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### 1

#### 1. CIR will pass now

Roll Call 2/6 (Jonathan Strong, covers House leadership for Roll Call. He previously served as an investigative reporter for the Daily Caller, http://www.rollcall.com/news/democrats\_see\_hopeful\_signals\_from\_republicans\_on\_immigration-222229-1.html)

LEESBURG, Va. — Top Democrats are walking a fine line in assessing the GOP’s signals on an immigration overhaul, both criticizing what they described as tepid steps forward by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor while praising what Republicans privately say they will be willing to do.¶ At a speech billed as a rebranding of the GOP’s image, the Virginia Republican said he would support citizenship for young people brought to the country illegally as children.¶ But Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra called the shift small potatoes.¶ “Been there, done that. We’ve moved on. I think the American people have moved on. It’s great that our Republican colleagues are catching up,” the California lawmaker said at a news conference here, where House Democrats are gathered for a retreat over the next two days.¶ But Becerra, who is part of a secretive bipartisan working group on the topic that includes several conservative Republican lawmakers, did not dismiss signals by the GOP that it is open to moving immigration legislation.¶ He described a House Judiciary Committee hearing Tuesday as encouraging, saying, “I didn’t hear Republicans speaking about how it is impossible and how there should be death placed upon anyone who tries to fix the system comprehensively.”¶ “Perhaps the most encouraging thing for me is the conversations I hear privately outside of the reach of a camera from some of my Republican friends and colleagues who I believe understand that the American people are ready to fix this broken immigration system,” he added.¶ At a closed-door session on immigration moderated by California Democratic Rep. Zoe Lofgren, who is also part of the working group, Lofgren did not update Members on specifics of the bipartisan discussions, Becerra said. Speakers included Angela Kelley from the Center for American Progress and Drew Westen, a professor of psychology and psychiatry at Emory University.

#### 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. New financial incentives for Native Americans are perceived as wasteful spending.

Sullivan, JD from the University of Arizona, ‘10

[Bethany, Changing Winds: Reconfiguring the Legal Framework for Renewable-Energy Development in Indian Country,” 52 Ariz. L. Rev. 823, Fall, lexis]

Aside from reforming the existing tax credit system, the federal government could also create new tax credits aimed at private businesses engaged in renewable-energy projects on reservations. n166 One possible financial incentive would be a special employment tax credit. Under this type of approach, employers receive a credit for wages paid to qualified employees, i.e., employees who are members of the tribe or otherwise classify as Indian. n167 Not only would this incentivize outside businesses to operate on the reservation, it would also encourage them to hire locally. This has the dual benefits of contributing to the tribal economy and increasing tribal involvement with renewable-energy projects. In joint-ownership arrangements, this type of tax credit would give tribes [\*847] substantial leverage in demanding that a certain percentage of the project's employees be tribe members. The disadvantage with this approach is that it fails to get to the heart of the problem. It only indirectly attempts to level the tax-credit-based disparity and it is questionable, at best, whether the benefits of new tax credits would be proportional to the benefits of existing renewable tax credits.¶ Another approach would be to increase the grant money available to tribally owned or jointly owned renewable-energy projects. Under this plan, rather than allocating several hundred thousand dollars to each tribal project for preliminary studies, the DOE and/or DOI would provide the bulk of necessary investment funding. n168 Since the construction and installation costs of renewable-energy generation from wind turbines, solar panels, and other renewable technologies are quite costly, this could require a budget of hundreds of millions of dollars. n169 Considering the current economic climate and constraints on federal spending, a proposal such as this is unlikely to get far in Congress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2

#### The United States federal government should ban all subsidies and tax credits for energy production and institute a carbon tax per ton of emissions and a security tax per barrel of oil. The tax should be revenue neutral and the revenue should be used for offsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit.

#### A carbon and a security tax solves better for warming and oil depedence and avoids picking winners

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

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

### 3

#### Hegemonic power politics reduces the world and human being to standing reserve by calculating culture and civilization in terms of the utility of international order and economics

Swazo 2 [Norman K., Professor of Philosophy at the University of Alaska, *Crisis Theory and World Order: Heideggerian Reflections*, p. 114-115]

For Huntington this international order does not entail Westernization of the world given the cultural affirmations of "non-Western societies." However, Huntington's analysis is troubling insofar as it at times explicitly and at times tacitly advances in the context of the archaic "friend/enemy" distinction in political thought. This operative distinction leads him to assert that "The survival of the West depends on Americans reaffirming their Western identity and Westerners accepting their civilization as unique not universal and uniting to renew and preserve it against challenges from non-Western societies.""' This mode of politics of identity is for Huntington unavoidably agonistic: "We know who we are only when we know who we are not and often only when we know whom we are against." Thus, Huntington claims that in the post-Cold War world, "local politics is the politics of ethnicity; global politics is the politics of civilizations. The rivalry of superpowers is replaced by the clash of civilizations." But here Huntington is mistaken on fundamentals, for the clash of civilizations is itself the mode of power-politics in which values are the means of self-assertion, and the domain in which Nietzsche's anticipated grossen Politik now seek settlement in the ranking of rival moralities. In this "clash of civilizations" the West manifests its concern for both conditions of preservation and conditions of enhancement. One must consider, moreover, that the normativity of world order thinking is Christian in essence and, in the Nietzschean view, "herd morality" comprised of the two dominant configurations of subjective egoism, viz., liberal democracy and socialism. In the quest for a moral world order the West abandons the institutional authority and dogma of Christendom while appropriating its ideal: though "God is dead," humanity may yet be master of the earth and may yet strive with all its power for "a universal green-pasture happiness on earth" (Will to Power, note 957). As Nietzsche puts it, "Since the belief has ceased that a God broadly directs the destinies of the world ... man has to set himself ecumenical goals embracing the whole earth" (Human, All Too Human, "Of First and Last Things," note 25). "In the place of the authority of God and Church looms the authority of conscience, or the domination of reason, or the God of historical progress, or the social instinct ."' World order thinking qua normative thinking, then, is an inaugural phenomenal configuration of the metaphysics of will to power marked by a hesitant self-affirmation in tension with the religious instinct which yet seeks satisfaction. Self-affirmation--which self-liberation enjoins--is hesitant at the outset of the modern subject's movement towards global governance. Notwithstanding, this hesitant self-affirmation is transient--it is destined to give way; for, "the same conditions that hasten the evolution of the herd animal also hasten the evolution of the leader animal" (Will to Power, note 956.^ Which conditions? – that strife of liberal democracy and socialism which, in conformation with the "seduction" of the "mediocre spirit” advances "the mastery of the mediocre." The "homogenization of European man," produced as a consequence of herd morality and effectively extended to the whole of the planet through the hegemony of the Western valuation, promises a "multifarious" type of human being. Multifarious humanity (the type secured by both liberal democratic ideology and socialist ideology) is mankind adapted "to a special utility," insofar as "the consumption of man and mankind becomes more and more economical and the `machinery' of interests and services is integrated ever more intricately" (Will to Power, note 866)--to wit, the international economic order, the world economy, the world as market."' ,The "economic valuation of ideals" institutes maximum exploitation of humanity; the multifarious human being would be made "as useful as possible" and approximated "as far as possible, to an infallible machine": "Once we possess that common economic management of the earth that will soon be inevitable, mankind will be able to find its best meaning as a machine in the service of this economy. ..." (Will to Power, note 866).

#### Modern wind energy is technologized – it is the storage of the wind that robs it of its’ objectivity

Beckman 2k Tad Beckman 2000 (<http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html> Harvey Mudd College Claremont California)

Heidegger clearly saw the development of "energy resources" as symbolic of this evolutionary path; while the transformation into modern technology undoubtedly began early, the first definitive signs of its new character began with the harnessing of energy resources, as we would say. [(7)](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_7_) As a representative of the old technology, the windmill took energy from the wind but converted it immediately into other manifestations such as the grinding of grain; the windmill did not unlock energy from the wind in order to store it for later arbitrary distribution. Modern wind-generators, on the other hand, convert the energy of wind into electrical power which can be stored in batteries or otherwise. The significance of storage is that it places the energy at our disposal; and because of this storage the powers of nature can be turned back upon itself. The storing of energy is, in this sense, the symbol of our over-coming of nature as a potent object. "...a tract of land is challenged into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit." {[7], p. 14} This and other examples that Heidegger used throughout this essay illustrate the difference between a technology that diverts the natural course cooperatively and modern technology that achieves the unnatural by force. Not only is this achieved by force but it is achieved by placing nature in our subjective context, setting aside natural processes entirely, and conceiving of all revealing as being relevant only to human subjective needs.

