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### 1NC

#### Interpretation – “Financial incentives” require disbursement of public funds – excludes indirect incentives and non-financial incentives

Webb 93 (Dr. Kernaghan, Associate Professor of Law and Business – Ryerson University's Ted Rogers School of Management, Adjunct Research Professor – School of Public Policy and Administration and Department of Law –Carleton University, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives,” Alta Law Review, 31 Alta L. Rev 501-535, Hein Online, p.505-6)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements\*\* of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures."' Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies."' In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (**eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant**, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.2' Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.2- And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,3 **are excluded** from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

[\*\*Continues to footnote]

The word "disbursement." while admittedly lacking in elegance, is used to convey the wide spectrum of ways in which public funds can be conveyed, from loans to **loan guarantees, grants, contributions, allowances, deductions** and so on.

#### Violation – FIT’s are regulatory incentives, not financial

**Brady 4 -** A Thesis In The Department of Political Science Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (Public Policy and Public Administration) at Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada (Jonathan, “Wind Boom, Wind Bust: An Examination of the Conditions and Policies that Led to Gennany's Wind Industry and Canada's Lack Thereof,” December, <http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/8274/1/MR20699.pdf>)

Government employed regulatory and financial incentives have played a salient role in this rapid growth of wind energy production. The most successful regulatory incentive in stimulating wind energy production and decreasing technology costs has been a form of regulatory pricing legislation known as feed-in tariffs or feed-in laws. The chief idea behind them is that national governments establish the price of the wind energy and allow the market to determine capacity and generation. More specifically, national governments oblige electric utility companies to enable wind-generating producers (i.e. owners and operators of wind turbines) to connect to the electric grid, and purchase any electricity generated by wind turbines at a fixed minimum share of the retail price of electricity - at least 85 percent? These prices and payments are guaranteed over a specific period of time - usually no less than five years. The costs of higher payments for wind energy are either covered by an additional per kilowatt-hour (kWh) charge on all consumers according to their level of use, or by a charge on those customers of utilities required to purchase wind generated electricity (EWEA 2004b; EWEA 2004c; Hvelplund 2002; Sawin 2004). Financial incentives such as tax credits and/or production subsidies have also been useful in sparking investment interest in the wind industry. These regulatory and financial incentives, in tandem or individually, represent national government's means of stimulating private sector investment into the wind industry. It has been the private sector's enthusiastic response to these incentives that have driven this remarkable wind boom (i.e. expansive growth in wind energy production and wind industry development) during the last decade.

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – each category is massive, they explode the topic by allowing hundreds of new, conceptually distinct incentives – makes neg research impossible.

#### B. Categorical bi-directionality – negative incentives allow affs to ADD restrictions to parts of the topic – forcing us to defend both increased and decreased restrictions for each category – that explodes predictable limits.

#### C. Ground – different generics apply by category – they dodge the best incentive DA links by not picking a winner and negatively incentivizing a different type of energy source.

### 1NC

#### A. Electricity prices will remain stable and low for 2013

Szablya 12/27/12 (Louis, Energate VP of Marketing and Product Management @ Home Energy Management, "10 home energy management trends for 2013," http://www.smartgridnews.com/artman/publish/Technologies\_Demand\_Response/10-home-energy-management-trends-for-2013-5384.html/#.UOSslm\_AfoI)

1. Base electricity prices will stay relatively low owing to natural gas prices remaining low, but gasoline prices will continue to be volatile throughout the year. The combination is likely to support ongoing interest in and sales of electric vehicles.

#### Renewable energy skyrockets electricity prices – cost of production and transmission lines

Bryce 12 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Center for Energy Policy and the Environment - Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\_10.htm)

Although supporters of renewable energy claim that the RPS mandates will bring benefits, their contribution to the economy is problematic because they also impose costs that must be incorporated into the utility bills paid by homeowners, commercial businesses, and industrial users. And those costs are or will be substantial. Electricity generated from renewable sources generally costs more—often much more—than that produced by conventional fuels such as coal and natural gas. In addition, large-scale renewable energy projects often require the construction of many miles of high-voltage transmission lines. The cost of those lines must also be incorporated into the bills paid by consumers.¶ These extra costs amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says Suedeen Kelly, a former member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[5] Indeed, with Congress unwilling to approve national carbon dioxide restrictions or renewable-energy quotas, the RPS mandates have become a sprawling state system of de facto carbon-reduction taxes.

#### K2 Econ and manufacturing

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Manufacturing strength is key to both the economy and military power

Ettlinger and Gordon 11 (Michael and Kate, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute and Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress. Most recently, Kate was the co-director of the national Apollo Alliance, where she still serves as senior policy advisor. Former senior associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" [http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-)](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-%29)

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### Heg solves multiple scenarios for nuke war

Kagan 7 (Robert, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “End of Dreams, Return of History: International Rivalry and American Leadership”, Policy Review, August/September, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10)

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying —  its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not only on the goodwill of peoples but also on American power. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War II would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe ’s stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that ’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world ’s great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China ’s neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. Conflicts are more likely to erupt if the United States withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore  to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of “offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances.

### 1NC

#### The United States Congress should immediately establish a government-wide multiple staged-process Quadrennial Energy Review with a deadline for completion of each stage by February 1st of each year. The QER should include a top priority recommendation that the United States federal government should fund a renewable energy payment program that creates long-term purchase contracts for new qualifying facilities in the United States that use wind or solar power for energy production to ensure a reasonable rate of return. We’ll clarify.

#### It solves --

#### CP causes implementation and avoids budget fights

DOE 11 (U.S. Department of Energy, “Report on the First Quadrennial Technology Review,” September, <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/ReportOnTheFirstQTR.pdf>, p. 126-7)

When PCAST recommended the DOE QTR, the most important recommendation was the development of a multi-agency QER led by the Executive Office of the President. That QER would forge a more coordinated and robust federal energy policy, engaging many agencies and departments across the Executive Branch (see Table 9). As envisioned by PCAST, a QER would provide a multiyear roadmap that lays out an integrated view of technology-neutral energy objectives and would put forward anticipated Executive actions, coordinated across multiple agencies. The emphasis of the QER would be on establishing government-wide goals, and **identifying the non-budgetary resources** needed for the invention, translation, adoption, and diffusion of energy technologies. Because responsibility for setting these goals goes well beyond the reach of the DOE, the QER would serve as a **mechanism for managing this crosscutting challenge**. In both its development and implementation, the QER would provide an effective tool for Administration-wide coherence. Recognizing the scale of the task, PCAST recommended that the QER be implemented in a staged process led by the Executive Office of the President that would provide some elements of a QER during each of the next four years drawing on the support of an Executive Secretariat, provided by the Secretary of Energy.

### 1NC

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should fund a renewable energy payment program that creates long-term purchase contracts for new qualifying facilities in the United States that use wind or solar power for energy production to ensure a reasonable rate of return

#### States can solves – FERC guidelines and California examples

Browning 10 (Adam Browning – Executive Director of the Vote Solar Initiative, 8/4/2010, “FERC Defines States’ Feed-In Tariff Authority,” <http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/ferc-defines-states-feed-in-tariff-authority>.)

FERC thus found that the CPUC's decision under AB 1613, including the CPUC-set price, would be consistent with these federal laws as long as it satisfies certain requirements: ● The CHP generators must be QFs pursuant to PURPA. ● The CPUC-set price must not exceed the avoided cost of the purchasing utility." In other words, state legislatures and regulators are restricted in their ability to mandate premium, fixed-price requirements. What does this mean going forward? While this decision clearly limits feed-in tariff options, it does not preclude effective wholesale distributed generation programs. When the issue came up in a recent, similar proceeding -- the CPUC's effort to expand the renewable feed-in tariff program under AB 1969 (R.08-08-009) -- parties were required to file legal briefs on this subject. Here are a few policy approaches that fall within state's price-setting authority: ● Set the feed-in tariff price at utilities' avoided cost ● Establish a more targeted requirement (e.g., solar PV systems from 1MW to 10 MW) and let the market set the price ● Set a price at avoided cost, and cover the marginal gap to a workable price with a tax benefit or renewable energy credit from a public benefit fund. There are a few real-world examples of feed-in tariffs that use this approach. The Sacramento Municipal Utilities District recently issued a feed-in tariff priced on their time-differentiated avoided cost of generation (modeled on expected PV output, it comes out to a levelized rate of about 14 cents per kWh). All 100 MW of the available contract capacity was immediately sold out, principally in 5 MW chunks (note that similar programs eligible for only smaller sytems have proven less effective). Another take on this approach comes from California's SB 32. Passed in 2009, it is a fixed-price feed-in tariff that attempts to raise the 'avoided cost' by capturing as much value associated with distributed generation as possible (avoided transmission and distribution upgrades, etc.).

#### PURPA is the state’s vehicle for feed-in tariffs

NREL 10 (Scott Hempling – National Regulatory Research Institute, Carolyn Elefant – The Law Offices of Carolyn Elefant, Karlynn Cory – National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Kevin Porter – Exeter Associates, Inc., January, 2010, “Renewable Energy Prices in State-Level Feed-in Tariffs: Federal Law Constraints and Possible Solutions,” National Renewable Energy Laboratory, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/47408.pdf>.)

PURPA creates for retail utilities an obligation to buy capacity and energy from certain types of facilities. The statute makes state utility regulatory commissions responsible for administering that obligation with respect to retail utilities over which the state commission has jurisdiction. States can use the utility's PURPA obligation as a legal vehicle for creating feed-in tariffs. By relying on PURPA, they need not enact a separate state law. This section (Part I) provides the background necessary to understand how to design state-level feed-in tariffs within PURPA's constraints. It explains that: a. PURPA requires each utility to buy capacity and energy from FERC-certified "qualifying facilities.” The sales price can be established either (a) by state commissions, in which case the price must equal the utility’s “avoided cost” or (b) through utility-QF negotiations, in which case the price may exceed avoided cost. b. PURPA administration is split between FERC (which grants QF status) and states (which determine avoided cost and administer the utility's purchase obligation). c. In 2005, Congress authorized FERC to exempt utilities from PURPA QF purchase obligations if they are located where QFs have reasonable opportunities to sell into wholesale markets because of the availability of transmission access or RTO-organized markets. FERC has issued regulations governing the ability of utilities to request this PURPA exemption and has clarified that the utility is still obligated to purchase from QFs with a capacity of 20 MW and less. FERC has granted this exemption to most requesting utilities. d. FERC allows states to supplement a QF's avoided cost compensation (e.g., through cash grants, renewable energy credits, tax credits and/or production-based incentive payments) as long as the supplement does not take the form of mandatory utility payments for power to the QF. After providing this background, Part I summarizes NRRI guidance to states in how to design feed-in tariffs consistent with PURPA's constraints.

### 1NC

#### Hagel will get confirmed but Obama will need to spend capital.

Washington Post, **1/7**/2013 (President Obama picks a confirmation fight. Can he win it?, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/01/07/president-obama-picks-a-confirmation-fight-can-he-win-it/>)

Added the source: ”For these Democrats, the only reason to support Hagel is out of pure loyalty to the President. That is a major consideration, obviously, but Hagel will have some explaining to do on his past statements. A path certainly exists for him to be confirmed, but the administration can’t simply take it for granted that there are 50 Democratic votes for him. They will need to work it.” (If you need a gauge on whether Hagel is going to make it, keep an eye on Senator Chuck Schumer. Schumer has been lukewarm — at best — toward the prospect of Hagel at the Defense Department and the New York Senator is a major player and pivot point in this fight.) Other Democrats expressed wonderment at Obama’s decision to pick Hagel when the president backed off in a similar situation with Susan Rice, his preferred choice at the State Department. “Everyone is scratching their heads, wondering why this is the one time that the President has drawn a line in the sand and actually intends to stick to it,” said one Democratic Senate operative. Added another Capitol Hill Democrat: “The choice is confounding…I think they can ultimately get through this fight, but the White House has to get ahead of this thing quickly.” The White House is, of course, aware of both the opposition (in both parties) to Hagel and the blemish it would leave on the start of Obama’s second term to see his pick at Defense stumble in the confirmation process. This, like much of politics, is a calculated risk by the White House designed, at least in part, to show that Obama won’t back down from the prospect of a fight — even one in which members of his own party may throw a punch or two his way. Now, all he has to do is win.

