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#### You should view consumption as a complex network of environmental pressures – addressing one “hotspot” for environmental collapse distracts focus from the broader system and produces efficiency gains that are only re-invested for more consumption – only a reduction in consumption patterns can solve inevitable human extinction

Ehrlich & Ehrlich 13

(Paul, Professor of Biology and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology, Sydney, Anne, Senior Research Scientist in Biology at Stanford, “Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?”, January 9, 2013, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Biological Sciences*)

But today, for the first time, humanity's global civilization—the worldwide, increasingly interconnected, highly technological society in which we all are to one degree or another, embedded—is threatened with collapse by an array of environmental problems. Humankind finds itself engaged in what Prince Charles described as ‘an act of suicide on a grand scale’ [4], facing what the UK's Chief Scientific Advisor John Beddington called a ‘perfect storm’ of environmental problems [5]. The most serious of these problems show signs of rapidly escalating severity, especially climate disruption. But other elements could potentially also contribute to a collapse: an accelerating extinction of animal and plant populations and species, which could lead to a loss of ecosystem services essential for human survival; land degradation and land-use change; a pole-to-pole spread of toxic compounds; ocean acidification and eutrophication (dead zones); worsening of some aspects of the epidemiological environment (factors that make human populations susceptible to infectious diseases); depletion of increasingly scarce resources [6,7], including especially groundwater, which is being overexploited in many key agricultural areas [8]; and resource wars [9]. These are not separate problems; rather they interact in two gigantic complex adaptive systems: the biosphere system and the human socio-economic system. The negative manifestations of these interactions are often referred to as ‘the human predicament’ [10], and determining how to prevent it from generating a global collapse is perhaps the foremost challenge confronting humanity. The human predicament is driven by overpopulation, overconsumption of natural resources and the use of unnecessarily environmentally damaging technologies and socio-economic-political arrangements to service Homo sapiens’ aggregate consumption [11–17]. How far the human population size now is above the planet's long-term carrying capacity is suggested (conservatively) by ecological footprint analysis [18–20]. It shows that to support today's population of seven billion sustainably (i.e. with business as usual, including current technologies and standards of living) would require roughly half an additional planet; to do so, if all citizens of Earth consumed resources at the US level would take four to five more Earths. Adding the projected 2.5 billion more people by 2050 would make the human assault on civilization's life-support systems disproportionately worse, because almost everywhere people face systems with nonlinear responses [11,21–23], in which environmental damage increases at a rate that becomes faster with each additional person. Of course, the claim is often made that humanity will expand Earth's carrying capacity dramatically with technological innovation [24], but it is widely recognized that technologies can both add and subtract from carrying capacity. The plough evidently first expanded it and now appears to be reducing it [3]. Overall, careful analysis of the prospects does not provide much confidence that technology will save us [25] or that gross domestic product can be disengaged from resource use [26].

#### **The rebound effect means that technological gains in efficiency ultimately cause more consumption – renewables don’t displace fossil fuels but in fact supplement them**

Foster et al 10

(John Bellamy, prof of sociology @ U of Oregon, Brett Clark, asst prof of sociology @ NC-State, Richard York, associate prof of sociology @ U of Oregon, The Ecological Rift, pgs. 183-191)

Eco-Efficiency of National Economies Stephen Bunker, an environmental sociologist, found that over a long stretch of recent history, the world economy as a whole showed substantial improvements in resource efficiency (economic output per unit of natural resource), but that the total resource consumption of the global economy continually escalated. Similarly, recent research has shown that at the national level, high levels of affluence are, counter intuitively, associated with both greater eco-efficiency—GDP output per unit of ecological footprint—of the economy as a whole and with a higher per capita ecological footprint, suggesting that empirical conditions characteristic of the Jevons Paradox often may be applicable to the generalized aggregate level. Indeed, this type of pattern appears to be quite common. Statistical analyses using elasticity models of the effect of economic development (GDP per capita) on environmental impacts, such as carbon dioxide emissions, have shed light on the relationship between efficiency and total environmental impact. With such a model, an elasticity coefficient for GDP per capita (which indicates the percentage increase in the environmental impact of nations for a 1 percent increase in GDP per capita) of between 0 and 1 (indicating a positive inelastic relationship) implies a condition where the aggregate eco-efficiency of the economy improves with development but the expansion of the economy exceeds improvements in efficiency, leading to a net increase in environmental impact. This type of research does not establish a causal link between efficiency and total environmental impact or resource consumption, but it does empirically demonstrate that an association between rising efficiency and rising environmental impacts may be common, at least at the national level. These findings also suggest that improving eco-efficiency in a nation is not necessarily, or even typically, indicative of a decline in resource consumption. Fuel Efficiency of Automobiles The fuel efficiency of automobiles is obviously an issue of substantial importance, since motor vehicles consume a large share of the world’s oil. It would seem reasonable to expect that improvements in the efficiency of engines and refinements in the aerodynamics of automobiles would help to curb motor fuel consumption. However, and examination of recent trends in the fuel consumption of motor vehicles suggests a paradoxical situation where improvements in efficiency are associated with increases in fuel consumption. For example, in the United States an examination of a reasonable indicator of fuel efficiency of automobiles stemming from overall engineering techniques, pound-miles per gallon (or kilogram-kilometers per liter) of fuel, supports the contention that the efficiency of the light-duty fleet (which includes passenger cars and light trucks) improved substantially between 1984 and 2001, whereas the total and average fuel consumption of the fleet *increased*. For the purposes of calculating CAFE (corporate average fuel economy) performance of the nation’s automobile fleet, the light-duty fleet is divided into two categories, passenger cars and light trucks (which includes sports utility vehicles), each of which has a different legally enforced CAFE standard. In 1984 the total light-truck fleet CAFÉ miles per gallon (MPG) was 20.6 (~8.8 kilometers per liter; KPL) and the average equivalent test weight was 3,804 pounds (~1,725 kilograms), indicating that the average pound-miles per gallon was 78,362 (20.6 x 3,804) (~15,100 kilogram-KPL). By 2001, the total light truck fleet CAFÉ MPG had improved slightly to 21.0 (~8.9 KPL), while the average vehicle weight had increased substantially, to 4,501 pounds (~2,040 kilograms). Therefore the pound-miles per gallon had increased to 94,521 (21.0 x 4,501) (~18,200 kilogram-KPL), a 20.6 percent improvement in efficiency from 1984. A similar trend happened in passenger cars over this same period . In 1984 the total passenger car fleet CAFÉ was 29.6 MPG (~11.4 KPL) and the average equivalent test weight was 3,170 pounds (~1,440 kilograms), indicating that the pound-miles per gallon was 85,273 (26.9 x 3,170)(~16,400 kilogram-KPL). By 2001, the total passenger car fleet CAFÉ MPG had improved to 28.7 (~12.2 KPL) while the average vehicle weight had increased to 3,446 pounds (~1,560 kilograms), making the average fleet pound-miles per gallon 98,900 (28.7 x 2,446) (~19,070 kilogram-KPL)—a 16 percent improvement since 1984. Clearly engineering advances had substantially improved the efficiency of both light trucks and passenger cars in terms of pound-MPG (or kilogram-KPL) between 1984 and 2001. The observation of this fact in isolation might lead tone to expect that these improvements in efficiency were associated with a reduction in the fuel consumption of the total light-duty fleet. However, this is not what happened. Over this period, light; trucks, which on average are heavier and consume more fuel than passenger cars, grew from 24.4 percent of the light truck duty fleet to 46.6 percent. Because of this shift in composition, the CAFÉ MPG for the combined light-duty fleet declined from 25.0 to 24.5 (~10.6 to ~10.4 KPL), a 2 percent decrease. Clearly, engineering advances had improved the efficiency of engines and other aspects of automobiles, but this did not lead to a less-fuel thirsty fleet since the size of vehicles increased substantially, particularly due to a shift from passenger cars to light trucks among a large segment of drivers. It is worth noting that even if the total fleet MPG had improved, a reduction in fuel consumption would have been unlikely to follow, since over this period the distance traveled by drivers per year increased from little more than 15,000 km (~9,300 miles) per car, on average, to over 19,000 km (~11,800 miles). And, finally, an increase in the number of drivers and cars on the road drove up fuel consumption even further. For example, between 1990 and 1999, the number of motor vehicles in the United States increased from 189 million to 217 million due to both population growth and a 2.8 percent increase in the number of motor vehicles per 1,000 people (from 758 to 779). It appears that technological advances that improved the engineering of cars were in large part implemented, at least in the United States, in expanding the size of vehicles, rather than reducing the fuel the average vehicle consumed. The causal explanations for this are likely complex, but the fact that, despite engineering improvements, the U.S. light-duty fleet increased its total and average fuel consumption over the past two decades does suggest that technological refinements are unlikely in and of themselves to lead to the conservation of natural resources. Furthermore, it is possible that improvements in efficiency may actually contribute to the expansion of resource consumption, since it is at least plausible that success at improving the MPG/KPL of a nation’s automobile fleet may encourage drivers to travel more frequently by car, due to the reduction in fuel consumption per mile/kilometer—a situation directly analogous to the one Jevons observed regarding coal use by industry. The Paperless Office Paradox Paper is typically made from wood fiber, so paper consumption puts substantial pressure on the world’s forest ecosystems. It would seem on the face of it that the rise of the computer and the capacity for the storage of documents in electronic form would lead to a decline in paper consumption, and eventually, the emergence of the “paperless office”—which would be decidedly good news for forests. This, however, has not been the case, as Abigail J. Sellen and Richard H.R. Harper clearly document in their aptly titled book *The Myth of the Paperless Office*. Contrary to the expectations of some, computers, email, and the World Wide Web are associated with an increase in paper consumption. For example consumption of the most common type of office paper (uncoated free-sheet) increased by 14.7 percent in the United States between the years 1995 and 2000, embarrassing those who predicted the emergence of the paperless office. Sellen and Harper also point to research indicating that “the introduction of e-mail into an organization caused, on average, a 40% increase in paper consumption.” This observation suggests that there may be a direct causal link between the rise of electronic mediums of data storage and paper consumption, although further research is necessary to firmly establish the validity of this causal link. The failure of computers and electronic storage mediums to bring about the paperless office points to an interesting paradox, which we label the Paperless Office Paradox: the development of a substitute for a natural resource is sometimes associated with an increase in consumption of that resource. This paradox has potentially profound implications for efforts to conserve natural resources. One prominent method advocated for reducing consumption of a particular resource is to develop substitutes for it. For example, the development of renewable energy resources, such as wind and solar power, are commonly identified as a way to reduce dependence on fossil fuel, based on the assumption that the development of alternative sources of energy will displace, at least to some extent, fossil fuel consumption. However, just as the Jevons Paradox points to the fact that efficiency not lead to a reduction in resource consumption, the Paperless Office Paradox points to the fact that the development of substitutes may not lead to a reduction in resource consumption. The reasons that computers led to a rise in paper consumption are not particularly surprising. Although computers allow for the electronic storage of documents, they also allow for ready access to innumerable documents that can be easily printed using increasingly ubiquitous printers, which explains in large part the reason for escalating office paper consumption. Due to the particularistic reasons for the association between electronic storage mediums and paper consumption, the Paperless Office Paradox may not represent a generality about the development of substitutes and resource consumption. However, this paradox does emphasize the point that one should *not* assume that the development of substitutes for a natural resource will lead to a reduction in consumption of that resource. For example, over the past two centuries we have seen the rise of fossil fuel technologies and the development of nuclear power, so that whereas in the eighteenth century biomass was the principal source of energy in the world, biomass now only provides a small proportion of global energy production. However, it is worth noting that even though substitutes for biomass—such as fossil fuel and nuclear power—have expanded dramatically, the absolute quantity of biomass consumed for energy in the world has *increased* since the nineteenth century. This is likely due, at least in part, to the fact that new energy sources fostered economic and population growth, which in turn expanded the demand for energy sources of all types, including biomass. This observation raises the prospect that the expansion of renewable energy production technologies, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, may not displace fossil fuel or other energy sources, but merely add a new source on top of them, and potentially foster conditions that expand the demand for energy. Clearly, further theoretical development and empirical research aimed at assessing the extent to which substitutes actually lead to reductions in resource consumption is called for, and faith that technological developments will solve our natural resource challenges should at least be called into question. Coda Here, we have drawn attention to two ecological paradoxes in economics, the Jevons Paradox and the Paperless Office Paradox. The Jevons Paradox is a classical one, based on the Jevons observation that rising efficiency in the utilization of coal led to an escalation of coal consumption. We presented two examples, which suggest that the Jevons Paradox may have general applicability to a variety of circumstances. The Paperless Office Paradox is a new one, and draws attention to the fact that the development of computers and electronic storage mediums has not led to a decline in paper consumption, as some predicted, but rather to more paper consumption. It is important to note that these are empirically established paradoxes—they point to the correlation between efficiency or substitutes and resource consumption. Each paradox may actually house phenomenon that have a diversity of theoretical explanations. Therefore, underlying these two paradoxes may be many forces that need to be theorized. Together, these paradoxes suggest that improvements in the efficiency of use of a natural resource may not lead to reductions in consumption of that resource—in some circumstances they may even lead to an escalation of consumption of that resource. Although improvements in efficiency and utilization of substitutes will reduce consumption of a resource *all else being equal* (if the scale of production remains constant), economies are complex and dynamic systems with innumerable interactions among factors. Changes in the type and efficiency of resource utilization will likely influence many other conditions, thus ensuring that all else will rarely be equal. Relying on technological advances alone to solve our environmental problems may have disastrous consequences. The two paradoxes we present here suggest that social and economic systems need to be modified if technological advances are to be translated into natural resource conservation.

#### Wind requires tons of rare earth minerals – causes increased toxicity

Cho 2012 (September 19, Renee, “Rare Earth Metals: Will We Have Enough?” <http://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2012/09/19/rare-earth-metals-will-we-have-enough/>)

Wind power has grown around 7 percent a year, increasing by a factor of 10 over the last decade, noted Peter Kelemen, Arthur D. Storke Memorial Professor of Geochemistry at the Earth Institute’s Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. “Every megawatt of electricity needs 200 kilograms of neodymium—or 20 percent of one ton,” he said. “So if every big wind turbine produces one megawatt, five turbines will require one ton of neodymium. If wind is going to play a major part in replacing fossil fuels, we will need to increase our supply of neodymium.” A recent MIT study projected that neodymium demand could grow by as much as 700 percent over the next 25 years; demand for dysprosium, also needed for wind turbines, could increase by 2,600 percent. China currently supplies 97 percent of global rare earth metal demand, and 100 percent of heavy rare earth metals such as terbium and dysprosium, used in wind turbines. In 2005, it began restricting exports to preserve resources and protect the environment, causing prices to soar. Today, the United States is 100 percent dependent on imports for rare earth metals. From the mid-1960s through the 1980s, however, Molycorp’s Mountain Pass mine in California was the world’s main source of rare earth metals. As the U.S. share of rare earth metal production declined, China used government support, research and development, training programs, cheap labor and low prices to develop its supply chain, increasing its share of rare earth metal production from 27 percent in 1990 to 97 percent in 2011. In March, the U.S., Japan and the European Union lodged a complaint with the World Trade Organization over China’s limits on rare earth exports. In response, China announced that it will export 30,996 more metric tons of rare earth metals in 2012 than it did in 2011. The U.S., South Africa, Canada, Australia, Brazil, India, Russia, South Africa, Malaysia, and Malawi also have deposits of rare earth metals, and while the U.S. Geological Survey expects that global reserves and as yet undiscovered deposits of rare earth metals will be able to meet future demand, new mines may take up to 10 years to develop, and resources in remote areas will likely be much more difficult to extract. Kelemen is confident that ongoing global exploration for neodymium, for which there is no known substitute in low-weight magnets for electric motors and generators, will be successful and boost short-term supplies. On the other hand, the heavy rare earth metal dysprosium, used to increase the longevity of magnets in wind turbines and electric cars, is harder to find. “Ninety-nine percent of the current supply comes from clay deposits that can be easily mined with a shovel in Jiangxi, China,” Kelemen said. “Other known deposits of dysprosium in Canada and Greenland will be much harder to mine.” To ease the bottleneck of rare earth metals, mines being developed in Australia, Brazil, Canada and Vietnam could be in production within five years. The Molycorp mine in Mountain Pass has reopened and expects to be operating at full capacity this year. More mining of rare earth metals, however, will mean more environmental degradation and human health hazards. All rare earth metals contain radioactive elements such as uranium and thorium, which can contaminate air, water, soil and groundwater. Metals such as arsenic, barium, copper, aluminum, lead and beryllium may be released during mining into the air or water, and can be toxic to human health. Moreover, the refinement process for rare earth metals uses toxic acids and results in polluted wastewater that must be properly disposed of. The Chinese Society of Rare Earths estimated that the refinement of one ton of rare earth metals results in 75 cubic meters of acidic wastewater and one ton of radioactive residue. The 1998 leak of hundreds of thousands of gallons of radioactive wastewater into a nearby lake was a contributing factor to Molycorp’s shutdown in 2002. Many new mines, including Molycorp, are now developing more environmentally friendly mining techniques. Nevertheless, we are mining poorer and poorer ores all the time, and it takes more and more energy to extract the same amount of metal, according to Graedel. “I’m not worried that we’ll run out of rare earth metals, but will we have enough energy at a reasonable price to extract it?” he asked. The high performance of our products depends on the specific rare earth metals they utilize; unless there are technological breakthroughs, doing without those materials would force products to revert to old performance standards. “I’m worried that things will become so scarce and expensive that we can’t routinely use them as part of modern industrial design,” said Graedel. There could come a point when the cost of extracting rare earth metals is simply not economically justifiable, no matter how high their prices rise. Because of rising prices, there is now renewed interest in seabed mining for rare earth metals. Since the 1960s, scientists have known about the existence of manganese nodules, rocks abundant in water 4,000 to 5,000 meters deep that contain nickel, copper, cobalt, manganese and rare earth metals, but in the past, mining them never made economic sense. In 2011, a Japanese team found huge deposits of rare earth metals, including terbium and dysprosium, in sea mud 3,500 to 6,000 meters deep in the Pacific Ocean. One square kilometer (0.4 square mile) of deposits will be able to provide one-fifth of the current global annual consumption, according to Yasuhiro Kato, an associate professor of earth science at the University of Tokyo. The New York Times recently reported the discovery of deposits of gold, silver, copper, cobalt, lead and zinc in the sulfurous mounds that gush hot water from fissures near active volcanic areas on the ocean floor. Seabed mining, however, could cause great damage to fisheries and marine ecosystems, so environmentalists are pushing for more research and mitigation planning before it begins. As global warming accelerates the melting of the Arctic ice cap, rare earth metal deposits are becoming accessible and a number of countries are positioning themselves to exploit them.

Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production

Rather than focusing on production of technology, we should embrace our ability to shape and transform our subjectivity as consumers, embracing voluntary simplicity – this debate offers a crucial moment to produce alternative knowledge about everyday living practices

Alexander ‘11

(Samuel, University of Melbourne; Office for Environmental Programs/Simplicity Institute, “

Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence”, Social Sciences Research Network, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1941087)

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western--‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western--‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption--‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self enfgaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

### 1nc California CP

#### The government of the state of California should incentivize offshore wind production.

#### California can develop significant offshore wind

Miller, 12 (9/14/2012, Craig, “Studies: Offshore Wind Potential is Huge,” http://blogs.kqed.org/climatewatch/2012/09/14/studies-offshore-wind-potential-is-huge/)

“California has a tremendous offshore wind resource,” said Habib Dagher, who joined Jacobson and other experts on the program. Dagher, who runs the DeepCWind Consortium at the University of Maine, calculates that within 50 nautical miles of the California coast is about 587 gigawatts of untapped energy, the equivalent of more than 500 commercial nuclear power plants. The tricky part will be tapping it. The ocean depths off of California would likely require a whole new generation of turbines that ride the waves like big buoys.

In March, Dagher’s group will place an experimental floating turbine off the Maine coast. The scale-model test will offer insights into how giant six-megawatt turbines would perform offshore. He says research & development funding doesn’t support a bigger push right now, that the DOE wind research budget hovers between $70-80 million per year, “very small” compared to what much smaller countries are spending. Dagher says the U.K., for example, is aiming to get a quarter of its electricity from offshore wind farms by 2020.

#### Federal government will empirically model

Keppley, 12 --- M.A. Candidate, International Relations and Environmental Policy at Boston University (Summer 2012, Jesse M., The Josef Korbel Journal of Advanced International Studies, “A Comparative Analysis of California and German Renewable Energy Policy: ACTORS AND OUTCOMES,” http://www.du.edu/korbel/jais/journal/volume4/volume4\_keppley.pdf)

Conclusion

Renewable energy policy is sure to continue evolving over the coming decades. Moving beyond policy differences to examine the way actors pursue policy goals within unique institutional structures provides a useful framework for comparative analysis. Both Germany and California have enacted aggressive policies in pursuit of their renewable energy goals. While it might seem, given the similar federal systems within which they operate, that these policies should have evolved in a similar manner, this is far from the case. A comparative approach demonstrates how in California policymakers were forced to incorporate interest group concerns to eventually arrive at acceptable policy outcomes. As AIR v. CARB demonstrates, this was not always a smooth process. The federal government also played a crucial role in limiting the options available to California, while at the same time allowing the state to experiment with aggressive policies. As climate change climbs up the political agenda, California’s unique leadership position within the U.S. federal system places it in a desirable position moving forward. California has a long history of driving change at the federal level (Rabe, 2009). Thus, if the history of U.S. environmental policymaking is any indication, the increased interest in renewable energy policies at the state level should eventually force more consolidated change at the federal level. Again if prior history is any indication, it would appear reasonable to expect future federal policies to build off of the model established by California.