#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. The alternative is to reject the aff’s challenging forth and embrace bringing forth as the only way to avoid the 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

#### Status quo should have solved - department of energy is supporting tribal energy projects

Burke and Sikkema 7 (Kate, Linda, National Conference of State Legislatures energy program manager, Institute for State-Tribal Relations director“Native American Power”, State Legislatures, Volume: 33, June 2007, page 32, EBSCO Academic Search Complete)

Funding for new projects can be a challenge, however. Many tribes have been able to invest their own money, while others have turned to banks, the federal government and other tribes. Since 1992, the Tribal Energy Program at the U.S. Department of Energy has supported tribes with renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies to encourage self-sufficiency, economic development and employment opportunities. So far, the DOE has invested $12.4 million in 76 projects in Indian Country with tribes putting in around $3.3 million.

#### Government subsidies creates risky market structures – this turns case as pricing bubbles collapse

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.

#### Can’t displace fossil fuels - intermittency

Post 12 (Willem Post, BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer, July 1, 2012, “Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated,” Energy Collective, http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Dispatch Value, Variability and Intermittency of Wind Energy¶ ¶ Dispatch Value: Wind energy is significantly different from conventional gas, coal, nuclear and hydro energy; just ask any grid operator with significant wind energy on his grid. The latter are controllable and dispatchable on short notice, whereas wind energy is a product of weather-dependent, variable wind speeds, i.e., its supply is unpredictable and uncontrollable. Therefore, it has zero-dispatch value to a grid operator. ¶ ¶ A grid operator needs to have available an adequate mix of generating capacity to serve peak demands for long-term planning purposes. The mix varies from grid to grid. Wind turbine systems have a capacity value in this mix. ¶ ¶ Example: For summer peak capacity planning, ERCOT counts 8.7 percent of wind turbine rated capacity as dependable capacity at peak demand, in accordance with ERCOT’s stakeholder-adopted methodology. According to ERCOT, the capacity value is a statistical concept created for generator planning purposes. It is based on multi-year averages of wind energy generation at key peak demand periods. ¶ http://www.ercot.com/news/press\_releases/show/381¶ ¶ ERCOT's capacity planning value of 8.7% does not mean the ENERGY of 8.7% of wind turbine rated capacity would be available at any specified “time-ahead” period. Because of the randomness of wind speeds, no one can accurately predict available wind energy at any future time. Hence, it's not available “on-demand”, i.e., not dispatchable.

#### Backlog means plan won’t even begin implementation for years

Richard 8 (Michael, Science & Technology, 4/7, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/04/wind-power-turbine-shortage-supple-problems.php)

We recently wrote about the massive **growth in the wind power industry** and how **forecasts estimate a 155% growth between now and 2012** (bringing total installed capacity to 240 gigawatts). Well, **there's a dark cloud on the horizon. The problem is not with demand, but with supply.**¶ **If you want wind turbines to build a wind farm, take a number and grab a magazine, because the wait could be long. If you order now, you might not get the turbines before late 2009 or later, depending on your connections with suppliers.** This is similar to what solar panel makers have been going through with the silicon shortage for the past few years.

#### Wind fails – electrical grid infrastructure can’t support it

Morriss et al 9 (ANDREW P. MORRISS, H. Ross and Helen Workman Professor of Law & Professor of Business, University of Illinois; WILLIAM T. BOGART, Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Economics, York College of Pennsylvania; ANDREW DORCHAK, Head of Reference and Foreign/International Law Specialist, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; ROGER E. MEINERS, John and Judy Goolsby Distinguished Professor of Economics and Law, University of Texas-Arlington; UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH PAPER SERIES NO. LE09-001, “GREEN JOBS MYTHS”, March 12th, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/morriss-green-jobs-myths.pdf)

Yet another problem associated with wind energy is that the most favorable locations for wind power are often not accessible by the existing electrical grid,468 a problem recognized by President Obama:¶ One of, I think, the most important infrastructure projects that we need is a whole new electricity grid. Because if we're going to be serious about renewable energy, I want to be able to get wind power from North Dakota to population centers, like Chicago. And we're going to have to have a smart grid if we want to use plug-in hybrids then we want to be able to have ordinary consumers sell back the electricity that's generated from those car batteries, back into the grid. That can create 5 million new jobs, just in new energy.469¶ Additional electrical transmission lines are also key to entrepreneur T. Boone Pickens’ dream of turning Texas into “the Saudi Arabia of wind.”470 According to the Department of Energy, it would require an additional 12,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines costing $60 billion (undiscounted) to increase the contribution of wind to national electricity production to 20 percent by 2030.471¶ Wind power thus faces two key problems in increasing its share of electricity generation. First, it is unavailable at some times of peak power demand and so requires costly backup capacity. Second, current infrastructure is inadequate to support a rapid expansion of wind energy generation. Further, as we noted earlier, existing efforts to increase wind generation capacity have run into major hurdles with regulatory laws and NIMBY efforts.472 Despite these widely known problems, which are never discussed in depth in the green jobs literature, green jobs policy proposals propose enormous increases in wind capacity without detailing a strategy for how these problems will be solved.473 Green jobs proponents thus exhibit extensive technological optimism with respect to wind’s prospects.

### Heg

#### Oil Dependence is key to heg- reserve currency and engagement

Drezner 8 (Daniel W. Drezner is a professor of international politics at the Fletcher School at Tufts University and a senior editor at The National Interest “Oil Dependence as Virtue” National Interest Nov/Dec 2008, Issue 98 Ebsco)

But would this really be the case? It may be that the assumptions we hold are grounded in a misunderstanding of the global order. Perhaps instead, without oil dominating their economies, the Middle East oil states would be far less dependent on the United States for trade, for security and for dollars. Perhaps the dollar would no longer be the world's reserve currency, which would severely hinder America's ability to fund its current-account deficit--and its military superiority. And then, perhaps, the security guarantee the United States provides to the Middle East--and by extension the entire oil-dependent world--would be null and void. In short, a world that doesn't need oil may also be a world that doesn't need the United States. But when prices of oil are skyrocketing, people aren't thinking about the possible long-term implications of energy independence, only the short-term gains.

#### **US is resilient – no risk of negative impact to dependence**

Veazey 12 (Matthew, writer for Rigzone and he has written about the upstream and downstream O&G sectors for more than a decade, July 20, 2012, “Many US Voters Fear 'Foreign Oil,' But Should They?”, http://www.rigzone.com/news/oil\_gas/a/119472/ Many\_US\_Voters\_Fear\_Foreign\_Oil\_But\_Should\_They, 8/1/12, atl)

Although the U.S. has made progress in producing more of its oil and gas at home, a national security expert with The Independent Institute maintains that growing domestic oil production likely will not totally wean the United States off much-maligned "foreign oil" in the foreseeable future.¶ "The U.S. is most dependent on foreign sources of oil for vehicle transportation, but even that is being reduced by new technology to exploit oil in the U.S.," said Ivan Eland, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace and Liberty with the Oakland, Calif.-based think tank. "Nevertheless, the U.S. will not become independent of foreign oil anytime soon."¶ In fact, Eland challenges claims by policymakers that U.S. energy independence would be good for American consumers. In a recent commentary, he argued that energy independence is "a canard and not even desirable."¶ "Politicians of both parties who endorse energy independence as a goal don't tell consumers that even in the unlikely event that they could achieve it, it would increase the price of energy greatly," said Eland, pointing out that protectionist measures inevitably increase prices for any item.¶ "For example, the U.S. buys some of its oil from Saudi Arabia because it is much cheaper to produce than the relatively expensive U.S. supplies. Thus, shutting off foreign oil would significantly raise the price to the consumer."¶ Eland also dispels the view that energy independence is essential for the United States to achieve energy security. He reasons that "huge incentives" exist for people and countries to sell oil and other commodities on the world market.¶ "The two main alleged threats to energy security are that the U.S. would not have enough oil to run its military or its economy [or, in the latter case, that it would be too expensive]," said Eland. "We have enough oil within the U.S. many times over to run the U.S. military, even fighting two medium-sized wars simultaneously."¶ Eland added the attractiveness of selling oil in an international market has even thwarted threats to energy security such cartels or embargoes.¶ "Because there is a worldwide market for oil and incentives to cheat on any cartel or embargo, neither have ever been successful," Eland said. "The U.S. will always be able to get oil, but sometimes the price will be elevated."¶ "[F]ortunately, research shows that contrary to conventional wisdom, industrial economies are resistant to oil price shocks, Eland added, pointing out the same is true for other price shocks.¶ "Therefore, with a working global market, energy independence is not needed for energy security."¶ In fact, Eland sees the U.S. energy security as "usually relatively good, especially if we rely on the market to bring us oil and not resort to armed force."¶ "Wars fought for oil are usually counterproductive by taking oil off the market, thus increasing the price," continued Eland.¶ "[P]aradoxically, the best way to secure oil is not to defend it," Eland concluded. "Let the market work. Besides, oil and other energy exports have been routed around war and even through it. So the market does work, even in the face of foreign threats to it."