#### Plan kills capital --- massively unpopular.

**Dong 12**

[Baofeng, Department of Planning, Public Policy & Management, School of Architecture and Allied Arts, of the University of Oregon, June, <http://www.oregonrenewables.com/Publications/Dong_Thesis_Solar_FIT_Final.pdf>]

Though FIT programs have experienced significant growth and great success in Germany, solar PV deployment in the U.S. still faces tremendous political and economic barriers. Trial FIT programs have been started in several states, such as California, Florida, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin (Couture and Cory 2009). As of 2009, Gainesville Regional Utilities (GRU) district was the only public utility district (PUD) in the United States that had a FIT program based on the cost of renewable energy (RE) generation (Couture and Cory 2009). There is no overarching federal policy that requires certain amounts of renewable energy deployment. Legislation that has aimed to pass permanent tax credit for renewable energy has failed in Congress, and renewal of federal investment tax credit and other incentives has faced significant opposition.

#### Capital determines whether Obama nominates Hagel.

**The Hill**, **12/30**/2012 (Hagel plays waiting game as White House sits on nomination, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/274835-hagel-plays-waiting-game-as-white-house-sits-on-defense-nomination)

Whether the president actually picks Hagel could depend on the White House’s appetite for a fight over the nomination. The Obama administration may not want to spend the political capital to win Hagel’s confirmation battle, particularly with other nominees — Deputy Defense Secretary Ash Carter and former undersecretary of Defense for policy Michele Flournoy are considered the other short-list candidates — readily available. But after losing U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice as a possible secretary of State choice, the White House may not want to back down on another choice for the president’s national security team. “I think that Sen. Hagel and a lot of people were surprised and taken off guard by the venom and the velocity of the attacks,” said Alan Elsner of J Street, the “pro-Israel, pro-peace” group that supports Hagel’s nomination. “Right now, I think that the debate is kind of irrelevant because it’s all down to President Obama,” Elsner said. “We have no doubt that Sen. Hagel would be confirmed if he was nominated.”

#### Hagel bolsters Obama’s foreign policy --- prevents war with Iran.

**McGovern**, **1/2**/2013 (Ray – former Army officer and veteran of the CIA’s analysis division, Obama needs Hagel in the Pentagon, Baltimore Sun, p. http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-02/news/bs-ed-hagel-20130102\_1\_pentagon-generals-robert-mcnamara)

During his first year in office, President Barack Obama encountered similar insubordination when the Pentagon pigeonholed his order to serve up options (plural) on Afghanistan. In the end, they came up with one singularly ineffective and costly option, namely, the "surge" of 40,000 (or "only" 30,000, if that's all they could get) additional troops — that was the brainchild of generals David Petraeus and Stanley McChrystal. Mr. Obama had tasked then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates to give him options (plural). But Mr. Gates' assessment of the relative power of the generals vis-à-vis the president persuaded him that Mr. Obama didn't even have to be "slow rolled." He could be simply ignored. The contrast between Robert McNamara and Robert Gates raises a key question with respect to what role Mr. Hagel would play, if our trial-balloon-fan president were to summon the courage to actually nominate him to head the Pentagon. Chuck Hagel is his own man. There is even some chance his example might prompt Mr. Obama to be more his own man. Clearly, the president needs all the backbone strengthening he can get, if he is to stick to his plan to exit Afghanistan and face down supporters of hard-right Israelis itching for war on Iran. Mr. Obama's better-late-than-never, Kennedy-like decision to pull almost all U.S. troops from Afghanistan by 2014 has already drawn fire from neocon pundits like Max Boot, who argue for keeping major U.S. bases near key cities like Kandahar, the birthplace of the Taliban and the most populous Afghan city after Kabul. Who remembers General McChrystal's cringe-worthy promise to pacify Marja, some 100 miles from Kandahar, as a dress rehearsal for taking Kandahar itself? In early February 2010, he proudly told The New York Times, "We've got a government in a box, ready to roll in." Right. Mr. Obama will be offered more hare-brained schemes like that. Mr. Hagel would likely recognize them for what they are. He has "been there, done that," having volunteered for Vietnam, with two purple hearts to prove it.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war.

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially leading humanity into a World War III Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust over a large part of the Middle East.

## Nat Gas Advantage

### 1NC Chemical Industry

#### -- Chemical industry demand declining

**Fulp 11** (Mickey, Certified Professional Geologist with a B.Sc. Earth Sciences with honor from the University of Tulsa, and M.Sc. Geology from the University of New Mexico, “What's Up (or Down) with the Nat Gas Market?,” 7-12-11, The Energy Report, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/10247>)

Domestic demand for natural gas comes from four general uses: Residential and commercial: 22%; space heating and cooking. Industrial: 38%; fuel for the pulp and paper, metal, chemical, petroleum refining and food-processing industries; feedstock for plastic, **chemical** and fertilizer **production**. These uses are projected **to decline** as the economy moves toward **less energy-intensive** manufacturing processes.

#### -- Chemical industry resilient

CNI 8 (Chemical News & Intelligence, “This Week in ICIS Chemical Business”, 8-18, Lexis)

Engineering and construction companies are expanding to specialties and photovoltaics Global engineering and construction companies report that the projects are changing, but the chemical sector continues to show a surprising amount of resilience Profitability analysis reveals North American petrochemical industry's demise is exaggerated Profits in the North American petrochemical industry are expected to decline sharply following Middle Eastern and Asian capacity additions. But contrary to the prevailing view, fears of its long-term demise will prove to be exaggerated. Shell's Omega MEG process kicks off in South Korea The big goal for a process engineer could be the development of a technology that converts all the raw materials to the desired end product with the minimum theoretical energy consumption, no emissions and the lowest capital cost.

#### -- Chemical industry doesn’t solve sustainability

**Elkington 12** (John, executive chairman of Volans and non-executive director at SustainAbility. “Chemical industry isn't doing enough to embrace sustainability,” 9-12-12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sustainable-business/sustainability-with-john-elkington/chemical-industry-embrace-sustainability-environment?newsfeed=true>)

One speaker showed a slide headed 'Sustainability is …', spotlighting Shin-Etsu, a Japanese chemical company that suffered a major explosion. Instead of clamming up, as Japanese corporate leaders are wont to do, the CEO took a voluntary pay-cut and went out to apologise to the local community. Apologising to people when you have accidentally blown them up makes sense, most of the time, but in the context of the global challenges we face I struggle to see this as a definitive (indeed, even a legitimate) case of sustainability in practice. Then another speaker, this time from ExxonMobil Chemical, asserted that – based on the latest life-cycle assessment data – shopping bags made out of high density polyethylene (HDPE) are the sustainable option. Paper bags, he insisted, should be dropped because of the energy and water consumption involved. Ah. When the discussion period came, I asked whether the data had taken into account the great swirling gyres of plastic debris that now scar large areas of the world ocean? No, he admitted. For such people, as a speaker from BASF assured us, sustainability means we "are on a journey". Like many others, this German company has talked to a considerable number of stakeholders (350, by their reckoning) and boiled it all down to a shortlist of issues (just 40 of those). The main conclusion seems to be that we must all create more shared value while, simultaneously, shrinking our environmental footprints. Good, but by how much? That's a question that the sector finds it hard to answer, except in areas where there is a legal requirement that the use of particular chemicals be driven to zero, like hexavalent chromium. And, while most participants intensely dislike the idea of further regulation, there were those – including Peter Kunze of the European Automobile Manufacturers Association – who argued for much clearer signals on which chemicals would be banned ultimately, coupled with "smart legislation" to ensure that the process of conversion didn't undermine industrial or regional competitiveness. It was intriguing to see successive speakers through the lenses of vested interests. A panel of four speakers, for example, agreed that renewable feedstocks were very unlikely to make much of an impression on the industry in the next decade or two. Then a colleague from another chemical company whispered in my ear that three of the four companies were backwards-integrated into the **oil sector**, effectively making them fossil fuel junkies. Hardly surprising, then, that they find it hard to imagine – or at least publicly admit the possibility of – a radically different future. Behind the scenes people spoke quietly of lobbying that is underway by parts of the industry: in the US, for example, chemical companies are fighting tooth-and-nail to ensure **suspect chemicals** and products like formaldehyde and styrene continue to be allowed in LEED-certified buildings. On the upside, Nicholas Denis of McKinsey & Co reported results of their recent market survey showing that green products are now seen much more positively by both consumers and industry executives, with between 82 and 93% of both categories saying they want to go greener, even though "the road to green chemicals is harder than we thought initially" and the notion of a "green premium is still a Holy Grail for most companies." Procter & Gamble promptly disagreed, to a degree, noting that their efforts to promote greener products like compact detergents had been stymied by the unwillingness of most consumers to change to seemingly smaller products at the same price-point. So the detergent industry went to government, asked for permission to avoid anti-trust rules, and moved as a group of companies to strip non-compact products from the shelves. "I would love it if consumers wanted greener products, mused P&G's Peter Kunze, "because we would then have a business model!"

#### -- Asian chemical companies will fill-in

CEN 4 (Chemical and Engineering News, 1-12,

http://pubs.acs.org/cen/coverstory/8202/html/8202asia.html)

China's outstanding economic performance is having a major impact on the Asian chemical industry. The country is mentioned in nearly every financial statement released by chemical companies in the region. Based on numbers for the first 10 months of 2003, China last year increased its imports of chemicals by more than 40%. Most of this increase was due to increased imports of organic chemicals, a category that includes polymers. As it experiences high profitability in its chemical operations, China Petroleum & Chemical Corp. (Sinopec) is speeding up the renovation of an ethylene cracker at its Qilu Petrochemical unit as well as a coal gasification project at the same site. Sinopec profits surged 69% compared with a year earlier in the fiscal year's first nine months, which ended Dec. 31. Chemicals account for approximately 20% of the oil company's sales and 7% of its operating income. THE BUOYANT Chinese economy is helping to prop up Japan. A large portion of the electronic materials, components, plastics, machinery, and engineered goods that China needs to fuel its growth is supplied by Japan, Witte says. Based on numbers for the first 10 months of 2003, it appears that Japanese exports of chemicals--excluding photographic materials--grew 25% in 2003 to nearly $40 billion., the highest amount ever. Unlike in previous years when Japanese production of most chemicals was in decline, a major portion of Japanese-made chemicals has experienced growth in 2003. And as incomes rise, Japanese consumers purchase more Chinese-made goods, thus creating a "virtuous" circle of growth. Evidence of this circle was not clearly visible in the mixed bag of financial statements released by Japanese chemical companies in their first half. JSR, for example, increased its net profit by 173% over the past year's first half, but Sumitomo's net profit declined by 31% on high depreciation charges. However, chemical companies are generally optimistic about their full-year results--as of March 31. Sumitomo is expecting to boost its net profit by 6% over last year; Mitsui, by 13%; and JSR, by 50%. The Indian economy is being propelled by strong industrial and agricultural growth. ADB reports that industrial growth reached 6% in the first few months of 2003. Agricultural production received additional impetus from a "normal" monsoon--neither too long nor too short. Agriculture is more important to India than industry, so the rise in rural income had a more positive effect on the economy than the increase in industrial output. ADB expects stronger growth this year as India further benefits from the strengthening of the world economy. With rising incomes, Indian demand for petrochemicals is strong. Reliance reported a 23% increase in net profit for the half-year ended Sept. 30. This happened despite an unscheduled shutdown of its Jamnagar p-xylene facilities. Overall, Reliance says it experienced 16% growth in demand for its petrochemical products, which it was able to supply by having most of its plants producing beyond their nameplate capacities. In an upbeat forecast in October, Chairman and Managing Director Mukesh D. Ambani said, "We are seeing signs of an upturn in the petrochemical cycle and are confident of achieving even better performance in the future."