### Natural Gas

#### Natural gas prices are rising now – causes utilities to shift to coal

Litvak 2012 (November 9, Anya, “Pennsylvania coal industry faces changing future” <http://www.bizjournals.com/pittsburgh/print-edition/2012/11/09/coal-industry-faces-changing-future.html?page=all>)

When having a discussion on the future of coal, it would be unlikely to hear natural gas go unmentioned. Natural gas is a cleaner burning fuel whose recently made available reserves have brought down prices to historic lows. “It is economics driving this move from coal to gas, at least right now,” said Paul Sotkiewicz, chief economist for PJM, the nation’s largest grid operator that controls the flow of electricity in 13 states, including Pennsylvania. In the first six months of this year, under 42 percent of electricity in PJM came from coal, while nearly 20 percent came from gas — a record high and a record low, respectively. Five years ago, coal was at 57 percent and gas below 6 percent. Over the past two years, new gas units coming into the grid have doubled, while nearly 18 gigawatts of coal generation will be deactivated. “Gas prices will be between $4-$5 per British thermal unit in the near term range and coal prices are only going to continue marching forward,” Sotkiewicz said. “We’re looking at a huge reconfiguration of the fleet.” In spite of all that, he warned, in paraphrasing Mark Twain, “the death of coal has been greatly exaggerated.” This year, Ohio-based FirstEnergy Corp. (NYSE: FE), the largest utility in Pennsylvania and owner of West Penn Power, said it was considering co-burning natural gas with coal at five of its power plants, including three in the state. More than 60 percent of FirstEnergy’s fuel comes from coal plants. Its first gas co-firing test target would be Hatfield’s Ferry, a three-boiler coal plant in Masontown with a capacity of 1,710 megawatts. Spokesman Mark Durbin said it’s unlikely FirstEnergy would go through with co-firing if natural gas prices go beyond $3 per MBtu (million British thermal units). That would make gas uncompetitive with the price of coal, he said. For the first part of 2012, the average price of a million Btus of coal at electric utilities was $2.44, according to the Energy Information Administration. The average price of natural gas was $2.50 per MBtu. Usually, the gap is much greater. In 2009, Consol Energy Inc. (NYSE: CNX), a 148-year-old coal company, entered the shale business, partly as a hedge against its traditional fuel. “We made a $3.5 billion bet that gas was going to be the fuel of the future,” said Randy Albert, COO of Consol’s gas division. Alpha Natural Resources (NYSE: ANR) did the same a year later, partnering with Rice Energy to explore the Marcellus Shale in Washington and Greene counties. Right now, low natural gas prices are actually hurting both sides of their business. They handicap the profits the companies can make on the gas side and make coal less competitive for utilities, thereby decreasing demand. However, when the price of one fuel goes up, the other follows. “People in the gas market are sitting there rooting for exports to Asia so they can get the price of coal up, so that can drive the prices of gas up,” said John Hynes, a partner with West Virginia-based Excidian LLC. In late September, natural gas finally broke the $3 mark for the first time this year and has since been on the rise. Already, Consol is seeing the upside of that trend, said Robert Pusateri, executive vice president of energy sales and transportation services. “Favorable natural gas price trends have enabled us to conclude several large thermal coal agreements for 2013,” Pusateri told investors during an earnings call last month. “In a recent conversation that I had with a fuel buyer, he commented that with the recent uptick of natural gas pricing, that this was making him rethink his coal purchase strategy for 2013 so that he didn’t get himself caught short as gas prices continually trend up.” With natural gas prices on the rebound, coal may regain its traditional rank as a stable, low-cost fuel. “Cheap energy’s not a right, it’s a privilege,” Albert said. “And at the end of the day, American people won’t stand for that privilege to be taken away.”

#### Expansive deployment of renewables drives down natural gas prices

Blake, Editor of the Washington Monthly, 09

(The Rooftop Revolution, www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0903.blake.html)

In some nations where feed-in tariffs have reached critical mass, there is evidence that they have actually driven down the overall price of electricity. This may seem counterintuitive—after all, renewable energy is more expensive on average than, say, coal power. But the price of electricity is often driven by natural gas, a costly and volatile fuel that is frequently used to meet peak power needs. If you have a large volume of renewable energy (particularly less-expensive wind power) you can cut your use of natural gas, bringing prices down across the board.

#### EPA regulations mean low natural gas prices stop the shift to CCS

McCarthy and Copeland 2011 - Specialist in Environmental Policy AND Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy (August 8, James E. and Claudia, “EPA’s Regulation of Coal-Fired Power: Is a “Train Wreck” Coming? ” <http://www.lawandenvironment.com/uploads/file/CRS-EPA.pdf>)

What these scenarios tell us is that utilities will look at the impending regulations and decide what to do largely based on their assumptions regarding the cost of the alternatives—natural gas (where it’s available) being the most often discussed, but others include conservation, wind, and other renewable resources. If they expect the price of gas to remain low or the cost of other alternatives to be competitive, their primary method of compliance likely will be to retire old coal plants and switch to gas or the alternatives. If they expect the price of gas or other alternatives to be high, they’ll invest the money in retrofitting the coal plants to reduce their emissions. As the NERC report stated: Unit retirement is assumed when the generic required cost of compliance with the proposed environmental regulation exceeds the cost of replacement power.... For the purpose of this assessment, replacement power costs were based on new natural gas generation capacity. If the unit’s retrofit costs are less than the cost of replacement power, then the unit is marked to be upgraded and retrofitted to meet the requirements of the potential environmental regulation., i.e., it is not considered “economically vulnerable” for retirement. 99 As utilities attempt to forecast the price of natural gas, their conclusions will be based in large part on assumptions as to whether gas will be available in sufficient quantities to meet the increased demands of electric power generation. Natural gas faces its own controversies, as domestic production increasingly relies on “unconventional” sources such as shale, from which gas is obtained by hydraulic fracturing. (For additional information on this practice, see CRS Report R41760, Hydraulic Fracturing and Safe Drinking Water Act Issues, by Mary Tiemann and Adam Vann.) Nevertheless, a 2009 NERC report stated: Concerns regarding the availability and deliverability of natural gas have diminished during 2009 as North American production has begun to trend upward due to a shift toward unconventional gas production from shale, tight sands, and coal-bed methane reservoirs. In its latest biennial assessment, the Potential Gas Committee increased U.S. natural gas resources by nearly 45 percent to 1,836 TCF [trillion cubic feet], largely because of increases in unconventional gas across many geographic areas. Pipeline capacity has similarly increased, by 15 BCFD [billion cubic feet per day] in 2007 and 44 BCFD in 2008, with an increase of 35 BCFD expected in 2009. Storage capacity has also increased substantially. 100 In short, the “train wreck” facing the coal-fired electric generating industry, to the extent that it exists, is being caused by cheap, abundant natural gas as much as by EPA regulations. As John Rowe, Chairman and CEO of Exelon Corporation, recently stated: “These regulations will not kill coal.... In fact, modeling done on the impacts of these rules shows that up to 50% of retirements are due to the current economics of the plant due to natural gas and coal prices.

#### Cheap natural gas obliterates the railroad industry – Coal shipping and competition with trucking

Ferry, Contributor to the Motley Fool Blog Network, 12

(6/17, Railroads Prepare for the Threat of Natural Gas, beta.fool.com/catominor/2012/06/17/railroads-prepare-threat-natural-gas/5836/

North American's freight railroads have delivered impressive performances since deregulation in the 1980s, growing into one of the largest and most efficient freight transportation systems in the world. Significant revenue drivers for railroads over the past few years have been large coal shipments to power plants, as well as a competitive advantage over trucking due to better fuel efficiency. Over the next decade, a secular trend in favor of cheap, clean natural gas will undermine these strengths. Railroads are anticipating the challenge and are taking steps to protect their businesses, but some lines will be far more exposed than others. American power plants have been hungry for coal, and the railroads have delivered it, transporting over 70% of the nation's coal. Coal typically accounts for around a quarter of rail volumes and just under a third of revenue for North America's Class I railroads. Like most commodities, coal volumes took a hit in 2009, which in turn dragged heavily on railroad's bottom lines. More distressingly, coal has been slow to recover with the rest of the economy, as a natural gas boom made possible by hydrofracking makes coal a less attractive fossil fuel. Worse for coal, the EPA has come out with new emissions guidelines that are likely to prevent another new coal plant from ever opening in the country. Last quarter, the volume of coal shipped by railroads slipped by 15–20%. But the railroads aren't sitting still. For one, while natural gas may be on the rise in the US, China is still hungry for coal and American exporters haven't even begun to meet this need. As domestic demand cools, coal miners and railroads alike are hoping that China can pick up the slack. Vast reserves in Wyoming's Powder River Basin are conveniently located for Pacific export, but current infrastructure on the West Coast is insufficient to handle large volumes. Plans are in the works to construct six new coal terminals in Washington and Oregon, and that would tremendously benefit rail lines with access to both the Powder River Basin and the planned terminals, including Union Pacific (NYSE: UNP) and BNSF, owned by Berkshire Hathaway (NYSE: BRK-B). Rail lines exposed primarily to Appalachian coal, without access to Pacific terminals, like CSX (NYSE: CSX) and Norfolk Southern (NYSE: NSC), will find it much more difficult to compensate for lagging domestic demand through export growth, as the European export market is already quite developed. These companies will simply have to diversify their shipment mix away from coal. Canadian National (NYSE: CNI) is the leader here, with coal accounting for only 7% of revenue, less than a quarter of its peers. Recently railroads have profited from an increase in the volume of automobiles and intermodal traffic, typically containerized cargo. Ironically the natural gas boom could help railroads, because cheap natural gas is used by American chemical companies as a feedstock for other products. Increased chemical production should translate to increased volumes of chemical shipments on the rails. Ultimately, the bigger threat from natural gas could be the advantage it gives to rail's chief competitor, freight trucking. The trucking industry is in the early stages of converting to natural gas engines, which will drastically reduce truckers' fuel costs. The better fuel efficiency of rail is what makes it competitive, because trucking benefits from public infrastructure support that rail doesn't have. Trucks do pay the Federal Highway Use Tax, but this doesn't cover the full cost of highway construction and maintenance, and truckers only have to pay the tax to the extent that they actually use roads, allowing them to better control expenses when volumes are low. Rail companies typically own their own tracks, and are fully responsible for maintenance and expansion. When volumes suffer, and fewer trains use the tracks, the railroads must still maintain them at full cost, putting them at a disadvantage. Most Class I railroads pay around 20% of total revenue on capital expenditure. If they lose their advantage in fuel efficiency to natural gas engine trucks, they could be forced to accept lower pricing to remain competitive. In an industry that has typically struggled to earn returns above and beyond their cost of capital, this prospect could negatively impact shareholders for many years to come.

#### Railroads key to military readiness and deployment

Pike, Policy analyst at the Federation of American Scientists, 12

(Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET), [www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/stracnet.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/stracnet.htm))

The military places heavy and direct reliance on railroads to integrate bases and connect installations to predominantly maritime ports of embarkation. Mainlines, connectors, and clearance lines must all combine to support movement of heavy and/or oversized equipment. To ensure that military needs are factored into railroad industry decisions that may impact on national defense, the Department of Defense relies on the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC). In this capacity, MTMC identifies facilities of the railroad infrastructure important to national defense, informs the commercial and civil sectors of Defense needs, and encourages the retention and upkeep of railroad assets vital to support military movements. To ensure this continuity and coordination, MTMC has created the Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET). STRACNET has identified 32,500 miles of rail line critical for movement of essential military equipment to ports located around the country as well as another 5,000 miles of track essential to connect one facility to another. In addition to identifying key lines and facilities, MTMC also conducts analysis of potential railroad industry construction, mergers, bankruptcies, and abandonments to determine how any of these actions may affect DOD mobility capabilities. Since 1976, MTMC has reviewed more than 2,100 abandonments affecting 33,000 miles of track, as well as eight bankruptcies affecting more 1/3 of the nation's railroad network. MTMC analysis and reviews are the main source of DOD input to the railroad industry in attempts to preclude the loss of a critical section of track or facility that is essential to effective movement of heavy military lift requirements. The Railroads for National Defense Program (RND) ensures the readiness capability of the national railroad network to support defense deployment and peacetime needs. The Program works to integrate defense rail needs into civil sector planning affecting the Nation's railroad system. Rail transportation is extremely important to DOD since the predominance of our heavy and tracked vehicles will deploy by rail to seaports of embarkation. The RND Program in conjunction with the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), established the Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET) to ensure DOD's minimum rail needs are identified and coordinated with appropriate transportation authorities. STRACNET is an interconnected and continuous rail line network consisting of over 38,000 miles of track serving over 170 defense installations.

#### Training is key to readiness which is key to global deterrence – decline causes lashout and war

Spencer, Senior Research Fellow at Heritage, 2000

(The Facts About Military Readiness, www.heritage.org/research/reports/2000/09/bg1394-the-facts-about-military-readiness

Military 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. Readiness Defined. Readiness measures the ability of a military unit, such as an Army division or a carrier battle group, to accomplish its assigned mission. Logistics, available spare parts, training, equipment, and morale all contribute to readiness. The military recognizes four grades of readiness.7 At the highest level, a unit is prepared to move into position and accomplish its mission. At the lowest level, a unit requires further manpower, training, equipment, and/or logistics to accomplish its mission. There is evidence of a widespread lack of readiness within the U.S. armed forces. Recently leaked Army documents report that 12 of the 20 schools training soldiers in skills such as field artillery, infantry, and aviation have received the lowest readiness rating. They also disclose that over half of the Army's combat and support training centers are rated at the lowest readiness grade.8 As recently as last November, two of the Army's 10 active divisions were rated at the lowest readiness level, and none were rated at the highest.9 Every division required additional manpower, equipment, or training before it would be prepared for combat, due largely to the units' commitments to operations in the Balkans.10 And 23 percent of the Army's Chinook cargo helicopters, 19 percent of its Blackhawk helicopters, and 16 percent of its Apaches are not "mission-capable."11 In other words, they are not ready. The Facts about Military Readiness The reduction in forces of the U.S. armed forces began in the early 1990s. After the end of the Cold War, the Bush Administration began to reduce the size of the military so that it would be consistent with post-Cold War threats.12 Under the Clinton Administration, however, that reduction in forces escalated too rapidly at the same time that U.S. forces were deployed too often with too little funding. The result was decreased readiness as personnel, equipment, training, and location suffered. Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, the U.S. military has been deployed on over 50 peacekeeping and peace-enforcement operations.13 Yet the resources available to fund these missions have steadily decreased: The number of total active personnel has decreased nearly 30 percent, and funding for the armed services has decreased 16 percent. The strain on the armed forces shows clearly now as the reduced forces deploy for too long with insufficient and antiquated equipment. The result is indisputable: Readiness is in decline. Because the security of the United States is at stake, it is imperative to present the facts about military readiness: FACT #1. The size of the U.S. military has been cut drastically in the past decade. Between 1992 and 2000, the Clinton Administration cut national defense by more than half a million personnel and $50 billion in inflation-adjusted dollars.14 (See Table 1.) The Army alone has lost four active divisions and two Reserve divisions. Because of such cuts, the Army has lost more than 205,000 soldiers, or 30 percent of its staff, although its missions have increased significantly throughout the 1990s. In 1992, the U.S. Air Force consisted of 57 tactical squadrons and 270 bombers. Today the Air Force has 52 squadrons and 178 bombers. The total number of active personnel has decreased by nearly 30 percent. In the Navy, the total number of ships has decreased significantly as well. In 1992, there were around 393 ships in the fleet, while today there are only 316, a decrease of 20 percent. The number of Navy personnel has fallen by over 30 percent. In 1992, the Marine Corps consisted of three divisions. The Corps still has three divisions, but since 1992, it has lost 22,000 active duty personnel, or 11 percent of its total. The Clinton Administration also cut the Marine Corps to 39,000 reserve personnel from 42,300 in 1992. Effect on Readiness. In spite of these drastic force reductions, missions and operations tempo have increased, resulting in decreased military readiness. Because every mission affects far greater numbers of servicemen than those directly involved, most operations other than warfare, such as peacekeeping, have a significant negative impact on readiness. For each serviceman who participates in a military operation, two others are involved in the mission: one who is preparing to take the participant's place, and another who is recovering from having participated and retraining. Therefore, if 10,000 troops are on peace operations in the Balkans, 30,000 troops are actually being taken away from preparing for combat. Ten thousand are actively participating, while 10,000 are recovering, and 10,000 are preparing to go. Coupled with declining personnel, increased tempo has a devastating effect on readiness. Morale problems stemming from prolonged deployments, equipment that wears out too quickly, and decreased combat training levels heighten when troops are committed to non-combat operations. Further exacerbating the military's declining readiness is the tendency to take troops with special skills from non-deployed units. Thus, a mission may affect non-deployed units as well because they will not be able to train properly. The soldiers integral to the non-deployed mission are not present, and there is no one to take their place. A mission's spillover effects are clearly illustrated by a July 2000 report by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) on the U.S. commitments in the Balkans: In January 2000 ... four active divisions and one Guard division were affected by these operations [in the Balkans]. Among the active divisions, the 1st Cavalry Division was recovering from a 1-year deployment in Bosnia, the 10th Mountain Division was deployed there, and elements of the Guard's 49th Armored Division were preparing to deploy there. At the same time, the European-based 1st Infantry Division was deployed to Kosovo, and the 1st Armored Division was preparing to deploy there. Although none of these divisions deployed in its entirety, deployment of key components--especially headquarters--makes these divisions unavailable for deployment elsewhere in case of a major war.15 Simultaneously, the military's budget has continuously decreased over the past eight years; and, thus, the services are being forced to choose between funding quality of life improvements, procurement, training, and other essential spending. Consequently, none is adequately funded. For example, the Army is short by thousands of night vision goggles, binoculars, global positioning systems and hundreds of generator sets, battery chargers, and chemical agent monitors. (See Table 2.) According to the Office of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, these shortages are due to "recent increases in requirements," "slowed procurement funding," and "use of operations and maintenance funds for higher priorities."16 Furthermore, when smaller forces deploy for more missions, the result is increased wear-and-tear on equipment and longer deployments for servicemen. Coupled with too little money, the result is a military weakened by aging equipment, low morale, and poor training. FACT #2. Military deployments have increased dramatically throughout the 1990s. The pace of deployments has increased 16-fold since the end of the Cold War.17 According to Representative Curt Weldon (R-PA), the Clinton Administration has deployed U.S. forces 34 times in less than eight years. During the entire 40-year period of the Cold War, the military was committed to comparable deployments just 10 times.18 Between 1960 and 1991, the Army conducted 10 operations outside of normal training and alliance commitments, but between 1992 and 1998, the Army conducted 26 such operations. Similarly, the Marines conducted 15 contingency operations between 1982 and 1989, and 62 since 1989.19 During the 1990s, U.S. forces of 20,000 or more troops were engaged in non-warfighting missions in Somalia (1993), Haiti (1994), Bosnia (1996), and Iraq and Kuwait (1998).20 In 1998, before U.S. interventions in Kosovo and East Timor, General Henry Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned, "In the past four years we've conducted some four dozen major operations. And today, in support of our national strategy, we have more than 50,000 troops deployed in 12 major operations--and, I might add, many smaller ones--in dozens of countries around the world." Today the Army has 144,716 soldiers in 126 countries.21 Throughout the 1990s, U.S. taxpayers spent an average of $3 billion per year on peace operations.22 In 1990, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) spent around $200 million on peace operations. Today that amount has ballooned to $3.6 billion.23 The 78-day Kosovo campaign in 1999 cost around $5 billion, not including the ongoing peace mission.24 Operations Southern and North Watch in Iraq cost $1.1 billion per year; the Haiti operation cost a total of $2.4 billion; and to date, the Balkans have cost over $15 billion.25 (See Table 3.) Effect on Readiness. This dramatic increase in the use of America's armed forces has had a detrimental effect on overall combat readiness. According to General Shelton, "our experience in the Balkans underscores the reality that multiple, persistent commitments place a significant strain on our people and can erode warfighting readiness."26 Both people and equipment wear out faster under frequent use. For example, units deployed in Somalia took 10 months to restore their equipment to predeployment readiness levels.27 According to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) survey of Army leaders who participated in peace missions, almost two-thirds said that their units' training readiness had declined.28 Training is a key component of readiness, and frequent missions cause the armed forces to reduce training schedules. For example, Operation Allied Force caused 22 joint exercises to be cancelled in 1999. Joint training exercises were reduced from 277 in fiscal year (FY) 1996 to 189 in FY 2000.

### Politics

#### Obama’s new charm offensive is paying off – it is creating cooperation that is yielding progress on immigration

Eilperin, 3/24 (Juliet, 3/24/2013, Washington Post.com, “White House’s outreach is yielding modest benefits, lawmakers say; While tensions remain, White House outreach yields modest benefits,” Factiva))

Two weeks after launching a high-profile charm offensive targeting Capitol Hill, President Obama and his aides have taken their effort behind the scenes — quietly pushing for cooperation between the White House and congressional Republicans on key disputes. Before departing for Israel last Tuesday, for example, Obama called Republican Sens. John McCain (Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (S.C.) to discuss immigration reform and other issues. The White House legislative affairs office reached out to Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.) last week after he spoke of being ignored. And Obama counselor Pete Rouse worked with Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) on resolving the impasse over Interior Secretary-designate Sally Jewell's nomination. Lawmakers and aides say the effort has begun to yield modest dividends. Last week, Congress managed to pass a continuing resolution averting another potential government shutdown. "It's sort of like the two sides are looking across the table and thinking, 'We really are going to have to live in this house for the next four years. Let's divide up who does the dishes: I'll take Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday,' " said Cole, who has broken ranks with his party on occasion. "I sort of see the CR as a confidence builder." But diplomacy still has its limits. On Friday, the White House formally withdrew the nomination of Caitlin Halligan to join the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit after Republicans had blocked her appointment for years. House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) had lunch with both Obama and his panel's ranking Democratic member, Rep. Chris Van Hollen (Md.), on March 7. But last week, Ryan's aides had no contact with White House officials as they pushed through their conservative budget plan. By contrast, Obama called Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) to thank her for her work on the Senate Democrats' budget blueprint. "This is not a week where they are going to pick up the phone and call House Republicans," Van Hollen said, referring to White House officials. "After a week of constructive meetings, the president and his senior team have continued conversations with members," White House spokeswoman Amy Brundage wrote in an e-mail, adding: "That outreach will continue." Van Hollen said that one of the inherent challenges is that House GOP leaders are willing to engage with Obama only in a public context — such as during a budget conference — for fear of alienating their rank-and-file members. Rep. Scott Rigell (R-Va.), for example, said he hesitated for a moment when the White House called him Feb. 25 as he was sitting in Norfolk's Piccadilly Cafe to ask whether he wanted to travel to Hampton Roads with the president aboard Air Force One. "I had to do two hours of thinking in about four of five seconds," Rigell said, knowing he would come under attack from conservatives for having a private talk with the president. "I just went, 'Oh my, here we go.' But it was a good conversation, I'm glad we had it." Rigell, who said he told Obama it was urgent to cut federal spending, said the discussion did not transform his relationship with the White House. "I'd love to say we're text messaging back and forth. That is not happening," he said, adding he hasn't heard from the administration since. "I do feel if I needed to reach out, I could do that. Sen. Ronald H. Johnson (R-Wis.), who had dinner with the president and 11 other Republicans at the Jefferson Hotel on March 6, said Obama made a point of telling the group that Americans don't realize they get $3 back for every dollar they pay into the federal entitlement system. But the president needs to do more than acknowledge it privately, Johnson said: "He needs to start honestly telling the American people how serious the problem is." Ryan described the charm offensive as "helpful" during an interview on Greta Van Susteren's "On the Record" on Thursday, adding: "The question is, is it real and will it last? If it is real and if it does last, then I think we've got a chance of getting a down payment on the problem fixed."For the most part, these conversations are taking place outside congressional leadership circles. Cole told The Washington Post earlier this month that he hadn't been contacted in months by the White House legislative affairs office. Staffers quickly reached out to schedule an appointment between Cole and the White House's new legislative director, Miguel Rodriguez. "They've been trying," Cole said, saying members appreciated that Obama spent an hour and a half speaking to the House GOP Conference of March 13 and shook hands and took photos with any member who came up to him afterward. "He was not whisked out. That was not lost on anybody."

