tomatoes from his vines in years prior had been forced to flee the state. 4. A path to citizenship would help families access health care. About a quarter of families where at least one parent is an undocumented immigrant are uninsured, but undocumented immigrants do not qualify for coverage under the Affordable Care Act, leaving them dependent on so-called safety net hospitals that will see their funding reduced as health care reforms are implemented. Without being able to apply for legal status and gain health care coverage, the health care options for undocumented immigrants and their families will shrink. 5. **U.S. employers need a legalized workforce.** Nearly half of agricultural workers, 17 percent of construction workers, and 12 percent of food preparation workers nationwide lacking legal immigration status. But business owners—from farmers to hotel chain owners—benefit from reliable and skilled laborers, and a legalization program would ensure that they have them. 6. In 2011, immigrant entrepreneurs were responsible for more than one in four new U.S. businesses. Additionally, immigrant businesses employ one in every 10 people working for private companies. Immigrants and their children founded 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies, which collectively generated $4.2 trillion in revenue in 2010—more than the GDP of every country in the world except the United States, China, and Japan. Reforms that enhance legal immigration channels for high-skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs while protecting American workers and placing all high-skilled workers on a level playing field will promote economic growth, innovation, and workforce stability in the United States. 7. Letting undocumented immigrants gain legal status would keep families together. More than 5,100 children whose parents are undocumented immigrants are in the U.S. foster care system, according to a 2011 report, because their parents have either been detained by immigration officials or deported and unable to reunite with their children. If undocumented immigrants continue to be deported without a path to citizenship enabling them to remain in the U.S. with their families, up to 15,000 children could be in the foster care system by 2016 because their parents were deported, and most child welfare departments do not have the resources to handle this increase. 8. Young **undocumented immigrants would add billions to the economy if they gained legal status**. Passing the DREAM Act—legislation that proposes to create a roadmap to citizenship for immigrants who came to the United States as children—would put 2.1 million young people on a pathway to legal status, adding $329 billion to the American economy over the next two decades. 9. And DREAMers would boost employment and wages. Legal status and the pursuit of higher education would create an aggregate 19 percent increase in earnings for young undocumented immigrants who would benefit from the DREAM Act by 2030. The ripple effects of these increased wages would create $181 billion in induced economic impact, 1.4 million new jobs, and $10 billion in increased federal revenue. 10. **Significant reform of the high-skilled immigration system would benefit certain industries that require high-skilled workers**. Immigrants make up 23 percent of the labor force in high-tech manufacturing and information technology industries, and immigrants more highly educated, on average, than the native-born Americans working in these industries. For every immigrant who earns an advanced degree in one of these fields at a U.S. university, 2.62 American jobs are created.

**5. Impact – Global Aging – Open immigration key to US aging transition – solves global aging.**

**Haas, '7** (Political Science Professor -- Duquesne, International Security, Summer)

**The more the U**nited **S**tates **maintains its enviable demographic position** (compared with the other great powers) **and relatively superior ability to pay for the costs of its elderly** population, **the more it will** be able both to **preserve its own position of international power dominance and** to **help other states address their aging** (and other) **problems** when it is in U.S. interests to do so. A critical implication of these facts is that such domestic policies as means-testing Social Security and Medicare payments, raising the retirement age to reflect increases in life expectancies, **maintaining largely open immigration policies to help keep the United States’ median age relatively low,** encouraging individual behaviors that result in better personal health, **and** perhaps above all **restraining the rising costs of its health-care system are critical international security concerns.** A defining political question of the twenty-first century for U.S. international interests is whether U.S. leaders have sufficient political will and wisdom to implement these and related policies. **The more proactive U.S. leaders are in minimizing** the scope of its **aging** population **and** the **costs associated** with it, **the more protected U.S. international interests will be. To ignore these costs, or even to delay** implementing various **reforms designed to limit their size, will jeopardize the level of global influence and security that the U**nited **S**tates enjoys today.

**6. Multiple nuclear wars.**

**Jackson & Howe, 11** (Senior Fellow – CSIS & Senior Associate – CSIS, http://csis.org/files/publication/110104\_gai\_jackson.pdf)

**A number of demographic storms are now brewing in different parts of the developing world**. The moment of maximum risk still lies ahead—just a decade away, in the 2020s. Ominously, this is the same decade when the developed world will itself be experiencing its moment of greatest demographic stress. Consider China, which may be the first country to grow old before it grows rich. For the past quarter-century, **China has been “peacefully rising,” thanks** in part **to a one-child**-per-couple **policy** that has lowered dependency burdens and allowed both parents to work and contribute to China’s boom. **By** the **2020**s, however, **the huge Red Guard generation**, which was born before the country’s fertility decline, **will move into retirement**, **heavily taxing the** resources of their children and **the state.** **China’s coming age wave**—by 2030 it will be an older country than the United States—**may weaken the t**wo pillars of the current **regime’s legitimacy**: rapidly rising GDP and social stability. Imagine workforce growth slowing to zero while tens of millions of elders sink into indigence without pensions, without health care, and without large extended families to support them. **China could careen toward social collapse**—**or**, in reaction, toward an **authoritarian clampdown**. The arrival of China’s age wave, and the turmoil it may bring, will coincide with its expected displacement of the United States as the world’s largest economy in the 2020s. According to “power transition” theories of global conflict, this moment could be quite perilous. By the 2020s, **Russia**, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, **will be in the midst of an extended population decline** as steep or steeper than any in the developed world. The Russian fertility rate has plunged far beneath the replacement level even as life expectancy has collapsed amid a widening health crisis. Russian men today can expect to live to 60—16 years less than American men and marginally less than their Red Army grandfathers at the end of World War II. By 2050, Russia is due to fall to 16th place in world population rankings, down from 4th place in 1950 (or third place, if we include all the territories of the former Soviet Union). Prime Minister Vladimir Putin flatly calls Russia’s demographic implosion “the most acute problem facing our country today.” **If the problem is not solved, Russia will weaken progressively, raising the nightmarish specter of a** failing or **failed state with nuclear weapons**. Or **this cornered bear may lash out** in revanchist fury rather than meekly accept its demographic fate. Of course, **some regions** of the developing world **will remain extremely young** in the 2020s. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is burdened by the world’s highest fertility rates and is also ravaged by AIDS, will still be racked by large youth bulges. So will a scattering of impoverished and chronically unstable Muslim-majority countries, including Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. **If the correlation between extreme youth and violence endures, chronic unrest and state failure could persist** in much of sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the Muslim world through the 2020s, or even longer if fertility rates fail to drop. Meanwhile, many fast-modernizing countries where fertility has fallen very recently and very steeply will experience a sudden resurgence of youth in the 2020s. It is a law of demography that, when a population boom is followed by a bust, it causes a ripple effect, with a gradually fading cycle of echo booms and busts. In the 2010s, a bust generation will be coming of age in much of Latin America, South Asia, and the Muslim world. But by the 2020s**, an echo boom will follow**—dashing economic expectations and perhaps **fueling political violence, religious extremism, and ethnic strife**. These echo booms will be especially large in Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan, the decade-overdecade percentage growth in the number of people in the volatile 15- to 24-year-old age bracket is projected to drop from 32 percent in the 2000s to just 10 percent in the 2010s, but then leap upward again to 19 percent in the 2020s. In Iran, the swing in the size of the youth bulge population is projected to be even larger: minus 33 percent in the 2010s and plus 23 percent in the 2020s. **These echo booms will be occurring in countries whose social fabric is already strained by rapid development**. **One country teeters on the brink of chaos, while the other aspires to regional hegemony. One already has nuclear weapons, while the other seems likely to obtain them**..