#### **Dependence is good – it gives us international leverage to protect our interests**

Fisher 10(Max, associate editor at The Atlantic, where he edits the International channel, April 2, 2010, “The Upside of Depending on Foreign Oil”, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2010/04/the-upside-of-depending-on-foreign-oil/38380/, 7/31/12, atl)

When President Obama opened the coastline to offshore oil drilling, nearly every aspect of the plan came under heated debate. The only thing everyone agrees on, it seems, is the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Statements from the Environmental Protection Agency to automakers to [T. Boone Pickens](http://www.earthtimes.org/articles/show/t-boone-pickens-statement-on-president-obamarsquos-remarks-on-offshore-drilling%2C1229147.shtml) to Obama himself, whether supporting or condemning offshore drilling, all cite the dangers of relying on foreign energy. It's not hard to see why. Shipping oil from halfway around the world is environmentally costly, economically inefficient, and lands us in bed with some of the world's least democratic regimes. But our ties to these states might not be categorically terrible things for us, as they're often assumed to be. Hidden unexamined among the many downsides of our dependence on foreign oil is an upside: It gives us leverage over the countries that sell us oil. The top ten oil exporters to the U.S., which account for half of all U.S. consumption, read like a State Department tourism warning list: Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Nigeria, Iraq, Angola, Russia, Colombia, and Brazil. (To be fair, Canada has long been our number one oil source, and Mexico alternates with Saudi Arabia for the number two spot.) But keep in mind that most of these countries need our money a lot more then we need their oil. If Saudi Arabia and the U.S. suddenly ended our trade tomorrow, for example, the U.S. and global economies would not suffer nearly as much as Saudi Arabia's. The Saudis understand this and so want to keep U.S. and Saudi interests aligned. As a result, buying Saudi oil gets us a lot more than just energy. It gets us a dedicated ally that wields unparalleled influence in a part of the world where we desperately need it: the Middle East. The Saudi royal family has put their wily intelligence service at our disposal and allowed sprawling U.S. military bases onto their soil. In 1992, the Saudis even exiled one of their own on America's behalf: A prominent, wealthy, and popular humanitarian and freedom fighter named Osama bin Laden. Saudi royalty risked a violent backlash by expelling bin Laden to Sudan, but U.S. officials had demanded his ouster. That's no small favor. It would be almost as if the United States deported Google CEO Eric Schmidt to Honduras at the request of angry Chinese officials. The Saudis came to our aid again in 1996 when they convinced the Sudanese regime to themselves deport bin Laden. Bin Laden's anti-American terrorism did not begin until he fled to Afghanistan, where the United States then had little influence. In the decade since, he has moved between there and Pakistan, two countries with which the U.S. has no meaningful economic ties save foreign aid. Unlike with Saudi Arabia, our pleas to those governments to help us rout bin Laden went largely ignored. If our oil-greased relationships with other top producing states are half as close as the U.S.-Saudi partnership, it will give us much-needed leverage over some of this century's biggest emerging threats. In Nigeria, we can pressure the government to peacefully contain the state's alarming increase in terrorism. For Iraq, the economic ties with America would be an important counterbalance to Iran's religious and political influence. As for Venezuela, no matter how antagonistic President Hugo Chavez gets, he would be a lot worse if we didn't take close to a million barrels off his hands every day.

#### Wind turbines hurt military readiness and national security – causes blockage, clutter, and impairs weapon testing

Robyn 10 (Dorothy, Phd, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, “Impact of Wind Farms on Military Readiness, <http://www.acq.osd.mil/ie/download/robyn_testimony_hascr_29jun10.pdf>, Acc: 8/3/12, og)

Wind turbines can interfere with the effectiveness of radar and other electromagnetic systems¶ that are critical to national security. Although solar towers and even buildings can cause¶ interference, wind farms are the most common source of the problem. Wind turbines interfere¶ with radar in two ways. One is blockage, which results when wind turbines keep the radar¶ system’s microwave signals from reaching their intended targets. The other form of interference¶ 3¶ is “clutter,” which is created by unwanted reflections of the radar signals from wind turbine¶ towers and their moving blades. The blockage and clutter that turbines create reduce the¶ sensitivity and performance of the radar, producing shadowed areas and false targets that make it¶ difficult or impossible for the radar operator to see an actual target.¶ For DoD, the problem arises in two different contexts. The first involves the long-range radars¶ managed by NORAD and USNORTHCOM to maintain airspace surveillance and air defense.¶ These FAA radars are decades old and many still use analog signal processors, which are¶ inherently less effective at removing wind turbine clutter. Although all long-range radars lose¶ targets and have tracking problems in the vicinity of wind turbines, advanced digital signal¶ processors on newer radar systems perform better than their analog counterparts and can be¶ upgraded more easily through improved software.¶ Second, wind turbines can affect DoD’s test and training missions. When DoD tests a new¶ weapon system, it must have an electromagnetically pristine environment in which to collect¶ baseline data about the performance and characteristics of the weapon. Interference from nearby¶ wind farms can compromise the telemetry, tracking radar and other electromagnetic systems¶ used to conduct these tests. Likewise, the Department’s training mission can suffer when air¶ traffic control radars used to train pilots are degraded by wind turbine clutter and shadowing.

#### Military readiness sustains US leadership and heg

Spencer 2k (Jack, Senior Research Fellow at the Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm>, Acc: 8/3/12, og)

U.S. military readiness cannot be gauged by comparing America's armed forces with other nations' militaries. Instead, the capability of U.S. forces to support America's national security requirements should be the measure of U.S. military readiness. Such a standard is necessary because America may confront threats from many different nations at once.¶ America's national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has little saliency.¶ The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames."4 According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

#### **No dependence now - major drilling trends and energy efficiency**

Shogen 12 (Elizabeth, NPR News Science Desk correspondent focused on covering environment and energy issues and news, January 24, 2012, “Foreign Oil Imports Drop As U.S. Drilling Ramps Up” http://www.npr.org/2012/01/24/145719179/foreign-oil-imports-drop-as-u-s-drilling-ramps-up, 8/1/12, atl)

Since President Obama took office, the U.S. has made considerable progress in overcoming a problem that has bedeviled presidents since Richard Nixon — dependence on foreign oil.¶ When U.S. oil dependence peaked at 60 percent in 2005, then-President George W. Bush said the country had a serious problem and was "addicted to oil."¶ Oil imports were down to 49 percent in 2010, and the Energy Information Agency predicted Tuesday that imports would drop to 36 percent by 2035.¶ "Reliance on imported petroleum we expect to decline dramatically over the next 20 years," says Howard Gruenspecht, acting administrator of the Energy Information Agency.¶ This reflects in part the fact that after decades of decline, U.S. oil production started posting gains in recent years. The Energy Information Agency predicted the increase will continue, and by 2020, the oil production rate would be up 11 percent to 6.7 million barrels per day.¶ "That's really reversing a long slide," says Gruenspecht.¶ Criticism For Blocking U.S. Production¶ Ironically, this breakthrough is happening during the administration of a president who has been steadily criticized for blocking domestic petroleum production. Republicans have attacked him for slowing off-shore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico after the BP spill and for deciding not to open some federal lands in the West to oil and gas development.¶ But energy experts make it clear that regardless of the criticism, a positive trend is underway that should change the way the county thinks of itself and its relationship with unfriendly, oil-rich nations.¶ "We have a complete change in the historic view that we are helplessly dependent on energy imports, oil imports going forward," says John Deutch, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology chemistry professor and former CIA chief who advises the Obama administration on energy.¶ Deutch says the situation is even brighter than it seems, because Canada could supply most of U.S. oil imports in the future.¶ "I frankly find Canadians as reliable as Californians [in] providing us with energy, so you should not include the Canadians in that import dependence," Deutch says.¶ Expansion On Private Lands¶ Oil industry executives agree that the outlook is rosy.¶ "Past assumptions of oil and gas scarcity that went into business strategic plans, governmental policies and public attitudes are out of date," says James Mulva, chairman and CEO of ConocoPhillips. "The major production trends have certainly been reversed."¶ The breakthrough comes as oil companies are using hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, to blast open the rock that contains the oil.¶ According to Mulva, more rigs are drilling for oil in the United States today than have been for 25 years.¶ But here is where the criticism of President Obama comes in: Mulva stresses that most of these rigs are on private property. They are drilling into places like the Bakken formation, which lies under parts of North Dakota and Montana.¶ "Had this been government land, we would likely still be awaiting drilling permits or fighting lawsuits from NGOs or outright drilling bans enacted from Congress," Mulva says.¶ Using Less Fuel¶ Still, increasing U.S. oil production is only one reason that reliance on foreign oil is waning.¶ Another is that Americans are using less fuel.¶ The Energy Information Agency says overall U.S. oil consumption has declined since 2005. The agency predicts it will grow only very slowly over the next two decades, because of policies that boost the fuel efficiency of cars and increase the use of renewable fuels like ethanol.¶ President Obama deserves credit for those policies. So does his predecessor, President Bush.¶ The EIA's Gruenspecht says America's dependency on foreign oil will ease even more than the agency's forecasts suggest if Obama goes forward with his proposal to further tighten fuel economy in cars for model years 2017 to 2025.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