### 1NC No Econ War

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### No escalation

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

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

### 1NC US Econ Resilient

#### Economy’s resilient – can survive shocks

Bloomberg 12 (“Fed’s Plosser Says U.S. Economy Proving Resilient to Shocks,” 5-9, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-09/fed-s-plosser-says-u-s-economy-proving-resilient-to-shocks.html)

Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank President Charles Plosser said the U.S. economy has proven “remarkably resilient” to shocks that can damage growth, including surging oil prices and natural disasters. “The economy has now grown for 11 consecutive quarters,” Plosser said today according to remarks prepared for a speech at the Philadelphia Fed. “Growth is not robust. But growth in the past year has continued despite significant risks and external and internal headwinds.” Plosser, who did not discuss his economic outlook or the future for monetary policy, cited shocks to the economy last year, including the tsunami in Japan that disrupted global supply chains, Europe’s credit crisis that has damaged the continent’s banking system and political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa. “The U.S. economy has a history of being remarkably resilient,” said Plosser, who doesn’t have a vote on policy this year. “These shocks held GDP growth to less than 1 percent in the first half of 2011, and many analysts were concerned that the economy was heading toward a double dip. Yet, the economy proved resilient and growth picked up in the second half of the year.” Plosser spoke at a conference at the Philadelphia Fed titled, “Reinventing Older Communities: Building Resilient Cities.” Urban Resilience His regional bank’s research department is working on a project to measure the resilience of different cities, to learn more about the reasons that some urban areas suffer more than others in downturns, Plosser said. He mentioned one early finding of the study: Industrial diversity increases a city’s resilience. “I do want to caution you that resilient and vibrant communities are not just about government programs or directed industrial planning by community leaders,” Plosser said. “The economic strength of our country is deeply rooted in our market- based economy and the dynamism and resilience of its citizenry.”

### 1NC

#### Price spike good – it blocks exports

Levi 12 (Michael, Senior Fellow for Energy and Environment – Council on Foreign Relations, “How to Stop Natural Gas Exports,” CFR, 8-27, http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/08/27/how-to-stop-natural-gas-exports/)

I actually agree with much of the sentiment. If the United States exports as much natural gas as many currently envision, it will probably be a sign that U.S. policy has failed. But the right response is not to bar exports – it’s to directly boost other sources of natural gas demand. The underlying logic is similar across different uses for natural gas. Exports raise natural gas prices. That reduces natural gas use in other sectors. Conversely, though, boosting natural gas consumption in other sectors increases natural gas prices. That reduces exports. This applies no matter what the alternative use is for natural gas. Want to use natural gas as a more climate-friendly substitute for coal? Implement a carbon price, clean energy standard, or regulation that promotes greater use of gas. Natural gas prices will rise. As a result, the gap between U.S. and overseas natural gas prices will shrink. Some export projects will no longer be viable. Exports will thus decline. How about natural gas as a transport fuel? Same thing. Write CAFE standards in a way that boosts the use of natural gas in cars and trucks, subsidize the purchase of natural gas vehicles, or raise oil and gasoline taxes, and more people will use natural gas for transport (including through conversion of natural gas to methanol and other fuels). Natural gas prices will rise, the gap between U.S. prices and overseas ones will decline, and exports will no longer be as attractive. The same thing even holds for natural gas use in manufacturing. I happen to find arguments in favor of using policy to steer natural gas into manufacturing suspect. But perhaps you don’t. Then subsidize manufacturing, as several administrations have done (and continue to do) through the tax code. You know the routine by now: more gas use in manufacturing will boost prices, and exports will decline. We can even put some numbers on this. Recent modeling by the EIA suggests that a modest price on carbon could raise natural gas use in the power sector by as much as five billion cubic feet a day as of 2020. Using natural gas to back out a million barrels of oil a day in the transport sector could add roughly six billion cubic feet a day of demand beyond that. The EIA has recently estimated what that much new demand might do to natural gas prices (though in a different context). **Assuming no surprises on the supply side**, natural gas prices circa 2020 would rise from about six dollars to between seven and eight dollars for a thousand cubic feet. This would erode a decent part (if not all) of any edge that U.S. exports might have. The result would be lower (or vanishing) exports in the first place. What if U.S. shale gas resources turn out to have been overestimated? The combination of scarcer gas and a big boost in domestic demand would crank prices up quickly. It would not be surprising to see prices rise well above ten dollars for a thousand cubic feet (though demand in other sectors would probably fall to restrain that increase). Needless to say, with natural gas prices that high, exports would most likely become uneconomic. U.S. exporters would probably still do just fine – their contracts typically guarantee payment for liquefaction services regardless of whether those services are actually used. Actual exports, though, would not materialize in any meaningful quantity. None of these domestic policies, of course, would be easy to implement. But blocking exports isn’t an effective substitute. Barring exports would do far less than even mediocre climate policy to move natural gas into power plants. Moreover, it would actually undermine renewable energy, nuclear power, and energy efficiency. Its impact on natural gas use in transport would be negligible. People who want to see the United States make better use of its natural gas have only one option: they will need to promote those better uses directly.

#### Plan kills Russia’s economy

Mead 12

Walter Russell Mead, April 25, 2012 (Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine), , The American Interest, North American Shale Gas Gives Russia Serious Headache, <http://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.

**Goes nuclear and turns case**

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Columnist and Founder – Global EconomicCrisis.com, “Russian Economy Faces Disasterous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://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.

## New Advantage

### 1NC Nat Gas Wins

#### Nat gas prevents solar development

Dumaine 12 -- senior editor-at-large @ CNNMoney (Brian, 4/17/12, "Will gas crowd out wind and solar?" http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/17/yergin-gas-solar-wind/?iid=HP\_LN)

Fracking technology has given the U.S. a 100-year supply of cheap natural gas. What's its impact on coal, nuclear, wind, and solar power? Inexpensive natural gas is transforming the competitive economics of electric power generation in the U.S. Coal plants today generate more than 40% of our electricity. Yet coal plant construction is grinding to a halt: first, because of environmental reasons and second, because the economics of natural gas are so compelling. It is being championed by many environmentalists as a good substitute for coal because it is cleaner and emits about 50% less carbon dioxide. Nuclear power now generates 20% of our electricity, but the plants are getting old and will need to be replaced. What will replace them? Only a few nuclear plants are being built in the U.S. right now. The economics of building nuclear are challenging -- it's much more expensive than natural gas. Isn't the worry now that cheap natural gas might also crowd out wind and solar? Yes. The debate is over whether natural gas is a bridge fuel to buy time while renewables develop or whether it will itself be a permanent, major source of electricity. What do you think? Over the past year the debate has moved beyond the idea of gas as a bridge fuel to what gas means to U.S. manufacturing and job creation and how it will make the U.S. more globally competitive as an energy exporter. The President's State of the Union speech was remarkable in the way it wrapped the shale gas boom into his economic policies and job creation. I believe natural gas in the years ahead is going to be the default fuel for new electrical generation. Power demand is going to go up 15% to 20% in the U.S. over this decade because of the increasing electrification of our society -- everything from iPads to electric Nissan Leafs. Utilities will need a predictable source of fuel in volume to meet that demand, and natural gas best fits that description. And that won't make the environmental community happy? Well, natural gas may be a relatively clean hydrocarbon, but it's still a hydrocarbon. So wind and solar will have a hard time competing? Remember that wind and solar account for only 3% of our electric power, whereas natural gas is 23%, and its share will go up fast. Most of that 3% is wind. Natural gas has a new role as the partner of renewables, providing power when the wind is not blowing and the sun is not shining. Will solar scale? Solar is still under 1% of U.S. electric generation, and even though its costs have come down dramatically, they must come down a lot more. Solar is generally much more expensive than coal and natural gas. You have to remember that energy is a huge, capital-intensive business, and it takes a very long time for new technologies to scale. The euphoria that comes out of Silicon Valley when you see how quickly a Twitter or a YouTube can emerge doesn't apply to the energy industry.

#### Fundamental picture is sustained low prices – warm weather

Bloomberg, 1/2/13 (Christine Buurma, “Natural Gas Drops Most in 5 Weeks on Forecasts of Warmer Weather.” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-02/natural-gas-futures-tumble-on-forecasts-of-warmer-u-s-weather.html)

Natural gas futures in New York tumbled the most in five weeks on forecasts of moderating temperatures that may reduce demand for the power-plant fuel. Gas fell as much as 9 percent, the biggest intraday drop in more than three years, after Commodity Weather Group LLC said cold weather in most of the U.S. this week would give way to above-normal temperatures from Jan. 7 through Jan. 11. The low in New York on Jan. 10 may be 37 degrees Fahrenheit (3 Celsius), 10 higher than usual, AccuWeather Inc. said. “We’re going to see some warm weather across the primary gas-consuming regions,” said Gene McGillian, an analyst and broker at Tradition Energy in Stamford, Connecticut. “As we get into the new year without signs of sustained cold weather, the **fundamental picture** is going to force us lower.”

#### Natural gas prices will stay low – S&P forecast

FuelFix, 12/6/12 (Simone Sebastian, “Natural gas will remain below $4 in 2013, S&P forecasts.” http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/12/06/natural-gas-will-remain-below-4-in-2013-sp-forecasts/)

Natural gas producers won’t get much relief from the commodity’s low price in 2013, researchers at Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services forecast in a report released this week. The price of North American gas will remain below $4 per thousand cubic feet, either stagnating or declining slightly over 2013, the rating agency projected. To generate a profit, producers need prices in the range of $4 to $4.50 at least, the S&P researchers wrote. “Current prices are not likely to result in a rush back into gas basins,” the report states. Read more: Government report predicts big economic boost from natural gas exports Despite the rapid exodus of drilling rigs from natural gas fields, production has remained high and Standard & Poor’s expects the abundance to continue through 2013. The forecast notes that after a well is drilled, it takes time to prepare it for production and connect it to gathering systems. Further contributing to high level of gas on the market, technology has made shale gas wells more productive and natural gas can be produced as a byproduct from oil wells. “We expect 2013 gas output in the U.S. to be about the same as this year’s – even though the pace of drilling new gas wells slowed,” the report states. “And although gas production is likely to fall after 2013, the decline will probably be less than directly proportional to the drop in number of rigs.”

### 1NC US Demand Irrelevant

#### Asia solar strong

SI 12 -- Solar Industry staff (8/28/12, "Year-End Solar Forecast Shows A Global Demand Surge For PV Installations," http://solarindustrymag.com/e107\_plugins/content/content.php?content.11043)

PV demand from the Asia Pacific (APAC) region is forecast to grow by 80% year-over-year (Y/Y) during the second half of 2012 (2H'12), driven by fourth-quarter demand at the 5.3 GW level, according to new research featured in the NPD Solarbuzz Asia Pacific Major PV Markets Quarterly. Although major European markets have historically fueled strong year-end PV demand, the fourth quarter of 2012 (Q4'12) will represent a transition phase within the PV industry, as demand becomes increasingly global and further diversified across new and emerging PV regions. "Strong growth in APAC and other emerging PV markets is providing new impetus for companies active within downstream PV segments," says Wolfgang Schlichting, research director at NPD Solarbuzz. "However, in established PV markets, the short-term business environment will remain challenging for the remainder of 2012, with continued reductions in incentive policies and uncertainties due to the ongoing trade disputes," he adds. Growth across APAC has already provided a significant boost to overall Q2'12 demand. The region showed more than 60% Y/Y growth, reaching 1.4 GW and compensating for the softening in demand across established markets. In particular, PV market demand in China grew by over 300% in Q2'12 to reach 0.6 GW, stimulated by deadline requirements for the completion of Golden Sun PV projects, NPD Solarbuzz says. Another APAC country providing new downstream opportunities is Japan. Combined with year-end projects planned within China and India, the new Japanese feed-in tariff program is now setting up Q4'12 as a quarter of potentially massive PV demand pull across the APAC region.