### 4

#### 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

#### Decentralized renewable energy can’t solve blackouts according to their only econ internal link – Their Bruch and Hunter 12 ev says the key cause for coming blackouts is that decentralized renewable energy is too volatile to connect to the old grid:

Bruch and Hunter 12 MICHAEL BRUCH Head of R&D Risk Consulting LARRY HUNTER Risk Engineer Allianz Risk Consulting Worldwide risk consulting, risk management and loss investigation services for corporate, industrial and specialty risks. Energy risks: Power trip http://www.agcs.allianz.com/assets/PDFs/GRD/GRD%20individual%20articles/Power\_blackout\_risks\_article.pdf

Many companies are unprepared for business disruptions caused by power blackouts, and are often unaware of the true costs and impact that they can have on their operations. While the majority of power failures from national grids last only a few hours, some blackouts can last days or even weeks, completely shutting down production at companies and critical infrastructures such as telecommunication networks, financial services, water supplies and hospitals. Furthermore, it is likely that power blackouts will become more frequent owing to the lack of incentives to invest in aged national grid infrastructures in Europe and the US, as well as the fact that energy from decentralized, “volatile” renewable sources is not well aligned to work on electricity grids that were designed 50 or 60 years ago. Also, as more and more grids are interconnected, a blackout in one region can trigger a domino effect that could result in supra-regional blackouts. Heightened risk from terrorism, cyber attacks and solar flares also highlights how vulnerable the world’s energy grids are to systemic failure. Research shows that the financial impacts of even a small power cut can be catastrophic. Analyses from blackout events in the US show that a 30-minute power cut results in an average loss of US$15,709 for medium and large industrial clients, and nearly US$94,000 for an eight-hour interruption. Even short blackouts – which occur several times a year in the US – add up to an annual estimated economic loss of between US$104 and US$164 billion. SOLAR STORMS AS TRIGGER A potential trigger for large-scale blackouts within the next two years may be space weather events. Geomagnetic induced solar flare storms follow an 11-year cycle and are expected to peak again in 2013. Particularly in the northern hemisphere, space weather events could severely damage high-voltage transformers whose repair can take weeks.

#### 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.

#### Can’t solve the grid – fuel cells are too expensive and MASSIVE infrastructure investment is needed

Fehrenbacher 12 [Katie, The case for a distributed, smarter, cleaner power grid post Hurricane Sandy, GIGAOM, http://gigaom.com/2012/10/30/the-case-for-a-distributed-smarter-cleaner-power-grid-post-hurricane-sandy/]

STILL, distributed power systems and energy storage units need to be far cheaper for this decentralized power grid to actually be viable. When fuel cell maker Bloom Energy launched years ago it painted the picture of a Bloom box in every home providing a mini power plant to all homes and businesses — but that’s a distant dream until the price of its fuel cells drops dramatically.¶ Clean power¶ There’s also another part of the story of the power grid and Hurricane Sandy. And that’s the need for a transformation of the grid to next-generation energy technologies, like adding in more carbon emissions-free power generation and energy efficiency technologies. Leaders like Governor Cuomo are already describing Hurricane Sandy as an example of a new era of extreme weather, without even mentioning the politicized word climate change.¶ Cuomo said:¶ “There has been a series of extreme weather incidents. That is not a political statement. That is a factual statement. Anyone who says there’s not a dramatic change in weather patterns, I think is denying reality.”¶ tweet this¶ Whatever combination is leading to more extreme weather (Mother Jones has a good take on the Sandy climate change argument), reducing the world’s carbon emissions is widely believed by scientists as something that can help address the problems of climate change. That means developing and deploying next-generation energy technologies that reduce energy consumption overall, and deliver low cost and viable clean power.¶ Even if you’re still not convinced about climate change, it’s actually an argument about infrastructure. The power grid needs a massive investment — at even a greater degree to the investment that’s been made in Internet infrastructure — to make it a more modern, digital, and resilient network. And hopefully, a cleaner network, too.

#### TURN: Shift away from Tax Credits is bad – cash grants are inefficient and raise prices

Novogradac 2011 [Michael, CPA, “Washington Wire: Tax Credits are More Efficient Than Cash Grants, Novogradic Journal of Tax Credits, p. 1]

Despite remarkably successful track records — some¶ decades-long — tax credit¶ programs continue to come under¶ attack by a handful of critics¶ who suggest that cash grants¶ might be more effective. To defend¶ cost effective programs¶ such as the low-income housing¶ tax credit (LIHTC) and new markets¶ tax credit (NMTC) against¶ such attacks, Novogradac & Company¶ has been commissioned to analyze the efficiency of¶ the tax credits compared to that of comparable cash grants.¶ We’ve also performed similar analysis of renewable energy¶ tax credits (RETCs) and the historic tax credit (HTC).¶ What we’ve found, simply put, is that when compared to¶ cash grant programs, tax credits are a more efficient way for¶ the federal government to support affordable housing, community¶ development, renewable energy and historic preservation.

### Grid

#### High energy costs and dropping solar panel costs are driving a shift to PV panels now

Trabish 11 [Herman, New Study: Solar Grid Parity Is Here Today: A definitive new LCOE study says solar has achieved parity, GreenTechMedia, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/New-Study-Solar-Grid-Parity-Is-Here-Today]

“Over 90 percent of the American public is pro-solar,” Pearce said. “What holds them back is the ability to finance. But costs have dropped by more than half in the last couple of years. When you compare the average cost of a home and the average cost of the solar system, you need to provide the average electricity you need for that home -- it’s not a significant fraction.”¶ Pearce noted that in cost terms, the homeowner’s choice is between a solar system and other options. “Before we hit the majority of the American public, which the Department of Energy puts out only a few more years,” Pearce said, “we still need to push the economics down a little further.”¶ The shift to solar “is not going to happen all at once,” Pearce said. “Two pockets of the country,” he predicted, will “open up to solar first.” Solar will most quickly be noticed as competitive where electricity rates are high or where utilities have inordinate monthly charges.¶ Where PV becomes “economically viable,” Pearce said, will be when “the banks get comfortable with it and it becomes something that you just put on your mortgage, a normal thing that everybody in the neighborhood is doing because they can save a little every month on their utility bill.”¶ “It is clear PV has already obtained grid parity in specific locations,” the study concludes, “and as installed costs continue to decline, grid electricity prices continue to escalate, and industry experience increases, PV will become an increasingly economically advantageous source of electricity over expanding geographical regions.”