### Warming

#### Wind power increases emissions – volatility reduces efficiency of conventional plants

Hawkins 10 (Kent, holds electrical engineering degrees from Royal Military College of Canada and Queen’s University, “Subsidizing CO2 Emissions via Windpower: The Ultimate Irony”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/06/subsidizing-co2-emissions/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

The two studies and calculator results demonstrate that claimed CO2 emissions are not reduced, but are increased, with the introduction of wind plants, and a straight substitution of gas for coal production is a far superior strategy. This is by no means the last word, as all three analysis approaches call for comprehensive and objective studies, based on complete information, to confirm these findings.¶ Point of Zero Fossil Fuel and Emissions Savings¶ The Netherlands study shows that the point where CO2 emissions overall become negative occurs at about 2% efficiency reduction across the fossil fuel fleet and corresponds to about 3% wind penetration. This is shown in Figure 2 which is reproduced from the Netherlands study. ΔF is the change in fossil fuel consumption and ΔR is the percent reduction in efficiency of the total fossil fuel fleet.¶ If the wind proponents are right and ΔR is zero, then ΔF is approximately 1.00 GWy. Therefore the fossil fuel consumption of 18.45 GWy as shown in Table 2 of the Netherlands study would be 18.45-1.00 = 17.45 GWy. That is to say, in theory the introduction of wind saves 1.00 GWy, but at ΔR of 2% gives this back due to the inefficient operation of the fossil fuel plants. Therefore the typical wind proponent claim is that the 1.00 GWy would be saved and the percentage saving is about 1.00/17.45, or 5.7%. Compare this to the calculated wind proponent claim of 6.3% for the Netherlands in Figure 1.¶ However theoretically possible, this has been demonstrated by Colorado and Texas experience not to be the case. Further, increases in the efficiency loss for the fossil fuel fleet above 2% will result in increased fossil fuel consumption (negative ΔF), and hence CO2 emissions, again as shown by the Colorado and Texas experience. Such increases in efficiency loss could be caused by:¶ Increased wind penetration¶ Increased wind volatility which may occur between jurisdictions and from year to year.¶ This report, sponsored by the Independent Producers Association of Mountain States, ¶ concludes that the emissions benefits of renewable energy are not being realized as planned ¶ based on examination of four years of Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCO) ¶ operational history. Integrating erratic and unpredictable wind resources with established coal ¶ and natural gas generation resources requires PSCO to cycle its coal and natural gas-fired ¶ plants.¶ 3¶ Cycling coal plants to accommodate wind generation makes the plants operate ¶ inefficiently, which drives up emissions. Moreover, when they are not operated consistently at ¶ their designed temperatures, the variability causes problems with the way they interact with ¶ their associated emission control technologies, frequently causing erratic emission behavior ¶ that can last for several hours before control is regained. Ironically, using wind to a degree ¶ that forces utilities to temporarily reduce their coal generation results in greater SO2, NOX and ¶ CO2 than would have occurred if less wind energy were generated and coal generation were ¶ not impacted.

#### Back up plants are worse – wind investment trades off with building cleaner fossil fuel plants

Page 8 (Lewis, National Wind Watch, July 3, http://www.wind-watch.org/news/2008/07/03/research-wind-power-pricier-emits-more-co2-than-thought/)

Oswald is an expert on gas turbines, having worked for many years at Rolls Royce\*. He says that most people, in allowing for gas backup to wind farms, assume that the current situation of gas-turbine usage applies. Not so, he says. Gas turbines used to compensate for wind will need to be cheap (as they won’t be on and earning money as often as today’s) and resilient (to cope with being throttled up and down so much). Even though the hardware will be cheap and tough, it will break often under such treatment; meaning increased maintenance costs and a need for even more backup plants to cover busted backup plants. Thus, the scheme overall will be more expensive than the current gas sector. And since people won’t want to thrash expensive, efficient combined-cycle kit like this, less fuel-efficient gear will be used — emitting more carbon than people now assume. High-efficiency base load plant is not designed or developed for load cycling … Load cycling CCGT plant will induce thermal stress cracking in hot components … The other impact on the individual plant is a reduction in the plant’s utilisation. This has an economic consequence, which will encourage operators of generation plants to buy cheaper, lower-efficiency and therefore higher carbon emission plants … Reduced reliability will require more thermal plant to be installed … And it gets worse. All this will hammer the gas grid’s pipeline networks and storage hardware too, costing the end consumer even more money — again, something that isn’t currently accounted for in wind power schemes. Power swings from wind will need to be compensated for by power swings from gas-powered plants, which in turn will induce comparable power swings on the gas network as plant ramps up and down. This will have a cost implication for the gas network, an implication that does not seem to have been included in cost of wind calculations …In essence, wind plans aren’t actually wind plans, according to Oswald. They’re gas plans with windfarms used to reduce the amount of gas actually burned in the plants. But he thinks the assumptions now made on costs and emissions reductions to be anticipated are unduly optimistic. From one perspective, one might argue that this is the exact purpose of renewable plants, namely to reduce fossil fuel burning. However, it does this not by obviating the need for that plant, but instead by reducing the utilisation of power plants which continue to be indispensable. Electricity operators will respond to the reduced utilisation … high capital [cleaner gas] plant is not justified under low utilisation regimes … it is critically important that the carbon saving achieved by the whole system is known, understood, and achieved in practice. The effect of this higher carbon calculation does not appear to be mentioned

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

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

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

The effects of climate change cannot quickly be reversed by reducing or even eliminating future emissions of greenhouse gases. There are two reasons for this. First, greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere linger for decades (in the case of relatively short-lived gases like methane), or hundreds of years § Marked 13:21 § (for carbon dioxide), or even thousands of years (for the long-lived gases like perfluorocarbons). Carbon dioxide and methane concentrations in the atmosphere are respectively one-third and more than twice as high as those at any time over the last 650,000 years. Even if no additional carbon dioxide were emitted from now on, atmospheric concentrations would take centuries to decline to pre-Industrial Revolution levels. While elevated levels of greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, additional warming will occur.

## 2NC

### Carbon Tax CP

### Solve

#### Oil security tax solves dependence

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.7)

A security tax on all oil consumed domestically would raise the price to the consumer, thereby reducing consumption. Although increased prices due to an oil security tax would not increase the flow of oil from conventional production, they would promote conservation and accelerate the development of substititues for conventional oil, such as oil sands and renewable fuels from promising new technologies. Most importantly, we can use our willingness to impose such as tax as a barganing chip to encourage other industrialized nations to follow our lead and to encourage developing countries to stop misguided oil-subsidy policies aimed at making oil artificially cheap. These subsidy policies thwart the desired conservation effects of higher oil prices and weaken oil security by increasing the reliance on Middle East oil.