#### Passage is contingent on continued bipartisan cooperation

Fabian, 1/30 (Jordan, 1/30/2013, “Obama Confident Immigration Reform Passes This Year,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/president-obama-confident-immigration-reform-passes-year/story?id=18358660>))

President Barack Obama expressed confidence on Wednesday that he would sign comprehensive immigration reform into law by the end of this year. In an interview with Univision's Maria Elena Salinas, Obama explained that significant details of a bill still must be worked out by lawmakers, including the structure of a pathway to citizenship for many of the 11 million undocumented immigrants. But Obama said that the progress made by a bipartisan group of lawmakers in the Senate has given him hope that a deal can get done.See Also: Transcript: President Obama's Interview When asked by Salinas if we will have immigration reform by the end of the year, Obama said, "I believe so." "You can tell our audience, 'Sí, se puede?'" Salinas asked. "Sí, se puede," Obama responded. Later in the interview, Obama said that he hopes a bill could be passed as early as this summer. But cognizant of deep divisions a topic like immigration has sewn in the past, Obama said that's contingent on bipartisan negotiations continuing to proceed well. "The only way this is going to get done is if the Republicans continue to work with Democrats in Congress, in both chambers, to get a bill to my desk," he said. "And I'm going to keep on pushing as hard as I can. I believe that the mood is right." Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama after his Las Vegas announcement on immigration reform. Univision Maria Elena Salinas talks to President Obama... View Full Size Although the president threatened to introduce his own bill if negotiations in Congress stall during his speech in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Tuesday, he said he is content to let lawmakers hash out the details among themselves for the time being. "If they are on a path as they have already said, where they want to get a bill done by March, then I think that's a reasonable timeline and I think we can get that done. I'm not going to lay down a particular date because I want to give them a little room to debate," he said. "If it slips a week, that's one thing. If it starts slipping three months, that's a problem." The president's principles and the Senate's principles on immigration broadly align with one another, but there are still thorny issues that could spark a division between Obama and Republicans, such as the pathway to citizenship. The Senate's path to citizenship would allow many undocumented immigrants to obtain legal status immediately upon passage of the law. But their ability to then seek legal permanent residency would be contingent upon the U.S.-Mexico border being deemed secure. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" on immigration, has been particularly vocal in stating that border security is a precondition for gaining legal permanent residence, and then citizenship.

#### And, reducing environmental laws is unpopular

O’Keefe, 12 --- CEO, George C. Marshall Institute (8/14/2012, William, “The Sweet Spot: Bipartisan Energy Policy,” <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php?comments=expandall#comments>, JMP)

We have seen that subsidies and industrial policy initiatives have unintended consequences that are far greater than any realistic benefits. Instead of continuing those, Congress should support a multi-year R&D program that does not promote one energy source over another but produces the scientific information that the private sector needs to advance commercial technologies. It also could make the R&D tax credit permanent. Overhauling environmental laws and regulations is a worthy goal but not one that attract a bi-partisan majority, at least not soon. What Congress could do is start a hearing process to determine which provisions of law have worked, which haven’t, and what overarching principles provide the basis to streamline and modernize environmental laws. The Code of Federal Regulations continues to grow. New regulations are added, rarely are old ones removed. There needs to be a law requiring a “look back” process leading to eliminating or revising past regulations.

#### Immigration reform is key to both hard and soft power

Nye, 12-10 --- Harvard Prof and former US assistant secretary of defense, state and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council (12/10/2013, “Immigration and American Power,” <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>)

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.” In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans. As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades. During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008. Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively. But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors. While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population. For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades. Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies. Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US. Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both. Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US. That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### Decline causes great power wars

Zhang & Shi, Researcher @ The Carnegie Endowment, ’11

[Yuhan Zhang, Researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Lin Shi, Columbia University, Independent consultant for the Eurasia Group, Consultant for the World Bank, “[America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/),” January 22nd 2011, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>]

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, [as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers](http://www.cfr.org/publication/23537/belttightening_for_us_foreign_policy.html), so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

## EU

### Frontline

#### U.S. and UK are already collaborating on floating wind turbines

Guardian, 12 (4/23/2012, by Staff and Press Association, “US and UK to collaborate on 'floating' wind turbines; The new technology could allow Britain to harness the consistently higher wind speeds available over deeper water,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/apr/23/us-uk-floating-wind-turbines>)

The UK and US will work together to develop "floating" wind turbines to harness more offshore wind power at a potentially lower cost, the government said on Monday.

Before this week's clean-energy meeting of ministers from 23 countries in London, the government announced it will collaborate with the US in developing wind technology to generate power in deep waters that are currently off-limits to conventional turbines.

In order to exploit the UK's huge wind resource, which accounts for about one-third of Europe's offshore wind potential, new technology is needed to access waters between 60 and 100 metres deep: too deep for turbines fixed to the seabed, but where wind speeds are consistently higher.

It is hoped that developing the technology will increase the UK's potential for offshore wind power, particularly after 2020, by which time many shallower sites will have been developed.

The government believes it could also reduce the current high cost of offshore wind, cutting the expense of seabed foundations and allowing repairs on floating wind platforms to be carried out in port rather than out at sea.

The energy secretary, Ed Davey, said: "Britain has more wind turbines installed around its shores than any other country in the world, and our market is rated year after year as the most attractive market among investors. Offshore wind is critical for the UK's energy future, and there is big interest around the world in what we're doing.

"The UK and US are both making funding available for this technology, and we're determined to work together to capitalise on this shared intent."

The Energy Technologies Institute is commissioning a £25m offshore wind floating system demonstrator, which will require the chosen participants to produce an offshore wind turbine that can generate 5MW to 7MW by 2016. The project could be demonstrated off the Cornish coast at the WaveHub site.

In the US, four offshore projects are being backed by the Department of Energy, potentially including a floating wind demonstration.

Norway already has a full-scale demonstration of a floating wind turbine, while a similar project is underway off Portugal.

This week's Clean Energy Ministerial will be co-chaired by Davey and his US energy counterpart, Steven Chu. The two countries are signing a memorandum of understanding to collaborate on a series of areas including power generation, energy efficiency and transmission.

### Prolif

#### Empirics prove that weapons don’t increase the risk of war

Tepperman ‘9 (Jonathan Tepperman a journalist based in New York City. “Why Obama should learn to love the bomb” Newsweek Nov 9, 2009 <http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome_files/nukes_Final.pdf>)

**A** growing and compelling body of research suggests that nuclear weaponsmay not, in fact, make the world more dangerous, as Obama and most people assume. The bomb may actually make us safer. In this era of rogue states and trans-national terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that’s a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Obama’s idealistic campaign, so out of character for a pragmatic administration, may be unlikely to get far (past presidents have tried and failed). But it’s not even clear he should make the effort. There are more important measures the U.S. government can and should take to make the real world safer, and these mustn’t be ignored in the name of a dreamy ideal (a nuke free planet) that’s both unrealistic and possibly undesirable. The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there’s never been a nuclear, or even a nonnuclear, war between **two states that possess them**. Just stop for a second and think about that: it’s hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading “nuclear optimist” and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, “We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It’s striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.” To understand why—and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way—you need to start by recognizing that **all state**s are rational on some basic level. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they’re pretty sure they can get away with them. Take war: **a country will start a fight only when it’s almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price**. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn’t think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often **make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side**—and millions of innocents pay the price. **Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war** obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button— and everybody knows it—the basic math shifts. Even the craziest tin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, “Why fight if you can’t win and might lose everything?” Why indeed? **The iron logic of deterrence** and mutually assured destruction **is so compelling**, it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world’s major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy **wars**, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on, great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there’s very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring—because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, “It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time.” The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. **The best recent example is India and Pakistan**, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. **Getting their hands o**n weapons of mass destruction didn’t do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war.

### Russian Expansionism

#### Russia doesn’t have the budget for expansionism

Koehl, Fellow at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, senior research fellow on US-European defense cooperation at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, 10-14-2K8 (Stuart, “Don't Laugh at the Bear But don't make him bigger than he is.”, The Weekly Standard)

Greenwald's main point appears to be Russia is still dangerous. It most certainly is, as the recent invasion of Georgia showed. Yet if you can get past the tone of the Newsweek article, its salient point is to assert the viability of the European policy of appeasing Russia into collapse. That notion is dangerously wrongheaded and misreads the nature of the Russian threat today--ironically, by overestimating its military dimension in the same way Greenwald has done. But first, some context. Yes, Russia will spend $48 billion on defense next year. That makes its budget about the same size as . . . Great Britain's. In comparison, the United States will spend somewhere in the vicinity of $650 billion (depending on the size of the supplemental appropriations for the war). Note that the bulk of the Russian defense budget, like ours, goes to military personnel expenses--salary, pensions, benefits, etc. The Russian defense budget is opaque, but it is probably reasonable to say that they resemble other European countries in spending about 25 percent of their budget on "investment"--meaning procurement plus research & technology (R&T). That leaves the remainder for operations and maintenance (O&M), the money spent on things like training, repairs, supplies, spare parts, fuel, and so forth, without which all the hardware in the world is so much overpriced junk. This means Russia will spend perhaps $20-22 billion on personnel next year (more, if they intend to improve professionalism and develop a real NCO corps); about $12 billion on investment (let's say about $10 billion on procurement); and about $9-10 billion on O&M. That's really not that much for modernization, push come to shove and even taking into account Russia's low labor rates. By way of comparison, Poland bought some 24 F-16s a couple of years back for about $3 billion; Romania intends to buy 48 multi-role fighters at a cost of $4.5 billion. How much do you think Russia can really buy for $10 billion per year? How much new technology can it develop into workable systems on $2-4 billion per year? As for O&M, Russia maintains an extremely large force of increasingly elderly tanks, APCs, artillery, aircraft and ships. Much of its inventory is non-operational because of lack of maintenance. What they do have they run on a shoestring, because they have chronically under-invested in O&M. This means their force, what there is of it, cannot sustain combat operations or deploy substantial forces out of area for any significant time. Much of what Russia has done with its military forces over the past few years can best be described as "stunts." Yes, they can get a few Tu-95 Bears or Tu-160 Blackjacks airworthy and send them to probe U.S. and British air defenses, but to do so means grounding most of the rest of the force, scrounging for parts, hoarding fuel (yes, the Russian military is short of fuel). Same thing with sending a battle group on a grand tour of warm water ports. Given the Russian fleet's record for maintenance and reliability, it would indeed be surprising if they make it to Venezuela without a major casualty. Ballistic missile tests? I'm underwhelmed. What's left of the Strategic Rocket Forces has no first-strike capability at all.

### China

#### Other countries will counterbalance China’s rise – Prevents aggression

Nye, ’10

[Joseph S. Nye, Jr., University Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University, “The Future of American Power,” Foreign Affairs, November/December 2010, Volume 89, Issue 6] AP

Some have argued that China aims to challenge the United States' position in East Asia and, eventually, the world. Even if this were an accurate assessment of China's current intentions (and even the Chinese themselves cannot know the views of future generations), it is doubtful that China will have the military capability to make this possible anytime soon. Moreover, Chinese leaders will have to contend with the reactions of other countries and the constraints created by China's need for external markets and resources. Too aggressive a Chinese military posture could produce a countervailing coalition among China's neighbors that would weaken both its hard and its soft power. The rise of Chinese power in Asia is contested by both India and Japan (as well as other states), and that provides a major power advantage to the United States. The U.S.-Japanese alliance and the improvement in U.S.-Indian relations mean that China cannot easily expel the Americans from Asia. From that position of strength, the United States, Japan, India, Australia, and others can engage China and provide incentives for it to play a responsible role, while hedging against the possibility of aggressive behavior as China's power grows.

## Oceans

#### Alt cause – nuclear reactors

Gunter, Director of the Reactor Oversight Project at NIRS, 01

(Licensed to Kill: How the nuclear power industry destroys endangered marine wildlife and ocean habitat to save money, www.nirs.org/reactorwatch/licensedtokill/LiscencedtoKill.pdf)

Fish, fish larvae, and fish eggs are harmed and destroyed upon entering the flow of reactor cooling water where they are sucked into and impinged on the water intake screens. These ecologically essential life forms are then stressed by the mechanical, chemical, and thermal impacts of the operation of the once-through cooling system. Smaller fish, fish larvae, spawn, and a tremendous volume of other marine organisms are daily drawn deeper inside the reactor coolant system where up to 95 percent are scalded and discharged back into the water body as lifeless sediment. These high destruction rates can overtake recovery rates, resulting in extensive depletion of the affected species. In this way, entire marine communities can lose their capacity to sustain themselves.

#### Internal link is ludicrous- trawling occurs globally and over any possible ocean patch- offshore wind wouldn’t take up the entire ocean

#### EU solves trawling- more critical than the US

Walter, 2012,

7-19, Mike, Pew Charitable Trusts, “EU Commission Makes History with Proposal to Phase Out Bottom Trawling for Deep-Sea Species,” http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/press-releases/eu-commission-makes-history-with-proposal-to-phase-out-bottom-trawling-for-deep-sea-species-85899401372

In a move that will help protect one of the most biodiverse areas on Earth, the European Commission today proposed phasing out destructive bottom trawling and bottom gillnetting among deep sea fishing fleets in the Northeast Atlantic. The Pew Environment Group praised EC Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Maria Damanaki, for the bold proposal to finally put an end to these unsustainable and destructive deep-sea fishing methods. Marine scientists have roundly concluded that deep-sea bottom trawling is the most direct and widespread threat to fragile deep-sea ecosystems. These ecosystems harbor a diversity of life – much of it as yet unidentified – that may exceed the biodiversity found in the Amazon rainforest.¶ “We congratulate Commissioner Damanaki on her leadership today in proposing a thorough overhaul of the management of deep-sea fisheries and taking the first step towards phasing out one of the most destructive fishing practices in use today,” commented Matthew Gianni, policy advisor to the Pew Environment Group and the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition. “It is now up to EU fisheries ministers and the European Parliament to show similar resolve by adopting legislation to implement the Commissioner's proposal and put an end to destructive deep-sea fishing practices.”

#### Oil and gas exploration triggers the link

NRDC ‘12

(National Resources Defense Council, “Deep Sea Treasures Protecting the Atlantic Coast's Ancient Submarine Canyons and Seamounts,” March 2012, <http://www.nrdc.org/oceans/canyons/>, accessed 1-13-13)

Renewed oil and gas exploration has also been approved for the Atlantic, threatening the canyons with sound pollution and the prospect of future drilling. Seismic surveys, using high-decibel acoustic energy pulses blasted from ships, can damage or kill fish and fish larvae and have been implicated in whale beaching and stranding incidents. And while Interior Secretary Salazar has said that areas off the east coast will not be leased for offshore drilling -- at least until 2017 -- seismic testing to assess potential oil and gas deposits will proceed.

#### Alt Cause –

#### Overfishing

UN, 04 (“Overfishing: A Threat to Marine Biodiversity”, http://www.un.org/events/tenstories/06/story.asp?storyID=800)

The magnitude of the problem of overfishing is often overlooked, given the competing claims of deforestation, desertification, energy resource exploitation and other biodiversity depletion dilemmas. The rapid growth in demand for fish and fish products is leading to fish prices increasing faster than prices of meat. As a result, fisheries investments have become more attractive to both entrepreneurs and governments, much to the detriment of small-scale fishing and fishing communities all over the world. In the last decade, in the north Atlantic region, commercial fish populations of cod, hake, haddock and flounder have fallen by as much as 95%, prompting calls for urgent measures. Some are even recommending zero catches to allow for regeneration of stocks, much to the ire of the fishing industry. According to a Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimate, over 70% of the world’s fish species are either fully exploited or depleted. The dramatic increase of destructive fishing techniques worldwide destroys marine mammals and entire ecosystems. FAO reports that illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing worldwide appears to be increasing as fishermen seek to avoid stricter rules in many places in response to shrinking catches and declining fish stocks. Few, if any, developing countries and only a limited number of developed ones are on track to put into effect by this year the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. Despite that fact that each region has its Regional Sea Conventions, and some 108 governments and the European Commission have adopted the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land based Activities, oceans are cleared at twice the rate of forests.

#### Don’t solve global alt causes – at best solve the US – means collapse inev

#### 3. Aquaculture

**CQ Researcher, 02** (“Threatened Fisheries”, Vol. 12, No. 27)

 “There's no question but that aquaculture is going to increase as an industry, not only here but throughout the world,” says Panetta of the Pew Oceans Commission. “The real question is whether or not we can regulate it in a way that ensures it doesn't have an adverse impact on the wild fisheries that we need to protect.” Aquaculture poses several environmental problems. Farmed fish are bred from a relatively small genetic pool of “pampered” stock unconditioned to natural hazards. So when they escape downstream and interbreed with wild fish, the ability of the already-endangered wild fish to survive can be undermined. The environmental threat increases when the escaped fish are non-indigenous. “Here in the Northwest, we're desperately worried about escaped Atlantic salmon moving into our rivers and displacing the critically depleted Pacific salmon populations that are just hanging by a thread,” Powell says. “Aquaculture could be a positive force, but in most situations right now that potential is not being realized because of its harmful effects.” The National Fisheries Institute, whose members depend on healthy stocks of wild fish, echoes this concern. “Fishermen and fishing communities should be consulted during the planning and development of aquaculture facilities,” the institute says. “Poor planning and management of aquaculture operations can damage native stocks of fish and shellfish, destroy fish habitat and degrade the productivity of local ecosystems.” The institute wants fish farmers to adhere to the FAO's 1995 “code of conduct for responsible fisheries,” which set standards for managing fisheries, including aquaculture facilities. Environmentalists also worry about the pollution generated by aquaculture operations. Like huge livestock feedlots on land, fish farms produce prodigious amounts of waste, which can pollute downstream waters. Chinese fish farmers, trying to curb disease outbreaks in crowded ponds, often add antibiotics to the water, which can show up in imported seafood, eventually contributing to consumers' antibiotic resistance. In Ecuador, shrimp farmers have decimated coastal mangrove stands, causing erosion and pollution. U.S. fishermen and fish farmers oppose imports of farmed seafood for a variety of reasons, mostly having to do with economics. Shrimpers along the Louisiana and Texas coasts say imports of cheaper farmed shrimp from Asia and Latin America have flooded the U.S. market, depressing shrimp prices and driving American shrimpers out of business. Domestic catfish farmers, concentrated in Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi, charge Asian exporters with false advertising by labeling an unrelated species as catfish.

#### Marine ecosystems are resilient.

Kennedy et. al. 02 – (Victor S. Kennedy, professor and researcher at¶ the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, COASTAL¶ AND MARINE ECOSYSTEMS AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE: POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF¶ U.S. RESOURCES, 2002, p.¶ <http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm>)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient¶ to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the¶ biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to¶ physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid¶ environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable.¶ Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their¶ range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

## Federalism

### Water Contamination

### China-Russia War

**China will never attack the Russian Far East–it would be diplomatic and military suicide**

**Menon, 03** (Rajan, Monroe J. Rathbone Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University, The National Interest, Fall)

By contrast, China's military, which was quite recently a giant horde of foot soldiers, is modernizing steadily-chiefly with Russian weaponry, much of it supplied from cash-starved military industries in Khabarovsk, Komsomol'sk and Vladivostok. It may lag far behind the United States, but in force projection, speed, accuracy and lethality it is a wholly different force than it was a decade ago, thanks to Russian fighter jets, submarines, tanks and missiles, many of them built in the Russian Far East. Yet the chances that China will attempt to conquer Russia's Far East are slim. Such a brazen power play would damage China's wider interests. Taiwan might recoil in terror and treat Beijing's proposals for a negotiated reunification with even greater skepticism and wariness. The prevailing Western rationale for economic engagement with China-that commerce will transform and co-opt that country-would be shredded. China would likely face a counterbalancing, encircling coalition of the United States, India, Japan, Russia and Vietnam. Would such setbacks justify the burdens of ruling the vast, problem-infested Russian Far East? The Chinese leaders know their Sun Tzu: what they seek from the Russian Far East (access to resources and a benign northern front) can be had by means of silk-gloved hegemony. Chinese interests can be served without its formal occupation of the territory. Indeed, what may emerge could be a "reverse Manchurian" scenario, where the Russian Far East remains a titular part of Russia but is increasingly integrated into Beijing's sphere of influence. That is precisely what the conspiracy among geography, demography, power and time may create in Russia's Far East.

#### Fear of Sino-Russian border war overblown

Abelsky, ‘6 (Paul, Oct 12, “An Exaggerated Invasion: Chinese Influence in Russia's Far East Is Growing, but the Dangers Are Overplayed” Russia Profile, http://www.russiablog.org/2006/10/chinas\_growing\_influence\_in\_ru.php)

It is an opinion echoed throughout the whole region by bureaucrats, experts, and bystanders. For example, a lawyer in the regional administration of the Jewish Autonomous Region says that even with the rise of the Chinese presence, there are few tensions between Chinese migrants and local residents, despite differences in mentality. "It's hard to maintain an overall parity with China, but our interests are in many ways complimentary," he said. "The broader strategy here is to revive and settle the region, which also means continuing to engage China, but it will be a real challenge to turn the situation vis-a-vis the Chinese fully in our favor." The precise intent and nature of Chinese economic interests in the Russian Far East is also a cause of much debate. Despite being unable to back their allegations with much evidence, Russian critics of Chinese "expansion" point to nebulous programmatic documents circulating within high government circles in Beijing that call for an absorption of underpopulated areas in Russia's border region by means of peaceful economic incorporation. Chinese schoolchildren purportedly study with geographic maps that render the swathe of the Russian Far East as Chinese land. Andrei Zabiyako, a professor and the head of the Religious Studies department at the Amur State University in Blagoveshchensk, has conducted detailed surveys of the migration process, carrying out expeditions into the outlying border areas. He says such accusations are not only unfounded, but also tend to misjudge the Chinese outlook with regard to Russia. "What is Chinese migration? It's a coordinated and stable process which stems wholly from the region's economic circumstances," Zabiyako said. "It does not involve a chaotic or spontaneous movement of people. The number of Chinese in any given place within the Russian Federation corresponds to the number that makes economic sense to the Chinese themselves. No more and no less." "The Chinese migrants are interested in sustaining this figure at a viable level, because competition between them is severe as it is," he added. "They are forced to vie for trading space, scarce resources, and finite demand on the part of the Russian consumer. The arriving Chinese made a conscious choice by themselves to come here, unlike the refugees from Central Asia, for example, who are flung by acute socio-economic crises or military conflicts. Chinese entrepreneurs and traders react to a particular state of economic affairs, and they are interested in capitalizing on the opportunities that exist in Russia." Zabiyako says the Chinese side extends brutal treatment to those caught crossing the frontier illegally, with border guards known to pummel the offenders in full view of Russian officials after the handover. Businesses based in Russia need to apply for permits in order to invite foreign personnel. During the first seven months of this year, 224 such licenses were issued in the Khabarovsk Region, 10 percent more than during a similar period last year. In Zabiyako's view, the Chinese would make perfect immigrants with their industrious work ethic and willingness to assimilate. Conversations with local vendors in markets across the region, where ethnic Russians and Chinese come into the most direct personal contact, do not contradict such an assessment. Chinese traders and hawkers of goods tend to speak rudimentary Russian but know enough to engage in lively bargaining sessions with Russian customers. Yekaterina, a middle-aged fruit seller in Blagoveshchensk, just shrugged when asked about her attitude toward her Chinese counterparts. "We just work next to each other and there has been no particular tensions," she said. "Just take a walk around the stalls and see for yourself."