#### Grid is resilient and sustainable – natural disasters prove AND funding to defend the grid is up

Clark, MA Candidate – Intelligence Studies @ the American Military University, ‘12

[Paul, senior analyst – Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/’12, , “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University]

In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred – trees shorted a power line and caused a fault – that had a cascading effect and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis 2010). This singular occurrence has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and subject to severe disruption through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars, brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the 2003 blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), is a worst case scenario and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context¶ of the robustness of the electrical grid.¶ When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command Rear Admiral Samuel Cox stated that an attack was¶ unlikely to succeed because of the “huge amounts of resiliency built into the [electrical] system¶ that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult” (Capaccio 2012). This optimistic view¶ is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be robust in the face of large natural¶ catastrophes. Complex systems like the electrical grid in the U.S. are prone to failures and the¶ U.S. grid fails frequently. Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. Power outages that affect more than 50,000 people have occurred steadily over the last¶ 20 years at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, the effect is mitigated by policies¶ and procedures that are meant to restore services as quickly as possible. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management Assistance Compact, a legally binding¶ agreement allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to a catastrophic¶ disaster such as power outages following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes that cause blackouts, the economy is¶ affected but does not collapse and even after massive damage like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, national security is not affected because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security¶ challenge” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). In response to the threat Congress is¶ crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security (Brito and Watkins 2012) and the Department of¶ Homeland Security budget for cyber-security has been significantly increased (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

#### Cyberattacks impossible – empirics and defenses solve.

Rid, Reader in War Studies at King’s College London, ‘12

[Thomas, author of "Cyber War Will Not Take Place" and co-author of "Cyber-Weapons”, “Think Again: Cyberwar”,

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/27/cyberwar?page=full]

"Cyberwar Is Already Upon Us." No way. "Cyberwar is coming!" John Arquilla and David Ronfeldt predicted in a celebrated Rand paper back in 1993. Since then, it seems to have arrived -at least by the account of the U.S. military establishment, which is busy competing over who should get what share of the fight. Cyberspace is "a domain in which the Air Force flies and fights," Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne claimed in 2006. By 2012, William J. Lynn III, the deputy defense secretary at the time, was writing that cyberwar is "just as critical to military operations as land, sea, air, and space." In January, the Defense Department vowed to equip the U.S. armed forces for "conducting a combined arms campaign across all domains -land, air, maritime, space, and cyberspace." Meanwhile, growing piles of books and articles explore the threats of cyberwarfare, cyberterrorism, and how to survive them. Time for a reality check: Cyberwar is still more hype than hazard. Consider the definition of an act of war: It has to be potentially violent, it has to be purposeful, and it has to be political. The cyberattacks we've seen so far, from Estonia to the Stuxnet virus, simply don't meet these criteria. Take the dubious story of a Soviet pipeline explosion back in 1982, much cited by cyberwar's true believers as the most destructive cyberattack ever. The account goes like this: In June 1982, a Siberian pipeline that the CIA had virtually booby-trapped with a so-called "logic bomb" exploded in a monumental fireball that could be seen from space. The U.S. Air Force estimated the explosion at 3 kilotons, equivalent to a small nuclear device. Targeting a Soviet pipeline linking gas fields in Siberia to European markets, the operation sabotaged the pipeline's control systems with software from a Canadian firm that the CIA had doctored with malicious code. No one died, according to Thomas Reed, a U.S. National Security Council aide at the time who revealed the incident in his 2004 book, At the Abyss; the only harm came to the Soviet economy. But did it really happen? After Reed's account came out, Vasily Pchelintsev, a former KGB head of the Tyumen region, where the alleged explosion supposedly took place, denied the story. There are also no media reports from 1982 that confirm such an explosion, though accidents and pipeline explosions in the Soviet Union were regularly reported in the early 1980s. Something likely did happen, but Reed's book is the only public mention of the incident and his account relied on a single document. Even after the CIA declassified a redacted version of Reed's source, a note on the so-called Farewell Dossier that describes the effort to provide the Soviet Union with defective technology, the agency did not confirm that such an explosion occurred. The available evidence on the Siberian pipeline blast is so thin that it shouldn't be counted as a proven case of a successful cyberattack. Most other commonly cited cases of cyberwar are even less remarkable. Take the attacks on Estonia in April 2007, which came in response to the controversial relocation of a Soviet war memorial, the Bronze Soldier. The well-wired country found itself at the receiving end of a massive distributed denial-of-service attack that emanated from up to 85,000 hijacked computers and lasted three weeks. The attacks reached a peak on May 9, when 58 Estonian websites were attacked at once and the online services of Estonia's largest bank were taken down. "What's the difference between a blockade of harbors or airports of sovereign states and the blockade of government institutions and newspaper websites?" asked Estonian Prime Minister Andrus Ansip. Despite his analogies, the attack was no act of war. It was certainly a nuisance and an emotional strike on the country, but the bank's actual network was not even penetrated; it went down for 90 minutes one day and two hours the next. The attack was not violent, it wasn't purposefully aimed at changing Estonia's behavior, and no political entity took credit for it. The same is true for the vast majority of cyberattacks on record. Indeed, there is no known cyberattack that has caused the loss of human life. No cyberoffense has ever injured a person or damaged a building. And if an act is not at least potentially violent, it's not an act of war. Separating war from physical violence makes it a metaphorical notion; it would mean that there is no way to distinguish between World War II, say, and the "wars" on obesity and cancer. Yet those ailments, unlike past examples of cyber "war," actually do kill people. "A Digital Pearl Harbor Is Only a Matter of Time." Keep waiting. U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta delivered a stark warning last summer: "We could face a cyberattack that could be the equivalent of Pearl Harbor." Such alarmist predictions have been ricocheting inside the Beltway for the past two decades, and some scaremongers have even upped the ante by raising the alarm about a cyber 9/11. In his 2010 book, Cyber War, former White House counterterrorism czar Richard Clarke invokes the specter of nationwide power blackouts, planes falling out of the sky, trains derailing, refineries burning, pipelines exploding, poisonous gas clouds wafting, and satellites spinning out of orbit -events that would make the 2001 attacks pale in comparison. But the empirical record is less hair-raising, even by the standards of the most drastic example available. Gen. Keith Alexander, head of U.S. Cyber Command (established in 2010 and now boasting a budget of more than $3 billion), shared his worst fears in an April 2011 speech at the University of Rhode Island: "What I'm concerned about are destructive attacks," Alexander said, "those that are coming." He then invoked a remarkable accident at Russia's Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric plant to highlight the kind of damage a cyberattack might be able to cause. Shortly after midnight on Aug. 17, 2009, a 900-ton turbine was ripped out of its seat by a so-called "water hammer," a sudden surge in water pressure that then caused a transformer explosion. The turbine's unusually high vibrations had worn down the bolts that kept its cover in place, and an offline sensor failed to detect the malfunction. Seventy-five people died in the accident, energy prices in Russia rose, and rebuilding the plant is slated to cost $1.3 billion. Tough luck for the Russians, but here's what the head of Cyber Command didn't say: The ill-fated turbine had been malfunctioning for some time, and the plant's management was notoriously poor. On top of that, the key event that ultimately triggered the catastrophe seems to have been a fire at Bratsk power station, about 500 miles away. Because the energy supply from Bratsk dropped, authorities remotely increased the burden on the Sayano-Shushenskaya plant. The sudden spike overwhelmed the turbine, which was two months shy of reaching the end of its 30-year life cycle, sparking the catastrophe. If anything, the Sayano-Shushenskaya incident highlights how difficult a devastating attack would be to mount. The plant's washout was an accident at the end of a complicated and unique chain of events. Anticipating such vulnerabilities in advance is extraordinarily difficult even for insiders; creating comparable coincidences from cyberspace would be a daunting challenge at best for outsiders. If this is the most drastic incident Cyber Command can conjure up, perhaps it's time for everyone to take a deep breath. "Cyberattacks Are Becoming Easier." Just the opposite. U.S. Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper warned last year that the volume of malicious software on American networks had more than tripled since 2009 and that more than 60,000 pieces of malware are now discovered every day. The United States, he said, is undergoing "a phenomenon known as 'convergence,' which amplifies the opportunity for disruptive cyberattacks, including against physical infrastructures." ("Digital convergence" is a snazzy term for a simple thing: more and more devices able to talk to each other, and formerly separate industries and activities able to work together.) Just because there's more malware, however, doesn't mean that attacks are becoming easier. In fact, potentially damaging or life-threatening cyberattacks should be more difficult to pull off. Why? Sensitive systems generally have built-in redundancy and safety systems, meaning an attacker's likely objective will not be to shut down a system, since merely forcing the shutdown of one control system, say a power plant, could trigger a backup and cause operators to start looking for the bug. To work as an effective weapon, malware would have to influence an active process -but not bring it to a screeching halt. If the malicious activity extends over a lengthy period, it has to remain stealthy. That's a more difficult trick than hitting the virtual off-button. Take Stuxnet, the worm that sabotaged Iran's nuclear program in 2010. It didn't just crudely shut down the centrifuges at the Natanz nuclear facility; rather, the worm subtly manipulated the system. Stuxnet stealthily infiltrated the plant's networks, then hopped onto the protected control systems, intercepted input values from sensors, recorded these data, and then provided the legitimate controller code with pre-recorded fake input signals, according to researchers who have studied the worm. Its objective was not just to fool operators in a control room, but also to circumvent digital safety and monitoring systems so it could secretly manipulate the actual processes. Building and deploying Stuxnet required extremely detailed intelligence about the systems it was supposed to compromise, and the same will be true for other dangerous cyberweapons. Yes, "convergence," standardization, and sloppy defense of control-systems software could increase the risk of generic attacks, but the same trend has also caused defenses against the most coveted targets to improve steadily and has made reprogramming highly specific installations on legacy systems more complex, not less.