#### A carbon tax will lead to private investment in renewable energy, solving the aff

Podesta et al 9 (John D. Podesta, Chair and Counselor of the Center for American Progress, Kate Gordon, Senior Fellow at American Progress, Bracken Hendricks, Senior Fellow at American Progress and Benjamin Goldstein, Energy Policy Analyst for Center for American Progress, September 2009, The Clean-Energy Investment Agenda: A Comprehensive Approach to Building the Low-Carbon Economy)

A host of market failures and distortions have conspired to inhibit the deployment of clean, renewable energy. First, a century of subsidies and infrastructure investments to support the provision of carbon-based energy has severely tilted the playing field. Second, the hidden costs associated with greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants have been typically treated as negative externalities and never factored in to the market price that¶ we pay for traditional energy. These costs affect our public health, national security, and our environment—indeed, the unchecked release of global warming pollution into the atmosphere has been called the greatest market failure of all time. And third, clean-energy solutions face major market barriers specific to their sector—the fact that landlords often do not pay their own utility bills hinders energy efficiency investments in buildings; the lack of distribution infrastructure inhibits the availability of ethanol and other alterna- tive fuels; and our outdated transmission grid poses major obstacles to deploying greater quantities of utility-scale renewable energy. A comprehensive policy approach will help us to overcome these numerous market failures and increase demand for clean energy.¶ Establishing a cap and a price on global warming pollution¶ Putting a cap and price on pollution is a critical first step and a major component in the mix of policies that will help build a prosperous low-carbon future. A price on pollution turns the negative environmental effects of carbon emissions into a real business cost for emitters, thus correcting a major market failure. A cap on emissions sets a clear goal and establishes a long-term signal in the market, encouraging innovation and allowing busi- nesses to plan their investment strategies.¶ The American Clean Energy and Security Act proposes a cap-and-trade system as the mechanism to establish a cap and a price on greenhouse gas pollution. This system has the additional benefit of allowing companies to trade emissions permits, which results in the highest-emitting firms and industries buying permits from—and therefore investing in— the lowest-emitting, most efficient firms and technologies.¶ ￼￼￼¶ ￼5

### A2: lins to ptx

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

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

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

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

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

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

### A2: Perm

#### 2. Permutation is worse - causes crowd-out—decreases domestic investments and innovations

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)

4. Crowding Out To some (for example, those lucky enough to receive the loan guarantee), government money may seem to be free. But it isn’t, of course. The government has to borrow the money on the open market too. This additional borrowing comes from Americans’ savings, as does the money that Americans invest in the private sector’s growth. There comes a point when there just aren’t enough savings to satisfy both masters. In other words, when government runs a deficit to finance its preferred projects, it can affect private sector access to capital, and lead to a reduction in domestic investment. Economists use the term “crowding out” to describe the contraction in economic activity associated with deficit- financed spending.[30] In addition, the competition between public and private borrowing raises interest rates for all borrowers, including the government, making it more expensive for domestic investors to start or complete projects. Over time, this could mean that American companies will build fewer factories, cut back on research and development, and generate fewer innovations. As a result, our nation’s future earning prospects will dim, and our future living standards could suffer.

### Solve

#### Incentives cause government dependence and undermine innovation

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

America has an energy addiction - and it’s not an addiction to oil, as many politicians would have you think. It’s an addiction to government subsidies. The addicts, you see, are energy producers, not the consumers.

Their growing dependence on federal handouts is the real cause of America’s energy crisis. Energy subsidies have needlessly wasted taxpayer dollars, retarded commercialization of new technologies and failed to reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. Washington would do well to end all energy subsidies.¶ Energy subsidies come in numerous forms ranging from direct expenditures to targeted tax breaks, from production mandates to loan guarantees. Basically, any public policy that favorsthe production or consumption of one type of energy over another can be considered a subsidy.¶ None of them come cheap. According to the Energy Information Agency, the federal government gave the energy industry $8.2 billion in subsidies and financial aid in 1999. This figure more than doubled to $17.9 billion in 2007 and more than doubled again to $37.2 billion last year.¶ But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.¶ The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### Innovation in the energy sector is vital to overall U.S. competitiveness

Deutsch 8 [John, Former undersecretary of DOE and Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Issues in Science and Technology, "Ending the Inertia on Energy Policy," Winter 08, RSR]

There is only one solution to the challenge: The United States must begin the long process of transforming its economy from one that is dependent on petroleum and high-emission coal-fired electricity to one that uses energy much more efficiently, develops alternative fuels, and switches to electricity generation that is low-carbon or carbon-free. The benefits of such a transformation are indisputable: It would avoid unnecessary cost and disruption to the U.S. economy, protect the environment, and enhance national security. The United States has sought to adopt an effective and coherent energy policy since the first oil crisis of 1973, but it has failed to do so. The challenge for U.S. political leaders is to craft, fund, and diligently sustain a range of policy measures that will make this critical transition as certain, rapid, and cost-effective as possible. In order to meet this challenge, the United States must undergo an innovation revolution. The rate at which the United States is able to develop and deploy new energy technologies will, to a great extent, determine the ultimate speed and cost of the economic transformation. Large-scale carbon capture and sequestration, advanced batteries, plug-in hybrid vehicle technologies, next-generation biofuels for the transportation sector, and a number of other innovations will be vital to achieving a low-carbon economy, and the United States must not only develop but deploy these technologies. The benefits of such innovation will accrue to other countries as well, for U.S. technical assistance programs and trade will carry these advances abroad.

#### Competitiveness is vital to U.S. hegemony and the economy.

Segal 4 [Adam, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, ‘4

Foreign Affairs, "Is America Losing Its Edge?" November / December 2004, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html>, RSR]

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system888. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

### Heg

#### Strategic benefits of weaning ourselves off oil are long term

Black 9 (Chris Black Major, US Army April 2009 “Post Oil America and a renewable energy policy leads to the abrogation of the Middle East to China” http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a530125.pdf)

The strategic and operational risks of reducing US consumption of oil are real and should be of concern of strategists and military planners alike. It is a popular statement today to proclaim that reducing American dependence on foreign oil will benefit the national security interests of the US. Reducing consumption of oil is not a panacea to US foreign policy in the Middle East and in fact, leaves policy makers and Presidents with fewer options. There may be long term gains from a renewable energy policy that reduces our consumption of oil, but in the short term, there will be significant risks as we reverse engineer over 60+ years of foreign and military policy that has been concerned with the access and free flow of oil. As stated earlier, oil represents an almost $2 trillion dollar a year business and to have the US not have a stake in this market will certainly cause concern from some countries and will bring about opportunities for other nation states to flex themselves onto the world stage. The US can still spread its influence around the world but that influence will be greatly diminished without a valuable negotiating tool as oil. The US exerts serious influence in the world oil market, and therefore, world oil geopolitics by being the world’s largest consumer of oil. As the US weans itself from oil, it will find itself increasingly isolated from other superseding powers in their quest to influence, negotiate, and ensure access to energy markets that will be vital to those nations’ national security. Other emerging powers’ quests for oil access will lead to bilateral and potentially multilateral arrangements based on the need to produce and/or consume oil. As US oil demand decreases, the ability to negotiate with the “oil card” will diminish as producers will gladly look to growing consumers so that producing states can maintain their economies. Concern over oil is a matter of vital national security to almost every developed or developing nation state in the world. As such, the concern for oil leads to multiple bilateral and multilateral agreements among other nations and it is through these agreements that national concerns to be addressed.

#### Engagement is more important than capability for hegemony

Black 9 (Chris Black Major, US Army April 2009 “Post Oil America and a renewable energy policy leads to the abrogation of the Middle East to China” http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a530125.pdf)

Throughout history there has been an ebb and flow of nation states. The question of whether we are truly at the end of American hegemony or merely in a period of rising nation states to a multi-polar world is hard to tell. What is clear is that a shift to renewable energy policies by the United States will only hasten its exit from world dominance. Contrary to the many pundits who believe that reducing our dependence on oil is the right course to follow, it is more important to be a part of the game than to stand on the sidelines or sit in the stands. Those options leave the US with no influence, merely a bystander watching the events. On the field one may get roughed up or muddy, but at least one is part of the game and can influence the outcome. For example, it was discussed earlier how the US and Saudi Arabia worked a plan that eventually led to the downfall of the Shah of Iran and the rise of a radical theocracy. Like Libya in 2004, one wonders what might happen if the US made the same sort of efforts with Iran. Could the US have gone to Iran with an effort to buy large volumes of Iranian crude in exchange for concessions on their nuclear program? It is an intriguing question to ask, but one whose possibility continually diminishes as the US begins to implement renewable energy policies.

#### Projects on privateand tribal land bypass DOD safeguards

Robyn 10 (Dorothy, Phd, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, “Impact of Wind Farms on Military Readiness, <http://www.acq.osd.mil/ie/download/robyn_testimony_hascr_29jun10.pdf>, Acc: 8/3/12, og)

By comparison, early identification and resolution of conflicts is more difficult when the project¶ is to be built on private land and requires no right-of-way on public land. In some counties and¶ states, developers and landowners do not have to file a land-use permit or notification prior to¶ going to the FAA. Thus, DoD may not learn of a project until shortly before groundbreaking.¶ (In the case of Shepherds Flat, the county required that the developer have a green light from the¶ FAA before it would grant the necessary permits. Nevertheless, NORAD and USNORTHCOM¶ did not learn of the project until the developer filed with the FAA.)