### Climate Adaption

#### Icebergs are a negative feedback – none of their evidence takes this into account

Macfarlane, 09 (Jo, The Daily Mail Online. “Amazing discovery of green algae which could save the world from global warming” [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1104772/Amazing-discovery-green-algae-save-world-global-warming.html?ITO=1490#](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1104772/Amazing-discovery-green-algae-save-world-global-warming.html?ITO=1490))

Melting icebergs, so long the iconic image of global warming, are triggering a natural process that could delay or even end climate change, British scientists have found. A team working on board the Royal Navy’s HMS Endurance off the coast of Antarctica have discovered tiny particles of iron are released into the sea as the ice melts. The iron feeds algae, which blooms and sucks up damaging carbon dioxide (CO2), then sinks, locking away the harmful greenhouse gas for hundreds of years. The team think the process could hold the key to staving off globally rising temperatures. Lead researcher Professor Rob Raiswell, from Leeds University, said: ‘The Earth itself seems to want to save us.’ As a result of the findings, a ground-breaking experiment will be held this month off the British island of South Georgia, 800 miles south east of the Falklands. It will see if the phenomenon could be harnessed to contain rising carbon emissions. Researchers will use several tons of iron sulphate to create an artificial bloom of algae. The patch will be so large it will be visible from space. Scientists already knew that releasing iron into the sea stimulates the growth of algae. But environmentalists had warned that to do so artificially might damage the planet’s fragile ecosystem. Last year, the UN banned iron fertilisation in the Great Southern Ocean. However, the new findings show the mechanism has actually been operating naturally for millions of years within the isolated southern waters. And it has led to the researchers being granted permission by the UN to move ahead with the experiment. The scientist who will lead the next stage of the study, Professor Victor Smetacek, said: ‘The gas is sure to be out of the Earth’s atmosphere for several hundred years.’ The aim is to discover whether artificially fertilising the area will create more algae in the Great Southern Ocean. That ocean is an untapped resource for soaking up CO2 because it doesn’t have much iron, unlike other seas. It covers 20million square miles, and scientists say that if this could all be treated with iron, the resulting algae would remove three-and-a-half gigatons of carbon dioxide. This is equivalent to one eighth of all emissions annually created by burning fossil fuels such as oil, gas and coal. It would also be equal to removing all carbon dioxide emitted from every power plant, chimney and car exhaust in the rapidly expanding industries of India and Japan. However, the experts warn it is too early to say whether it will work. The team from ice patrol ship HMS Endurance used sledgehammers to chip deep into the interior of a 33ft-long mass of polar ice from half-a-dozen house-sized icebergs that had blown ashore in Antarctica. Once back in the UK, they used a special microscope to analyse the samples, which revealed what they had been looking for – tiny iron particles, only a few millionths of a millimetre wide, embedded deep within the ice. Until now, it was thought that the only source of iron in the Southern Ocean was wind blowing in metal compounds from the deserts of nearby continents like Australia. But the research has disproved this. Prof Raiswell said: ‘These particles measure only a fraction of a millimetre, but they have great importance for the global climate.’ Rising global temperatures, particularly over the past 50 years, have increased the rate at which polar ice melts, causing sea levels to rise. Ten of the warmest years on record have been since 1991, with experts predicting that 2009 could be the hottest year yet. The climate-change effect is set to substantially increase over the coming decades, as developing industrial nations pump out more CO2. Temperatures along the Antarctic Peninsula alone have increased by 2.5C over the past 50 years. But for every percentage point increase in the amount of ice that breaks off, Prof Raiswell calculates that a further 26million tons of CO2 is removed from the atmosphere.

### Indo-Pak War

#### Nuclear deterrence is stable between India and Pakistan

Ganguly, poli sci prof- Indiana, 08 (Sumit, Nuclear Stability in South Asia, Intl Security Vol 33, No 2, Fall)

The Robustness of Nuclear Deterrence As the outcomes of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises show, nuclear deterrence is robust in South Asia. Both crises were contained at levels considerably short of full-scale war. That said, as Paul Kapur has argued, Pakistan's acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability may well have emboldened its leadership, secure in the belief that India had no good options to respond. India, in turn, has been grappling with an effort to forge a new military doctrine and strategy to enable it to respond to Pakistani needling while containing the possibilities of conflict escalation, especially to the nuclear level.78 Whether Indian military planners [End Page 65] can fashion such a calibrated strategy to cope with Pakistani probes remains an open question. This article's analysis of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises does suggest, however, that nuclear deterrence in South Asia is far from parlous, contrary to what the critics have suggested. Three specific forms of evidence can be adduced to argue the case for the strength of nuclear deterrence. First, there is a serious problem of conflation in the arguments of both Hoyt and Kapur. Undeniably, Pakistan's willingness to provoke India has increased commensurate with its steady acquisition of a nuclear arsenal. This period from the late 1980s to the late 1990s, however, also coincided with two parallel developments that equipped Pakistan with the motives, opportunities, and means to meddle in India's internal affairs—particularly in Jammu and Kashmir. The most important change that occurred was the end of the conflict with the Soviet Union, which freed up military resources for use in a new jihad in Kashmir. This jihad, in turn, was made possible by the emergence of an indigenous uprising within the state as a result of Indian political malfeasance.79 Once the jihadis were organized, trained, armed, and unleashed, it is far from clear whether Pakistan could control the behavior and actions of every resulting jihadist organization.80 Consequently, although the number of attacks on India did multiply during the 1990s, it is difficult to establish a firm causal connection between the growth of Pakistani boldness and its gradual acquisition of a full-fledged nuclear weapons capability. Second, India did respond with considerable force once its military planners realized the full scope and extent of the intrusions across the Line of Control. Despite the vigor of this response, India did exhibit restraint. For example, Indian pilots were under strict instructions not to cross the Line of Control in pursuit of their bombing objectives.81 They adhered to these guidelines even though they left them more vulnerable to Pakistani ground fire.82 The Indian military exercised such restraint to avoid provoking Pakistani fears of a wider attack into Pakistan-controlled Kashmir and then into Pakistan itself. Indian restraint was also evident at another level. During the last war in [End Page 66] Kashmir in 1965, within a week of its onset, the Indian Army horizontally escalated with an attack into Pakistani Punjab. In fact, in the Punjab, Indian forces successfully breached the international border and reached the outskirts of the regional capital, Lahore. The Indian military resorted to this strategy under conditions that were not especially propitious for the country. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first prime minister, had died in late 1964. His successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, was a relatively unknown politician of uncertain stature and standing, and the Indian military was still recovering from the trauma of the 1962 border war with the People's Republic of China.83 Finally, because of its role in the Cold War, the Pakistani military was armed with more sophisticated, U.S.-supplied weaponry, including the F-86 Sabre and the F-104 Starfighter aircraft. India, on the other hand, had few supersonic aircraft in its inventory, barring a small number of Soviet-supplied MiG-21s and the indigenously built HF-24.84 Furthermore, the Indian military remained concerned that China might open a second front along the Himalayan border. Such concerns were not entirely chimerical, because a Sino-Pakistani entente was under way. Despite these limitations, the Indian political leadership responded to Pakistani aggression with vigor and granted the Indian military the necessary authority to expand the scope of the war. In marked contrast to the politico-military context of 1965, in 1999 India had a self-confident (if belligerent) political leadership and a substantially more powerful military apparatus. Moreover, the country had overcome most of its Nehruvian inhibitions about the use of force to resolve disputes.85 Furthermore, unlike in 1965, India had at least two reserve strike corps in the Punjab in a state of military readiness and poised to attack across the border if given the political nod.86 Despite these significant differences and advantages, the Indian political leadership chose to scrupulously limit the scope of the conflict to the Kargil region. As K. Subrahmanyam, a prominent Indian defense analyst and political commentator, wrote in 1993: [End Page 67] The awareness on both sides of a nuclear capability that can enable either country to assemble nuclear weapons at short notice induces mutual caution. This caution is already evident on the part of India. In 1965, when Pakistan carried out its "Operation Gibraltar" and sent in infiltrators, India sent its army across the cease-fire line to destroy the assembly points of the infiltrators. That escalated into a full-scale war. In 1990, when Pakistan once again carried out a massive infiltration of terrorists trained in Pakistan, India tried to deal with the problem on Indian territory and did not send its army into Pakistan-occupied Kashmir.87 Subrahmanyam's argument takes on additional significance in light of the overt acquisition of nuclear weapons by both India and Pakistan. Third, Sagan's assertion about the dominance of the Pakistani military in determining Pakistan's security policies is unquestionably accurate. With the possible exception of the Kargil conflict, however, it is far from clear that the Pakistani military has been the primary force in planning for and precipitating aggressive war against India. The first Kashmir war, without a doubt, had the explicit approval of Pakistan's civilian authorities.88 Similarly, there is ample evidence that the highly ambitious foreign minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, goaded President Ayub Khan to undertake the 1965 war.89 Finally, once again Bhutto, as much as the Pakistani military dictator Yahya Khan, was complicit in provoking a war with India in 1971, following the outbreak of a civil war in East Pakistan.90

## Solvency

### 1NC

#### They can’t jump start offshore wind

#### --- Stakeholder opposition

McDonnell, 2/28 (Tim, 2/28/2013, “Why the US still doesn't have a single offshore wind turbine; Here's a look at the top four reasons why offshore wind remains elusive in the US,” [http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/feb/28/windpower-renewableenergy)](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/feb/28/windpower-renewableenergy%29))

2. Blowback from "stakeholders": Whale and bird lovers. Defenders of tribal lands. Fishermen. The Koch brothers. Since it was proposed in 2001, Cape Wind, a wind farm whose backers say could provide 75 percent of Cape Cod's energy needs, has been run through a bewildering gauntlet of opponents and fought off more than a dozen lawsuits on everything from boat traffic interference to desecration of sacred sites to harming avian and marine life. Just down the seaboard another major project, Deepwater Wind, had to negotiate concerns that its turbines would throw a roadblock in the migratory pathways of endangered right whales. Alliance for Nantucket Sound, Cape Wind's main opposition group, claims the project "threatens the marine environment and would harm the productive, traditional fisheries of Nantucket Sound."

Last summer's "Cape Spin" is an excellent "tragicomic" rundown of the controversy:

Of course, there's another powerful factor at play here: NIMBYism. No one could put it better than fossil fuel magnate Bill Koch, owner of a $20 million Cape Cod beachfront estate and donor of $1.5 million to ANS: "I don't want this in my backyard. Why would you want to sail in a forest of windmills?"

Why indeed.

But Catherine Bowes, a senior analyst with the National Wildlife Federation, says while there are legitimate concerns for wildlife, Cape Wind and Deepwater have both bent over backwards to accommodate them. "I think there's an attempt at hijacking" the wildlife message by the NIMBYers, she says. "Wildlife issues are often used as a reason to oppose a project even by those who have never cared about animals before." Many of the nation's leading environmental organizations—including the NWF, Greenpeace, and the Sierra Club—have come out in favor of the project. It's easy to see why, Bowes says: "We know that the biggest threat to wildlife is global warming."

#### --- No U.S. ships to install offshore turbines

McDonnell, 2/28 (Tim, 2/28/2013, “Why the US still doesn't have a single offshore wind turbine; Here's a look at the top four reasons why offshore wind remains elusive in the US,” [http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/feb/28/windpower-renewableenergy)](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/feb/28/windpower-renewableenergy%29))

3. Not a single ship in the Unites States is equipped to handle wind turbines: Forget about whales and yacht routes. How the hell do you go about lodging a 450-ton, over-400-foot tall turbine into the ocean floor? Answer: With one massive mother of a boat.

But there's a problem, says Chris van Beek, Deepwater's president: "At this point, there is not an existing vessel in the US that can do this job."

The world's relatively small fleet of turbine-ready ships—500-foot, $200 million behemoths—is docked primarily in Europe; an obscure 1920 law called the Jones Act requires ships sailing between two US ports to be US-flagged, and once the foundation of an offshore turbine is laid it counts as a "port." Consequently, turbine installation ships cruising in from, say, Hamburg, wouldn't be able to dock in the States.

On top of that, given the pittance of offshore projects in the works in the United States, bringing the ships in from abroad can be cost-prohibitive. Offshore turbines could find themselves all dressed up with nowhere to go.

Weeks Marine of New Jersey is working to solve the problem by building the first country's first turbine ship. They've completed the hull and hope to have the boat seaworthy by 2014, possibly in time to chip in on putting up Cape Wind.

#### Extremely costly and breaks down before planned --- thousands of wind turbines have been abandoned

Gunderson, 3/16 --- wealth management and investment advisor (3/16/2013, Bill, “GUNDERSON: Some basic facts about wind energy; It doesn’t work,” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/mar/16/gunderson-some-basic-facts-about-wind-energy/>))

When you set these facts aside, here is what remains: Wind turbines do not last as long as promised. They do not produce as much energy as hoped. Moreover, they require more maintenance than anyone imagined.

Wind energy turns out to be a lot like solar energy.

The Daily Mail recently reported that the University of Edinburgh found “for onshore wind, the monthly ‘load factor’ of turbines – a measure of how much electricity they generate as a percentage of how much they could produce if on at full power all the time - dropped from a high of 24 per cent in the first year after construction, to just 11 per cent after 15 years.”

That’s a 55 percent drop, for you dinosaurs who still think that is important — and that is just for turbines still working.

There’s a reason why so many wind projects got so much attention on the drawing board, but when it comes time to build them, they wither away. The offshore wind project in Delaware is a good example: One day it was hailed as the secret to the universe. The next day, it was gone. It disappeared down a black hole when people who actually had to pay for it and build it figured out what it actually was going to cost them.

It was the real numbers that scared them off. In America, these numbers are harder to come by — another red flag for investors — but as many as 1 in 4 wind turbines just does not work. Some do not even spin. Others spin, but do not generate electricity, so it is hard to tell by looking at them.

Hawaii provides the favorite example: The 37 turbines at the Kamaoa Wind Farm stood derelict for more than six years after it was discovered that repairs were more expensive than replacements. This is just one of six abandoned wind farms in one of the most wind-ideal places on the planet.

The Altamont Pass Wind Farm in Northern California used to be the largest wind farm on Earth. Now it is best known as the largest killer of eagles and other raptors. The turbines are shut down for four months a year to protect the birds during their migration. So much for that pro-forma.

As many as 4,500 wind turbines have been built — and abandoned — in California alone.

How long can that last? Ask that question of a True Believer at your own peril. They say making money is no longer the point of being in business; saving the planet is.

Even Al Gore is getting out of alternative energy such as wind. Just check the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission filings for his company, Generation Investment. Not a wind play in the portfolio.

There may be one million reasons to invest in wind, or to install a windmill. Most involve bragging to your friends that you are saving the planet. But if you need the energy or the money, don’t — because right now, wind is still nothing more than a faith-based initiative.

Just ask Al.

# 2NC

## Federalism

### 2NC Water

#### Water contamination from fracking is too rare to matter

Maugeri, Belfer Center @ Harvard School of Government, 2012,

Leonardo, June, the Geopolitics of Energy Project, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs @ John F. Kennedy School of Government @ Harvard. “Oil: The Next Revolution,” <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Oil-%20The%20Next%20Revolution.pdf>

The results of that study are still controversial. For example, a MIT research study recorded only ¶ 20 cases of groundwater contamination by natural gas or drilling fluids between 2005 and 2009, ¶ among thousands of wells drilled.¶ 53¶ The MIT research did not encompass the whole spectrum of ¶ drilled wells and reported accidents, but it did provide a reliable, high-level approximation of the ¶ low incidence of groundwater contamination as a function of overall drilling activity. Once again, ¶ this does not mean that a problem does not exist, but only that it is extremely rare and that it can ¶ be managed effectively, if best practices are adopted in the drilling process and adequate controls ¶ are enforced.

#### Innovation solves water consumption and there’s no impact

Maugeri, Belfer Center @ Harvard School of Government, 2012,

Leonardo, June, the Geopolitics of Energy Project, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs @ John F. Kennedy School of Government @ Harvard. “Oil: The Next Revolution,” <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Oil-%20The%20Next%20Revolution.pdf>

The consumption of water required by fracking is certainly a problem, but a much smaller one ¶ than is generally feared. A shale well requires between four and five million gallons of water (15¶ to 19 million liters). Even when the drilling activity is frenetic, these volumes do not affect the ¶ availability of water in the concerned areas, except for states where water availability is already a ¶ problem. Extensive data from shale gas operations show that “shale development water usage ¶ represents less than 1 percent of total water usage in the affected areas,” public supply and ¶ irrigation being the major sources of water consumption.¶ 54¶ Moreover, the “water intensity of shale ¶ gas development, at around 1 gallon of water for every MBtu of energy produced, is low ¶ compared with many other energy sources.”¶ 55¶ In any case, the solution to this problem is to minimize the use of water, a challenge that the ¶ industry is already copying with, searching for technological solutions that go from the recycle of ¶ wastewater from fracking operations to the use of high-pressure propane in place of water to ¶ fracturing wells, and the use of directional solvents. These solutions and others are in the ¶ experimentation stages and are still quite expensive, but they are necessary to cope also with ¶ another problem concerning fracking and water: what to do of contaminated water coming up ¶ from drilling operations.

### 2NC Internal

#### Energy decentralization fails – leads to dominance of special interest groups – cooperative federalism fails

Pursley ’12 - Assistant Professor, The University of Toledo College of Law (date from most recent cite, Garrick B., “Unblocking Cooperative Energy Governance” <http://www.law.northwestern.edu/searlecenter/papers/Pursley_Unblocking.pdf>)

The potential pathologies of full decentralization of regulatory authority should give ¶ us pause. First, the scalability problem persists—there still will be variation in the ¶ preferences of sub-state locations to which statewide measures cannot fully respond18¶ —¶ “the most populous states are very large in size and . . . [t]heir decision making largely ¶ sacrifices the benefits of decentralization[] because these states are seeking to govern a ¶ diverse population that will have very heterogeneous preferences.”19 Second, with the ¶ smaller scale of state-level politics comes a more constrained vision, likely, tailoring ¶ state policy to a narrower and more parochial set of interests that may exclude important ¶ priorities that would be on the table in nation-wide political negotiations. The classical ¶ objection is that interest groups that favor lax environmental regulation and have high ¶ individual stakes in regulatory outcomes—paradigmatically industry groups—tend to be ¶ small and cohesive, but groups favoring stricter environmental regulation tend to be ¶ more diffuse and less organized.20 This disparity in political power, from the ¶ perspective of economies of scale in political organization and advocacy of the two ¶ camps, is exacerbated at the state and local government levels.21 Diffuse environmental ¶ interests may muster the resources to organize and act within a single political forum, ¶ but organizing at multiple state or government locations would be too taxing upon their ¶ relatively undisciplined and typically under-funded infrastructures.22 Interests favoring ¶ laxer regulation, by contrast, are thought to possess relatively greater capacity to ¶ organize and advocate in multiple government forums and thus enjoy a comparative ¶ advantage.23 Comparative institutional analysis thus suggests that federal ¶ environmental authority is preferable to state or local authority because the federal level ¶ is the most efficient receiver of broadly shared but often under-organized public ¶ interests in environmental protection, which are needed to counterbalance industrial ¶ interests that would otherwise dominate the political process and impose their narrow ¶ interests on the unwitting public.24 In addition, some states may lack the political will to enact new energy¶ regulation—while state-level renewable portfolio standards have been around for years, ¶ 20 or so states still haven’t adopted comprehensive energy modernization policies.¶ 25¶ State governments also may be easier for opposition or industry interests to capture ¶ compared to both federal and local governments; the potential to resist capture created ¶ by dispersing power among 50 different governments is offset by the states’ narrower ¶ policy portfolios and varying barriers to industry influence, making states a ¶ comparatively bad bet for institutional resistance to capture. While public choice theory¶ suggests that subnational governments are forums in which industry and environmental ¶ interests are more evenly matched than they are at the federal level;¶ 26 there are also ¶ reasons to think that state governments may prove particularly responsive to entrenched ¶ conventional energy interests.27 This problem is enhanced in the energy field by state ¶ leadership on renewable energy, which has galvanized and enhanced the focus of ¶ traditional fuel interests on the state governments.¶ 28 There may be sufficient discipline, coordination, and resources in opposition interests to work effectively even in all 50 ¶ states to prevent or water-down enactment of progressive energy measures. Generally ¶ speaking, competition for residents and the possibility of resident exit—residents’ ¶ power to “vote with their feet”—offset to some extent the motivation for subnational ¶ governments to bow to industry pressure and loosen regulations.29 This disciplining ¶ force, however, diminishes as the transaction costs of resident relocation increase—as ¶ they do when considering out of state relocation rather than just moving from one city ¶ or town to another.30 From the perspective of interest group alignment and other ¶ political considerations, local governments are preferable to states.¶ Thus, without some sort of unifying nationwide policy guideline, there likely will be both geographic and substantive gaps in a patchwork of sub-national initiatives. The ¶ third problem is a conceptual but consistent critique of decentralization: With the ¶ mobility of capital, strong economic incentives exist and may drive states to engage in a ¶ “race to the bottom”—competing to enact regulations that will draw business and ¶ citizens—which, in theory, could involve diminishing environmental, consumerprotection, and perhaps energy-efficiency standards.¶ 31 Thus, while decentralization ¶ remains an important component of modern theory on optimizing environmental and ¶ energy regulation32, the current consensus for cooperative federalism arrangements in¶ which the federal government plays a coordinating or floor-setting role.¶ 33 A regime ¶ involving both federal regulatory discipline and corresponding empowerment of state ¶ policy experimentation above a baseline may provide the benefits of decentralization ¶ without the possibly negative consequences of state competition, free riding, and ¶ potential regulatory failure.¶ 34 Indeed, federal cooperation with state governments is an ¶ important part of the implementation strategy built into the Clean Air and Clean Water acts.35¶ The focus of most of these cooperative or integrative governance proposals on ¶ partnering the federal government with state governments on energy and environmental¶ issues, while perhaps a natural impulse in the light of state-centric public debates about ¶ federalism, may actually undermine cooperative regulation’s capacity to capture the ¶ benefits of decentralization. First, state governments may exercise what Professor ¶ Gerken has called the “power of the servant” to advance their own agendas even within ¶ cooperative, federally led regulatory programs, by over-enforcing, under-enforcing, ¶ resisting and otherwise indirectly reshaping the system.¶ 36 The focus of judicial ¶ federalism doctrine and federalism-related political rhetoric on “states rights” and “state ¶ sovereignty” may motivate state governments to push for a counter-productive degree ¶ of autonomy even when participating in cooperative regulation. Of course, state ¶ government autonomy might be desirable if the goal of federal-state cooperation is to ¶ foster varying policy initiatives; but there is little reason to think that autonomous state ¶ action contrary to the goals of the arrangement will create beneficial diversity. ¶ Therefore, the second problem with focusing cooperative regulation proposals on the ¶ state governments—“the false conflation of federalism with decentralization”37¶ —is that ¶ there are reasons to think that state governments will “be less amenable to decentralized ¶ localism with all of its benefits.”38 Large governments—the national government and the larger states like New York, Texas and California—face significant information ¶ deficits in tailoring regulation to local conditions and, as a result, recognize the benefits ¶ of decentralizing policymaking authority and tend to delegate real power to sub-units. ¶ Smaller state governments, however, decentralize less as an empirical matter; this likely ¶ results at least in part from the potentially significant differences between statewide ¶ policy interests and those of individual localities.39 Thus, theory suggests that states on ¶ net are less likely to delegate discretionary authority to local governments even where ¶ that would best serve policy goals and, indeed, that where “local preferences [do not] ¶ cleave closely to [those] of the state as a whole . . . states will interfere with ¶ decentralization.40 And because states possess generally limitless control over local ¶ governments, they have the capacity to interfere a great deal. If the goal is to promote ¶ regulatory diversity, state governments might be counterproductive partners for the ¶ federal government.