#### Risk of solar storms even happening is 7% and federal action being taken now

Zabarenko 12 [Deborah, Solar Storm Could Knock Out U.S. Power, Weather.com, http://www.weather.com/news/solar-superstorm-power-grid-20120806]

WASHINGTON -- U.S. weather has been lousy this year, with droughts, heat and killer storms. But a solar superstorm could be far worse.¶ A monster blast of geomagnetic particles from the sun could destroy 300 or more of the 2,100 high-voltage transformers that are the backbone of the U.S. electric grid, according to the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). Even a few hundred destroyed transformers could disable the entire interconnected system.¶ There is impetus for a group of federal agencies to look for ways to prepare for such a storm this year as the sun moves into an active period called solar maximum, expected to peak in 2013.¶ Some U.S. experts estimate as much as a 7 percent chance of a superstorm in the next decade, which seems a slight risk, but the effects would be so wide-ranging -- akin to a major meteorite strike -- that it has drawn official concern.¶ Although the likelihood of this kind of geomagnetic storm, like a big hit from a space rock, is extremely low, its impact would be great. By comparison, the probability of a large meteorite hitting Earth is at some fraction of 1 percent.

#### Solar is already cheaper than fossil fuels NOW – their ev is based on flawed, outdated studies – SQ solves the aff

Trabish 11 [Herman, New Study: Solar Grid Parity Is Here Today: A definitive new LCOE study says solar has achieved parity, GreenTechMedia, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/New-Study-Solar-Grid-Parity-Is-Here-Today]

Solar materials prices are down, financing is more accessible and technology has extended solar system life. The result: The price of solar energy-generated electricity, calculated by a legitimate levelized cost of energy (LCOE) method, is now competitive in many regions with the price of electricity generated by conventional sources.¶ To be clear, this review of solar photovoltaic LCOE is not one of those “if coal and nuclear paid for the real harm they do” analyses. It is a hard look at the actual numbers.¶ The study’s biggest surprise, said co-author Joshua Pearce, Materials Science and Mechanical Engineering Professor at Queen’s University and Michigan Technological University, was how much outdated information and misinformation there is about the price of residential and small/medium system solar energy. “We have reached a tipping point,” he said. “Solar has gone past grid parity.”

### Natural Gas

#### No recession 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.

#### 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. 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.

#### TURN: the plan increases energy prices – Subsidies create price bubbles

Gerdin 11 (Erik Gerding, Associate Professor at University of Colorado Law School. His research interests include securities, banking law, financial regulation generally, and corporate governance, “The Inherent, Ineluctable Instability of Financial Institution Regulation”, <http://www.theconglomerate.org/2011/09/the-inherent-ineluctable-instability-of-financial-institution-regulation.html>, September 12, 2011)

Here is my second contribution to the Faculty Lounge Online Forum on the legislative and regulatory process of financial reform. Check out the posts by the other contributors including, Kim Krawiec (Duke), Christie Ford (Univ. British Columbia), Brett McDonnell (Minnesota), Saule Omarova (North Carolina), and Dan Schwarz (Minnesota). In my last post, I concluded that the presence of government subsidies – particularly guarantees explicit (deposit insurance) and implicit (Too-Big-To-Fail) – makes the political economy of financial institution regulation different from other areas of the regulatory state. In this post, I argue that these government subsidies and moreover, the underlying reason for government subsidies, contributes to the inherent instability of financial institution regulation. The presence of government guarantees – explicit or implicit – creates strong incentives for financial firms to externalize the cost of their risk taking onto taxpayers. But there is more to government guarantees than moral hazard. Consider the following: Market distortion: When the government subsidizes some financial firms but not others, it distorts the market. A lower cost of capital allows the subsidized firms to undercut their competition. This can drive competitors either out of business or, if risk is being mispriced because of an asset boom, into riskier market segments (a phenomena I explored in a symposium piece). Cheaper debt and leverage: Government guarantees also. make debt cheaper than equity This supercharges the incentives of financial firms to increase leverage. Higher leverage of financial institutions, in turn, works to increase the effective supply of money. More money can fuel asset price bubbles and mask the mispricing of risk (phenomena explored by Margaret Blair in this paper, as well as by me in a forthcoming symposium piece in the Berkeley Business Law Journal.) Cheaper debt and regulatory capital arbitrage: Cheaper debt also supercharges financial firm incentives to game regulatory capital requirements (something I am writing about in the context of the shadow banking system. See also Jones; Acharya & Schnabl; Acharya & Richardson. Bailouts and correlated risk: Governments face pressure to bail out firms when their risk taking is highly correlated (because multiple firms will fail at the same time). On the flip side, this creates a strong incentive for financial firms to take on correlated risk. (See, e.g., Acharya et al.). Correlated risk taking reinforces the kind of herding that behavioral finance scholars have analyzed in the context of asset price bubbles. So feedback loops abound. What to do, then, about government subsidies? “Stop us before we bail out again” One approach is to erect barriers to the government providing subsidies and bailouts. Dodd-Frank is chock full o’ provisions that aim to do just this. But legal scholars need to give policymakers a dose of reality about the ability of law to hardwire “no bailouts, no subsidies.” I just came back from a conference last week in which a number of economists kept saying that this hardwiring was exactly what law needed to contribute to financial reform. Here is how some of the law professors in the room (including your friend and mine Anna Gelpern) responded: 1. Legal rules are by nature incomplete and, under pressure, firms and regulators will seek ways around rules. 2. It ain’t so easy for a sovereign to bind itself. In the end, what is the remedy and who will enforce it? 3. There is nothing to stop Congress from amending the law. Legislatures can’t entrench laws against amendments by future legislatures (although the government must honor contractual obligations – for a discussion of these issues, see U.S. v. Winstar) True, Dodd-Frank’s prohibitions on bailouts and governments are not just pieces of paper. Law does constrain government behavior to a degree and can promote political accountability. However, we should not expect “law” to work like a wind-up toy that is self-executing without worrying about issues of interpretation, compliance, incentives, and the norms of government actors. I restrained myself at the conference from delivering a little legal koan: “the law will bind government officials, if they believe it binds them.” As an aside: it strikes me that the legal academy has to do a much better job of educating economists, policy makers and the public about what is “law” and how it operates. We have to do this in an accessible manner and without undermining important norms of legal compliance. Financial reform proposals are replete with calls for more “automatic regulations” – whether to counter capture or political pressure to spike the economic punch when the party gets startin’. (For example, economists have proposed the very sensible policy of counter-cyclical capital buffers) But fetishizing automatic regulations can pervert financial regulation. Over-reliance on automatic regulation: Ignores the fact that regulators and lawmakers must interpret laws; and Discounts the likelihood or regulatory arbitrage or regulatory evasion. In short, we need to have a much richer discussion of what the “law in action” means. Letting it Burn: Confusing Bailouts with Other Externalities of Financial Institution Risk-Taking What if restrictions on bailouts and government guarantees work too well? There is a rationale for government interventions like deposit insurance, lender-of-last resort, and bailouts. They are not just about “capture.” Financial institution failure can impose significant negative externalities (which is a fairly antiseptic description of the social costs of financial crises). Counterparty and market discipline don’t force firms to internalize all of these externalities. I respect the intellectual consistency and fervor of those who believe that bailouts and government interventions are the root of all financial regulatory problems. But I wouldn’t trust them in any position of responsibility. Deposit insurance and bailouts aren’t the only ways governments distort markets when they act to avoid crises. Lender-of-last resort actions and even interest rates changes can create a type of moral hazard (see “Put, Greenspan”). It is a lot harder for central banks to calibrate liquidity responses to market seizures than armchair critics think. Countering Subsidies So if some government subsidization of the financial firms is inevitable, it is critical that the government counter these subsidies -- whether by limiting firm risk-taking or charging firms for the subsidy. Absent attempts to counter subsidies, we are right back where this post started – moral hazard, distortion, cheap debt --> leverage and capital arbitrage.