#### Military readiness maintains deterrence and prevents global war

Brownfield 12 (Mike, Assistant Director of Strategic Communications at The Heritage Foundation, “Morning Bell: Would You Take an SUV into Combat?” <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/10/morning-bell-would-you-take-an-suv-into-combat/>, Acc:8/3/12, og)

But from the ground level to the global stage, a weak, unprepared military poses great threats, as well. Unfortunately, the U.S. military is in very real danger of growing weaker, losing its deterrent force, and being left unable to fight and win wars in defense of America.¶ There are those in Washington who believe that America can afford to slash the military in order to shift that money elsewhere. That, though, will leave the military hollow and ill-prepared for growing threats. In a newly released Heritage lecture on the Obama Doctrine of humble engagement with friends and enemies, Kim R. Holmes explains that despite the president’s claim that the world is more secure, serious threats remain, all while the military’s readiness is being depleted.¶ Clearly, the military is becoming weaker. You can argue that smaller is smarter, but at some point quantity matters. The military is getting smaller and weaker. It has already cancelled the F-22 and some F-35s, the C-17s are being delayed, and 100,000 forces are being taken out of the military’s end strength.¶ Yet Iran has become more aggressive and is closer to gaining a nuclear weapon. Russia is far more aggressive and certainly not cooperating where we really need them to cooperate, such as on Syria and Iran. Our relationship with Pakistan has deteriorated sharply. It frankly is already acting as an adversary in some areas and may become even more so in the future. . .¶ There’s also the question of the future in Afghanistan. The Taliban clearly think that they are winning the conflict and only need to wait us out. It is entirely possible that after 2014, there will be areas in Afghanistan that again become safe havens that the Taliban and other terrorists control.¶ Despite these threats — not to mention China’s growing strength and North Korea’s erratic pursuit of nuclear weapons — future defense spending will be cut across the board by nearly $500 billion beginning next year, on top of the $487 billion in cuts proposed by President Obama in February. Those cuts will leave America with a military that is less prepared to defend the nation while signaling to our enemies that we have a weaker hand to play on the world stage.¶ In Heritage’s video, Kachejian explains that “The big picture is, the military really is a national insurance policy. Its primary purpose is to deter war, and if you have to go to war, it has to win it as fast and inexpensively as it can.” That insurance policy is about to lapse unless Congress acts to ensure that the U.S. military has the resources it needs to effectively defend America.

### Warming

#### Wind doesn’t decrease emissions – best studies prove

Kielisch 9 (Kurt, President, Appraisal Group One, “WIND TURBINE IMPACT STUDY”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/AGO-WIND-TURBINE-IMPACT-STUDY.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

Spinning reserves provide no useful electricity and do not reduce emissions from power ¶ generation.¶ 189¶ Promoters of wind energy routinely overstate environmental benefits. They advocate ¶ that each kilowatt-hour (kWh) of electricity produced by a wind turbine displaces the same ¶ amount of fuel-use and emissions associated with a kWh of electricity produced by a fossil-fuel ¶ generating unit. However, the saving of CO2 emissions is not proportional to the amount of ¶ fossil-fueled power that it displaces. Necessary spinning reserve fossil-fired capacity emits ¶ more CO2/kWh than if the plant were optimized, thus offsetting much of the benefit of wind.¶ 190¶ ¶ In addition to the assumption of kWh-per-kWh offsets, wind energy advocates often use ¶ outdated information about emissions when making their claims, not taking into account the ¶ difference made by newer, cleaner burning fossil fueled plants.¶ 191¶ The more wind power capacity is in the grid, the lower percentage of traditional ¶ generation it can replace. A wind farm of 24,000 turbines with a generating capability of 48,000 ¶ MW would replace just 2,000 MW of conventional generation, the equivalent to two mediumsized coal stations.¶ 192¶ The greater the distance between the source of generation and center of demand, the ¶ greater the losses during transmission. Currently these losses are estimated at 10-15%.¶ 193¶ This ¶ is a problem since most wind turbines are in rural locations and far from the need. ¶ Even at 10,000 turbines across the country, the UK will still not be able to supply 15% of ¶ its energy through wind turbines by 2020. Environmentalists say it’s necessary to stop Global ¶ Warming while others point out how thousands of more wind turbines will blight their land.¶ 194¶ The high cost and low return of wind farms is acknowledged by the U.S. National ¶ Association of Attorney Generals. In a 2008 presentation, they concluded that, despite being ¶ “green” wind farms are a high-cost alternative with a large footprint but small power output.¶ 195¶ ¶ As we have seen from empirical research gleaned from a worldwide search, wind ¶ turbines produce very little electricity.¶ 196¶ They have a high capital cost,¶ 197¶ and poor capacity ¶ utilization.¶ 198¶ Why, then, is wind-power the beneficiary of such extensive support if it is ¶ incapable of providing consistent power to replace traditional power plants, does not achieve ¶ the CO2 reductions required, and causes cost increases in backup, maintenance and ¶ transmission, while at the same time discouraging investment in clean, firm generation ¶ capacity?¶

#### Wind power only increases emissions – scientific consensus

Boone 10 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “OVERBLOWN: Windpower on the Firing Line (Part I)”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/09/windpower-overblown-part-1>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Third, the National Academy of Science, in a report published in early 2007, concluded that, in the words of one of the researchers, “Wind power will thus not reduce carbon emissions; it will only slow the increase by a small amount.”[1] Engineers and environmentalists in Britain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Canada, and Australia followed suit, publishing papers that are not only skeptical of wind’s CO2 offsetting abilities but also offer methodological accounting systems for scientifically calculating wind’s carbon impact on the electricity grid. None are beholden to the fossil fuel industry and none are paid lobbyists like Goggin. All, including the NAS, have been rebuffed in their efforts to examine data on wind integration behavior at meaningful time intervals and amounts; instead, they’ve been told that such data is “proprietarily confidential,” and can’t be released without the consent of the affected wind companies. So much for the transparency and accountability that were once the pillars of public policy, not to mention the scientific precept of refutability.¶ A few sources do publish wind performance information, notably the Ontario IESO and, most thoroughly, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in the Pacific Northwest. One can also get, with some digging, historic wind data on a plant-by-plant basis in New York and Pennsylvania. This information has clarified the peculiar nature of wind performance per se. But it is insufficient, for reasons explained later, to account for the way that “peculiar nature” affects the thermal performance of conventional generators throughout the grid system. And it is this phenomenon that intrigued the researchers from Colorado.¶ Fourth, it is true that the Independent Petroleum Association of the Mountain States (IPAMS, which is now the Western Energy Alliance) commissioned the Colorado report produced by Bentek Energy, an energy analytics firm based in Colorado. It is also true that Bentek was the first to get real time performance data at sufficiently fine-grained time intervals, using an ingenious methodological approach that examined the heat rate penalties of (particularly) coal plants intimately involved with wind integration. (More on this later.)¶ What is astonishing, given the nearly universal aversion to sharing wind related performance data, is that Bentek got permission to do this at all. Bentek demonstrated that, in the regions it studied, the peculiar nature of wind performance caused coal plants to perform more inefficiently, “often resulting in greater SO2, NOx, and CO2 emissions than would have occurred if less wind energy were generated and coal generation was not cycled.” The report concluded by recommending that Colorado and Texas begin replacing their older coal units with flexible fossil-fired natural gas units that produce half the emissions.¶ Ironically, this is precisely the recommendation that the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) made in the EWITS study Goggin cited. It is also the basis of AWEA’s own prescription for making wind variability work. On the one hand, Goggin rejects the Bentek study as a creature of the evil fossil fuel empire. But, without a hitch in his giddy-up, he then embraces language in that study that places fossil fuels in service to the white knights of wind. Whether this flop was noticed is unclear.

#### Even if all potential wind was used, dirty emissions would continue

Boone 5 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “The Aesthetic Dissonance of Industrial Wind Machines”, <http://www.contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=319>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

#### However, if the wind industry (and this is a most improbable "if") could immediately exploit all of the wind potential available in the uplands of the region, saturating it with 30,000 huge turbines optimally functioning at a capacity factor of 30 percent, then it could produce enough electricity to supply about one-fourth of the present level of demand. In the graph, this hypothetical supply from wind is represented in blue atop the ongoing level of demand. But note, in about 15 years our increased rate of demand will absorb any yield produced by windpower, necessitating additional energy sources to supply it. Unless wind turbines fill up the Chesapeake Bay and are constructed off the ocean's shore, the projected additional future power sources will not come from wind, for the industry will be tapped out on land. As the graph rather dramatically shows, wind energy development in this area of the United States will not reduce levels of greenhouse gases or cut the present rate of the burning of coal and other fossil fuels. The very best case scenario for windpower in the Mid-Atlantic region is that future wind energy development will only slightly depress the rapid growth in demand for electricity from "dirty

#### Deforestation

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

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

#### C. India

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

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

## 1NR

### Politics

### Overview

**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.

**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**.

### Uniqueness

#### Their Conservatives oppose argument is just not true – they’re on board.

Reeve 2/6 (Elspeth Reeve, staff writer at the Atlantic Wire, “The Anti-Immigration Coalition Is Shrinking”, http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2013/02/anti-immigration-coalition-shrinking/61856/)