#### Cooperative federalism over energy fails – Australia proves

Jones 2009 – PhD. and lecturer at University of Queensland (March 6, Stephen, “The Future of Renewable Energy in Australia: A Test for Cooperative Federalism?” Australian Journal of Public Administration¶ Volume 68, Issue 1, pages 1–20, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2008.00606.x/full#abstract>)

In the context of debate about global warming and the search for abatement measures to reduce GHG's from the generation of stationary electricity there has been considerable demand that government policies provide even greater levels of support for renewable energy. Experience in other developed nations shows that without favourable government policy intervention renewable energy providers cannot survive (Beck and Martinot 2004). The experience of other federal systems is that the most effective outcomes have been the result of the combination of coordinated national and sub-national government policies that account for the complex issues associated with the expansion of renewable energy (Beck and Martinot 2004). Within the Australian federal system stationary electricity supply is a state government responsibility. Any attempts by the federal government to effectively introduce national policies or reform initiatives in areas of state responsibility must be with the cooperation of the states and territories. The development of renewable energy is one tangible area where there has been federal policy measures introduced that required the cooperation of the states to expand the contribution of renewable energy to electricity supply systems.¶ The Australian literature on federalism suggests cooperation between the jurisdictions creates dilemmas in terms of accountability, responsibility and resource allocation issues. The record of federal–state relations provides evidence of administrative inefficiency, policy duplication and blame shifting (Sharman 1989; Wiltshire 1990). New federalism initiatives introduced in the early 1990s were designed to encourage and support cooperation between the jurisdictions through formal arrangements such as the Council of Australian Governments and joint Ministerial Councils within specific portfolios. The federal government has shown a tendency to involve itself in areas of its own choosing using its fiscal superiority through funding arrangements to encourage compliance from the states (Brown 2007; Selway 2001). Experience illustrates that the states and territories can be effective in inhibiting federal government initiatives in areas outside its constitutional responsibility, for example, refusal by the Victorian government to agree to the national water plan (Sinclair 2007); state government indolence in establishing national consistency in public education (Jones 2008); and the procrastination by some states to introduce uniform gun laws in 1996 (Laming 2007).¶ A general definition of cooperative federalism suggests ‘a willingness (or at least an acceptance) between two levels of government to work together in order to solve problems that are the constitutional responsibility of one or both levels’ (Laming 2007; Sawer 1977). Parkin and Anderson (2007) argue that structural arrangements within the Australian federal system make it sensible for even the most ambitious centralising federal government to pursue a strategy of cooperation and collaboration in achieving its agenda. The trend since federation however, has been for the states to comply with federal intrusion to the point where many commentators question the long term relevance of state governments (Brown 2006; Craven 2005; Wiltshire 2005). The development of renewable energy over the last decade helps to inform the Australian debate on federalism and the cooperation needed between jurisdictions to achieve national policy objectives. In this regard policy measures introduced to expand the contribution of renewable energy to stationary electricity supply provide an example to test cooperation across the federal system.¶ Australian governments recognise that energy supply is their shared responsibility despite the fact that constitutional demarcation allocates electricity supply to the states and territories (COAG 2001). A number of policy measures were introduced by the federal government in 1997 to increase the percentage of renewable energy sources to electricity supply. While the measures raised the level of development activity in the renewable energy industry they failed to increase the net contribution of renewable energy to the supply of stationary electricity in Australia. This article will discuss the policies that were designed to develop the Australian renewable energy industry and expand its contribution to stationary energy over the 1997–2007 period. This is an especially important time because it provides evidence of a mix of factors that served as barriers to the development of the renewable energy industry. These factors include:¶ • ¶ lack of a comprehensive cooperative coordinated approach to dealing with issues impacting on the industry;¶ • ¶ ‘short termism’ or the boom/bust disjointed approach to industry development policy;¶ • ¶ the fragmented approach by states and territories to energy market reform support for the renewable energy industry; and¶ • ¶ the dominance of the prime minister as the ‘driving force in shaping the government's policy agenda’.¶ The results of these factors impacted negatively on the development of the industry and the reduction of GHG in Australia. Australia continues to be in the top three of the world's largest emitters of GHG on a per capita basis, based largely on the use of inefficient coal fired power stations (UNHDP 2007; CGD 2007). In the context of Australia's commitment to global emissions reduction targets there is a need to improve the effectiveness of policies that reduce GHG emission by increasing the availability of renewable energy in the supply of electricity.

#### Cooperative federalism fails at energy policy – Australia proves

Jones 2009 – PhD. and lecturer at University of Queensland (March 6, Stephen, “The Future of Renewable Energy in Australia: A Test for Cooperative Federalism?” Australian Journal of Public Administration¶ Volume 68, Issue 1, pages 1–20, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2008.00606.x/full#abstract>)

The stalling of the development of the renewable energy industry provides evidence of the impact of government policies in the Australian context. Over the 1997–2007 decade the lack of coordination between the federal and state governments resulted in a mixture of renewable energy targets and uneven development of the renewable energy industry. Policy measures introduced by the federal government to increase the percentage of energy supply from renewable sources through a market based mechanism (MRET) provided challenges for state electricity systems to accommodate the improvements that were required.¶ The experience of the renewable energy industry highlights how the political environment shapes the policy measures that determine future development. Without political support the industry could not compete with the fossil fuel industry. State and territory governments were happy to leave the development of policy initiatives to support the renewable energy industry to the federal government. However, following the refusal of the prime minister to ‘increase and extend’ the MRET the states were forced to consider how to respond to the needs of the emerging industry. By 2007 most states and territories were making slow progress on their commitments. Despite the delays the industry welcomed the support, in some instances the state support was more attractive than that available from the federal scheme, but only within individual states; this placed a limit on market size. Research and development funds from state governments provided some incentive for innovation but were limited when compared with federal initiatives.¶ Despite an extensive program of electricity market reform, policies that restricted market access in favour of existing fossil fuel energy sources provided an intransigent range of barriers to the uptake of renewable energy. The complexity established by these state based policies was a major factor contributing to the difficulties experienced by project proponents in issues ranging from project approvals through to accessing state electricity networks. The states have been slow to act on undertaking work to reduce the impediments to network access. The complexity again highlights the inherent difficulties of coordination in the Australian federal system as it presents considerable barriers to establishing national coordinated policy settings, governance and institutional arrangements and other actions to improve the framework for planning and network investment and to streamline regulation to improve the expansion of renewable energy.¶ While the states have indicated their agreement to cooperate with possible future federal targets the challenge will be establishing an operational framework on how these targets will be achieved. Importantly, any discussion on governance and compliance arrangements, including international sanctions, is yet to be part of the renewable energy target debate. A fundamental criticism of the state schemes is that they have not been coordinated with each other or with the federal scheme. This failing has worked in the favour of the state based electricity providers as they attempt to manage the dual difficulties of energy reform and the increasing pressure to expand the access of renewables to existing energy supplies. Differences between the state and federal approaches contributed to industry apprehension and lack of confidence in future investment.

## EU

### 2NC Internals

#### And, European involvement and investment in U.S. offshore wind coming now

Herndon, 12/5 (Andrew, 12/5/2012, “U.S. Offshore Wind Market Becoming ‘Real’ With European Interest,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-12-05/u-s-offshore-wind-market-becoming-real-with-european-interest.html>)

European energy companies are considering participating in U.S. offshore wind-farm auctions, a sign of increasing confidence in the viability of marine-based wind power off U.S. shores, according to Arcadia Windpower Ltd. President Peter Mandelstam. Developers including Spain’s Iberdrola SA (IBE), Electricite de France SA and Ireland’s Mainstream Renewable Power Ltd., have filed official “indications of interest” for the first competitive lease auction for U.S. offshore wind farms, scheduled for next year. U.S. companies have been planning offshore turbines for more than a decade and none have been built. Having large European wind veterans evaluate the lease auctions shows that the “market is real,” said Mandelstam, who ran one of the early players in the industry, Bluewater Wind LLC. “The Europeans have been doing this since 1991,” Mandelstam said in a telephone interview yesterday. “It’s a badge of honor for the U.S. industry that the Europeans are here.” The U.S. Interior Department announced Nov. 30 plans to offer leases for wind farms off the coasts of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Virginia. The auction will be the first for commercial wind energy in federal waters more than three miles (five kilometers) from shore. The government has also awarded two offshore wind-energy leases, in Massachusetts in 2010 and in Delaware in October, to U.S. companies through non-competitive offers that each involved a single company.

#### Coop over energy is inevitable

EU EA, 12 (12/25/2012 – last date modified, European Union External Action, “EU-US Co-operation by Sector,” <http://eeas.europa.eu/us/sector_en.htm>)

Energy and Energy Security:

Energy security has become a key component of the EU’s foreign policy agenda. EU dependence on hydrocarbon imports (oil and gas) is currently at 80 and 50% but it is EU policy to cap and reduce the consumption of hydrocarbons in favour of alternative and renewable sources of energy, and to use energy more efficiently (20-20-20 policy). The development of renewable energy is thus a central element of EU energy policy. The EU has over the years intensified its cooperation with the USA in the areas of energy security, energy regulatory policy and energy technologies research.

At their Summit of June 2005, the EU and the US set ambitious goals for improved energy efficiency and a higher share of alternative energy, with a view to enhancing energy security by reducing vulnerability to disruption of supply (Declaration pdf - 14 KB [14 KB] on energy security, energy efficiency, renewables and economic development). The 2007 summit issued a Joint Statement on Energy Efficiency, Security and Climate Change pdf - 42 KB [42 KB] , which established a direct link between energy policy and the objective of combating climate change.

At the Summit of November 2009, both sides launched the EU-US Energy Council pdf - 11 KB [11 KB] , a mechanism at Ministerial level featuring three permanent working groups in the areas of Global Energy Security and Markets, Energy Policies and Deployment, and Energy Technologies Cooperation.

### 2NC EU Economy

#### The Eurozone is virtually suspended now

Market Leader, 3/21 (“Experts: Cyprus May Provoke Euro Collapse,” 3/21/2013, [http://www.profi-forex.us/news/entry4000004682.html)](http://www.profi-forex.us/news/entry4000004682.html%29))

It’s been 4 years since the latest global financial crisis. Some EU countries have found themselves in a difficult financial situation once again. Strikes and demonstrations in Greece, Cyprus , Portugal , Spain , Ireland, Belgium, France and other European states indicate that the unpopular austerity measures implemented by local governments are too painful and inefficient. It seems like the EU has got in a spiritual crisis. However, the most terrible thing is that the EU and the eurozone seem to have failed to find really efficient solutions. At this point, the European unity and integrity along with the common European currency are in jeopardy. Will the EU authorities manage to save the eurozone integrity by helping Greece, Cyprus and other needy eurozone economies? Let’s try to answer these questions together with Masterforex-V Academy. Eurozone: Past and Future The prolonged eurozone crisis started in 2010 was a natural outcome of the preceding global financial crisis. Some European economies saw major imbalances in their financial systems. The common Euro currency declined against other majors. Still, some experts say that the eurozone crisis should be considered as the start of another major crisis. First of all, the public dents of some European countries are not as big as the debts of some financial institutions, which may well provoke another crisis similar to the one we could see in 2008. Secondly, the crisis in Europe resulted mainly from the internal peculiarities of the integration development within the EU and the eurozone: EU and eurozone members are essentially different in many aspects, including economic development. This makes it next to impossible to conduct efficient economic policies. The economic and currency union has multiple fundamental contradictions. Out of all the elements of the European economic policy, only the money-and-credit policy is unified. As for the eurozone, the tendency to accumulated excessive public debts started long before the crisis. The European integration keeps seeing considerable obstacles amid ineffective antic-crisis measures, which provoked a crisis of confidence. International lenders do not trust risky economies anymore and question the pan-European governing. The situation in eurozone economies differs dramatically. Even if to take into account all the risky southern economies of the eurozone, the really critical situation can be seen only in Greece and Cyprus . The crisis has suspended the eurozone and EU integration and expansion. The eurozone crisis is a major concern for Russia and its allies in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. On the one hand, it is about the Russian-EU relations. In particular, there are threats of getting less considerable income from the Russian export of energy carriers. On the other hand, Russia and its CIS allies can learn a valuable lesson from the European integration. As for the Russian Ruble, its exchange rate versus the US Dollar may be revised as well. The forecast for 2013 is 32.4 rubles per dollar. график"> Euro Prospects: How Efficient Are Antic-Crisis Measures? Most Western analysts keep saying that the existing eurozone crisis is not that serious. They say the EU ahs enough intellectual potential to find efficient solutions. Moreover, the current debts of those risky eurozone economies are not as considerable as the debts of those financial institutions that provoked the 2008 global crisis. The very fact of the timely mobilization of European experts and politicians for working out and implementing efficient anti-crisis measures looks more important. At the same time, the currency market shows another point of view on the problem. According to Igor Zotov, an expert from Masterforex-V Academy, the Daily chart of EURUSD keeps showing the development of wave B inside a new bullish ABC pattern of a bigger-scale wave level. However, at this point, we lack conditions for a trend reversal on the H4 level and higher: график As we can see, there is a certain bearish ABC pattern that belongs to a big-scale wave level. A break below 1.28818 may initiate another downswing. Therefore, it is better to go bearish on H4 if there are all the necessary conditions. It is recommended to monitor the situation on the H4 chart till the end of the week.

### 2NC Middle East Conflict

#### Empirically denied – no ME conflict has escalated

Drum ‘7

(Kevin-, Political Blogger @ the Washington Monthly, Sept. 9, Washington Monthly, “The Chaos Hawks”, http://www.

washingtonmonthly.com/archives/individual/2007\_09/012029.php )

Having admitted, however, that the odds of a military success in Iraq are almost impossibly long, Chaos Hawks nonetheless insist that the U.S. military needs to stay in Iraq for the foreseeable future. Why? Because if we leave the entire Middle East will become a bloodbath. Sunni and Shiite will engage in mutual genocide, oil fields will go up in flames, fundamentalist parties will take over, and al-Qaeda will have a safe haven bigger than the entire continent of Europe.

Needless to say, this is nonsense. Israel has fought war after war in the Middle East. Result: no regional conflagration. Iran and Iraq fought one of the bloodiest wars of the second half the 20th century. Result: no regional conflagration. The Soviets fought in Afghanistan and then withdrew. No regional conflagration. The U.S. fought the Gulf War and then left. No regional conflagration. Algeria fought an internal civil war for a decade. No regional conflagration. So where does this bogeyman come from? Hard to say. Probably a deep-seated unwillingness to confront the fact that the United States can't really influence a course of events we originally set in motion. But Iraq is already fighting a civil war, and that civil war will continue whether we stay or go. If we go it will likely become more intense, but also shorter lived. The eventual result, however, will almost certainly be the same: a de facto independent Kurdistan in the north and a Shiite theocracy in the south. The rest of the Middle East will, as usual, watch events unfold without doing much of anything about them, and will accept the inevitable results. The U.S., for its part, will remain in the north to protect Kurdistan, in the east in Afghanistan, in the west in the Mediterranean, and in the south in its bases in the Gulf. We'll hardly be absent from the region.

## Oceans

### 2NC Defense

#### EU solves trawling- more critical than the US

Walter, 2012,

7-19, Mike, Pew Charitable Trusts, “EU Commission Makes History with Proposal to Phase Out Bottom Trawling for Deep-Sea Species,” http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/press-releases/eu-commission-makes-history-with-proposal-to-phase-out-bottom-trawling-for-deep-sea-species-85899401372

In a move that will help protect one of the most biodiverse areas on Earth, the European Commission today proposed phasing out destructive bottom trawling and bottom gillnetting among deep sea fishing fleets in the Northeast Atlantic. The Pew Environment Group praised EC Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Maria Damanaki, for the bold proposal to finally put an end to these unsustainable and destructive deep-sea fishing methods. Marine scientists have roundly concluded that deep-sea bottom trawling is the most direct and widespread threat to fragile deep-sea ecosystems. These ecosystems harbor a diversity of life – much of it as yet unidentified – that may exceed the biodiversity found in the Amazon rainforest.¶ “We congratulate Commissioner Damanaki on her leadership today in proposing a thorough overhaul of the management of deep-sea fisheries and taking the first step towards phasing out one of the most destructive fishing practices in use today,” commented Matthew Gianni, policy advisor to the Pew Environment Group and the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition. “It is now up to EU fisheries ministers and the European Parliament to show similar resolve by adopting legislation to implement the Commissioner's proposal and put an end to destructive deep-sea fishing practices.”

#### Oil and gas exploration triggers the link

NRDC ‘12

(National Resources Defense Council, “Deep Sea Treasures Protecting the Atlantic Coast's Ancient Submarine Canyons and Seamounts,” March 2012, <http://www.nrdc.org/oceans/canyons/>, accessed 1-13-13)

Renewed oil and gas exploration has also been approved for the Atlantic, threatening the canyons with sound pollution and the prospect of future drilling. Seismic surveys, using high-decibel acoustic energy pulses blasted from ships, can damage or kill fish and fish larvae and have been implicated in whale beaching and stranding incidents. And while Interior Secretary Salazar has said that areas off the east coast will not be leased for offshore drilling -- at least until 2017 -- seismic testing to assess potential oil and gas deposits will proceed.

#### Alt Cause –

#### Overfishing

UN, 04 (“Overfishing: A Threat to Marine Biodiversity”, http://www.un.org/events/tenstories/06/story.asp?storyID=800)

The magnitude of the problem of overfishing is often overlooked, given the competing claims of deforestation, desertification, energy resource exploitation and other biodiversity depletion dilemmas. The rapid growth in demand for fish and fish products is leading to fish prices increasing faster than prices of meat. As a result, fisheries investments have become more attractive to both entrepreneurs and governments, much to the detriment of small-scale fishing and fishing communities all over the world. In the last decade, in the north Atlantic region, commercial fish populations of cod, hake, haddock and flounder have fallen by as much as 95%, prompting calls for urgent measures. Some are even recommending zero catches to allow for regeneration of stocks, much to the ire of the fishing industry. According to a Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimate, over 70% of the world’s fish species are either fully exploited or depleted. The dramatic increase of destructive fishing techniques worldwide destroys marine mammals and entire ecosystems. FAO reports that illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing worldwide appears to be increasing as fishermen seek to avoid stricter rules in many places in response to shrinking catches and declining fish stocks. Few, if any, developing countries and only a limited number of developed ones are on track to put into effect by this year the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. Despite that fact that each region has its Regional Sea Conventions, and some 108 governments and the European Commission have adopted the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land based Activities, oceans are cleared at twice the rate of forests.

#### Don’t solve global alt causes – at best solve the US – means collapse inev

#### 3. Aquaculture

**CQ Researcher, 02** (“Threatened Fisheries”, Vol. 12, No. 27)

 “There's no question but that aquaculture is going to increase as an industry, not only here but throughout the world,” says Panetta of the Pew Oceans Commission. “The real question is whether or not we can regulate it in a way that ensures it doesn't have an adverse impact on the wild fisheries that we need to protect.” Aquaculture poses several environmental problems. Farmed fish are bred from a relatively small genetic pool of “pampered” stock unconditioned to natural hazards. So when they escape downstream and interbreed with wild fish, the ability of the already-endangered wild fish to survive can be undermined. The environmental threat increases when the escaped fish are non-indigenous. “Here in the Northwest, we're desperately worried about escaped Atlantic salmon moving into our rivers and displacing the critically depleted Pacific salmon populations that are just hanging by a thread,” Powell says. “Aquaculture could be a positive force, but in most situations right now that potential is not being realized because of its harmful effects.” The National Fisheries Institute, whose members depend on healthy stocks of wild fish, echoes this concern. “Fishermen and fishing communities should be consulted during the planning and development of aquaculture facilities,” the institute says. “Poor planning and management of aquaculture operations can damage native stocks of fish and shellfish, destroy fish habitat and degrade the productivity of local ecosystems.” The institute wants fish farmers to adhere to the FAO's 1995 “code of conduct for responsible fisheries,” which set standards for managing fisheries, including aquaculture facilities. Environmentalists also worry about the pollution generated by aquaculture operations. Like huge livestock feedlots on land, fish farms produce prodigious amounts of waste, which can pollute downstream waters. Chinese fish farmers, trying to curb disease outbreaks in crowded ponds, often add antibiotics to the water, which can show up in imported seafood, eventually contributing to consumers' antibiotic resistance. In Ecuador, shrimp farmers have decimated coastal mangrove stands, causing erosion and pollution. U.S. fishermen and fish farmers oppose imports of farmed seafood for a variety of reasons, mostly having to do with economics. Shrimpers along the Louisiana and Texas coasts say imports of cheaper farmed shrimp from Asia and Latin America have flooded the U.S. market, depressing shrimp prices and driving American shrimpers out of business. Domestic catfish farmers, concentrated in Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi, charge Asian exporters with false advertising by labeling an unrelated species as catfish.

#### Marine ecosystems are resilient.

Kennedy et. al. 02 – (Victor S. Kennedy, professor and researcher at¶ the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, COASTAL¶ AND MARINE ECOSYSTEMS AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE: POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF¶ U.S. RESOURCES, 2002, p.¶ <http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm>)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient¶ to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the¶ biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to¶ physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid¶ environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable.¶ Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their¶ range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

## Solvency

### 2NC Solvency

#### **Permitting isn’t the key barrier --- financial issues outweigh**

Trabish, 11 (7/8/2011, Herman K. Trabish, “Is the U.S. Offshore Wind Industry About to Boom?” <http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/is-the-u.s.-offshore-wind-industry-about-to-boom>)

It is the success of these Obama Administration policy initiatives that has caused some Congress watchers to question the motives of the Republican-led House subcommittee initiatives on OCS offshore wind permitting matters. In the hearing at which Lanard testified, seven of the eight presenters reportedly told the subcommittee it is not permitting but Republican-led withholding of incentives such as tax credits, loan guarantees and R&D funding that is the obstacle.