#### TURN: Picking winners bad—distorts the market, causes trade-offs, and undermines innovation

De Rugy 12 (Veronique, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center, "Assessing the Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program", 6/19 mercatus.org/publication/assessing-department-energy-loan-guarantee-program)

This government involvement can distort the market signals further. For instance, the data shows that private investors tend to congregate toward government guarantee projects, independently of the merits of the projects, taking capital away from unsubsidized projects that have a better probability of success without subsidy and a more viable business plan. As the Government Accountability Office noted, “Guarantees would make projects [the federal government] assists financially more attractive to private capital than conservation projects not backed by federal guarantees. Thus both its loans and its guarantees will siphon private capital away.”[25] This reallocation of resources by private investors away from viable projects may even take place within the same industry—that is, one green energy project might trade off with another, more viable green energy project. More importantly, once the government subsidizes a portion of the market, the object of the subsidy becomes a safe asset. Safety in the market, however, often means low return on investments, which is likely to turn venture capitalists away. As a result, capital investments will likely dry out and innovation rates will go down.[26] In fact, the data show that in cases in which the federal government introduced few distortions, private investors were more than happy to take risks and invest their money even in projects that required high initial capital requirements. The Alaska pipeline project, for instance, was privately financed at the cost of $35 billion, making it one of the most expensive energy projects undertaken by private enterprise.[27] The project was ultimately abandoned in 2011 because of weak customer demand and the development of shale gas resources outside Alaska.28 However, this proves that the private sector invests money even when there is a chance that it could lose it. Private investment in U.S. clean energy totaled $34 billion in 2010, up 51 percent from the previous year.[29] Finally, when the government picks winners and losers in the form of a technology or a company, it often fails. First, the government does not have perfect or even better information or technology advantage over private agents. In addition, decision-makers are insulated from market signals and won’t learn important and necessary lessons about the technology or what customers want. Second, the resources that the government offers are so addictive that companies may reorient themselves away from producing what customers want, toward pleasing the government officials.

#### 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

#### Net Metering is the best approach to decentralize the grid

Ferrey 3 [Steven, Visiting Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, spring 2003; Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School, NOTHING BUT NET: RENEWABLE ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT, MIDAMERICAN LEGAL FICTIONS, AND SUPREMACY DOCTRINE, Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 1-2]

With state governments at the barricades of federalism, an energy revolution has been launched. Perhaps usurping federal law,¶ thirty-eight states recently mounted a statutory and regulatory charge¶ to establish “net metering,” a regulatory innovation to implement decentralized¶ renewable power. This innovation fundamentally shifts¶ the regulatory balance as well as the energy mix in America. Net metering¶ profoundly reshapes the energy landscape, providing the most significant boost of any policy tool at any level of government—both¶ qualitatively and quantitatively—to decentralize and “green” American¶ energy sources.¶ While only twelve states have passed statutory initiatives to implement¶ renewable energy system benefit charges and eight have¶ elected to implement renewable portfolio standards,1 thirty-six states¶ to date have implemented net metering.2 Net metering enables consumers with small generating facilities, for example solar panels, fuel cells, or wind turbine systems, to offset their electric bills with any excess power produced at their facility, running the retail utility meter backwards when the renewable energy generator funnels power to the grid. Net billing, or net metering, is the cornerstone of state energy¶ policies encouraging private investment in renewable energy¶ sources.3¶ Net metering can pay the eligible renewable energy source approximately¶ four times more for this power than paid to any other independent¶ generators and much more than the time-dependent value¶ of this power to the purchasing utility. A 400% price advantage over¶ the competition provides a nationwide platform in thirty-six states—¶ including all of the major states—to launch a revolution in renewable and decentralized energy production.

#### The AFF does not solve startup costs – Section 1603 cash grants are given as refunds

Novogradac 2011 [Michael, CPA, “Washington Wire: Tax Credits are More Efficient Than Cash Grants, Novogradic Journal of Tax Credits, p. 4]

In any event, it is important to note that under Section 1603 the cash grant structure very closely mimics the tax¶ credit structure because rather than being an upfront¶ payment, the Section 1603 cash grant is awarded after¶ placement in service and is a function of qualifying basis.¶ In this way, the Section 1603 grant acts more like a refundable¶ tax credit than a traditional cash grant program.

#### And, Congress wants to turn Section 1603 into the PTC and ITC they criticize – it will be implemented this way because the plan doesn’t specify

Novogradac 2011 [Michael, CPA, “Washington Wire: Tax Credits are More Efficient Than Cash Grants, Novogradic Journal of Tax Credits, p. 4]

In fact, efforts to extend the program have taken this¶ even further by proposing to adopt a refundable tax¶ credit structure rather than proposing a simple extension¶ of the existing Section 1603 program. Rep. Earl¶ Blumenauer, D-Ore., last year proposed H.R. 4599, the¶ Renewable Energy Expansion Act, which would make¶ several technical improvements to the underlying Section¶ 1603 grant program that would result in a grant¶ program that more closely resembles the PTC and ITC.