### 1NC Nat Gas Wins

#### Natural gas fills-in – solves Chinese coal

Geng 12 (An, reporter at China Energy News, Beijing seeks to kill coal with gas, China Dialogue, 7-9, http://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/5031)

For Beijing, a wholesale switch from coal to natural gas was once considered a pipe dream. But today, a gas-powered capital looks like an ever closer possibility. Unlike most developed-nation cities, Beijing and the rest of urban China have seen mass car ownership appear before replacement of local coal-fired power generation with cleaner alternatives. As a result, Chinese cities are grappling simultaneously with pollution from coal burning and fumes from their ever more crowded roads. The consequences haven’t been pretty, and Beijing’s air quality in particular has become a focus of a searing national debate. Specifically, its levels of pollutant PM2.5 – fine particulates which pose particular hazards to human health – have shot up the list of public concerns. The need to deal with urban China’s dual affliction is increasingly clear. Hong Feng, Beijing’s vice-mayor, has said that around 22% of Beijing’s PM2.5 pollution comes from vehicles and 17% from coal combustion, in power plants and district boilers, and scattered, small-scale burning. On March 3, the Beijing Development and Reform Commission (BDRC) announced a new round of targets to cut coal use, with the aim of improving air quality and reducing PM2.5 levels. The city’s plan is to cap coal use at 15 million tonnes a year by 2015, the end of the 12th Five-Year Plan period. Now, it has said it will extend and deepen this cap, cutting use to 10 million tonnes by 2020, which represents a 60% drop on 2010 figures. Natural gas is a core part of the strategy to wean the city off coal. Under plans released in 2010, Beijing’s four remaining coal-burning power plants are due to switch over to natural-gas combined heat and power (CHP) systems by the winter of 2014 at the latest. Despite concerns about cost and supply, Beijing has pulled out the policy stops to drive through the switch, and looks set to be the first Chinese city to consign coal power to the history books.

But that does not mean it will be easy for others, without the clout of the capital, to follow suit. And meanwhile, debate about the make-up of China’s future gas supplies and returns for investors as sources become less conventional, rumbles on. So too do global arguments about the environmental impacts of gas: though less carbon intensive than coal, it is still a fossil fuel and, say environmentalists, one diverting investment away from genuinely clean renewable sources. Energy and water-intensive methods to extract unconventional gas, notably from shale, and the footprint of the vast pipelines needed to convey supplies have also prompted serious concern. A long time coming These are not the first moves by Beijing to change the make-up of its energy supply. In fact, there has been a long-running strategy to move towards gas. In 1997, the first phase of the Shaanxi-Beijing natural gas pipeline completed, providing the capital with a guaranteed supply of a certain quantity of natural gas, and allowing policymakers to start plotting to get rid of coal. Since 1998, Beijing has built no new coal-fired power plants. Under the energy strategy for the 2008 Beijing Olympics, the four existing coal-power plants were retained, but emissions standards were raised. A set of “air quality assurance measures” issued ahead of the games required Beijing Jingneng Thermal Power and other major coal-burning power stations and coal-fired boilers to cut emissions by 30%. Then, in November 2009, Zhang Guobao – at that time head of the National Energy Administration (NEA) – chaired a meeting about the need to retrofit Beijing’s four remaining coal plants, on the grounds their technology was outdated and their city-centre location was affecting urban development and emissions-reduction efforts. But the prospect of a wholesale switch to natural gas drew almost unanimous opposition from the energy industry; companies complained of high generating costs, a constrained fuel supply and even problems guaranteeing employee safety. The plants had already spent heavily on improved equipment in the run up to the Olympics, they said, and were in line with both national and city standards. Their plants would be considered advanced even on the global stage, they insisted. Energy companies weren’t the only ones worrying about a gas-fired future. Beijing officials were also concerned – primarily about cost. Deputy mayor Huang Wei had worked out some troubling figures. If all the city’s thermal power plants switched to natural gas, and prices for gas, electricity and heat remained steady, then the state could sustain losses of over 15 billion yuan (US$2.4 billion) in power-generation, and 3.5 billion yuan (US$551 million) in heat-generation. If the price of natural gas went up, however, from 1.95 yuan per cubic metre to, say, 3 yuan, total losses would rise to more than 27 billion yuan (US$4.3 billion). In the end, cost concerns weren’t sufficient to defeat the plan, however. Beijing decided to foot the bill and is pushing ahead with the switch to gas. Pro-gas advocates argue the environmental benefits this will bring are clear. Natural gas emits around half as much carbon dioxide as coal-fired generation and less than a third as much nitrogen oxides, according to the US Environmental Protection Agency, and creates none of the ash and slag. The BDRC estimates that the changes at the four plants will result in annual reductions of 11 million tonnes of carbon-dioxide emissions, 7,500 tonnes of sulphur dioxides and 12,000 tonnes of nitrogen oxides by the end of the 12th Five-Year Plan. Hard to copy Beijing isn’t the only city looking to gas. Shanghai also has a good number of natural gas power plants, and Chongqing is trying to subsidise a switch over from coal. For the rest of China’s cities, Beijing’s policies may look like an easy route to bluer skies. But, away from the centre of government, the pro-gas lobby may have a harder time getting its way. A draft strategy for dealing with air pollution in the south Chinese city of Guangzhou from 2012 to 2016 proposes reducing levels of PM10, PM2.5, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide by 12%, 7%, 12% and 10% respectively on 2011 levels. But the costs involved in switching to gas – an important part of the strategy – have united the city’s power companies in opposition to the plan. Though Beijing has seen similar opposition from business, its symbolic status as the capital of the nation has allowed the switch to gas to win the policy support necessary to drive it through. Gao Xinyu, head of the energy office at the BDRC, told the media: “Beijing is the capital of China and to a degree represents the nation, and so it must bear the costs of developing clean energy.” The National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), China’s top economic planning body, sets a price of 0.472 yuan per kilowatt hour (kW/h) for electricity supplied to the grid. But, for natural gas power plants in Beijing, that is increased to 0.573 yuan.That means Beijing subsidises natural gas power plants to the tune of about 0.10 yuan per kW/h. That the meeting on adjusting Beijing’s energy structure was chaired by the head of the NEA – not at all the norm – was in itself a sign of the political weight behind the proposed shift. Clearly, Beijing hopes to be a model in China’s push to eliminate coal. But even for Beijing, there are still risks, notably when it comes to security of supply. Background statistics included in Beijing’s 12th Five-Year Plan for developing the use of natural gas show that, from 2006 to 2010, daily demand for natural gas fluctuated by up to 49 million cubic metres, while monthly demand varied by up to 1.22 billion cubic metres. Beijing adjusted prices to try and even out demand, but it became increasing difficult to moderate those peaks. In the winter of 2009, peak gas demand in Beijing hit 53 million cubic metres and the authorities had no choice but to impose emergency measures, vigorously constraining industrial gas use and reducing supply to district boilers, in order to guarantee power plants could continue to operate at full capacity. It as against this background that work started on a thirdpipeline in the Shaanxi-Beijing project in May, 2009, which was up and running by the end of the following year. And, in February 2010, at a ceremony to seal a new partnership between the Beijing Natural Gas Group and power giant Datang International, Zhang Guobao sought to alleviate concerns: “The Shaanxi-Beijing 1st and 2nd Pipelines provide over 20 billion cubic metres of gas a year. The 3rd Pipeline will open at the end of 2010, and the construction of the 4th Pipeline has been confirmed. Together those four routes will supply over 40 billion cubic metres of gas – enough to meet Beijing’s future demands,” he said. Through this system of pipelines, Zhang explained, north China is now linked up to central Asian gas supplies, providing a major boost to energy security. Strong support for Beijing’s “gas project” from the NDRC and the NEA has calmed the nerves of many in the city. But worries persist, about both supply and cost – expected to rise in line with demand – as well as the uncertainty of the gas market as unconventional sources come online. Speculation that China could join the United States in experiencing a shale-gas boom is rife, but this is a nascent industry with an unclear future, and environmentalists are up in arms about its effect on groundwater, among other impacts. More fundamentally, many in the green community argue that natural gas is more of a sticking plaster than a real solution to China – and the world’s – pollution and climate challenges. Guaranteeing a stable and sustained supply will be the major concern for Beijing as it restructures its energy mix, and also the key difficulty when it comes to replacing coal with natural gas further afield. “Large-scale refitting of coal-burning power stations across China still needs time and preparation,” said Zhang Baoguo.

### 1NC Asia War

#### Asian war is unlikely --- regional initiatives check

Bitzinger and Desker ‘8 (senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

### 1NC China

#### No impact to the Chinese economy and the CCP solves econ collapse

Coonan ‘8 (10/25, Clifford, IrishTimes.com, “China's stalling boom has globe worried,” http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/opinion/2008/1025/1224838827729.html)

All of this downbeat news feeds into a growing suspicion that China has had its cake and eaten for way too long, and that there is simply no precedent for a country growing and growing without some kind of respite. Establishing what that pause will look like and what it means to the rest of the world is the latest challenge facing global analysts. A hangover is considered inevitable and the Olympics, while meaningless economically, are widely considered the psychological trigger for China to face a slowdown. Despite all this gloom, however, writing China off is premature. The Beijing government is well placed to help protect the economy from the worst ravages of a global downturn. It has spent the last two years trying to fight inflation and cool the overheating economy, so it's a lot easier for it to take the foot off the brakes than it is to put them on in the first place. The central bank has lowered its benchmark interest rate twice in the past two months, the first time in six years. The State Council is increasing spending on infrastructure, offering tax rebates for exporters and allowing state-controlled prices for agricultural products to rise. Expect significant measures to kick-start the property market to avoid house prices falling too drastically. China has a lot of plus points to help out. Chinese banks did not issue subprime loans as a rule, and the country's €1.43 trillion in hard-currency reserves is a useful war chest to call on in a downturn. The currency is stable and there are high liquidity levels, all of which give China the most flexibility in the world to fend off the impact of the global financial crisis, says JP Morgan economist Frank Gong. China is now a globalised economy, but its domestic market is still massively underexploited, and it is to this market that the government will most likely turn. While it is a globalised economy committed to the WTO, China is also a centralised economy run by the Communist Party, and it has no real political opposition at home to stop it acting however it sees fit to stop sliding growth. Should the economy start to worsen significantly, public anger will increase, but China has been so successful in keeping a tight leash on the internet and the media that it is difficult for opposition to organise itself in a meaningful way. Recent years of surging growth in China have certainly done a lot to keep global economic data looking rosy, but perhaps China's influence has been somewhat oversold. It is not a big enough economy by itself to keep the global economy ticking over, accounting for 5 per cent of the world economy, compared to the United States with a muscular 28 per cent. And whatever about slowing growth, 9 per cent is still an admirable rate, one that European leaders gathered this weekend in Beijing for the Asian-Europe Meeting would give their eye teeth to be able to present to their constituencies.