#### Number of other obstacles --- expiring PTC and lack of specialized vessels, port capacity, transmission lines and grid configuration

Nunez, 12/20 --- with National Geographic (12/20/2012, Christina, “As U.S. Eyes Offshore Wind Development, Whales Get New Protections,” <http://theenergycollective.com/cnunez/162456/us-eyes-offshore-wind-development-whales-get-new-protections>)

The United States does not currently have any utility-scale wind turbines installed in its waters. A DOE-commissioned analysis projects that in a “high-growth scenario,” the offshore wind industry could support up to 350,000 jobs and stimulate $70 billion in annual investments by 2030 (the DOE seems to be sticking to a more conservative number, citing 200,000 potential jobs on its blog and infographic). But the offshore wind industry has many hurdles to overcome in order to achieve that high growth.

Aside from the potential end of the production tax credit, which would result in a loss of $10 billion in investments to the wind industry as a whole next year, according to a report from the American Wind Energy Association, the offshore wind industry faces other significant challenges. Though offshore wind has the potential to generate 4,000 gigawatts of electricity — four times the current overall U.S. generation capacity — the industry lacks adequate means of integrating that power with the nation’s grid. (See related story: “High-Voltage DC Breakthrough Could Boost Renewables“)

As the DOE notes in its National Offshore Wind Strategy document, the specialized vessels, port capacity, transmission lines and grid configuration necessary for cost-effective offshore wind energy installations does not yet exist in the United States. Projects also face a complex permitting process that must take into account an array of existing activity in U.S. waters: shipping lanes, fisheries, military operations, and wildlife.

#### Offshore wind is not competitive --- will kill investment

Taylor, 12 (8/10/2012, Phil, E&E reporter, “OFFSHORE WIND: With advance of tax credit and OCS leases, optimism builds in nascent U.S. industry,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/08/10/1>)

Still, skeptics of Interior's offshore wind energy program, known as "smart from the start," include the Institute for Energy Research, a think tank led by a former oil industry lobbyist, which last month criticized the cost of new projects.

"It is 'dead in the water' because offshore wind energy is 3.4 times more expensive than onshore wind energy," the group said in a July 26 blog post, "making it not a prudent investment compared to other renewable alternatives for electricity generation."

#### U.S. demand will be low --- natural gas and ample onshore wind

North American WindPower, 12/17 (“Report: U.S. Offshore Wind Energy Progress Expected To Be 'Lackluster' Through 2016,” 12/17/2012, <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.10836#.UNx7WcWgRGk>)

Offshore wind energy installations are expected to achieve a compound annual growth rate of 44% between 2011 and 2016, with 18 GW of installations expected by the end of that period, according to a new analysis from MAKE Consulting. Much of that growth can be attributed to favorable policy in Europe and China, the firm notes.

MAKE Consulting expects that Europe will be the growth powerhouse for offshore wind, with the continent accounting for 62% of total installations in the 2011-2016 period. Of those European installations, 77% will be driven by Germany and the U.K., which are striving toward their ambitious 2020 offshore wind targets of 18 GW and 10 GW, respectively.

Mirroring the upward swing in northern Europe, the Asia Pacific region is expected to install 6.6 GW of offshore wind through 2016, representing 36% of the global offshore wind energy market. Although China will remain the largest offshore wind market in the Asia Pacific, the emergence of South Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan will supplement growth during that period.

In sharp contrast, progress in the U.S. is expected to be lackluster, due to low gas and electricity prices, an ample onshore resource and weak political commitment to renewables, MAKE Consulting says.

Offshore wind asset ownership will remain dominated by European utilities and developers, with Vattenfall and DONG Energy leading the way, according to the firm. Currently, southern European utilities are not represented in the top asset owners, due to a lack of offshore wind activity and challenging economics in their home markets, but they do represent a sizable chunk of the 185 GW pipeline.

## Gas DA

### 2NC Flaring Impact

#### Low prices cause flaring

Weber, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin, 12

(May, THE LOOMING NATURAL GAS TRANSITION IN THE UNITED STATES, [www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf](http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf))

These attractive market opportunities are offset in some respects by the negative environmental impacts that are occurring from production in the Bakken and Eagle Ford shale plays in North Dakota and Texas. At those locations, significant volumes of gases are flared because the gas is too inexpensive to justify rapid construction of the pricey distribution systems that would be necessary to move the fuel to markets. Consequently, for many operators it ends up being cheaper in many cases to flare the gas rather than to harness and distribute it.

#### Flaring depletes the ozone layer - extinction

Osai, Professor of Social Sciences at The Rivers State College of Arts and Science, 02

(SHELL AS AGAMA LIZARD, www.waado.org/Environment/OilCompanies/Shell-Communities/ShellsFalsePR.html)

Talking of the impact of gas flaring on the environment, in 1984/85, I was part of a team of professors and graduate students from the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Port Harcourt that undertook a field trip to what is now called the Orashi Region. I guided the team to the gas flare site at Obagi, Obrikom, Ebocha, Ukwugba and Izombe. From one site to another, we took sample of cassava and other crops; we observed the plantains, palm trees and the general vegetation within a certain radius of the gas flared racks and we noted that though the cassava stems and leaves looked unaffected, their tubers were rotten. We also observed a pathetic degeneration from the lush vegetation with giant trees that used to be a rustic meadow; giant racks, spewing roaring flames into the sky had taken the place of the giant trees. These findings were published in Newswatch. It is, therefore, an insult on the collective intellect of the peoples of the Niger Delta for Shell to aver that "gas flaring is not detrimental to the immediate environment." Matter-of-factly, the statement is an insult on the collective intellect of humanity, which is facing imminent extinction as a result of the depletion of the ozone layer - a phenomenon that gas flaring contributes immensely to. Incidentally, I did my administrative internship in 1977 at the Cleveland Division of Air Pollution Control, Cleveland, Ohio, USA and I think I learned quite a bit about pollution and its negative impact on the environment - immediate or otherwise.

### 2NC Russian Exports Impact

#### Low prices key to gas exports

Slutz, President and Managing Director of Global Energy Strategies LLC, 12

(9/4, The Shale Gas Revolution Implications for U.S. and Canadian Energy Policy and Asian Energy Security, www.nbr.org/downloads/pdfs/ETA/Slutz\_interview\_09042012.pdf

It is important to appreciate that before natural gas exports can occur, industry must spend several billion dollars for each export terminal to build the liquefaction facility. To make this decision, companies must believe that U.S. natural gas prices will remain low enough and Asia prices high enough to make money on exports to Asia for the entire term of a 20-year contract. While the differentials between Asia and North America currently support trade, the cost of liquefaction and shipping will account for a significant amount of that differential. Asia’s LNG contracts are based on oil prices. At oil prices below $80 per barrel, importing LNG from North America is less attractive to Asian buyers. As oil prices rise, the economics of importing gas from North America become more attractive. The United States does have a very large resource base, which will support production of more natural gas than will be consumed domestically. The market, not government, will be the best mechanism to determine the extent of exports. Most projections, including from the EIA, anticipate some level of North American gas exports in the next four to eight years. The level of exports will be determined by the cost of gas and the cost of converting it to LNG, as well as the cost of transporting the gas to market. The United States has huge gas resources, but the cost of production varies between different areas. While there is plenty of gas for domestic use and exports, as we move into areas that cost more to develop, there is less incentive to export gas. The other important issue to remember is that significant gas resources exist around the world. Gas exports from the United States directly compete with other supplies and the least costly supplies will be the ones that go to market. Economics will ultimately determine how much gas is exported.

**US gas exports collapse the Russian economy**

Mead, Professor of Foreign Affairs at Bard, 12

(North American Shale Gas Gives Russia Serious Headache, blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/04/25/north-american-shale-gas-gives-russia-serious-headache/)

North America’s shale gas boom is chipping away at the market for gas producers like Russia. What’s more, if the United States becomes a gas exporter, Russia’s customers (especially in Europe) could decide to cancel expensive contracts with Gazprom in favor of cheaper American natural gas. “If the US starts exporting LNG to Europe and Asia, it gives [customers there] an argument to renegotiate their prices with Gazprom and Qatar, and they will do it,” says Jean Abiteboul, head of Cheniere supply & marketing. Gazprom supplied 27 percent of Europe’s natural gas in 2011. While American gas is trading below $2 per MMBTU (million British thermal units), Gazprom’s prices are tied to crude oil markets, and its long-term contracts charge customers roughly $13 per MMBTU, says the FT. European customers would love to reduce their dependence on Gazprom and start to import American gas. Already Gazprom has had to make concessions to its three biggest customers, and others are increasingly dissatisfied with their contracts. Worse, from Russia’s point of view: evidence that western and central Europe contain substantial shale gas reserves of their own. Fracking is unpopular in thickly populated, eco-friendly Europe, but so are high gas prices. All this ought to give Russia serious heartburn. Eroding Gazprom’s dominance of the European energy market would be a major check on Russian economic growth and political influence.

#### Extinction

Filger, columnist and founder of GlobalEconomicCrisis.com, 09

(Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction, www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html)

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

### 2NC Japan Exports Impact

#### Low prices key to gas exports

Slutz, President and Managing Director of Global Energy Strategies LLC, 12

(9/4, The Shale Gas Revolution Implications for U.S. and Canadian Energy Policy and Asian Energy Security, www.nbr.org/downloads/pdfs/ETA/Slutz\_interview\_09042012.pdf

It is important to appreciate that before natural gas exports can occur, industry must spend several billion dollars for each export terminal to build the liquefaction facility. To make this decision, companies must believe that U.S. natural gas prices will remain low enough and Asia prices high enough to make money on exports to Asia for the entire term of a 20-year contract. While the differentials between Asia and North America currently support trade, the cost of liquefaction and shipping will account for a significant amount of that differential. Asia’s LNG contracts are based on oil prices. At oil prices below $80 per barrel, importing LNG from North America is less attractive to Asian buyers. As oil prices rise, the economics of importing gas from North America become more attractive. The United States does have a very large resource base, which will support production of more natural gas than will be consumed domestically. The market, not government, will be the best mechanism to determine the extent of exports. Most projections, including from the EIA, anticipate some level of North American gas exports in the next four to eight years. The level of exports will be determined by the cost of gas and the cost of converting it to LNG, as well as the cost of transporting the gas to market. The United States has huge gas resources, but the cost of production varies between different areas. While there is plenty of gas for domestic use and exports, as we move into areas that cost more to develop, there is less incentive to export gas. The other important issue to remember is that significant gas resources exist around the world. Gas exports from the United States directly compete with other supplies and the least costly supplies will be the ones that go to market. Economics will ultimately determine how much gas is exported.

#### LNG exports trade off with Japan nuclear restart

Cunningham, Policy Analyst at the American Security Project, March

(2013, The Geopolitical Implications of U.S. Natural Gas Exports, americansecurityproject.org/ASP%20Reports/Ref%200116%20-%20The%20Geopolitical%20Implications%20of%20U.S.%20Natural%20Gas%20Exports.pdf)

LNG exports will help American allies in two key regions - Europe and Asia - by undercutting the political clout of dominant producer states and by expanding the quantity of total energy supplied to allies starved of energy. European Allies Europe remains highly dependent on Russia for natural gas, which supplies 34% of its total natural gas imports.18 For countries in Central and Eastern Europe (like Czech Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece), that share is much higher. 19 Russia has demonstrated its willingness to use energy as a political tool, cutting off natural gas supplies to European consumers several The reasons for such actions are disputed by the Russian government and Gazprom, but the timing of these events seem created to maximize Russia’s political influence. The result is that European countries are vulnerable to a supplier that can be described as unreliable at best. There has been moderate progress to date in loosening Russia’s grip over European energy, and the role of LNG has been instrumental. Rising LNG purchases has allowed Europe to find new suppliers for its energy needs, including Nigeria, Egypt, Trinidad and Qatar. This has led to a diversification of natural gas imports, allowing Europe to cut its dependence on Russia for natural gas from 75% in 1990 down to only 34% today.21 The U.S. has already contributed to this trend, albeit unwittingly. The shale gas revolution in the U.S. has freed up LNG imports that were once destined for American ports. LNG shipments were essentially rerouted to Europe. This has allowed LNG supplies around the world to grow, pushing down prices.22 However, Russian gas will continue to play a dominant role in Europe’s energy future. 23 Germany’s decision to shut down its nuclear fleet is already requiring more natural gas in its place. It is unknown whether natural gas production in Europe, from shale in particular, will grow in the future. New infrastructure, like the recently opened Nord Stream gas pipeline under the Baltic from Russia to Germany and the beginning of the South Stream pipeline under the Black Sea, will ensure that the link between Russia as a supplier and Europe as a buyer remains strong. Finally, efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will mean natural gas takes on a bigger role, displacing coal (despite the temporary uptick in coal consumption as of late). Several European countries, including Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine hope to weaken this dependence by constructing LNG import terminals.24 The expansion of U.S. LNG exports to Europe could help these countries reduce Russian influence – in particular, the small, heavily dependent, Eastern and Central European states. The more these nations can diversify their energy portfolio, including more sources of imports, the less market share – and political power – Russia and Gazprom will control. This will pre-empt the incentive and ability of Gazprom and the Russian government to play games with energy supplies. Turkey depends on Iran for 20% of its natural gas imports.25 While the U.S. and its allies are trying to isolate Iran from international markets in an attempt to force a negotiation over its nuclear program, Iranian natural gas exports provide an economic lifeline. Iran only exports natural gas to three countries – Turkey, Armenia, and Azerbaijan – and Turkey accounts for 90% of Iran’s natural gas exports, earning Iran $10.5 million per day.26 Providing Turkey with more options to meet its energy demand can reduce their reliance on Iran – and increase the pressure of sanctions on the Iranian regime. The U.S. could make progress in critical national security goals by allowing the export of natural gas to its allies. European countries are making efforts to reduce Russian control over their energy markets, and U.S. LNG can accelerate this trend. Increased LNG from the U.S. will provide Europe with more options, diversify the global LNG market, undermine Russia’s ability to dictate terms and reduce revenues to the Iranian regime.27 Asian Allies Japan lacks substantial indigenous energy resources and is thus highly dependent on maritime imports for energy. It is the world’s third largest importer of crude oil, second largest importer of coal, and the top importer of LNG.28 To generate electricity, Japan relies heavily on these imported sources of energy. The shuttering of nearly all of its nuclear power plants created a surge in energy imports to replace the lost capacity. This included a steep rise in LNG demand, pushing up prices. The high costs of LNG are sapping the Japanese economy, putting pressure on the government to return to nuclear power. Russia has already made preliminary moves to capitalize on Japan’s energy problems – it is considering building LNG export terminals in the Far East to service Japan.29 Japan is in desperate need of energy and is actively lobbying the U.S. government to permit new LNG exports.

#### Japanese nuclear power is key to cooperation overall

Itoh, Senior Analyst in the Strategy Research Unit at the The Institute of Energy Economics, March, ’13 ¶ [Shoichi Itoh, Energy Security in Northeast Asia: A Pivotal Moment for the U.S.-Japan Alliance, March 12th 2013, www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/03/12-energy-security-itoh?rssid=energy+and+environment&utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+BrookingsRSS%2Ftopics%2Fenergyandenvironment+%28Brookings+Topics+-+Energy+and+Environment%29]

It also must be emphasized that Japan’s nuclear future will directly affect the range of U.S.-Japan cooperation which goes by far beyond mere energy issues. The Japanese and U.S. nuclear industries have developed as “twin brothers” for more than a half century. Today, Hitachi and GE, as well as Toshiba and Westinghouse, have nuclear power joint ventures. Japanese nuclear vendors have made significant contributions to make up for the declining of the nuclear industry in the United States after the Three Mile Island accident in 1979, by developing high-tech nuclear products for civilian use and producing a large number of the world’s top-class engineers.

#### US/Japan alliance solves the most likely scenario for war

Nye et al., Former Deputy Secretary of State, 2K

[Joseph S. Nye, Professor @ The John F. Kennedy School of Government @ Harvard University, Former Deputy Secretary of State, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Richard L. Armitage, Former Deputy Secretary of State, Michael J. Green, Advisor & Japan Chair @ The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Associate Professor @ The Walsh School of Foreign Service, Kurt M. Campbell, Fellow @ The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Frank Jannuzi, Minority Staff Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Edward J. Lincoln, Fellow @ The Brookings Institution, “The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership,” The Institute for National Strategic Studies, October 11th 2000, <http://homepage2.nifty.com/moru/lib/nichibei-anpo/pdf/INSS%20Special%20Report.pdf>]

Asia, in the throes of historic change, should carry major weight in the calculus of American political, security, economic, and other interests. Accounting for 53 percent of the world's population, 25 percent of the global economy, and nearly $600 billion annually in two-way trade with the United States, Asia is vital to American prosperity. Politically, from Japan and Australia, to the Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia, countries across the region are demonstrating the universal appeal of democratic values. China is facing momentous social and economic changes, the consequences of which are not yet clear. Major war in Europe is inconceivable for at least a generation, but the prospects for conflict in Asia are far from remote. The region features some of the world’s largest and most modern armies, nuclear-armed major powers, and several nuclear-capable states. Hostilities that could directly involve the United States in a major conflict could occur at a moment notice on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. The Indian subcontinent is a major flashpoint. In each area, war has the potential of nuclear escalation. In addition, lingering turmoil in Indonesia, the world fourth-largest nation, threatens stability in Southeast Asia. The United States is tied to the region by a series of bilateral security alliances that remain the region made facto security architecture. In this promising but also potentially dangerous setting, the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship is more important than ever. With the world second-largest economy and a well-equipped and competent military, and as our democratic ally, Japan remains the keystone of the U.S. involvement in Asia. The U.S.- Japan alliance is central to America global security strategy. Japan, too, is experiencing an important transition. Driven in large part by the forces of globalization, Japan is in the midst of its greatest social and economic transformation since the end of World War II. Japanese society, economy, national identity, and international role are undergoing change that is potentially as fundamental as that Japan experienced during the Meiji Restoration. The effects of this transformation are yet to be fully understood. Just as Western countries dramatically underestimated the potential of the modern nation that emerged from the Meiji Restoration, many are ignoring a similar transition the effects of which, while not immediately apparent, could be no less profound. For the United States, the key to sustaining and enhancing the alliance in the 21st century lies in reshaping our bilateral relationship in a way that anticipates the consequences of changes now underway in Japan. Since the end of World War II, Japan has played a positive role in Asia. As a mature democracy with an educated and active electorate, Japan has demonstrated that changes in government can occur peacefully. Tokyo has helped to foster regional stability and build confidence through its proactive diplomacy and economic involvement throughout the region. Japan's participation in the United Nations peacekeeping mission in Cambodia in the early 1990s, its various defense exchanges and security dialogues, and its participation in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Regional Forum and the new plus Three grouping are further testimony to Tokyo's increasing activism. Most significantly, Japan's alliance with the United States has served as the foundation for regional order. We have considered six key elements of the U.S.-Japan relationship and put forth a bipartisan action agenda aimed at creating an enduring alliance foundation for the 21st century. Post-Cold War Drift As partners in the broad Western alliance, the United States and Japan worked together to win the Cold War and helped to usher in a new era of democracy and economic opportunity in Asia. In the aftermath of our shared victory, however, the course of U.S.-Japan relations has wandered, losing its focus and coherence- -notwithstanding the real threats and potential risks facing both partners. Once freed from the strategic constraints of containing the Soviet Union, both Washington and Tokyo ignored the real, practical, and pressing needs of the bilateral alliance. Well-intentioned efforts to find substitutes for concrete collaboration and clear goal-setting have produced a diffuse dialogue but no clear definition of a common purpose. Efforts to experiment with new concepts of international security have proceeded fitfully, but without discernable results in redefining and reinvigorating bilateral security ties. This lack of focus and follow-through has been evident in both countries. Some in Japan have been drawn to the notion of Asianization and the hope that economic interdependence and multilateral institutions would put the region on a path similar to that of Europe. Many in the United States regarded the end of the Cold War as an opportunity to return to economic priorities. The early 1990s was a period of heightened bilateral tensions, primarily over the question of access to Japanese markets. Some Americans saw economic competition from Japan as a threat. In the past five years, however, trade tensions have diminished. Envy and concern over Japanese economic prowess have turned to dismay over the Japanese recession and building financial crisis. Neither country dealt with the need to redefine and reinvigorate the alliance. In fact, both took it for granted. The drift in the alliance was obvious until the mid-1990s when the crisis on the Korean peninsula-- punctuated by the horror of the Okinawa rape incident--captured the attention of policymakers in Washington and Tokyo. These episodes prompted them to recognize belatedly the costs of neglecting the bilateral relationship. The subsequent Taiwan Strait confrontation in March 1996 gave even more impetus to efforts on both sides of the Pacific to reaffirm the bilateral security alliance. The 1996 U.S.-Japan Joint Security Declaration went a long way toward directing attention in both capitals toward the need to refurbish the alliance, and led to concrete changes that updated defense ties in the ¶ form of the revised Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, the 1996 report of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa, and the bilateral agreement to cooperate in theater missile defense research. But the symbolism of the 1996 declaration stood alone, unsupported by sustained high-level attention. As a result, the United States and Japan soon returned to bickering and poor policy coordination. The costs of the deterioration in the U.S.-Japan relationship have been insidious as well as obvious. By the end of the 1990s, many U.S. policymakers had lost interest in a Japan that appeared incapable of renewing itself. Indeed, Japan's prolonged recession has discouraged or dispirited even some Japanese officials. In Tokyo, many see Washington as arrogant and unable to recognize that its prescriptions are not universally applicable to others' economic, political, and social needs. A number of government officials and opinion-makers perceived the U.S. approach as a self serving rationale for commercial and economic interests and grew resentful of a United States seemingly preoccupied with its own self-centered version of globalization. It has been obvious that U.S. attention and interests have turned elsewhere in Asia. More recently, the principal focus of American policymakers has been the bilateral relationship with China--a relationship characterized by a series of crises ever since the 1989 Tiananmen Square pro-democracy demonstrations. Neither Washington nor Tokyo followed through aggressively on the security agenda set forth in the 1996 declaration, in large measure because of concerns over Beijing's hostile reaction to the reinvigoration of the security partnership. Beijing let it be known in no uncertain terms that it regarded the U.S.-Japan partnership as an important element of a broader effort by Washington to constrain its regional diplomacy. And as the United States and-- to a lesser extent--Japan sought to improve relations with China, both demonstrated a clear desire to downplay the notion of a containment strategy. In fact, the only active security dialogue between the United States and Japan has been a byproduct of a desire to coax North Korea out of its self-imposed isolation. The United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea all concur that close cooperation and unity of purpose offer the most effective strategy to deal with Pyongyang. This record of diffidence, uncertainty, and indirection has no single father, nor does it support an oversimplified laying of blame. Rather, it demands a recognition that the time has arrived for renewed attention to improving, reinvigorating, and refocusing the U.S.-Japan alliance. Both the United States and Japan face an uncertain security environment in Asia at a time of political transition and important change in both countries--for the United States, a new national leadership, and for Japan, a continuing process of economic, political, and social transformation. At the same time, political and economic uncertainties in China and Russia, the fragile nature of detente on the Korean peninsula, and the prospect of protracted instability in Indonesia--all pose shared challenges. For those who argue that Japan is a pasting asset in irreversible decline, it might be useful to recall that it has been only a decade since it was taken as an article of faith that American power was ebbing on the international scene. It would be foolhardy to underestimate the enduring dimensions of Japanese power, much as it was unwise for some Japanese to dismiss the latent and enduring qualities of American power in the 1980s and 1990s. Politics Over the past decade, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), faced with internal divisions, a clash of traditional interest group agendas, and a growing split among key constituencies, has focused primarily on hanging on to its dwindling power. At the same time, the political opposition has failed to produce credible, well-conceived policy proposals. The net effect is an LDP struggling to maintain its grip on the reins of government, an opposition unable to provide a governing alternative, and a Japanese public, faced with a lack of credible alternative leadership, reluctantly returning the LDP to office. The result has been a government stuck in neutral, incapable of more than muddling through. Nevertheless, the necessity of economic reform and restructuring, driven by the pressures of a relentless globalization of the international economy, are likely to lead to political change. These economic forces are breaking apart the monopoly power of the so-called Iron Triangle--the heretofore collusive relationships among politicians, business, and the bureaucracies-- and making power more diffuse. The Japanese political order is experiencing protracted change. Political changes in Japan could lead to unprecedented opportunities to reinvigorate the U.S.-Japan relationship--as well as test it further. The end of bipolar ideological confrontation in Japanese politics and the emergence of a new pragmatism about security affairs among a younger generation of elected officials provide fertile soil for creative new approaches to leadership. It would be unrealistic to expect the current leadership suddenly to embrace reform or to assume a higher profile on the global stage. The demands of Japan's parliamentary system make it difficult to implement policies, that require short-term pain in exchange for long-term gain. The political system is risk-averse. But the successor generations of politicians and the public at- large also recognize that economic power alone will no longer be enough to secure Japan's future. Moreover, the Japanese public, by giving official standing to the national flag and anthem, and in focusing on such territorial claims as the Senkaku islands, has evidenced a new respect for the sovereignty and integrity of the nation state. The implications for the U.S.-Japan relationship stemming from these changes are profound. A similar process is at work in the United States. The growing role of Congress as a force in foreign policy, the rising influence of state and local governments, and the dramatic transformation of the private sector as the initiator of economic change--driven by technology and the empowerment of the individual--are altering the influence of once-central foreign policymaking institutions. But, just as Japan's risk-averse political leadership has held back the nation's economic transformation, the lack of clear direction from Washington also has taken a toll. Episodic executive branch leadership has failed to produce a well-conceived game plan for America's relationship with Japan. This, in turn, has accelerated the erosion of political support and popular understanding of the importance of the alliance. In short, the political, economic, and social changes underway in the United States put an even greater premium on executive branch leadership in foreign affairs. If the United States can exercise leadership--that is to say, excellence without arrogance--in its relations with Japan, the two countries will be better able to realize the full potential for cooperation nurtured during the past 50 years. If the changes underway in Japan ultimately produce a stronger, more responsive political and economic system, the synergy in U.S.- Japan relations will enhance our abilities to play an engaged, mutually supportive, and fundamentally constructive role in regional and global arenas in the years to come. Because the stakes are so high in Asia, it is urgent that the United States and Japan develop a common perception and approach regarding their relationship in the 21st century. The potential for conflict in Asia is lowered dramatically by a visible and real U.S.- Japan defense relationship. The use of bases granted by Japan allows the U.S. to affect the security environment from the Pacific to the Persian Gulf.