#### Section 1603 only repays within 60 days *after* completion of the project

Solar Nation 2011 [http://www.solarnation.com/federal-incentives.html]

The federal government has created a number of programs to encourage the adoption of solar power. Solar Nation identifies federal incentives that are available for our customers and prepares all paperwork necessary to qualify. When combined with state and local incentives, including exemptions from property and sales tax and Solar Renewable Energy Credits (SREC), these federal incentives typically effectively help underwrite the cost of installing large solar-electric system by as much as 100%, allowing for returns on investment of 15%-25%.¶ Federal Renewable Energy Grant¶ 30% of solar property that is part of a qualified solar property.¶ Paid within 60 days of project completion from U.S. Treasury¶ Available for entities with no tax liability¶ Summary of Federal 1603 Grant Program¶ Federal 1603 Grant Program is available for property for which construction commences prior to the end of 2011.¶ Section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (“ARRA") created a cash grant equal to the value of the ITC, payable within 60 days of a completed installation of an eligible solar generation property and a completed grant application (“Treasury Grant” or “1603 Grant”). A taxpayer may choose to take the ITC pursuant to Section 48 or the 1603 Grant, but cannot claim both.¶ The grant is equal to 30% of the basis of the solar energy property, with eligible solar-energy property including equipment that uses solar energy to generate electricity.¶ The 1603 Grant is not included in the Federal gross income of the taxpayer. However, the basis of the property for depreciation purposes is reduced by 50% of the grant. State tax treatment of the grant and depreciation amounts vary, so separate analysis of those items will be necessary for state tax purposes.¶ Only tax-paying entities are eligible for the 1603 Grant. Federal, state and local government entities and other non-profits are not eligible to receive this grant, except in cases where the ineligible party only owns an indirect partnership interest in the applicant through a taxable C corporation. Grant applications must be submitted by October 1, 2011.¶ Grants are available for eligible property placed into service by December 31, 2011 , or placed into service by 2016, if construction began in 2009, 2010 or 2011. The guidelines include a “safe harbor” provision that sets the beginning of construction at the point where the applicant has incurred or paid at least 5% of the total cost of the property, excluding land and certain preliminary planning activities. Alternatively, construction will be considered to be qualified if “physical work of a significant nature” has occurred.¶ Recapture rules for the grant apply in a similar manner as with the investment tax credit. If the taxpayer disposes of the property within 5 years of the property being placed in service a portion of the grant must be repaid.

#### 3. Lawmakers like the CP – doesn’t impose new taxes or spending

Ferrey 3 [Steven, Visiting Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, spring 2003; Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School, NOTHING BUT NET: RENEWABLE ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT, MIDAMERICAN LEGAL FICTIONS, AND SUPREMACY DOCTRINE, Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 119]

Moreover, net metering implementation is achieved not by raising taxes or creating a new line item charge on the utility bill, but¶ merely by establishing an accounting practice for power producers¶ that is invisible to the typical ratepayer, no doubt accounting for its¶ popularity with state lawmakers. Net metering and billing works by¶ causing the regulated utility to pay or credit more than the established¶ wholesale price for power, even if it does not need power at¶ that time of day. No retail consumer ever sees this transfer payment¶ except the individual customer/generator who benefits from it.¶ If electricity were any other energy form, such as natural gas or¶ oil, its energy value could be saved and conserved. Oil and gas can be¶ stored in the system without significant diminution. However, electricity¶ is a unique energy form: It cannot be stored or conserved with¶ any efficiency. Therefore, electricity has substantially different value¶ at different hours of the day, different seasons of the year, and at different¶ places in the utility system.

#### 5. Our link isn’t about renewables – it’s GOP opposition to handouts. This is a clear link distinction between the plan and CP

Demirjian 2012 [Karoun, Reid: State must act to ‘realize its renewable energy potential,’ Las Vegas Sun, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/mar/12/reid-state-must-act-realize-its-renewable-energy-p/]

WASHINGTON - Sen. Harry Reid issued a report today noting Nevada’s renewable energy accomplishments and highlighting where he thinks the state industry can go.¶ The 18-page report is mostly a review of facts and figures, and synopses about each of the six major, federally backed renewable energy projects under construction in the Silver State.¶ But it’s also a platform for Reid, and highlights his planned focus over the next year promoting renewable energy-related programs and tax incentives in Congress.¶ The project that receives the most attention is a renewal of the Section 1603 tax credit program, that lets project developers monetize tax credits into a cash grant to invest in their project. The program, which helped finance a number of renewable energy projects in Nevada while it was ongoing, expired at the end of last year.¶ An extension of that program is coming up for a vote in the Senate Tuesday, as an amendment to the transportation bill currently under consideration – but getting enough support for the extension will be an uphill battle.¶ “The challenge then for Nevada is to beat back these short-sighted attacks so we can build on our successes,” Reid said Monday in a call formally unveiling the bill.¶ Congress’s appetite for federal renewable energy investments, once a huge part of the stimulus bill, has waned. While most Republicans aren’t opposed to renewable energy per se, they question whether the federal government should be underwriting the industry.

#### 6. CP doesn’t link - Republicans want to repeal all energy subsidies and stop picking winners

CNS News 12 (http://cnsnews.com/news/article/gop-congressmen-gov-t-should-stop-picking-winners-and-losers-energy-sector)

(CNSNews.com) – Several Republican leaders in the Senate and House spoke about their legislation to repeal all tax subsidies to the energy industry on Thursday, stating that government should not be in the business of “picking winners and losers” but should instead seek to ensure a level playing field for all competitors.¶ At a Capitol Hill press conference with Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.), Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah), and Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wisc.), House Rep. Mike Pompeo (R-Kan.) introduced his legislation, which mirrors that currently in the Senate, to repeal all energy tax credits.¶ The federal government must “stop picking winners and losers, stop supporting multi-million dollar, billion -dollar boondoggles, things like Solyndra, companies that simply can’t survive in the marketplace on their own,” said Sen. Johnson.¶ Rep. Pompeo said, “We have been uniform and broad and favor no one. We are literally trying to get the federal government’s tax code out of the business of picking winners and losers.”¶ “It’s time for these industries to compete, to enter their products into the marketplace, and convince customers that the energy that they provide is something that they can afford and they want,” he said.

#### No impact to loss of biodiversity – empirically proven.

**Lomborg**, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, **‘1**

[Bjorn, “The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World”,

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/lomborg2.htm>]

Third, that threat of biodiversity loss is real, but exaggerated. Most early estimates used simple island models that linked a loss in habitat with a loss of biodiversity. A rule-of-thumb indicated that loss of 90% of forest meant a 50% loss of species. As rainforests seemed to be cut at alarming rates, estimates of annual species loss of 20,000-100,000 abounded. Many people expected the number of species to fall by half globally within a generation or two. However, the data simply does not bear out these predictions. In the eastern United States, forests were reduced over two centuries to fragments totalling just 1-2% of their original area, yet this resulted in the extinction of only one forest bird. In Puerto Rico, the primary forest area has been reduced over the past 400 years by 99%, yet “only” seven of 60 species of bird has become extinct. All but 12% of the Brazilian Atlantic rainforest was cleared in the 19th century, leaving only scattered fragments. According to the rule-of-thumb, half of all its species should have become extinct. Yet, when the World Conservation Union and the Brazilian Society of Zoology analysed all 291 known Atlantic forest animals, none could be declared extinct. Species, therefore, seem more resilient than expected. And tropical forests are not lost at annual rates of 2-4%, as many environmentalists have claimed: the latest UN figures indicate a loss of less than 0.5%.

#### Too many alt causes to solve for bioD.

Pynn 7

[Larry, staff writer at The Vancouver Sun, “Global warming not biggest threat: expert,” *The Vancouver Sun*,

http://www2.canada.com/vancouversun/news/story.html?id=6e2988da-31ab-4697-810d-7a008306d571&p=1]

"We all worry about climate change, as we should, but it doesn't mean we shouldn't worry about protecting habitat," says James Grant, a biology professor at Concordia University in Montreal and co-author of a new report on threats to endangered species in Canada. "The really immediate causes right now for many species are things like farming, urbanization and habitat loss caused by the direct things we do." Research by Grant and his pupils shows the biggest threat is habitat loss at 84 per cent, overexploitation 32 per cent, native species interactions 31 per cent, natural causes 27 per cent, pollution 26 per cent, and introduced species 22 per cent. On average, species are threatened by at least two of the six categories. Human activities representing the biggest source of habitat loss and pollution are not industrial resource extraction, but agriculture at 46 per cent and urbanization at 44 per cent. "Farming is huge," Grant said in an interview. "The Prairies are one of the most affected habitats in the world. We've turned them into wheat fields." The southern Okanagan-Similkameen is another example, home to about one-third of species at risk in B.C. as well as a thriving agricultural industry, including vineyards, and increased urban development.