### 1NC US/China War

#### No US-China war – economics

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

### 1NC Russia/China War

#### No risk of border war—growing ties prevent conflict, land handover proves

Moscow News10/16/08(“China, Russia end lengthy border dispute.” http://mnweekly.ru/national/20081016/55351138.html)

Russia ended a decades-old border dispute with China on Tuesday by giving it a stretch of river island territory in a ceremony symbolising the Cold War rivals' warming ties. Chinese and Russian flags were raised and new border markers erected as part of the handover at China's far northeastern tip near the Russian city of Khabarovsk, Interfax news agency reported. A Russian border guard unit withdrew from what is now Chinese territory, leaving behind an empty headquarters and barracks buildings, Interfax said. Under an agreement signed by the two countries' foreign ministers in July, Russia agreed to give up Tarabarov Island, known as Yinlong in Chinese, and half of Bolshoi Ussuriysky Island, called Heixiazi in Chinese. "This event completes the delineation and the legal establishment of all parts of the Russian-Chinese border, which is over 4,300 kilometres (2,700 miles) long," Russia's foreign ministry said in a statement. "The border issue, a historical legacy that had been left to Russia and China, has received its **complete and final resolution**." Interfax said about 170 square kilometres (66 square miles) of land were handed over in the islands along the Amur River border between Russia and China, which saw skirmishes during the Cold War. After a bitter rift between the one-time communist allies in the 1960s, both nations deployed enormous tank armies along the border, raising the spectre of a vast land battle in the event of full-scale war. Recently, however, Russia and China have drawn closer together, motivated by factors including a joint desire to promote economic growth and form a regional counterweight to the power of the United States.

## Warming Advantage

### 1NC Warming

#### Solar insufficient in solving warming

Post 12 -- BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, MBA, University of Connecticut. P.E. Connecticut. Consulting Engineer and Project Manager (Willem, 7/1/12, "Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated," http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Solar energy is variable (during a day and during variable cloudiness) and intermittent; usually it is minimal in the morning, maximal at noon about 3-5 hours before the daily peak demand, minimal in the afternoon, minimal during foggy, overcast, snowy days, and zero at night. About 65-70 percent of the hours of a year solar energy is near zero, and it cannot be turned off, as in Southern Germany with about 1 million PV systems, when on sunny summer days solar energy surges to about 12,000 MW to 14,000 MW and has to be partially exported to France and the Czech Republic at fire sale prices, 5.5 euro cent/kWh or less, after having been subsidized at an average of about 50 euro cent/kWh. Example: German solar power is as little as 2% of rated capacity, or 340 MW, on cloudy days and when snow covers the panels. This means there are many hours during a year when no wind or solar energy is generated. Therefore, all conventional generator units will need to be kept in good operating condition, AND staffed 24/7/365, AND fueled to serve the daily demand when wind and solar energy is near zero. Without utility-scale energy storage, wind turbines and solar systems cannot replace any conventional units. All the units that would be needed WITHOUT the existence of wind turbines and solar systems, would also be needed WITH the existence of wind turbines and solar systems. Some of the conventional units would have less energy production with wind and solar energy on the grid, thereby adversely affecting their economics, due to increasingly inefficient start/stop, part-load and part-load-ramping operations, but without wind and solar energy on the grid, the energy production of almost all the conventional units would be needed to serve the daily demand. Building Wind Turbines Everywhere?: There are some (mostly wind turbine vendors, project developers, trade organizations, NRELs, financial types setting up LLC tax shelters for the top 1% of households, etc.) who say that building wind turbines everywhere there is wind, and connecting all of them with a national HVDC overlay grid into a super grid (similar to the US Interstate Highway System overlaying state and local roads), the variation and intermittency of wind energy in the diverse geographical areas will largely be canceling each other out so that the overall energy production will become increasingly steadier as more wind turbines are connected to the super grid, and that therefore there will be little need for balancing plants, and that there will always be wind energy somewhere no matter what the weather conditions in one or more geographical areas. Several National Renewable Energy Laboratories and other entities have made studies of this scheme, using mathematical modeling, as described in the EWITS and NEWITS reports. However, someone went one step further and combined the outputs of 5 widely dispersed geographical areas: - http://transmission.bpa.gov/Business/Operations/Wind/default.aspx Bonneville Power Administration, which serves 3.5 GW of installed capacity in the Pacific Northwest - The Australian Energy Market Operator, which serves 1.8 GW of installed capacity in New South Wales - The Independent Electricity System Operator, which serves 1.2 GW of installed capacity in Ontario - The Alberta Electric System Operator, which serves 0.8 GW of installed capacity in Alberta - http://www.eirgrid.com/operations/systemperformancedata/windgeneration/ EirGrid, which serves 1.4 GW of installed capacity in Ireland The result of the analysis is described in this article which concludes geographical dispersion of wind turbines does not reduce the variation and intermittency of wind energy. http://www.ethiopianreview.com/business/122605 A French energy systems analyst, Hubert Flocard, combined the wind energy outputs of several European nations. The results of his analysis yielded the same conclusion. http://www.dimwatt.eu/index.php/our-campaigns/keeping-the-lights-on/documents/108-ground-breaking-french-study-should-stop-further-expenses-on-the-so-called-super-grid Energy Cost Projections The US Energy Information Administration projects levelized production costs (national averages, excluding subsidies) of NEW plants coming on line in 2016 as follows (2009$) : Offshore wind $0.243/kWh, PV solar $0.211/kWh (higher in marginal solar areas, such as New England), Onshore wind $0.096/kWh (higher in marginal wind areas with greater capital and O&M costs, such as on ridge lines in New England), Conventional coal (base-loaded) $0.095/kWh, Advanced CCGT (base-loaded) $0.0631/kWh. http://www.energytransition.msu.edu/documents/ipu\_eia\_electricity\_generation\_estimates\_2011.pdf IS WIND ENERGY GOOD ENERGY POLICY? Within federal, state and local governments tens of thousands of people are busying themselves promoting renewables by with holding meetings and public hearings, preparing studies, writing reports, energy plans, laws, rules and regulations, monitoring projects for compliance, etc. Outside of government wind turbine vendors (Siemens, GE, Vestas, Iberdrola, etc,), project developers/owners, financiers managing tax shelters, trade organizations, etc., are busying themselves popularizing wind energy as saving the planet from global warming with PR campaigns that claim there would be significant reductions of fossil fuel consumption and CO2 reductions/kWh, that capital costs/MW would decrease, and that wind energy costs/kWh would be at grid parity in the near future. These claims have largely not been realized. Global Warming is a Given: A just-released report from EIA shows the actual world energy consumption data and projected consumption data for the 1990 to 2035 period. The report shows world energy consumption is estimated to increase from 505 quads in 2008 to 770 quads in 2035, a 52% increase. The biggest part of the increase is by (non-OECD nations + Asia). http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/ieo/world.cfm See spreadsheet associated with figure 12 World energy consumption by fuel (quadrillion Btu) Liquids: From 173.2 in 2010 to 225.1 in 2035; 30% more Natural gas: 116.7 to 174.7; 50% more Coal: 149.4 to 209.1; 49% more Nuclear: 27.6 to 51.2; 86% more Renewables: 55.2 to 109.5; 98% more Renewables fraction of total consumption: From 10.6% in 2010 to 15.2% in 2035 Fossil fraction of total consumption: 84.1% to 79.1% The significant increase in projected fossil fuel consumption during the next 24 years means global warming will continue unabated, because (non-OECD + ASIA) will have energy consumption growth far outpacing the energy consumption growth of the rest of the world; i.e., global warming is a given. The above indicates the enormous investments required to achieve the 2035 projected renewables energy production would have practically no benefit regarding global warming.

### Warming Irreversible 1NC

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### Transportation outweighs

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Climate impacts differ by sector. On-road transportation has the greatest negative effect on climate, especially in the short term. This is primarily because of two factors unique to on-road transportation: (1) nearly exclusive use of petroleum fuels, the combustion of which results in high levels of the principal warming gases (carbon dioxide, ozone, and black carbon); and (2) minimal emissions of sulfates, aerosols, and organic carbon from on-road transportation sources to counterbalance warming with cooling effects. Scientists find that cutting on-road transportation climate and air-pollutant emissions would be unambiguously good for the climate (and public health) in the near term. Transportation’s role in climate change is especially problematic, given the dependence on oil that characterizes this sector today. There are too few immediate mobility and fuel options in the United States beyond oil-fueled cars and trucks. U.S. and international policy makers have yet to tackle transportationclimate challenges. In its fourth assessment report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the global transportation sector was responsible for the most rapid growth in direct greenhouse gas emissions, a 120 percent increase between 1970 and 2004. To further complicate matters, the IPCC projects that, without policy intervention, the rapidly growing global transportation sector has little motivation to change the way it operates, because consumer choices are trumping best practices. Herein lies a fundamental mismatch between the climate problem and solutions: transportation is responsible for nearly one of every three tons of greenhouse gas emissions but represents less than one of every twelve tons of projected emission reductions. Clearly this sector is a major contributor to climate change; therefore, it should be the focus of new policies to mitigate warming. Government must lead this effort as the market alone cannot precipitate the transition away from cars and oil, which dominate this sector.

### Emissions Declining 1NC

#### Status quo solves – emissions are declining

Levi 9-25 (Michael, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment – CFR, “Why Have U.S. Carbon Dioxide Emissions Plummeted?,” Council on Foreign Relations, 2012, http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/09/25/why-have-u-s-carbon-dioxide-emissions-plummeted/)

U.S. carbon dioxide emissions for January-May are down six percent from 2011 to 2012. Headlines have highlighted the fact that emissions from January-March hit a twenty year low. What explains the shift? That question has been the subject of intense debate. John Hanger argues that 77 percent of that decline can be attributed to the shift from coal to gas. The folks over at CO2Scorecard, looking at January-March data, put that number at a more modest 21 percent. These are drastically different figures. What number should we believe? Part of the discrepancy comes from looking at different time periods. January-March emissions were affected more by the warm winter than April-May ones were. That makes sense because January-March is part of the winter. April-May emissions were affected more by rock bottom natural gas prices than January-March ones were. That makes sense because it was April-May when rock bottom (i.e. sub-two-dollars wellhead) natural gas prices prevailed. Let’s focus on the full January-May span, since it’s now the longest period for which we have 2011 and 2012 data, and do the analysis for ourselves. First the basics: Carbon dioxide emissions fell from 2,303 metric tons (Mt) in 2011 to 2,158 Mt in 2012, a drop of 145 Mt. (To keep things simple, the January-May time period is implicit in all this.) The basic story is that emissions from coal consumption plummeted by 132 Mt. Falling oil emissions chipped in another 18 Mt. Natural gas emissions were nearly flat; they were actually down 5 Mt. This would seem to suggest that natural gas played little role in falling emissions. Instead, it appears to suggest, reduced demand for coal is what did the trick. This’s roughly the intuition behind the conclusion from CO2Scorecard that natural gas has played a modest role in the U.S. emissions decline. Hanger contests this by making three basic points. First, he notes, “about 85% (132 of 144 million tons) of the 2012 U.S. Carbon emission decline is a product of falling emissions from coal.” Second, he argues, the decline in emissions from coal are “almost entirely as a result of more gas displacing coal generation this year. Indeed, coal’s electricity generation market share fell from 42% for all of 2011 to 32% in April and 34% in May.” Third, he observes, “Electricity demand is down 2% in the first 5 months of 2012 compared to 2011 so that is a small reason for declining emissions and probably explains about 10% of the 132 million ton decline of coal emissions.” Hanger puts these together with a few other estimates to come to his conclusion that 77 percent of the emissions decline is due to gas.

### No Impact 1NC

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – past temperature fluctuations prove

**Stampf 7** (Olaf, staff writer for Spiegel Online, 5/5. “Not the End of the World as we Know it,” [http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html](http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0%2C1518%2C481684%2C00.html))

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

# Block

## CP

### Solvency – 2NC – Policy Adoption (DOE)

#### DOE recommendation leads to policy adoption – it’s a roadman and coordinates Congressional policy with the DOE – that’s PCAST 10.