At a hearing on immigration Tuesday, Republican Rep. Robert Goodlatte tried to define a proposal to eventually grant illegal immigrants citizenship as extreme. If that's true, then some of his most conservative fellow Republicans are liberal extremists. "Are there options that we should consider between the extremes of mass deportation and a pathway to citizenship for those not lawfully present in the United States?" Goodlatte said, The New York Times reports. It's strange to equate these two things. Team Mass Deportation is shrinking, and Team Legalization is growing. Mass deportation is a nearly impossible fantasy, and legalization is something that's been proposed by both Republican and Democratic presidents and senators and is gaining support among important conservative groups.¶ Despite some outrageous anti-immigration statements during the Republican presidential primary -- Herman Cain's alligator-filled moat and electric fence, Mitt Romney's support of harsh policies that would inspire immigrants to "self-deport" -- the issue is much less hot than it used to be. According to the Pew Research Center, Republican voters care far less about immigration than they did in 2007, when George W. Bush's proposed immigration overhaul failed in Congress. Back then, 69 percent of Republicans said dealing with immigration should be a top priority for Washington; today on 44 percent think so. And in saying it was a top priority, those voters weren't demanding amnesty. In June 2007, Pew found a plurality of Republicans, 43 percent, opposed the immigration reform bill, even though 62 percent of Republicans favored a path to citizenship. The number of Americans saying immigrants are a threat to traditional American values has declined since 2007, and now they're a minority.¶ And what about conservative leaders? Conservative Christians are joining business leaders in calling for immigration reform. In 2006 and 2007, leaders of the Christian right opposed reform or were silent, Politico's Anna Palmer reports. But in 2013, it's different. "I think it is night and day, particularly among social conservatives," Faith and Freedom Coalition’s Ralph Reed told Politico. Liberty University vice president Mathew Staver supports reform. Focus on the Family backed reform in its radio broadcast. The Southern Baptist Convention's Richard Land points out that many of the most anti-immigration House members were defeated in the Democratic wave of the 2006 midterm elections, and says, "I think there’s a bigger coalition in the House for immigration reform than people think."¶ Take, for example, Idaho Rep. Raul Labrador, who is no moderate. Labrador was elected in the Tea Party wave of 2010. He once said he "didn’t come to Washington to be part of a team." He demonstrated this by not voting for John Boehner to keep his job as House Speaker in January. But Labrador tells The Washington Post's Rosalind S. Helderman that even he sees an opportunity for moderation on immigration. Labrador has been in talks with Democratic Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez on immigration. He's requested to meet with President Obama. Of immigration reform, Labrador told the Post, "It’s one of the stumbling blocks that I see for some Republicans. They’re moderate on every other issue, and they think this is the one issue where they have to become conservatives. I feel the reverse."

#### Will pass – House

The Hill 2/8 (http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/281987-house-group-on-the-cusp-of-deal-on-immigration-reform)

LANSDOWNE, Va. — A bipartisan House group working on immigration is “on the cusp” of an agreement, a senior House Democrat participating in the talks said Friday.¶ Rep. Xavier Becerra (Calif.), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters that lawmakers on both sides of the aisle were being pragmatic about the issue, and that he was hopeful the Senate would also deliver on legislation soon.¶ “The reality is that we are on the cusp of actually having an opportunity to put forward a bipartisan proposal in the House of Representatives,” Becerra said at a news conference capping off the House Democrats’ annual retreat ¶ “I am optimistic that the conversations will bear fruit. But make no mistake, there are voices out there that would love nothing more than to destroy ... the progress.” ¶ Becerra would not say whether the group hoped to release legislation next week in conjunction with President Obama's State of the Union address, which had been a target for the coalition. He said only that conversations are continuing.¶ The bipartisan House group also includes Reps. John Carter (R-Texas), Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.), Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.), Sam Johnson (R-Texas) and Zoe Lofgren (Calif.).

### A2: Econ Thumpers/Thumpers

#### No thumpers – one issue of compromise.

Marketwatch 2/8 (quoting Ethan Siegal, founder of the Washington Exchange, a firm that monitors Washington for Wall Street., http://www.marketwatch.com/story/obama-to-reward-coalition-in-state-of-union-speech-2013-02-08?pagenumber=1)

The goal will be to find something he can accomplish given the fact that he doesn’t control the House.¶ “His confidence can only take him so far, every time he wants to go the distance, he runs up against 218,” the number of votes needed to pass a bill in the House, Siegal said.¶ In most cases, there is little, if any, “middle ground” for compromise between House Republicans, Obama and congressional Democrats, Siegel said.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform may be the one item that Obama can enact this year, Siegal said.¶ Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the American Action Forum, a Republican think tank, said the GOP wants Obama to put out solutions to issues.

#### Immigration reform will pass, Obama is key, and it’s the top priority

Maestas 1/25 (http://politic365.com/2013/01/25/chc-meets-with-president-on-immigration-signaling-top-legislative-priority/)

Congressman Gutierrez said the following in a statement after the meeting, “Immigrants need action now and immigration reform cannot wait. We have a unique opportunity to finally put our government on the side of hard-working immigrants. We all need to work together — the President and Congress, Republicans and Democrats — to get something done right away.”¶ “The President is the quarterback and he will direct the team, call the play, and be pivotal if we succeed. I am very optimistic based on conversations with Republicans in the House and Senate that we will do more than just talk about the immigration issue this year. The President putting his full weight and attention behind getting a bill signed into law is tremendously helpful. We need the President and the American people all putting pressure on the Congress to act because nothing happens in the Capitol without people pushing from the outside.”¶ Gutierrez also mentioned what the immigration legislation will likely include, “We need a secure border and an electronic employment verification system that is combined with a generous and rigorous legalization program to get immigrants already living here on-the-books and in the system. We also need visas and visa reform for the people waiting decades to come here and a system for the future that people and employers will actually use and not try to go around. All of this is achievable if Republicans work with Democrats and that work has already begun.”¶ The White House released the following in a statement after the meeting, “The President was pleased to hear from CHC members and noted that they share the same vision, including that any legislation must include a path to earned citizenship. The President further noted that there is no excuse for stalling or delay. The President made it clear he will continue to lead on this issue, and that he looks forward to working with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and other key Members of Congress in a bipartisan process to move this debate forward at the earliest possible opportunity.”¶ On Tuesday, President Obama is expected to travel to Nevada to deliver an immigration speech to signal his commitment to achieving legislation on this topic.¶ Also of note today, The Washington Post has reported that a bipartisan working group of senators has come close to an agreement on a broad set of principles that will guide the immigration reform legislation.

#### Immigration comes before guns

AP 1/26 (http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2013/01/26/white-house-senators-launching-immigration-push?page=2)

The president met privately Friday morning with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to discuss his next steps on immigration. Among those in the meeting was Rep. Linda Sanchez, D-Calif., who said Obama told lawmakers "immigration reform is his number one legislative priority."¶ That could bump back the president's efforts to seek legislation enacting stricter gun laws, another issue he has vowed to make a top second term priority.

### A2: Not Using PC

#### Obama’s top priority

Cramer 1/25 (Ruby, Buzzfield staff, http://www.buzzfeed.com/rubycramer/obama-tells-hispanic-caucus-immigration-is-my-top)

President Barack Obama met Friday morning with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to assure them that comprensive immigration reform would be his "top legislative priority," Representative Linda Sánchez told BuzzFeed. Sánchez, along with six members of Congress, convened in the Roosevelt Room with Obama and members of his senior staff, including advisors Cecilia Muñoz, Valerie Jarrett, and Rob Nabors.¶ "In his opening remarks he said, 'This is my top legislative priority,' and that resonated with us. We know he's serious about this. It was a very positive meeting," said Sánchez.¶ Sánchez — a key member of immigration talks who has been working toward reform legislation for more than 10 years — said specifics were not discussed at the meeting.

### Link Debate

#### Solyndra and the deficit has killed the image of renewables – answers any lobbying arguments.

NYT 12 (Cardwell, Diane, 2012, Jan. 26, “Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/27/business/energy-environment/clean-energy-projects-face-waning-subsidies.html?pagewanted=all)

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](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/solyndra/index.html?inline=nyt-org), a bankrupt maker of solar modules that defaulted on a federal loan, has tarnished the image of renewable power in particular.