#### Economic consensus against winner picking---we have experts on our side---only the CP addresses a specific market failure

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

The final issue of disagreement that remains is the question of market failure. We have argued that government intervention to promote renewable energy only makes sense if market prices for energy are “wrong.” We follow with the contention that, if prices are found to be wrong for some reason (say, by not including the cost of the environmental damages associated with energy consumption), the best and most appropriate remedy is to correct the price and then leave markets alone. Joe responds by arguing that this is hard-line libertarian ideology disconnected from observable reality and that government can indeed make better decisions about what to invest in than can market actors left to their own devices … even when market prices are “correct.” ¶ This, we believe, is the real nub of the disagreement between us and Joe. More accurately, this is the real nub of the disagreement between economists and Joe. Our contention that market actors, as a general matter, outperform government planners and that government cannot improve on market performance unless it is correcting an identifiable market failure is not a matter of hard-line libertarian ideology. It is a matter of broad agreement among economists everywhere. Even Nobel laureate and liberal economist par excellance Paul Krugman would not disagree. Hence, Joe is declaring intellectual war on an entire academic discipline – economics – not on libertarianism (which is, in fact, about other things).

#### Government empirically fails in the energy sector

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

Ever since World War II, Washington has periodically promised that synthetic oil was on the horizon and that government could and should deliver what the market mysteriously would not. Again, a half century later, we’re still confronting claims that yet one more government stab at the synthetic energy wagon will produce affordable energy despite at least four separate mad crash programs coming to naught in the past.¶ In the 1970s, government preferences for solar energy were sold as a means of delivering us unto a low-cost solar energy economy. Now, solar has a trivial market share and has been all but forgotten in our rush to wind power despite a repeat of the same promises. ¶ People like Joe were once head-over-heals in love with corn ethanol and attested to the need to move heaven-and-earth to deliver that fuel to the market. Today, the evidence has mounted that corn ethanol will never be economically competitive with oil, cannot displace oil in any significant manner, and is almost certainly a worse conventional air and greenhouse gas pollutant than even gasoline.¶ Over the past two decades, government has launch a dizzying array of frenetic programs to reinvent the car: first, to produce cars run largely upon battery electric power (California’s Zero Emission Vehicle program); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by conventional internal combustion engines that could get 70 or more miles per gallon (Clinton’s “Partnership for a New ¶ Generation of Vehicles); then, to produce an auto fleet run on hydrogen powered fuel cells (Bush’s “Freedom Car” initiative); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by cellulosic ethanol (the so-called switch-grass initiative), and now, to produce an auto fleet made up of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Every year or two, either the Congress or the President can be reliably expected to come up with some bright new idea to redesign the car and launch a program to translate new wish into new reality. We’re sure more fads will come even while acknowledging that pure chance may eventually prove one of these investment frenzies to be worthwhile.¶ During the 1990s, state legislatures thought they knew best how to structure electricity markets. The result were game-able systems in California and elsewhere that bear no resemblance to the sort of market that might have arisen had government not dictated politically favored industry blueprints to power companies. ¶ The above list could go on and on, but we must leave a comprehensive exegesis of government energy failure for another day. Suffice it to say that the observation that markets are not always right about what constitutes a “good” investment is correct but insufficient. One must also find that governments can be reliably expected to do better. And there is no evidence in theory or practice that this is the case … particularly in energy markets.

### Solvency

#### No Solvency – storage cost barrier

Maryniak 12 [Gregg, Chairman of the Energy and Environmental Systems Track of Singularity University and the Secretary of the X PRIZE Foundation, “Storage, Not Generation, is the Challenge to Renewable Energy,” Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/singularity/2012/07/20/storage-not-generation-is-the-challenge-to-renewable-energy/]

If solar and wind power are to break out of their present tiny niche positions, they will need to achieve systems parity with traditional energy supplies. This means that the cost of conversion plus the cost of storage will have to be similar to the cost of providing energy on demand from the energy stored in chemical or nuclear fuels. You can find some pretty shrill Internet rhetoric suggesting that the requirement for power on-demand (what the industry calls “baseload power”) is an irrelevant argument concocted by “renewables deniers.” But the reality is that many solar energy pioneers themselves say that solar power will be severely limited in market penetration, unless competent energy storage is developed. Our present fixation with energy generation ignores the “time value of energy.” Instead of concentrating all of our efforts on generation we need to pay increased attention to energy storage. Only after the cost of generation and storage of renewable energy matches the cost of on-demand generation from fossil, nuclear and hydro we will we see a transformation of the energy industry.

### Grid

#### No risk of sabotage - their internal link is based on flawed topological models.

Page, ‘10

[Lewis Page, “Power grid scare stories a 'bunch of hooey',” The Register, 13th October 2010, http://www.theregister.co.uk/2010/10/13/leccy\_grid\_strike\_hooey/]

There have been a lot of scare stories in the media about electrical power grids in recent times, suggesting that it would be a simple matter to bring down a national transmission system by way of a minor cyber attack or physical sabotage—thereby bringing that nation's infrastructure to a grinding halt. There's just one problem with that idea: it's "a bunch of hooey," according to power-engineering boffin Seth Blumsack. Blumsack and his colleagues were moved to look into the matter of deliberate power-grid crashing after recent papers and studies in hefty journals—including some briefed to US politicians—painted a grim picture earlier this year. The perception was that making a targeted strike on a relatively minor electrical installation such as a neighbourhood substation (by bomb, arson or electronic/network sabotage) could easily bring down the whole grid to which it was attached. According to Blumsack and his fellow 'leccy boffins Eduardo Cotilla-Sanchez and Ed Hines, the alarmist analyses are based on a particular type of mathematical modelling of power grids—so-called "topological" models. "Some modellers have gotten so fascinated with these abstract networks that they've ignored the physics of how things actually work," Hines says. "This can lead you grossly astray." Blumsack, Hines and Cotilla-Sanchez decided to contrast the performance of a topological model with one based on actual physics—specifically on Ohm's and Kirchoff's Laws governing the flow of electricity in the real world. They tried out both kinds of model on an accurate representation of the North American Eastern Interconnect, the largest and one of the most trouble-prone portions of the US grid, using real-world data from a test case generated in 2005. The three engineers say that the physics-driven model was much closer to reality, and that this verifies what physics models show. The results showed that in fact it is major grid components through which a lot of power flows—big generating stations and massive transformers—which are the main points of vulnerability, not the minor installations scattered across the country. It isn't so much that a minor event on a minor line or installation can't crash the network: such things do happen. But in general there have to be huge numbers of such minor events before one of them happens to hit the miracle weak point and bring everything down. It would be an impossible task for terrorists or other malefactors to know in advance just where and when a minor pinprick could cause massive effects. "Our system is quite robust to small things failing," says Hines. Hitting a bigger installation or link, which would generally be better secured and more resilient, would be much more likely to work. Even then a well-resourced terror or sabotage unit with the ability to knock out bigger grid components would struggle to take down the whole thing as it is still very difficult to know exactly where and when to strike. "It takes an incredible amount of information," says Hines, "to really figure out how to make the grid fail."

### Natural Gas

#### 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.
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### Politics

#### Turns both advantages – CIR is key to econ and manage security threats.

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.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**2012** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war.