### Prices Rising – Demand

#### Prices are rising – cold weather, production decline, demand from utilities – that’s WSJ

#### Natural gas demand means prices are rising and will stay up

Barrons 3/21/13 (“Natural Gas Prices Up 12% In March; Some NGL Energy Plays Undervalued” <http://blogs.barrons.com/stockstowatchtoday/2013/03/21/natural-gas-prices-up-12-in-march-some-ngl-energy-plays-undervalued/2/>)

While land drilling in carbon-rich shale formations has produced an overabundance of dry natural gas in the United States, producers have cut spending budgets and decent winter demand has soaked up some supply.¶ The U.S. Energy Information Administration is expecting natural gas storage levels at the end the heating season will be “significantly lower” than last year.¶ The result is a 12% rally in natural gas prices this month, and 18% so far this year. The front-month contract for Henry Hub natural gas is holding steady today at $3.96 per million British thermal units. A year ago, as traders contemplated the prospect of natural gas prices falling below $1 per million Btus, we noted that the futures market predicted a recovery to $4 in 2013. (See that post, “Will Natural Gas Price Sink to $1?“)¶ Gas liquids are part of the story. Exploration and production companies are finding a strong market for natural gas liquids, which are used in chemicals and other industrial processes. And some stocks with “NGL” exposure have been left behind, according to a note out this morning from Nicholas Pope at Cowen Securities.¶ Pope says companies with gas liquids production exposure are trading at a multiple of 5.1 times (using 2014 enterprise value to his exploration-specific estimate for earnings before interest, taxes depreciation and amortization (Ebitdax)). Oil-weighted names have a similar valuation at 5.1x. But energy companies with a dry-gas weighting are trading at 8.3x, Pope estimates. Among natural-gas weighted names,¶ Among natural-gase weighted names, Pope favors SM Energy (SM) because it is notably discounted, trading at only 3.9 times his 2014 estimate for Ebitda. It had only rallied 2% this month compared to a 12% rise in spot prices for the U.S. natural gas benchmark; shares are trading near $58 and Pope has a Buy rating and $70 price target on the stock.¶ Other NGL explosed names, all lower in morning trading: Rosetta Resources (ROSE), Bill Barett (BBG), Cimarex Energy (XEC) and WPX Energy (WPX).¶ Range Resources (RRC) is another name with gas liquids exposure, but the company also has significant dry gas exposure and is on Pope’s list of “dry gas”-exposed names he rates Hold. Range Resources shares were rallying 1.4%. Dry-gas exposed names have rallied 17% so far this month, ahead of the rise in gas prices, Pope notes. Those names, some up and some down Thursday, include Southwestern Energy (SWN), Exco Resources (XCO), Quicksilver Resources (KWK) and Ultra Petroleum (UPL).¶ “The long-term demand profile in the US for the NGL components has more visibility than the other hydrocarbons, with significant demand growth from the chemical sector. This demand makes us more comfortable viewing 2013 as trough level earnings, and thus should warrant a trough multiple closer to the gas group. Despite significant cash flow leverage to natural gas, SM has underperformed in this recent gas rally, up 2% month to date, and now trades at only 3.9x our 2014 EBITDAX estimate.

#### Natural gas prices are rising – demand means storage levels are down and production is flat

Globe and Mail 3/19/13 (“Gas price rally is something to bark about” <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/gas-price-rally-is-something-to-bark-about/article9881522/>)

Natural gas prices appear to be waking up from their two-year coma. The revival, though still nascent, is a welcome signal for cash-starved producers. But will the rally sustain? Recent indicators are positive – consumption is at a record level, production is relatively flat and storage levels are on a downward trend – so there is good chance that some momentum will carry through summer and beyond.¶ What’s notable is that natural gas prices in North America are nudging up at a time of year when erosion is to be expected; the low demand “shoulder season” that is sandwiched between the grip of frigid winter cold and oppressive summer heat. Every year, over the last four, prices have dropped between February and April, on average by 17 per cent. Each time, the catalyst has been ballooning storage levels, due either to excess production, weak winter demand, or both.¶ Storage levels, the measure of where supply meets demand, are showing greatest reason for optimism at the moment. Not only is the total amount of natural gas in U.S. storage caverns approximately 20-per-cent lower than last year, the trajectory is decidedly downward. The optimism should stretch out this week as more cold weather is on the way in key consuming regions. By the time the weakest demand period of the year arrives, the amount of natural gas in storage may have dropped to under 1.8 trillion cubic feet (Tcf), a deflated volume compared to 2.5 Tcf in 2012.¶ Last year was a storage disaster. The demand-heavy winter months of December and January were hardly cold and spring arrived early. By contrast, this year’s hot chocolate weather was much more “normal” (if there is such a thing any more). A more typical heating season, combined with a cool entry into spring, largely explains today’s depleting inventories. But that’s not all: Industrial demand is at a record high and gas-fired electrical power generators are still enjoying some market share stolen from the coal guys.

#### Natural gas prices rising – increased demand

Adams, Chief Contributor for Atomic Energy Insights and small nuclear plant operator/designer, 12 (8/31, Where is the huge increase in US natural gas supply?, atomicinsights.com/2012/08/where-is-the-huge-increase-in-natural-gas-supply.html

Low prices natural gas prices in the US are largely an artifact of an economic recession that coincided with a couple of relatively mild winters that combined to reduce demand. Those low prices will not last because there are many factors building up to increase demand at the same time that increases in supply are dropping; most drillers and their backers are not happy about sustained low prices. Please understand that the total above ground inventory of natural gas is roughly equal to ONE month of demand.

### AT: Displacement

#### NO displacement in offshore wind – supplemental effect

Vartabedian, 12/9 (Ralph, 12/9/2012, “Rise in renewable energy will require more use of fossil fuels,” http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-unreliable-power-20121210,0,6250142.story)

The Delta Energy Center, a power plant about an hour outside San Francisco, was roaring at nearly full bore one day last month, its four gas and steam turbines churning out 880 megawatts of electricity to the California grid.

On the horizon, across an industrial shipping channel on the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, scores of wind turbines stood dead still. The air was too calm to turn their blades — or many others across the state that day. Wind provided just 33 megawatts of power statewide in the midafternoon, less than 1% of the potential from wind farms capable of producing 4,000 megawatts of electricity.

As is true on many days in California when multibillion-dollar investments in wind and solar energy plants are thwarted by the weather, the void was filled by gas-fired plants like the Delta Energy Center.

One of the hidden costs of solar and wind power — and a problem the state is not yet prepared to meet — is that wind and solar energy must be backed up by other sources, typically gas-fired generators. As more solar and wind energy generators come online, fulfilling a legal mandate to produce one-third of California's electricity by 2020, the demand will rise for more backup power from fossil fuel plants.

"The public hears solar is free, wind is free," said Mitchell Weinberg, director of strategic development for Calpine Corp., which owns Delta Energy Center. "But it is a lot more complicated than that."

Wind and solar energy are called intermittent sources, because the power they produce can suddenly disappear when a cloud bank moves across the Mojave Desert or wind stops blowing through the Tehachapi Mountains. In just half an hour, a thousand megawatts of electricity — the output of a nuclear reactor — can disappear and threaten stability of the grid.

To avoid that calamity, fossil fuel plants have to be ready to generate electricity in mere seconds. That requires turbines to be hot and spinning, but not producing much electricity until complex data networks detect a sudden drop in the output of renewables. Then, computerized switches are thrown and the turbines roar to life, delivering power just in time to avoid potential blackouts.

The state's electricity system can handle the fluctuations from existing renewable output, but by 2020 vast wind and solar complexes will sprawl across the state, and the problem will become more severe.

Just how much added capacity will be needed from traditional sources is the subject of heated debate by utility officials, government regulators and policy experts. The concerns are expected to come to a head next year when the state must adopt a 10-year plan for its energy needs.

"This issue is someplace between a significant concern and a major problem," said electricity system expert Severin Borenstein, a professor at UC Berkeley's Haas School of Business. "There is definitely going to be a need for more reserves."

Borenstein said state legislators and the governor did not consider all of the details, such as unleashing this new demand for fossil fuel generators, when they set the 33% mandate for renewable energy. The state now gets 20% of its power from renewables, in part from older hydro and geothermal energy. Gov. Jerry Brown has advocated upping the goal to 40%.

The cost to consumers in the years ahead could be in the billions of dollars, according to industry experts. California's electricity prices are already among the highest in the nation and are projected to rise sharply in coming years. At the moment, the need for reserve power isn't considered a cost of renewable power, though consumers have to bear its costs as well.

The California Independent System Operator, the nonprofit company that runs the grid, estimates that by 2020 the state will need to double its reserve capacity. California now maintains a margin of 7% to 8% above projected daily demand, in case a nuclear power plant goes offline or outages occur. But when 33% of the state's power comes from renewables, that margin will have to rise to 15%, said Stephen Berberich, the firm's chief executive.

Nobody knows whether Berberich's estimate is right or how much the added capacity will cost. The California Energy Commission, which has responsibility for licensing new power plants and forecasting future power demand, said it doesn't have the analytical tools necessary to know how much reserve power will be needed.

"It is frankly in the development stage," said Mike Jaske, the commission's senior policy analyst for electricity supply.

### 2nc Uniqueness --- Rate of Renewable Increase Slowing

#### Renewable growth slowing now --- declining investment

Woody, 3/12 (Todd, 3/12/2013, “Is the renewable energy boom slowing down?” <http://qz.com/62147/is-the-renewable-energy-boom-slowing-down/>))

The numbers are in on 2012 and it was not the best of years for renewable energy, according to a report released today by market research firm Clean Edge.

After years of breakneck growth, the value of global wind industry installations rose by just $2.3 billion from the previous year to $73.8 billion in 2012. Worldwide wind capacity jumped to a record 44,700 megawatts, but that was only about 8% up on the previous year.

The value of photovoltaic installations actually fell for the first time, from $91.6 billion in 2011 to $79.7 billion in 2012, as solar panel prices continued to plummet and Chinese manufacturers grappled with overcapacity. Total solar capacity hit a record 30,900 megawatts in 2012 but revenues fell for the first time in a dozen years.

Biofuels were the one bright spot, with the market growing to $95.2 billion in 2012 from $83 billion the previous year.

Global-markets-for-alternative-energy

Last year “proved to be an unsettling and difficult year for clean energy,” the report’s authors wrote. “High-profile bankruptcies and layoffs plagued many clean-tech companies, overall venture investments retreated in the face of increasingly elusive returns, and the industry was begrudgingly transformed into a partisan wedge issue during the highly contentious US presidential campaign.”

So why does the green energy business seem to be in something of a funk? The shale gas boom is one reason, allowing investors and utilities to look forward to a cheaper, cleaner-burning fossil fuel that can provide power around the clock. The upheaval in the Chinese solar industry, home to 80% of the world’s photovoltaic manufacturing, and the failure of US startups developing next-generation solar technology to gain ground has also unnerved investors. And advanced biofuels have yet to make a commercial impact.

Still, Clean Edge estimates that the global wind, solar and biofuels market will grow from $248.7 billion in 2012 to $426.1 billion in 2022. And to put 2012 in perspective, the value of the worldwide wind market a decade ago was just $4 billion, the solar market was worth $2.5 billion, and the biofuels market was too small for Clean Edge to measure.

Venture capitalists’ enthusiasm for green technologies has waned as the market has grown and renewable-energy projects have reached the kind of size that needs more heavyweight funding. Total investment dropped from $5 billion in 2012 from $6 billion in the previous year.

Luckily, investors like Warren Buffett have stepped into the void. Buffett’s MidAmerican Energy Holdings, for instance, recently acquired two California solar power plants for $2 billion while Google has invested $200 million into a Texas wind farm. Google alone now has invested in renewable energy projects that generate 2,000 megawatts of electricity, enough to power 500,000 average American households at peak output—or a whole lot of server farms.

#### Continued uncertainty over the PTC will slow new wind projects

Crooks, 1/2 (Ed, 1/2/2013, “US wind power investment set to fall,” <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/4a9b6d6e-54fb-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html#axzz2MdV0Ertg)>)

Investment in US wind power is expected to fall sharply this year in spite of the one-year extension of the production tax credit agreed by Congress as part of the fiscal cliff deal – but the drop is likely to be less than if the credit had been allowed to expire.

The uncertainty over the wind PTC, which was scheduled to lapse on December 31, has already caused a sharp slowdown in new projects and orders for equipment.

The industry is hopeful that orders will now pick up again. Liz Salerno of the American Wind Energy Association said many jobs had already been lost, but “with clarity in place, the development activity will be reactivated and projects can move toward starting construction”.

An important change is that wind farms that have started construction by the end of the year will now be eligible for the credit. The previous deadline was for them to begin supplying power to the grid. That will give new developments more time to sign contracts and secure permits.

However, any revival in investment this year is highly unlikely to take construction back to anywhere near last year’s levels, when a record of about 12,000 megawatts of wind generation capacity was installed in the US.

Analysts also warned that the continued uncertainty over the long-term future of the credit would deter investment and innovation.

## Add-Ons

### SQ Solves Trawling 2NC

#### Global action and EU spillover occurring now- solves their internal link

Stokstad, author @ Science Insider, subset of ScienceMag, 2012,

7-20, Erik, “European Commission Proposes Protections for Deep-Sea Habitat,” http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2012/07/european-commission-proposes-pro.html

The European Commission wants to tighten its oversight of deep-sea habitat, proposing yesterday to phase out deep-sea trawling, reduce discards of unwanted fish, and implement scientific quotas for fishing. "If you want to take deep-sea fish, you have to do it in a sustainable manner," says Oliver Drewes, a commission spokesperson for maritime affairs and fisheries.¶ Only 1% of fish caught in the Northeast Atlantic come from the deep sea, including species such as black scabbard and red sea bream. The amounts aren't huge—34 tons in 2008—compared to more fecund, faster growing fish in shallower waters, but they have been declining due to overfishing. Worse, the methods used to catch them are particularly destructive of fragile deep-sea habitat, which includes slow-growing coral reefs thousands of years old. There's other collateral damage, too: Trawling and bottom-set gillnets (which are left on the seafloor and then hauled up) can contain up to 20% "bycatch" of unwanted species, such as deepwater sharks.¶ The commission's proposal is part of a larger effort to improve the management and health of European fisheries. It was also inspired by calls by the United Nations General Assembly over the past decade to protect deep-sea habitat in international waters. The proposal would phase out licenses for deep-sea trawling 2 years after the regulation is approved, require strict quotas for deep-sea species that lack solid scientific data on the size of populations, and require impact assessments for opening new areas to deep-sea bottom fishing. It would apply to all the economic exclusive zones of E.U. countries and international waters of the Northeast Atlantic.¶ Several nations have already taken steps to restrict deep-sea bottom trawling, and Palau has banned it, but the commission is the first large fishing community to propose a ban. "This action is a complete turning point in potential protection of deep-sea bottom communities," says marine biologist Les Watling of the University of Hawaii, Honolulu: "One can hope that this will lead to a global ban of bottom trawling in the deep sea, but I can't say I am optimistic on that point. The few companies still trawling for the ever-dwindling supply of deep-sea fish are reaping huge profits and they won't give those up easily."¶ Environmental groups reacted favorably. The Pew Environment Group would like to see impact assessments for existing deep-sea fisheries as well, and closures where vulnerable species might live.¶ The proposal will go to the European Parliament and Council of Ministers for review when they reconvene in early September. It could be adopted by end of year, if they move quickly, Drewes says. Matthew Gianni of the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition says it's "impossible to predict" how long the legislative process will take, but he estimates 8 to 12 months, which would mean a commission ban on deep-sea bottom trawling in 2015.

### AT: Bioterror

#### Countries won’t use bioweapons- they are too unrealiable

MIT 2 (Ocotber 30, pg. http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2002/anthrax-1030.html)

Biological weapons - which could contain germs that cause diseases such as anthrax, smallpox, brucellosis or tularemia - are not effective tactical military weapons. They do not immediately harm enemy soldiers on the battlefield, or destroy artillery, tanks or munitions supplies. And each germ has its drawbacks. Smallpox, for example, is highly contagious, so it could harm friendly soldiers. Anthrax is not contagious, but if it gets in the soil for long periods of time, it can kill cattle and other animals. In addition, the efficacy of biological weapons hinges on several factors, including how many germs survive the explosion of the small bomb in which they are contained, whether the wind is blowing in the correct direction and strongly enough to carry the germs over a target, what constitutes a lethal dose, and how many people will get infected or die. Depending on the germ, as few as 1 to 4 percent of the exposed population may get infected, and estimates of mortality rates vary. "If the wind is blowing one way you have a weapon. If not, you don't," said Guillemin.

# 1NR

### 2NC AT: Plan Popular

#### Link outweighs – areas of disagreement will be highlighted

Metzler, 12 (4/20/2012, Rebekah, “Energy Policy Becoming a Losing Issue for Obama; Republicans have been pounding the president on high gas prices as domestic oil production is at a level not seen in over a decade,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/04/20/energy-policy-becoming-a-losing-issue-for-obama>)

But Paul Bledsoe, senior adviser at the Bipartisan Policy Center, says Obama's actual record on energy lines up pretty closely with what both Republicans and Democrats support. "I kind of find this a little bit ironic, because on many of the major issues, there's actually a lot of agreement," he says. In the last six or so years, Bledsoe says, Republicans have shown support for fuel economy standards and Democrats for offshore oil drilling – a reversal for each party that used to vehemently oppose those policies. The Keystone decision that has become such a flashpoint is really an outlier for Obama, he adds. [See a slideshow of U.S. energy sources.] "Keystone is really an outlier in the administration's approach to energy because, in general, they have been very bullish on domestic production, maybe not as bullish as some in industry would like," Bledsoe says. As far as the increased production, he says the culprit is the high price of oil. "The main reason we're producing more oil is it's been incredibly expensive for five straight years, so everyone wants to produce it to make a lot of money," Bledsoe says. Ultimately, the president's positions on energy seem to self-consciously line up with the views of most Americans, he says. The White House has shown support for increased domestic oil production, renewable and alternative energy and cutting oil industry tax breaks. "It's a very self-consciously populist set of energy position," Bledsoe says. So why is it so easy for Republicans to score points on Obama on energy? "We're in such a hyper-partisan political atmosphere that major areas of agreement are obscured and minor areas of disagreement are highlighted," he says. And the longer gas prices are pinching people's pocketbooks, the steeper Obama's climb to re-election becomes.