#### More reasons –

#### Expertise guarantees policy adoption

DOE 11 (U.S. Department of Energy, “Report on the First Quadrennial Technology Review,” September, <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/ReportOnTheFirstQTR.pdf>, p. 11-12)

An important finding of this Review is that the Department impacts the energy sector and energy-technology innovation through activities other than targeted, technology development initiatives. Public comments indicated that DOE’s informational and convening roles are among its most highly valued activities. Information collected, analyzed, and disseminated by DOE shapes the policy and decisions made by other governmental and private-sector actors. That expertise in energy-technology assessment gives DOE the standing to convene participants from the public and private sectors to coordinate a collective effort. The Department’s energy-technology assessments are founded upon its extensive R&D capabilities. By supporting precompetitive R&D and fundamental engineering research, DOE builds technical capabilities within universities and its national laboratories and strengthens those capabilities in the private sector. Also heard clearly from external stakeholders was that DOE’s technology-development activities are not adequately informed by how consumers interact with the energy system or how firms decide about technologies. As a result, DOE will integrate an improved understanding of applied social science into its technology programs to better inform and support the Department’s investments.

#### Industry insiders conclude neg

DOE 11 (U.S. Department of Energy, “Report on the First Quadrennial Technology Review,” September, <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/ReportOnTheFirstQTR.pdf>, p. 11-12)

Since advanced biofuels do not yet have cost parity with petroleum products, their short-term economic viability will continue to depend upon government policies. One of DOE’s roles in this field is to provide technical knowledge and analyses, available to both the fuels and vehicles industries, as well as other government agencies. Analyses—such as the so-called Billion-Ton Study and its recent update, 136 which evaluate the availability of biomass resources—bring technical rigor to policy development. We heard clearly from stakeholders that DOE’s evaluations of life-cycle impacts, food-fuel interactions, land-use requirements, and techno-economic forecasts are highly valued by industry stakeholders, academia, and government agencies alike.

### Politics NB – 2NC

#### **CP creates bipartisanship**

Koski 11 (Ian, Vice President for New Media Strategy – Kennedy Communications, “Senator Coons Calls for Coordinated National Energy Review,” Christopher Coon’s Office, 10-13, http://www.coons.senate.gov/newsroom/releases/release/senator-coons-calls-for-coordinated-national-energy-review)

The Quadrennial Energy Review Act of 2011 authorizes a high-level, government-wide working group to submit a comprehensive review of current domestic capabilities and future energy needs, as well as the resources, technologies, and policy recommendations to meet them. The first Quadrennial Energy Review (QER) would be submitted to Congress by February 1, 2014, and every four years thereafter. The reviews will offer a strategic roadmap to drive innovation in domestic energy sources in order to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and improve economic competitiveness and security in the United States. The proposal is modeled after the highly regarded Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), a legislatively mandated review of defense strategy and priorities. According to the Department of Defense (DoD), QDRs set a long-term course for DoD as it assesses the changing threats and challenges that the nation faces. It allows DoD to re-balance its strategies, capabilities, and forces to address today’s conflicts and tomorrow’s threats. "Leadership in energy innovation is critical to America’s long-term economic competitiveness," Senator Coons said. "A quadrennial review of our energy strategy will yield a balanced, integrated assessment of our national energy policies and will strengthen our path forward. It is time for Congress to put aside partisan debates and embark, as a nation, on a path that creatively and efficiently meets our energy needs. **This bill will help us do that**."

### Solvency – 2NC – A2: Delay

#### Zero risk of offense – delay makes policy better

Bazerman 9 (Max H., Jesse Isidor Straus Professor of Business Administration – Harvard Business School, *Acting in Time on Energy Policy*, Ed. Kelly Sims Gallagher, Brookings Institution, Google Books, p. 178)

Many wise energy policies require people to make a small-to-medium current sacrifice in return for larger benefits in the future (or to avoid larger future harms). Todd Rogers and I have shown that such proposals tend to fail because people overweight the immediate costs of implementation. Laibson's work on hyperbolic discounting shows that people's discount function is not linear but rather in a shape that resembles a hyperbola. In other words, while most people would prefer $5 today over $6 tomorrow, most would also prefer $6 in 31 days over $5 in 30 days. Applied to the policy arena, Rogers and I show that people are more likely to support energy policies that have initial costs and long-term benefits when the policies will be implemented in the future---even in the near future---rather than today. While a small delay may create inefficiency, we find large increases in support for slightly delayed policies. Effectively, the small **delay gets people to look beyond the steep slope of the loss function created by the current costs**.

#### Delay’s inevitable

Shah 12 (Nasim-ur Rehman, Director of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) – Punjab Environment Protection Department (EPD), and Abida, “Ad Hoc Energy Policies and Strategic Decisions: Role of Environmental Impact Assessment in Energy Planning,” IAIA 12 Conference Proceedings, June, http://www.iaia.org/conferences/iaia12/uploadpapers/Final%20papers%20review%20process/Shah,%20Nasim-ur-Rehman.%20%20Ad%20Hoc%20Energy%20Policies%20and%20Strategic%20Decisions.pdf)

The main reason behind failure of energy plans and policies in Pakistan is political destability which consequently destabilized the policy initiative taken by preceding governments. Pakistan energy plans have been operating on interim basis. Since 1947 as many as seven five-year plans were formulated which could only envisage the future demand and supply issue for a specific period of time. None of the government could anticipate the growing demand of energy against the booming population. Besides, the economic growth in Pakistan has been exceptionally well with a GDP growth rate of 7 percent since 2000 (Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2009). The energy system could not sustain the rapid industrialization. Corruption is another major challenge in the energy sector. In addition, the instantaneous decision by government are also rejected widely and openly, case in point the Prime Minister’s announcements during energy policy 2010 that markets should be closed after 8pm and Saturday was declared as a weekend. Both these decision were strongly rejected by the masses. The government also doesn’t have any guidelines in place for attracting foreign investments. **Delayed implementation of energy projects and theft are other major reasons of current energy crises in the country**. **Lack of institutional coordination and absence of an autonomous body for to look after energy affairs solely is also a drawback which weighing down the already deteriorating energy sources**.

### Solvency Tricks – 2NC

#### singular energy policies fail, only the counterplan sets up contingencies which are key

Friedman, 11

Julio, the Carbon Management Program Leader for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the technical leader for the clean coal consortium under the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center, May, 4/3/11, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2011/04/why-we-need-a-quadrennial-energy-review/73371/

Why We Need a Quadrennial Energy Review On good days, when I'm more optimistic about achieving our needs in climate and energy, I imagine that we as a country or globe will wake up and realize we need to clean our room (see last blog entry). If so, we need a plan. Many people discuss this undertaking as something akin to the Apollo project or the Manhattan project. I rather think those are the wrong metaphors. In both those other projects, there was only one client (the US government), the physics was fairly straightforward, and market forces didn't matter. In energy and climate, the situation is opposite. Everyone's a customer, the systems are **complicated and non-linear**, and all energy and environmental technology competes in the global market. A better analogy may be the Marshall Plan, which rebuilt post-war Europe. It laid out goals over time and spent tons of money transforming systems in disrepair, with little immediate direct benefit to the US taxpayer. It was controversial, driven by a moral compass and some sobering economics. It required time, money, and focus. **But it started with a plan**

. For the most part, we can generally agree as a nation or globe on a few framing goals: -- Reduce our dependence on imported oil. -- Reduce pollution. -- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions. -- Improve energy efficiency. -- Have a reliable, resilient infrastructure. However, goals are not a plan. Even timetables and targets (85% reduction by 2050) do not make a plan. To get there, the nation needs three things we lack. First, the U.S. needs internal agreement on the specifics of our goals. While many may agree that we would benefit to reduce oil imports, that's as far as we typically get. How many barrels imported by what date? Should we be only 20% imports by 2050? How much should be achieved through efficiency standards versus established technology (diesel) versus new supplies (compressed natural gas or coal-to-liquids). The same thing is for greenhouse gas emissions (what are good targets for 2030 or 2050?) or efficiency targets (2% improvement per year? 4% which sectors?). Ultimately, Congress will choose the menu and set the table. Second (and more importantly), the US needs a program management plan to achieve its goals. Project management 101 -- what's the budget, timetable, milestones, and deliverables? This requires an understanding or priorities, staging, and contingency. What must be done by when? If we run into trouble in 2020, how do we decide on alternate plans? How many wind turbines, solar panels, nuclear plants, or clean coal plants? Why? This kind of program management plan requires concrete metrics and scientifically defensible decisions.

### Perm Do Both – 2NC

#### QER is leak-proof – perm publicizes decisions quickly – links to politics, but the CP doesn’t

Energy Washington Week, 11 (3/30, lexis)

The Department of Energy is seeking broad public input on its first-ever "quadrennial review" of energy technology policies and programs, pursuing a **fast-paced schedule** to take initial comments by April 15 followed by a series of public workshops to gather information and viewpoints. One key issue DOE hopes to address is what principles the department should follow for allocating its research, development and deployment resources "among technologies of disparate maturity and potential time to impact" -- a critical question as the Obama administration attempts to advance its clean energy agenda and a budget-conscious Congress reviews the DOE fiscal year 2012 budget request. The DOE "quadrennial technology review" (QTR) initiative is following a process similar to the one being pursued by Senate Energy & Natural Resources Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) and ranking member Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) for development of a clean energy standard (CES). The senators have circulated a white paper that solicits public comments on numerous CES-related questions. DOE's 40-page QTR "framing document" lays out the key challenges facing the U.S. energy system and critical research, development and demonstration (RD&D) choices that must be made given those challenges. The March 14 Federal Register notice of availability and the document list a wide range of topics DOE is opening for discussion, including its proposed mission statement. The QTR framing document will be used to provide input for a five-year Quadrennial Energy Review plan that a high-level, seven-member DOE-QTR team will be developing as the process moves forward,

according to a DOE spokesperson. Energy Secretary Steven Chu in March 2 remarks at a Senate Budget Committee hearing revealed that the QTR was forthcoming but **without providing any details**. His brief statements on the issue were partly in response to remarks by Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX), who questioned the administration's emphasis on research and innovative technologies at the apparent expense of natural gas and other domestic fossil resources and said, "I would love to see a plan" dealing with every aspect of energy.

####  “Substantial” requires legal effect

Words & Phrases 64 (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

####  “Should” means “must” and requires immediate legal effect

Summers 94 (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 OK 123, 11-8, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13)

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling *in praesenti*.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn16)

[CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE]

[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) *In praesenti* means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is *presently* or *immediately effective*, as opposed to something that *will* or *would* become effective *in the future [in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### **Resolved requires certainty**

OED 89 (Oxford English Dictionary, “Resolved,” Volume 13, p. 725)

1. a. of the mind, etc.: Freed from doubt or uncertainty, fixed, settled. Obs.

#### Plan and topic require a mandated increase —- financial incentive as a "possible outcome" severs

**HEFC 4** (Higher Education Funding Council, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt200304/jtselect/jtchar/1> 67/167we98.htm# n43)

9.1 The Draft Bill creates an obligation on the principal regulator to do all that it "reasonably can to meet the compliance objective in relation to the charity".[ 45] The Draft Bill defines the compliance objective as "to increase compliance by the charity trustees with their legal obligations in exercising control and management of the administration of the charity".[ 46] 9.2 Although the word "increase" is used in relation to the functions of a number of statutory bodies,[47] such examples demonstrate that "increase" is used in relation to considerations to be taken into account in the exercise of a function, rather than an **objective** in itself. 9.3 HEFCE is concerned that an obligation on principal regulators to "increase" compliance per se is unworkable, in so far as it does not adequately define the limit**s** or nature of the statutory duty. Indeed, the obligation could be considered to be ever-increasing.