#### Current lawmaker perceptions deny your job creation link turn.

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

### A2: US Not Key

#### US agriculture is key to prevent global food wars.

**Klare 12** [Michael, Professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, As Food Prices Rise, Dangers of Social Unrest Seem Imminent, August 9, http://highbrowmagazine.com/1459-food-prices-rise-dangers-potential-social-unrest-seem-imminent]

The Great Drought of 2012 has yet to come to an end, but we already know that its consequences will be severe. With more than one-half of America’s counties designated as drought disaster areas, the 2012 harvest of corn, soybeans, and other food staples is guaranteed to fall far short of predictions. This, in turn, will boost food prices domestically and abroad, causing increased misery for farmers and low-income Americans and far greater hardship for poor people in countries that rely on imported U.S. grains. This, however, is just the beginning of the likely consequences: If history is any guide, rising food prices of this sort will also lead to widespread social unrest and violent conflict. Food—affordable food—is essential to **human survival** and well-being. Take that away, and people become anxious, desperate, and angry. In the United States, food represents only about 13 percent of the average household budget, a relatively small share, so a boost in food prices in 2013 will probably not prove overly taxing for most middle—and upper-income families. It could, however, produce considerable hardship for poor and unemployed Americans with limited resources. “You are talking about a real bite out of family budgets,” commented Ernie Gross, an agricultural economist at Omaha’s Creighton University. This could add to the discontent already evident in depressed and high-unemployment areas, perhaps prompting an intensified backlash against incumbent politicians and other forms of dissent and unrest. It is in the international arena, however, that the Great Drought is likely to have its most devastating effects. Because so many nations depend on grain imports from the U.S. to supplement their own harvests, and because intense drought and floods are damaging crops elsewhere as well, food supplies are expected to shrink and prices to rise across the planet. “What happens to the U.S. supply has immense impact around the world,” says Robert Thompson, a food expert at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. As the crops most affected by the drought, corn and soybeans, disappear from world markets, he noted, the price of all grains, including wheat, is likely to soar, causing immense hardship to those who already have trouble affording enough food to feed their families. The Hunger Games, 2007-2011 What happens next is, of course, impossible to predict, but if the recent past is any guide, it could turn ugly. In 2007-2008, when rice, corn, and wheat experienced prices hikes of 100 percent or more, sharply higher prices—especially for bread—sparked “food riots” in more than two dozen countries, including **Bangladesh**, **Cameroon**, **Egypt**, **Haiti**, **Indonesia**, **Senegal**, and **Yemen**. In Haiti, the rioting became so violent and public confidence in the government’s ability to address the problem dropped so precipitously that the Haitian Senate voted to oust the country’s prime minister, Jacques-Édouard Alexis. In other countries, angry protestors clashed with army and police forces, leaving scores dead. Those price increases of 2007-2008 were largely attributed to the soaring cost of oil, which made food production more expensive. (Oil’s use is widespread in farming operations, irrigation, food delivery, and pesticide manufacture.) At the same time, increasing amounts of cropland worldwide were being diverted from food crops to the cultivation of plants used in making biofuels. The next price spike in 2010-11 was, however, closely associated with climate change. An intense drought gripped much of eastern Russia during the summer of 2010, reducing the wheat harvest in that breadbasket region by one-fifth and prompting Moscow to ban all wheat exports. Drought also hurt China’s grain harvest, while intense flooding destroyed much of Australia’s wheat crop. Together with other extreme-weather-related effects, these disasters sent wheat prices soaring by more than 50 percent and the price of most food staples by 32 percent. Once again, a surge in food prices resulted in widespread social unrest, this time concentrated in North Africa and the Middle East. The earliest protests arose over the cost of staples in Algeria and then Tunisia, where—no coincidence—the precipitating event was a young food vendor, Mohamed Bouazizi, setting himself on fire to protest government harassment. Anger over rising food and fuel prices combined with long-simmering resentments about government repression and corruption sparked what became known as the Arab Spring. The rising cost of basic staples, especially a loaf of bread, was also a cause of unrest in **Egypt**, **Jordan**, and **Sudan**. Other factors, notably anger at entrenched autocratic regimes, may have proved more powerful in those places, but as the author of Tropic of Chaos, Christian Parenti, wrote, “The initial trouble was traceable, at least in part, to the price of that loaf of bread.” As for the current drought, analysts are already warning of **instability in Africa**, where corn is a major staple, and of increased popular **unrest in China**, where food prices are expected to rise at a time of growing hardship for that country’s vast pool of low-income, migratory workers and poor peasants. Higher food prices in the U.S. and China could also lead to reduced consumer spending on other goods, further contributing to the slowdown in the global economy and producing yet more worldwide misery, with unpredictable social consequences. The Hunger Games, 2012-? If this was just one bad harvest, occurring in only one country, the world would undoubtedly absorb the ensuing hardship and expect to bounce back in the years to come. Unfortunately, it’s becoming evident that the Great Drought of 2012 is not a one-off event in a single heartland nation, but rather an inevitable consequence of global warming which is only going to intensify. As a result, we can expect not just more bad years of extreme heat, but worse years, hotter and more often, and not just in the United States, but globally for the indefinite future. Until recently, most scientists were reluctant to blame particular storms or droughts on global warming. Now, however, a growing number of scientists believe that such links can be demonstrated in certain cases. In one recent study focused on extreme weather events in 2011, for instance, climate specialists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Great Britain’s National Weather Service concluded that human-induced climate change has made intense heat waves of the kind experienced in Texas in 2011 more likely than ever before. Published in the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, it reported that global warming had ensured that the incidence of that Texas heat wave was 20 times more likely than it would have been in 1960; similarly, abnormally warm temperatures like those experienced in Britain last November were said to be 62 times as likely because of global warming. It is still too early to apply the methodology used by these scientists to calculating the effect of global warming on the heat waves of 2012, which are proving to be far more severe, but we can assume the level of correlation will be high. And what can we expect in the future, as the warming gains momentum? When we think about climate change (if we think about it at all), we envision rising temperatures, prolonged droughts, freakish storms, hellish wildfires, and rising sea levels. Among other things, this will result in damaged infrastructure and diminished food supplies. These are, of course, manifestations of warming in the physical world, not the social world we all inhabit and rely on for so many aspects of our daily well-being and survival. The purely physical effects of climate change will, no doubt, prove catastrophic. But the social effects including, somewhere down the line, food riots, mass starvation, state collapse, mass migrations, and conflicts of every sort, up to and including full-scale war, could prove even more disruptive and deadly. In her immensely successful young-adult novel, The Hunger Games (and the movie that followed), Suzanne Collins riveted millions with a portrait of a dystopian, resource-scarce, post-apocalyptic future where once-rebellious “districts” in an impoverished North America must supply two teenagers each year for a series of televised gladiatorial games that end in death for all but one of the youthful contestants. These “hunger games” are intended as recompense for the damage inflicted on the victorious capitol of Panem by the rebellious districts during an insurrection. Without specifically mentioning global warming, Collins makes it clear that climate change was significantly responsible for the hunger that shadows the North American continent in this future era. Hence, as the gladiatorial contestants are about to be selected, the mayor of District 12’s principal city describes “the disasters, the droughts, the storms, the fires, the encroaching seas that swallowed up so much of the land [and] the brutal war for what little sustenance remained.” In this, Collins was prescient, even if her specific vision of the violence on which such a world might be organized is fantasy. While we may never see her version of those hunger games, do not doubt that some version of them will come into existence—that, in fact, **hunger wars** of many sorts will fill our future. These could include any combination or permutation of the deadly riots that led to the 2008 collapse of **Haiti’s government**, the pitched battles between massed protesters and security forces that engulfed parts of Cairo as the Arab Spring developed, the ethnic struggles over disputed croplands and water sources that have made **Darfur** a recurring headline of horror in our world, or the inequitable distribution of agricultural land that continues to fuel the insurgency of the Maoist-inspired **Naxalites of India**. Combine such conflicts with another likelihood: that persistent drought and hunger will force millions of people to abandon their traditional lands and flee to the squalor of shantytowns and expanding slums surrounding large cities, sparking hostility from those already living there. One such eruption, with grisly results, occurred in Johannesburg’s shantytowns in 2008 when desperately poor and hungry migrants from Malawi and Zimbabwe were set upon, beaten, and in some cases burned to death by poor South Africans. One terrified Zimbabwean, cowering in a police station from the raging mobs, said she fled her country because “there is no work and no food.” And count on something else: millions more in the coming decades, pressed by disasters ranging from drought and flood to rising sea levels, will try to migrate to other countries, provoking even greater hostility. And that hardly begins to exhaust the possibilities that lie in our hunger-games future. At this point, the focus is understandably on the immediate consequences of the still ongoing Great Drought: dying crops, shrunken harvests, and rising food prices. But keep an eye out for the social and political effects that undoubtedly won’t begin to show up here or globally until later this year or 2013. Better than any **academic study**, these will offer us a hint of what we can expect in the coming decades from a hunger-games world of rising temperatures, persistent droughts, recurring food shortages, and **billions of famished**, **desperate people**.