### 2NC AT: Thumpers (Generic)

#### No thumper – Immigration is the top priority in Congress and will be dealt with right after the Easter Recess

#### \*\*\*Insert Top Priority/Cross-Apply U/Q\*\*\*

#### Obama is shifting back to immigration but taking a behind the scenes approach to prevent backlash

* **This ev also proves that the guns thumper is priced into Obama’s political strategy**

Sink, 3/26 (Justin, 3/26/2013, “After taking hit in the polls, Obama pivots back to immigration reform,” [http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/290249-after-taking-hit-in-the-polls-obama-pivots-back-to-immigration)](http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/290249-after-taking-hit-in-the-polls-obama-pivots-back-to-immigration%29))

The White House hopes to bolster President Obama’s political standing by shifting attention from the bruising budget battles of the last month to immigration reform and gun control.Democrats welcome the pivot after watching Obama’s standing in polls fall amid fights with Congress over the budget and the automatic spending cuts known as the sequester. They see immigration and gun reform as a better playing field for Obama that could provide political wins for the president. “What the public wants to see right now is him achieving things, leading,” said Tad Devine, a former strategist to Secretary of State John Kerry and former Vice President Gore. “For him, there's real opportunity on all these fronts, and… realistically in the next six months, he can have progress he can bring back to the American people.” On gun control, Obama will travel the country to bolster the case for strengthening background checks on gun purchases. Obama is expected to play an active role in the looming Senate fight over what Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) has described as the “sweet spot” of legislation. A poll released Friday from Quinnipiac University shows that 88 percent of respondents support an expansion of background checks on new weapons purchases. Other provisions banning straw sales and improving gun research programs and school security funding garner similarly commanding poll advantages. "There actually is a lot of strong support for the proposals that the president has put forward, whether it's universal background checks, whether it is, you know, outlawing gun trafficking or straw purchasers," White House spokesman Josh Earnest said. "There's even some support out there in the public for the assault weapons ban." Yet, the assault weapons ban doesn't have the votes to pass the Senate, and neither does background checks — unless a bipartisan deal is reached. Immigration is a better issue for the president, partly because a growing number of Republicans want to pass a bill in the 113th Congress. While Republicans in Congress had little reason to negotiate with Obama on preventing the sequester, they do have reason to offer concessions on immigration. "Immigration reform in particular is something clearly that Latinos and the American public as a whole signaled they wanted in the last election, and Republicans ought to get on the right side of that issue," said Democratic strategist Jamal Simmons. "It doesn't seem like complicated math, and Republicans are basically deciding, do they want to be a House-based party, or do they want to be a national party that competes for the presidency and competes for the control of the Senate?" Moreover, immigration reform — which failed in the George W. Bush administration — would be Obama's most significant legislative achievement behind healthcare reform. “If the administration were able to get an immigration bill that looked anything like comprehensive immigration reform after President Bush had failed on it, President Clinton had failed on it, every president back to Reagan had failed, it would be a big deal,” said Cal Jillson, a political science professor at Southern Methodist University. Democrats are worried that Obama hasn't had a lot of signing ceremonies in 2013 as unresolved budget battles have hit the president's approval ratings. Obama's healthy post-election advantage on the economy has dwindled into a virtual tie with congressional Republicans. Voters equally blame Obama and the GOP for the sequester, which is expected to hit in full force in the coming weeks. “It goes back to a sense in Washington that things aren't getting done,” Devine said. “No matter whose fault that is, when you're president, the buck stops here.” Obama faces a delicate high-wire act on guns and immigration: Claim too much ownership for an issue, and swing-state Republicans who had been considering working with the White House might buck; Sit too far back, and risk losing steam on policy initiatives — or allowing Republicans to take credit. “In both of those policy areas, the president is involving himself carefully, allowing what appears to be some momentum in Congress to manage the issues,” Jillson said. “The president's involvement is modest, if not behind the scenes, because there is still enough post-election bad blood among the House GOP that direct presidential involvement drives away support.”

#### Obama not spending capital on guns

Steinhauer, 3/15 (Jennifer, 3/15/2013, NYTimes.com Feed, “Party-Line Vote in Senate Panel for Ban on Assault Weapons,” Factiva))

President Obama has made an emphatic call for new gun regulations, but he so far has not spent extensive political capital on the effort. In visits to Capitol Hill to meet with lawmakers this week, the issue barely came up. “The Senate has now advanced legislation addressing three of the most important elements of my proposal to help reduce the epidemic of gun violence in this country,” he said in a statement.

### Wind Links

#### The plan gets sucked into larger congressional budget battles

Conathan, 1/31 --- Director of Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress (1/31/2013, Michael, “Filling The Sails Of Offshore Wind Energy,” <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/01/31/1521031/filling-the-sails-of-offshore-wind-energy/?mobile=nc>)

As America has stood on the sidelines, other countries such as Denmark, the United Kingdom, Germany, and even China have leapt ahead of us in developing one particularly strong—and commercially viable—renewable resource, which the United States also happens to have in abundance: offshore wind. As of June 2012 the rest of the world boasted 4,619 megawatts of total installed offshore wind energy capacity. Meanwhile, we have not even begun construction of our first offshore turbine. Lack of a clear regulatory structure, inconsistent messages from other ocean stakeholders, congressional budget battles, opposition to specific project siting, and instability in financial markets have all played a role in preventing domestic offshore wind from becoming a reality.

### AT: DOI Takes Out Politics Link

#### 1) The plan has to be Congress or 100% solvency takeout – only congress can determine preemption

Garvey, Legislative Attorney, 11

(State Authority to Regulate Nuclear Power: Federal Preemption Under the Atomic Energy Act, https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=718958)

Although preemption is a constitutional principle arising from the Supremacy Clause, the extent to which state laws are preempted is a matter of congressional intent. Therefore, Congress retains the authority to define the preemptive scope of a statute. If Congress is unhappy with a court’s interpretation of a given statute, Congress is free to amend the statute to make the statute’s preemptive effects clear. Likewise, if Congress disagrees with the degree to which a state is regulating in an area, Congress is free to either restrict or enlarge that freedom. It is “up to Congress to determine whether a state has misused the authority left in its hands.” Courts have struggled to define the precise borders of the preemptive field emanating from the NRC’s exclusive authority over radiological safety aspects of the construction and operation of nuclear power plants. Given the uncertainties associated with field preemption generally, it is not surprising that the AEA has been subject to a number of conflicting interpretations, which have, in turn, given rise to conflicting case law. Congress, however, is free to adjust or clarify those preemptive boundaries by amending the AEA. The Supreme Court expressly invited Congress to adjust the separation of authority between the states and the federal government if it felt state laws like the California moratorium infringed on federal authority to encourage the development of nuclear power. In Pacific Gas, the Court noted that “it is for Congress to rethink the division of regulatory authority in light of its possible exercise by the States to undercut a federal objective. The courts should not assume the role which our system assigns to Congress.” If Congress believes that courts have interpreted the AEA in a way that provides states with too much freedom in slowing or preventing the development of nuclear power; or, conversely, that courts have interpreted the AEA in a way that excessively restricts a state’s ability to regulate nuclear power within its borders; or if Congress simply seeks to mitigate the uncertainty associated with defining the scope of field preemption under the AEA, then Congress is free to expressly adjust the preemptive field of the AEA accordingly. Preemption is, at its core, controlled by Congress.

#### 2) DOI offshore wind support will fuel political backlash – 2010 offshore wind battles prove

Corbin, Reporter, 10

(Interior Department Approves Construction of Controversial Offshore Wind Farm, www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/04/28/interior-department-poised-annouce-decision-controversial-offshore-wind-farm/)

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar on Wednesday approved the construction of a controversial wind farm off the coast of Cape Cod that puts the Obama administration at odds with one of the president's biggest supporters: the Kennedy family. Salazar's decision will affect thousands of residents, local businesses and tourists who flock to the seashore paradise each summer -- and sets the course for the building of other such offshore wind farms in states from New York to Michigan. The Cape Wind project, which will be the first of its kind in the nation, had created a bipartisan jumble that pit environmentalists and lawmakers against each other on both sides of the dispute over the 130 planned turbines -- whose windmill arms would extend over 400 feet above the water. Salazar said the decision marks a "new direction in our nation's energy future," claiming the wind farm will be "one of the largest greenhouse gas reduction initiatives in the nation," cutting carbon dioxide emissions from conventional power plants by 700,000 tons annually. Click here for more on the controversial project from Molly Line. The wind farm, to be built five miles off the Massachusetts coast, has been blasted by critics like the Kennedy clansmen as an "economic boondoggle" that will cost taxpayers billions, hurt commercial fishing and pose a danger to wildlife along a pristine stretch of the Nantucket Sound. "It's a boondoggle of the worst kind," Robert F. Kennedy Jr., an environmental lawyer and the son of the late Bobby Kennedy, said in an interview Tuesday with FoxNews.com. "It's going to cost the people of Massachusetts $4 billion over the next 20 years in extra costs." The late Sen. Ted Kennedy, D-Mass., an avid sailor who had been a leading opponent of the project, contested the project up until his death last August. He claimed that taxpayers already hit with the highest energy costs in the nation will be forced to pay double the price of a land-based wind system. "We're the windiest country on earth and we have lots and lots of land" on which to build wind farms, the younger Kennedy said. "Americans don’t want to pay 27 cents a kilowatt hour for energy." Kennedy's opposition is also shared by Sen. Scott Brown, R-Mass., and Rep. Bill Delahunt, D-Mass., whose district includes the Cape. The two penned a joint letter last week to Salazar, asking him to bring together all "stakeholders" of the project to reach a consensus decision on the project. An "up or down" decision, they wrote, would result in years of legal battles over its development. "Cape Wind is the first offshore wind farm to be built in the wrong place, in the wrong way, stimulating the wrong economies," Delahunt said in a statement Wednesday. Critics, like Delahunt and Brown, say they are not opposed to offshore wind farms but favor building them in deeper waters, like in Germany and Scotland. On Wednesday, Salazar addressed many of the criticisms, saying the government will demand that developers "minimize and mitigate" any potential adverse impacts on the environment. He also said the project has been scaled back from 170 turbines to 130, and that he will require the developers to make the them less visible from the shore. The offshore wind farm, which would cost an estimated $1 billion to construct, has been heralded by several environmental agencies and six East Coast governors as a breakthrough in alternative energy production. Massachusetts Gov. Deval Patrick as well as governors in Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware each support the project. Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass., praised the project on Wednesday as a "cleaner way to power America." "With this historic decision, the answer to America’s energy future is blowing in the wind," Markey said in a statement. "The same winds that delivered the Mayflower to Massachusetts and created the Perfect Storm will now deliver a clean energy future to Massachusetts and create new jobs." The ocean winds along the eastern sea board are among the strongest in North America, proponents say, and the project would be a critical step in developing clean sources of energy and reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. "It’s the Saudi Arabia of wind," said Amy Kempe, press secretary for Rhode Island Gov. Donald Carcieri. "So long as due diligence is done, something tells me that fish can swim around [turbines] just as cattle can move around them on the plains." Some environmental groups have also expressed a plethora of concerns over the project -- from effects on marine life and the local economy to potential public safety hazards and risks to air traffic control and a disturbance to sacred tribal land.

### 2NC Uniqueness

#### Its top of the docket and legislative momentum building --- delay could prevent passage

Silverleib, 3/27 --- CNN Congressional Producer (3/27/2013, Alan, CNN Wire, “Immigration tops agenda as senators tour border,” Factiva))

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A bipartisan group of U.S. senators at the heart of the debate over immigration reform toured the U.S.-Mexico border in Arizona on Wednesday -- the latest sign of growing legislative momentum on a polarizing issue that has been stalled on Capitol Hill for years. Arizona GOP Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake were joined on the tour by New York's Chuck Schumer and Colorado's Michael Bennet, both Democrats. The four men are part of a group of eight senators expected to unveil comprehensive legislation soon after Congress returns from its spring break in April. President Barack Obama also stepped up his push for a comprehensive bill, sitting down for interviews with the Telemundo and Univision. While both interviews were embargoed, immigration was expected to dominate the discussion. Speaking at a naturalization ceremony at the White House on Monday, Obama said he expects significant legislation action next month. "We are making progress, but we've got to finish the job," the president said. "I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible." House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-California, told reporters Wednesday she is "optimistic" about the chances of legislative success. Democrats and Republicans have been bogged down for years over the question of how best to secure the country's border while resolving the status of roughly 11 million undocumented immigrants. A rare political window appeared to open after last November's presidential election, when GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney performed dismally among Hispanic voters. Despite strong conservative resistance to a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, Republican leaders recognize their party's need to appeal more strongly to America's fastest growing minority group. For his part, Obama is hoping to lock in a major second term legislative victory. A source familiar with the congressional negotiations has told CNN that the eight senators have tentatively reached agreement on some of the thorniest issues, such as a path to citizenship and metrics for securing the border. The groups is also working on a revamped guest worker program, the source noted. More specifically, one of the big outstanding issues appears to be around the future flow of low-skilled guest workers who would come to the United States to be maids, waiters, hotel workers or home-care workers. Negotiators are discussing how much they would be paid, and how many workers would be allowed into the country each year. Labor unions influencing the talks are arguing for higher pay and fewer workers per year, since they are concerned about the effect guest workers would have on American workers. Groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, however, are pushing senators for lower pay and high numbers of guest workers per year, since that will help businesses' bottom lines. On the issue of permanent legal status, the source told CNN the senators have essentially agreed to a 13 year path to citizenship. According to the tentative agreement, it would take 10 years for illegal workers to get a green card to work legally in the U.S. and then an additional three years to move towards citizenship. Illegal workers would have to pay a fine, back taxes, and have no criminal record. The senators, according to the source, have agreed that no illegal worker will be eligible for citizenship until the border is considered secure. Figuring out how to measure that has been a major part of the talks. Others senators involved in the immigration talks include: Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-South Carolina; Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Florida; Sen. Robert Menendez, D-New Jersey; and Sen. Dick Durbin, D-Illinois. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vermont, sent a letter to several strong Senate conservatives last week urging them not to obstruct the upcoming legislative process relating to the issue."I hope it is not your intention to discredit the process," Leahy said. "I intend to proceed to comprehensive immigration reform with all deliberate speed. ... I hope and expect that you will not delay consideration simply to prevent the legislation from moving forward." "Artificial delays, delays for delays' sake, has tainted too much of the Senate's work over the last few years," he added. Leahy's letter was sent to Alabama GOP Sen. Jeff Sessions, a high ranking member of the committee. Committee Republicans Chuck Grassley of Iowa, Orrin Hatch of Utah, Mike Lee of Utah, John Cornyn of Texas, and Ted Cruz of Texas also received copies of the letter.

#### Reform is the top priority and will pass --- stumbling blocks are resolvable

Pace, 3/27 (Julie, 3/27/2013, Associated Press Newswires, Obama says Congress could pass immigration bill by summer; remaining issues are 'resolvable'” Factiva))

WASHINGTON (AP) - President Barack Obama pressed for swift action on a sweeping immigration bill Wednesday, saying last-minute obstacles are "resolvable" and predicting Congress could pass historic legislation by the end of the summer. In back-to-back interviews with Spanish-language television networks, Obama repeatedly voiced confidence in a bipartisan Senate group that appears to be on the cusp of unveiling a draft bill. And he said that while he is still prepared to step in with his own bill if talks break down, he doesn't expect that step to be necessary. "If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month as these senators indicate it will be, then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer," Obama told Telemundo.While overhauling the nation's patchwork immigration laws is a top second term priority for the president, he has ceded the negotiations almost entirely to Congress. He and his advisers have calculated that a bill crafted by Capitol Hill stands a better chance of winning Republican support than one overtly influenced by the president. In his interviews Wednesday, Obama tried to stay out of the prickly policy issues that remain unfinished in the Senate talks, though he said a split between business and labor on wages for new low-skilled workers was unlikely to "doom" the legislation. "This is a resolvable issue," he said. The president also spoke Wednesday with Univision. His interviews followed a citizenship ceremony conducted Monday at the White House where he pressed Congress to "finish the job" on immigration, an issue that has vexed Washington for years. The president made little progress in overhauling the nation's fractured immigration laws in his first term, but he redoubled his efforts after winning re-election. The November contest also spurred some Republicans to drop their opposition to immigration reform, given that Hispanics overwhelmingly backed Obama. In an effort to keep Republicans at the negotiation table, Obama has stayed relatively quiet on immigration over the last month. He rolled out his immigration principles during a January rally in Las Vegas and made an impassioned call for overhauling the nation's laws during his early February State of the Union address, then purposely handed off the effort to lawmakers. The president has, however, privately called members of the Senate working group, and the administration is providing technical support to the lawmakers. The Gang of Eight is expected to unveil its draft bill when Congress returns from a two-week recess the week of April 8. Obama and the Senate group are in agreement on some core principles, including a pathway to citizenship for most of the 11 million illegal immigrants already in the country, revamping the legal immigration system and holding businesses to tougher standards on verifying their workers are in the country legally. But they're at odds over key issues. The Senate group wants the citizenship pathway to be contingent on securing the border, something Obama opposes. The president has also sidestepped the contentious guest-worker issue, which contributed to derailing immigration talks in 2007. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO have reached significant agreements on a new visa program that would bring up to 200,000 lower-skilled workers to the country each year. But they reached a stalemate Friday over wages for the workers, with the labor union pushing for higher wages than the chamber has agreed to so far. Since then, talks have resumed and negotiators are "back on the right track," Ana Avendano, a lead AFL-CIO negotiator, said Wednesday. Avendano declined to offer specifics but said the chamber had moved off what she termed its insistence on "poverty-level wages" for the new workers. "We're very hopeful that we're moving," Avendano told reporters after a briefing for congressional staff on temporary-worker programs. While Obama tries to keep the pressure on lawmakers this week, four members of the Senate immigration group toured Arizona's border with Mexico to inspect the conditions there. Arizona's Republican Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake were joined by Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer of New York and Michael Bennet of Colorado for the border tour. The president also announced in his interviews that he planned to visit Mexico, as well as Costa Rica, in early May. The immigration debate in the U.S. is being closely watched by Latin American countries.

### AT: Guest Worker

#### Most recent ev says passage is likely because of bipartisan efforts

NYT, 3/30/2013, “Deal Is Said to Be Reached on Immigration Overhaul,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/us/politics/deal-said-to-be-reached-on-guest-worker-program-in-immigration.html

WASHINGTON — The nation’s top business and labor groups have reached an agreement on a guest worker program for low-skilled immigrants, a person with knowledge of the negotiations said on Saturday. The deal clears the path for broad immigration legislation to be introduced when Congress returns from its two-week recess in mid-April. Senator Charles E. Schumer, a New York Democrat and one of eight senators from both parties who have been negotiating an overhaul of the nation’s immigration laws, convened a conference call on Friday night with Thomas J. Donohue, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Richard L. Trumka, the president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the nation’s main federation of labor unions, in which they agreed in principle on a guest worker program for low-skilled, year-round temporary workers. Pay for guest workers was one of the final sticking points on a broad immigration deal, and one that had stalled the Senate negotiations just before the break. The eight Senate negotiators still need to formally sign off on the deal between the business and labor groups, but they are expected to do so by the end of the weekend, the person with knowledge of the talks said.

### 2NC AT: Winners Win/Hirsch

#### Their turn isn’t responsive to our bipartisanship link – Obama’s charm offensive is paying off with cooperation between the two parties. The plan poisons the well. They have no evidence that political capital will produce passage

#### Issue selection is key – he can only get momentum if he starts with an issue like immigration where the public mood is changing like immigration.

Hirsh, 2/7 --- Chief correspondent (2/7/2013, Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital; The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong,” [http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207%29))

Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories. In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction. Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### Their Hirsch ev goes neg – he says that the Gang of Eight are pushing for reform for reasons that have VERY LITTLE to do with Obama’s personal influence

#### Wrong political strategy --- charm offensive is key to securing passage

Collinson, 3/7 (Stephen, 3/7/2013, Agence France Presse, “Obama tries new tack -- talking to Republicans,” Factiva)

President Barack Obama has hit on a novel antidote to Washington's endless cycle of political crises: breaking bread with Republicans. Since his re-election triumph in November, Obama has used his political capital to harangue his foes, holding rallies across the country at which he accused rival Republicans of obstructing legislation and serving the rich. His strategy worked up to a point -- securing new higher tax rates for the wealthy as he pocketed a political win in December over the fiscal cliff showdown. But with the glow of his re-election waning, Obama came up short in the sequester clash last week as Republicans refused to bend on raising taxes -- and $85 billion in economy-sapping austerity was set in motion. Two years of incessant budget melodrama between Obama and his foes on Capitol Hill have poisoned the political well but done little to tackle the debt load endangering America's future prosperity. Now, Obama and conservative Republicans in the House of Representatives are left staring across a seemingly unbridgeable ideological divide. Since Obama's ambitious second term agenda must clear a divided Congress, the onus is on the president to plot a way through Washington's dysfunction. So Obama, who disdains the superficiality of backslapping politics, has embarked on a charm offensive -- and on Wednesday night he bought dinner for a dozen Republican senators out of his own pocket. At an expensive hotel, Obama supped with senators John McCain, Lindsey Graham and others, vocal foes who have also expressed frustration at being stuck in the political purgatory of a Washington where nothing gets done. Next week, the president will make a rare foray into enemy territory on Capitol Hill to address Republicans from both the Senate and the House. For now, Obama appears to have dropped the "outside" game of campaigning to move public opinion against Republicans, instead probing whether there is any space for a deal on key issues. Steven Smith, a former congressional staffer who is now a professor of political science at Washington University, St Louis, said the president had little choice but to try to change the political climate in Washington. "If you can't deal with the House Republicans in the current political environment -- see if you can change the political environment," he said. "What (Obama) is hoping is that Republicans in the Senate can start serving almost as opinion leaders for a new way of tackling these fiscal challenges." Obama is courting Republican senators who may be willing to deal on issues like the national debt, the deficit and growing costs threatening entitlement programs like health care for the elderly. "The President is interested in finding the members of the 'caucus of common sense,'" said White House spokesman Jay Carney. A person familiar with Obama's thinking said the White House believes there may be a window for action since -- after the sequester and fiscal cliff dramas -- Washington is finally not on the cusp of an immediate crisis. Obama aides also think some Senate Republicans may be ready to compromise -- a feeling bolstered by Graham's recent comment that he would swap $600 billion in new revenues in return for entitlement reform. It is not the first time that Obama has tried dialogue with Republicans -- he tried unsuccessfully to conclude a grand bargain with House Speaker John Boehner aimed at $4 trillion in deficit reduction during his first term. Obama says that offer is still on the table, but so frayed are his relations with Boehner that it seems doubtful the two of them share the necessary trust to strike a bargain. Should he fare better with Senate Republicans, Obama hopes his new dance partners can build pressure on their brethren in the House to compromise, which might also ease the way for other top initiatives, like immigration reform. Republicans, who have long accused Obama of hectoring them, welcome his change of tone. "Where this goes, I don't know," said Graham, who recently met Obama along with McCain at the White House. "I do believe (in) what the president has been doing lately, getting off the campaign trail (and) back into the normal way of doing business up here, of talking to each other." Moderate Republican Senator Susan Collins agreed. "The important thing is, for the first time in a very long time, the president appears to be doing some outreach to both Republicans and Democrats, and that's long overdue," she said. Wednesday's dinner might have been a good start, but such is the philosophical gulf between Obama and Republicans that any deal still seems a long shot. And with mid-term congressional elections in 2014, the window for bipartisan comity is short. But Wednesday night's dinner did provide an unusual spectacle in Washington these days -- political foes actually talking to one another.

#### Poisoning the well of cooperation destroys the agenda

Wallsten & Goldfarb, ’12 (Peter Wallsten and Zachary A. Goldfarb, 12/8/2012, “Obama’s second-term agenda will be shadowed by budget woes,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obamas-second-term-agenda-will-be-shadowed-by-budget-woes/2012/12/08/ea97e956-4091-11e2-ae43-cf491b837f7b_story.html>)

One House GOP leadership aide said Obama would be unwise “if he comes in here and poisons the well by trying to break as many Republicans as he can. By nature of how politics works, you’re going to see a lot less cooperation going forward.” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.), a top Boehner lieutenant, hinted at that sentiment among House Republicans last week when he told reporters Obama had “an unbelievable opportunity to be a transformational president” by bringing the parties together for a debt deal. “Or he can dissolve into zero-sum game politics, where he wins and . . . other people lose.”

# 2NR