### Theory – QER CP Good

#### 3. Key to education.

**Nolan, 11** - Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director, Vermont Law School (Seth, “Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines” Negotiating the Wind: A Framework to Engage Citizens in Siting Wind Turbines, SSRN)

Despite demonstrated need and available technology, the promise of wind energy has yet to live up to its potential. As a society, we see the benefits of renewable sources of energy but struggle to implement our vision through siting of new facilities. In some instances, this gap results from opposition caused by applicants’ and regulators’ emphasis (read: overemphasis) on the substance rather than the process of decision-making. Applicants often enter an approval process expecting that doling out concessions will adequately address citizen opposition. The resulting opposition is often as much a product of what was proposed as how it was proposed.210 Attending to procedural needs as well as substantive needs can offer some solace to weary and suspicious citizens and provide the substrate on which a satisfactory solution can be reached.

## Prices

### 1NC Semiconductor Ind UQ

#### Semiconductor industry is serious weak-sauce and will continue to decline for other reasons – prefer our metrics

Castellano 12 -- Ph.D. degree in solid state chemistry from Oxford University, president of The Information Network (Robert, 8/14/12, "Semiconductor Industry Will Stay In The Red For All Of 2012," http://seekingalpha.com/article/807001-semiconductor-industry-will-stay-in-the-red-for-all-of-2012)

Forecasts by semiconductor companies for the next quarter have almost unanimously been lowered following Q2 earnings announcements. Intel (INTC) lowered its Q3 guidance, citing "a more challenging macroeconomic environment." Taiwan Semiconductor (TSMC), however, expects to see a future dip in the company's earnings due to weakening economic conditions in the U.S., where job growth is weak, and in other countries including Europe, Japan and China, according to CEO Morris Chang. Texas Instruments (TXN) cut its third-quarter outlook as customers pulled back on orders for its wireless products. Qualcomm (QCOM) sees sales softening, lowering outlook, but is upbeat on year-end smartphone demand. The semiconductor industry in 2012 through June is currently DOWN 5.4% over the same period in 2011 based on Semiconductor Industry Association's (SIA) 3-month moving average, as shown in the chart below. For this year, the most optimistic forecaster is Semico with a 6-8% growth forecast. IDC is forecasting 4.6%; IHS expects 4.3%; while Gartner (IT) and Future Horizons forecast 4% and IC Insights is the lowest at 3%. In looking at the chart above, all these organizations are betting on growth of about 10% over the next 6 months in order to average out a growth they predict. We beg to differ. According to our Proprietary Leading Indicators, which we've developed over the past 17 years, the slight drop in the 3-month moving average according to SIA is the start of a downturn that will last over at least the next three months, and in light of increasingly dour macroeconomic forces, at least through 2012. Our PLLs peaked in the current cycle in February 2012, three months ahead of the peak in the SIA numbers in May 2012. Our August 2012 chart is shown below. We see a continued decline in our PLLs since February followed by the decline in semiconductor sales. Note that our PLLs have consistently predicted the direction of the semiconductor industry by at least 3 months. At issue is not the mobile space, memory, processors, tablets, customers, thin computers, iPhone5, or 28nm manufacturing. The problem is purely economic connected with the European crisis, the "wait-and-see" buying plans for high-tech items and automobiles, which contain the most semiconductors, and a plethora of other FUD (Fear Uncertainty Doubt) factors that influence purchasing habits. China's exports dropped to 1% in July from 11.3% in June for the very same reason, although on a broader product scale. I pointed out in a April Seeking Alpha article entitled "When Will Semiconductor Revenues Stop Dropping?" that semiconductor sales are directly correlated with macroeconomics, including GDP.

### 2NC Semiconductor Ind UQ

#### Semiconductor industry weak

EE Herald 12 -- citing IHS iSuppli's semiconductor revenue analysis (8/28/12, "Negative revenue growth in 2012 for many semiconductor companies," http://www.eeherald.com/section/news/nws20120899287.html)

IHS iSuppli's latest semiconductor revenue analysis finds global semiconductor market revenue in the second quarter fell by 3 percent year-on-year, resulting in widespread revenue declines for chip suppliers, particularly those headquartered in Japan and Europe. Here below is the other findings reported by IHS iSuppli: Worldwide semiconductor sales decreased to $75.2 billion in the second quarter of 2012, down from $77.5 billion during the same period in 2011. In a troubling sign for the health of the semiconductor market in 2012, second-quarter revenue increased by less than 3 percent compared to the typically weak first quarter. If the semiconductor industry were on a trajectory for stronger growth in 2012 compared to 2011, second-quarter sequential growth would be expected to amount to at least 4 percent or more. “Amid rising economic concerns—including the Eurozone crisis, slowing manufacturing growth in China and stubbornly highly unemployment in the United States—second-quarter growth for the global semiconductor industry was highly disappointing,” said Dale Ford, senior director of electronics and semiconductor research at IHS. “Approximately two-thirds of the world’s semiconductor suppliers saw their revenues decline in the second quarter compared to the same period in 2011. This weak performance bodes ill for the semiconductor industry’s growth prospects for the entire year.”

## Nat Gas

### 2NC No Econ War

#### AND - even if wars occur, they won’t escalate.

Bennett & Nordstrom 2k [Department of Political Science Professors @ Penn state U, D. Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic problems in Enduring Rivalries” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Feb., p33-61]

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a cheap, quick victory that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states’ desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

#### 93 examples are on our side

Miller 2k [Morris Miller, Winter 2K. economist and adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration and former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank. Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 25.4]

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Their chain of causation is backwards

Ferguson 6 (Niall, prof. of history, Foreign Affairs, “The Next War of the World”, lexis)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

### 2NC US Econ Resilient

#### Prefer our authors – their evidence is biased by economic Stockholm syndrome

Dornbrook, 10 – Reporter for the Kansas City Business Journal, \*\*Citing Brian Wesbury – Chief Economist for First Trust Advisors and Author (James, "Economist: Ongoing rebound gives reason for optimism", January 8th 2010, May 21st 2010, http://kansascity.bizjournals.com/kansascity/stories/2010/01/04/daily46.html)

People should start being more optimistic about the economy because it probably will continue rebounding in 2010, said Brian Wesbury, chief economist for First Trust Advisors LP. Wesbury was the keynote speaker at the Association for Corporate Growth Kansas City’s annual economic forecast meeting Friday morning at the Kansas City Marriott Downtown. Wesbury was also the keynote speaker for last year’s event, and many members agreed that his predictions for 2009 were accurate. Wesbury, author of “It’s Not as Bad as You Think,” told the crowd that too many people are suffering from a sort of economic Stockholm Syndrome, where they have fallen in love with pessimism. It’s because we just experienced the first real panic in the economy since 1907, Wesbury said, and it altered the psyche of people to the point where they expect bad things to constantly happen. But economic data show that the economy bottomed out in March 2009 and that recovery is under way, he said.

#### -- Economy resilient

Main Wire 8 (Reporting the Congressional Budget Office Summer Report on Economic Assessments, “FOMC Seen Hiking FFR Through '09,'10”, 9-9, Lexis)

However, the economic outlook could also improve sooner than CBO is currently forecasting. During the past 25 years, the economy has been **resilient in the face of** **adverse shocks**; since 1983, it has experienced only two relatively mild recessions, and inflation has been much more contained than in earlier years. Some economists attribute that long period of relative stability to a number of developments -- for example, less economic regulation, greater competition in labor and product markets (including globalization), and more-effective monetary policy. They argue that the economy has become more competitive and more flexible, able to respond to shocks because prices can adjust more quickly to reflect relative scarcities. (According to that view, scarce goods and services can be quickly redirected to their most valued uses, and a price shocks negative effect on output will be muted.) The current turbulence in the financial markets is testing that argument, but up to now, the economy has coped with the severe shocks of the past year relatively well. In particular, in a distinct contrast to events following the shocks of the 1970s, the lack of a steady surge in core inflation and unit labor costs, and the degree to which the consumption of petroleum products has declined, indicate an efficient response by businesses and households to skyrocketing oil prices. (For example, initial estimates indicate that the consumption of petroleum products during the second quarter of this year was about 4 percent lower than it was a year ago, even though real GDP was 1.8 percent higher. In contrast to responses to earlier oil price shocks, the reduction in the use of petroleum per unit of GDP has occurred without causing major disruptions.) Moreover, the apparent restraint in core inflation has given the Federal Reserve more latitude to try to mitigate the downturn in the economy. Also, some of the negative effects that the shortage of credit has had on businesses' investment spending may have been alleviated by the relatively healthy balance sheets of nonfinancial corporations.

## Exports DA

### Impact Overview – 2NC

#### Russian econ decline outweighs – Econ decline causes political upheaval which causes loose nukes and preemption- that’s Filger

#### And- It’s most likely scenario for nuclear war and causes US draw in

Steven **David**, Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University, “Saving America From the Coming Civil Wars,” FOREIGN AFFAIRS, v 78 n 1, Jan/Feb **1999**, LN.

Only three countries, in fact, meet both criteria: Mexico, Saudi Arabia, and Russia. Civil conflict in Mexico would produce waves of disorder that would spill into the United States, endangering the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans, destroying a valuable export market, and sending a torrent of refugees northward. A rebellion in Saudi Arabia could destroy its ability to export oil, the oil on which the industrialized world depends. And internal war in Russia could devastate Europe and trigger the use of nuclear weapons. Of course, civil war in a cluster of other states could seriously harm American interests. These countries include Indonesia, Venezuela, the Philippines, Egypt, Turkey, Israel, and China. In none, however, are the stakes as high or the threat of war as imminent.

#### Plus it’s the Only existential risk

Nick **Bostrom** (PhD Philosophy – Oxford U) **2002** Existential Risks, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that *might* have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4]  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### Russian Instability Turns heg

**Baran et al, 2007** (Zeyno, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Eurasian Studies at the Hudson Institute, “U.S-Russia Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?”, Hudson Institute Symposium on U.S.-Russia Relations, www.hudson.org/files/pdf\_upload/Russia-Web%20(2).pdf)

The West needs a stable Russia in order to maintain the global balance of power against China. In the event of Russia’s disintegration, her resources will go to China, not the West. The West cannot stop Russia’s slide into a systemic crisis, and can only help get out of it once it has begun. This is a challenge for the future. Currently, the West needs a “Cold War” only with Russia’s new masters, not with the Russian people. Russians are protesting against the politics of the Russian bureaucracy, and their protest should not be re-directed at the bureaucracy’s strategic partners in the West. If the West understands and accepts this, it needs to learn to acknowledge Russians’ rights to patriotism and to a normal level of freedom—not as a religious symbol, but as the only path to prosperity and justice. Russian “democrats” and “liberals” have forgotten these demands and rights, and therefore the terms “dem - o crat” and “liberal” are cursed in Russia. Official propaganda uses this to divert Russian citizens from asserting their interests and rights to fighting the West. The West needs to explain to Russia that these rights have been destroyed not by rivalry with the West, but solely by the avarice of the new Russian leaders. It is true that in the future, the issue of global competition will arise. Currently, however, there is only one key problem—corruption (including, of course, corruption in the interests of the West) and a lack of bureaucratic integrity. After Russia experiences a systemic crisis the West must be able to say to Russians; “You see? We are for democracy, but not for “democrats,” for law, but not for lawyers, for prosperity, but not for prospering oligarchs.” All of these are things that the West could not say after the 1990s. Russia will be useful to the West if the West can side with Russia against China and global Islam in foreign policy and with the Russian people against the Russian bureaucracy in domestic policy. If the West attempts to transform Russia according to its own conceptualization of the correct societal order, or simply to seize Russian raw materials, intellect, and money, it will destroy Russia and pay dearly for the relatively small gain. As a consequence of doing so, the West will experience large-scale, global systemic problems.