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

#### 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.

#### issue selection is key --- he can only get momentum if he starts with an issue like immigration where the public mood is changing. Overreaching with an unpopular issue empirically triggers backlash.

Hirsh, 2/7 --- Chief correspondent (2/7/2013, Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital; The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)>)

Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories.

In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.

Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### Missteps undermine capital more than victories replenish it

Anderson, 5 --- Phd candidate in Philosophy at Ohio State (William David, THE PRESIDENT’S AGENDA: POSITION-TAKING, LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT, AND THE PERSISTENCE OF TIME, DISSERTATION, Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University, <http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi/Anderson%20William%20David.pdf?osu1123169358>)

Expansionism and Protectionism

Besides policy congruence and taking advantage of policy windows, presidents build their personal skills while solidifying in their own minds the risks they are willing to accept as they take positions on bills and lobby before Congress. Like members of the House (Fenno 1978), presidents move through expansionist and protectionist periods during their administrations, with expansionist periods more likely to immediately follow the election when political capital is high and legislative deference more common. The president’s coalition is larger, and he has more latitude to even further expand that coalition—a tactic that may serve him well during the next electoral cycle. Presidential capital, however, erodes over time: a president’s mistakes during the term erode political capital more than victories replenish it, and activist presidents expose themselves to greater “capital risk” § Marked 15:38 § than reticent executives. Thus, the president’s accumulated legislative record from earlier in the term may harm his legislative and electoral chances later in the term (Light 1999). The early months of the first Clinton term illustrate how difficult it is to seize on the momentum elections provide. Clinton’s struggles with health care reform and his missteps with peripheral issues—that eventually harmed agenda items more germane to his presidential platform—suggest how important early presidential momentum is in shaping subsequent relations between Congress and the president.

#### GOP would still the plan as wasteful spending and foreign aid

FoxNews 1-17 [US taxpayers giving $4B to foreign firms for green energy projects, study says, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/17/us-taxpayers-giving-4b-to-foreign-firms-for-green-energy-projects-study-says/#ixzz2Lg97ySPr]

U.S. taxpayers have forked over nearly $4 billion to foreign-owned companies as part of a stimulus program that pays cash grants to green-energy firms, according to a newly released congressional report. ¶ The report from Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce Committee charged that the Treasury Department-administered program has "failed" in its goal of putting Americans to work. ¶ "Billions of dollars have filled the coffers of overseas firms while the evidence of the promised permanent jobs and economic growth here in the United States is scarce," the report said. ¶ The program is separate from the Energy Department fund that gave nearly $530 million to failed solar panel firm Solyndra. ¶ This one sprung out of the 2009 stimulus package, and offers cash payments to alternative energy companies worth 30 percent of any given project's cost. The money is available for everything from solar to wind to geothermal to fuel cell projects. ¶ According to the report, though, nearly one-quarter of the $16 billion approved to date has been for U.S. subsidiaries of foreign firms. The money went to several Spain-based companies, as well as those in Japan, Germany, France and Italy. ¶ Nearly $1.8 billion, for example, went to various wind energy projects across the country under the U.S. division of Spain's Iberdrola Renewables, according to the study. ¶ Republican lawmakers say the program is effectively aiding foreign competitors, with money the U.S. government arguably does not have. ¶ "With $16 trillion in debt, we cannot afford to send one out of every four taxpayer dollars overseas for a program that has failed to create the jobs promised," Rep. Fred Upton, R-Mich., chairman of the committee, said in a statement.

#### GOP empirically opposes the plan - filibuster

Kraemer 2010 [Susan, Republicans Kill Section 1603 Renewable Energy Cash Grants, http://cleantechnica.com/2010/12/04/republicans-kill-section-1603-renewable-energy-cash-grants/#8rp0m6JqVXpsxVfI.99]

As part of pushing for tax cuts for the rich, today Republicans filibustered (would not allow an up or down vote on) the Baucus Amendment that would have extended the deadline for solar projects to get a 30% cash grant. Previous story: Solar Cash Grant Extension to be in Saturday’s Tax Cut Vote!¶ Here’s some of the renewable energy tax provisions, that congress could have had a chance to vote up or down, if the GOP had not filibustered the entire bill, rather than let the Bush era tax cuts for the rich expire.¶ Baucus Amendment 4727: To change the end date from 2010, by extending till December 2011:¶ 1. Section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act – cash in lieu of tax credit for businesses not making a profit and unable to take the 30% tax credit¶ 2. Tax credits for heavy hybrid and natural gas vehicles and a 30% investment tax credit for alternative fuel refueling stations.¶ 3. Tax breaks for ethanol, 36 cents a gallon for blenders, and 8 cents a gallon for small producers. A 54 cents per gallon tariff on ethanol imports.¶ 4. A $1-per-gallon production tax credit for biodiesel and biomass diesel and the small agri-biodiesel producer credit of 10 cents per gallon extended through 2011.¶ 5. A 50-cent-per-gallon tax credit for biomass and other alternative fuels.¶ 6. Tax credits for energy-efficient appliances and homes.¶ 8. Adding $2.5 billion in funding for Section 48C the advanced energy manufacturing 30% tax credit for companies manufacturing advanced clean energy products and materials.¶ 9. Reinstating the Research and Development tax credit.¶ If the entire bill had not been filibustered all Senators would get up or down votes on each of these. The vote to take votes (cloture) on the Baucus Amendment got 53 votes. It needed 60 to get over the usual Republican filibuster.

#### Plan is controversial -- Senate is evenly split

Lillian 2012 [Jessica, U.S. Senate Rejects Amendment To Extend Section 1603 Program, http://www.solarindustrymag.com/e107\_plugins/content/content.php?content.9893#.UQ30JB3XYdg]

An amendment proposed by Sen. Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., that would have extended the U.S. Department of Treasury's Section 1603 program and other renewable energy tax incentives failed to receive approval from the U.S. Senate. Stabenow's legislation sought to revive the Section 1603 program and other incentives via an amendment to the Surface Transportation Bill (S.1813), legislation focusing on highway improvements. Her amendment - known as amendment #1812 (Energy Tax Extenders) - needed to receive 60 votes in order to be included in S.1813. However, it received just 49 votes. (The full vote breakdown, by senator, is available here.)

#### 1603 is perceived as stimulus, causes backlash

Ryan 2011 [Margaret, Tax Break Tactics Divide Renewable Industry, http://energy.aol.com/2011/08/31/tax-break-tactics-divide-renewable-industry/]

The Stimulus Backlash. But Rhone Resch, executive director of the Solar Energy Industries Association, said the option for conversion was already under discussion in Congress, and had bipartisan support, when it was attached to the stimulus bill as Section 1603.¶ Now, Resch said, its extension chances are being harmed by the Congressional backlash against anything "stimulus."¶ "In reality, it costs very little and delivers huge resources," Resch said, noting a Bipartisan Policy Center study that found Section 1603 made the ITC "twice as efficient as a tax credit alone." Under the section, he said, solar projects in 45 states have leveraged more than $4 billion in private money. Solar manufacturing and construction supports some 45,000 jobs, he said.

#### Obama gets the blame - attempts to deflect to other policymakers fail

Nicholas and Hook 10 (Peter and Janet, Tribune Washington Bureau, July 30, "Obama the Velcro president", http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730)jn

Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC’s “The View,” drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. “Stylistically, he creates some of those problems,” Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. “His favorite pronoun is ‘I.’ When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn’t get fixed or things happen.” A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable – such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Il.) said: “The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It’s naïve to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office.”