#### Russian economic downturn will disrupt the world economy

**Cooper 08**

 (William, Congressional Research Service Specialist in International Trade and Finance Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, “Russia’s Economic Performance and Policies and Their Implications for the United States,” May 30, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34512.pdf>)

The greater importance of Russia’s economic policies and prospects to the United States lie in their indirect effect on the overall economic and political environment in which the United States and Russia operate. From this perspective, Russia’s continuing economic stability and growth can be considered positive for the United States. Because financial markets are interrelated, chaos in even some of the smaller economies can cause uncertainty throughout the rest of the world. Such was the case during Russia’s financial meltdown in 1998. Promotion of economic stability in Russia has been a basis for U.S. support for Russia’s membership in international economic organizations, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO). As a major oil producer and exporter, Russia influences world oil prices that affect U.S. consumers.

### Natural Gas Key – 2NC

#### Natural Gas is key- allows for government revenue which prevents a crisis- that’s Mead

#### GDP- Gazprom is 1/10th of it- prevents economic collapse

Forrest 12

[[Brett Forrest](http://www.businessweek.com/authors/3479-brett-forrest) Journalist for Vanity Fair, The Atlantic, The New York Times Magazine, National Geographic, Time, The Wall Street Journal, Rolling Stone,  Bloomberg Businessweek,), February 09, , Bloomberg Businessweek Magazine, Gazprom's Empire at the End of the Earth, <http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/gazproms-empire-at-the-end-of-the-earth-02092012.html#p1>]

Gazprom performs many functions traditionally reserved for the state, including funding public works projects directly from its budget. It’s the only Russian company that is compelled to pay its tax bill monthly, since this revenue makes up the single largest portion of Russian gross domestic product (10 percent) and is critical to the basic workings of government. Gazprom is less a company than a public trust, one that enjoys special advantages in exchange for fulfilling official wishes. Such mixed status helps explain why the Medvezhye No. 5 gas field, Nadym’s first, operates with control room technology dating to 1975, even though on an average day it extracts gas worth $1 million on the European market. This continues to be one of Russia’s charms, its ability to press on regardless. Frills are for the weak, planning for the dawdler. Still, time is catching up with Gazprom. The old fields around Nadym, the foundation of the Soviet gas industry, are just that: Old and swiftly losing their vigor, operating at just 10 percent of original pressures. At Nadym’s pyramid-shaped Iceberg Hotel, the gas managers share a vodka at the end of the day. Their hair is pasted against their skulls after many hours under fur hats. Velmer Davletov, the director of Medvezhye No. 5, talks of little besides the booster pumps he has installed in his wells, as he and his men use every trick to drain every last cubic meter. Europe’s dependence on Gazprom for natural gas gives the Kremlin power to leave millions in the cold should it choose to do so (as it did to Ukraine after pricing disputes in 2006 and 2009). A deep freeze in Russia this winter has increased domestic demand for fuel, producing a shortfall in natural gas supply to Europe. Over the last year, as European customers have been squeezed by surging gas prices (generating Gazprom’s record earnings), some of Gazprom’s Western clients have demanded arbitration. European Union antitrust investigators stormed Gazprom offices in Germany and the Czech Republic, seizing contracts. (Gazprom insists its contracts adhere to international law.) And officials in Brussels are debating the Third Energy Package, anti-monopoly legislation focused squarely on Gazprom’s ability both to transport and sell gas in the territory of the EU.

#### Specifically- it prevents negative growth- reliance is inevitable

Nilsen 12

[Thomas, Barents Observer, 5/27/12, <http://barentsobserver.com/en/energy/gazprom-fuels-russian-economy>]

The state-own gas giant Gazprom’s share of the European gas market increased to 27 percent from 24 percent in 2010, the company reports on Friday. This is also the main reason for the boost in earnings last year. Profit inside Russia itself had only a marginal growth by 16 percent. Gazprom explains this with primarily the increase in the average domestic price for gas established by the Federal Tariffs Service. Net sales of crude oil and gas condensate increased by 20 percent year-on-year, mainly due to increased oil prices. On Thursday, Russia’s Economic Development Ministry presented the forecast for the country’s economical growth in the years to come. A growth of 3,4 percent this year will expand to 4,7 percent growth in 2015, according to the positive outlook. The big question debated was whether the new government to be formed after Putin takes over the presidency in May will choose to proceed with developing innovations or continue to rely on income from Russia’s petroleum sector, the Moscow Times reports. In a conservative scenario, Russia will continue to rely heavily on oil and gas in its economic development.

### U – No Exports

#### No exports now – doesn’t meet “public interest” and there’s political opposition especially from manufacturers

Caryl 12-21 (Ben, Associate – Kelley & Drye, “U.S. Department of Energy Seeking Comments on Impact of Natural Gas Exports,” West Virginia Manufacturers Association, 2012, http://www.wvma.com/201212211075/Latest-News/us-department-of-energy-seeking-comments-on-impact-of-natural-gas-exports.html)

On December 5, 2012, the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) published a study concluding that allowing increased exports of liquefied natural gas (“LNG”) would provide a net economic benefit to the U.S. economy, although such increased exports could raise domestic gas prices and undermine the current competitive advantage of energy-intensive U.S. manufacturers. DOE is now accepting comments from stakeholders on the LNG Export Study to assist it in deciding whether to approve 15 pending applications for permits that would allow additional LNG exports of LNG projected to equal to roughly one-third of total U.S. production. DOE commissioned private contractor NERA Economic Consulting to prepare the LNG Export Study, and DOE made clear that it does not take a position regarding NERA’s findings at this time, although the Obama Administration has said that the study would be central to its decision on whether to approve additional LNG exports. Only a few years ago, a number of energy companies were planning to build facilities to import LNG into the United States. Technological advances in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, however, have resulted in large increases in U.S. natural gas production, resulting in record natural gas production and a 10-year low in gas prices in the United States. These developments are causing a surge of new U.S. manufacturing activity and investment, particularly in high-value, energy-intensive businesses like steel, aluminum, plastics, glass, vehicles and packaging, as well as producers of chemical and fertilizer. Prevailing low natural gas prices gives U.S. manufacturers an important competitive advantage relative to their foreign competitors. Other nations with significant natural gas reserves, including China, are attempting to catch up to the United States’ increased production, but are years behind in terms of development of the needed infrastructure and technology. The substantial production increases have also led U.S. energy companies to seek authorization to sell gas in global markets to take advantage of higher international prices (for example, the price for natural gas is under $4 per million BTUs in the United States, while it is about $17 per million BTUs in Japan). Under U.S. law, an entity cannot export natural gas until it receives DOE authorization, as well as approval of its export liquefaction facilities from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”). DOE examines LNG export applications to determine whether they serve the “public interest.” Applications to export LNG to nations with which the United States has a free trade agreement (“FTA”) are presumed to serve the “public interest,” while applications to export LNG to non-FTA nations receive more scrutiny from DOE in order to determine whether the exports would serve the “public interest” based on the exports expected impact on balance of trade, energy security, the environment, and job creation. In August 2012, DOE issued a final authorization for LNG exportation for Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC (“Sabine Pass”). DOE still has pending before it, however, decisions on 15 applications from companies seeking to export as much as 21.5 billion cubic feet of gas per day. DOE will consider comments on the LNG Export Study in evaluating whether to grant these pending applications. The deadline for the submission of comment is January 24, 2013, and the related deadline for the submission of reply comments is February 25, 2013. The question of whether to approve the applications obviously raises highly sensitive political issues. Gas producers are eager to export, while environmental groups fear that allowing exports would encourage more natural gas production. Large consumers, including manufacturers and chemical producers are concerned that large volumes of U.S. LNG exports could raise domestic gas prices, decreasing their current cost advantage over foreign competitors. Proponents of restricting U.S. exports claim that natural gas brings much bigger benefits as a feedstock for the U.S. manufacturing and petrochemical industries than as an export. The LNG Export Study, however, found that “impacts will not be positive for all groups of the economy,” including energy-intensive manufacturers with significant exposure to foreign competition, but that the net effect on national employment would be negligible because employment in such industries represents “about one-half of one percent of total U.S. employment.” Further, several business groups have argued that the U.S. law requiring companies to secure approval from DOE in order to export LNG amounts to a violation of the United States’ international obligations under the World Trade Organization (“WTO”) because the law establishes a discretionary, non-automatic export licensing requirement. Lastly, a number of members of Congress have expressed growing concerns about the economic consequences of LNG exports. For example, Senator Wyden, who will become the Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee when the new Congress convenes in January 2013, has called on DOE to ensure that exports do not harm U.S. consumers and manufacturers and do not “squeeze out” new, natural gas-related investments that have been proposed in the U.S. chemical, industrial, and electric generation sectors. Representative Markey introduced legislation in 2012 that would further restrict U.S. exports of natural gas. As a result, there is likely to be continued policy debate on the merits of increased LNG exports from economic, energy security, international trade, and environmental perspectives. Kelley Drye & Warren is closely monitoring these issues. On October 23, 2012, we convened key members of the oil and gas industry and energy-intensive manufacturing industries for the first in a series of conferences entitled “Hydraulic Fracturing, Natural Gas and the U.S. Manufacturing Renaissance.” The next conference will take place in early 2013 in Washington, DC and focus on federal regulations that could impact the natural gas industry. For more information on the potential effects that U.S. natural gas export policy could have on the competitiveness of domestic manufacturing, or assistance in submitting comments to the DOE on the LNG Export Study, please contact John Herrmann or Benjamin Blase Caryl.

#### Conclusive ev – manufacturers will block exports, but new supply appeases concern

Dlouhy 12-6 (Jennifer A., Energy Policy – Houston Chronicle, “Manufacturers pushing hard against LNG exports,” Fuel Fix, 2012, http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/12/06/manufacturers-pushing-hard-against-lng-exports/)

Manufacturers terrified that rising natural gas prices threaten their bottom lines are stepping up pressure on the Obama administration to limit exports of the fossil fuel in the wake of a study that said selling more overseas would broadly benefit the United States. The government-backed report released Wednesday will be a major factor as the Energy Department weighs whether to grant applications from 15 companies to export a total of 21.5 billion cubic feet of natural gas daily to countries that don’t have free trade agreements with the United States. But chemical and manufacturing industry leaders insist if the Energy Department approves too many export licenses, natural gas prices would be pushed skyward, jeopardizing some $90 billion in planned capital spending. Dow Chemical’s vice president of climate change and energy, George Biltz, said the move also would threaten $4 billion in that company’s planned capital spending. Dow projects linked to abundant, inexpensive natural gas supplies include ethylene, propylene and herbicide facilities planned for St. Charles, La., and Freeport, Texas. Planned domestic manufacturing facilities were announced “with the assumption we would have available competitive and affordable natural gas,” Biltz said in an interview. “Our view is that too many exports would change that profile and would reduce the amount of investments that would be made.” It’s not clear where that magic number lies. Biltz didn’t offer one, and neither did the new study by NERA Economic Consulting, which concluded that even unlimited exports would benefit the country with up to $47 billion added to the gross domestic product — though not without some casualties. Most of the damage would be in the form of price increases for companies that have high demands for energy produced by burning natural gas or rely on the fossil fuel as a building block to produce chemicals, fertilizers and other products. Manufacturers say the study used outdated 2011 projections of demand for natural gas and that the report dismissed the effects on their sector while ignoring the positive contribution they have on the U.S. economy. “The report does not compare the economic benefits of exporting natural gas versus using it as a domestic jobs creator,” said Paul Cicio, president of the Industrial Energy Consumers of America. “If we use these resources domestically, it will maximize economic growth and job creation for this country.” Because natural gas prices aren’t set on a global market — and the cost in some Asian and European markets can be three to five times higher than in the U.S. — American manufacturers have competitive cost advantage when it comes to the fossil fuel and producing energy-intensive goods. Biltz stressed that if a single cubic foot of natural gas is exported, it gives the U.S. a one-time impact on the GDP. But, he added: “If you take that same cubic foot and you roll it through manufacturing, whether it’s steel or chemicals or pulp and paper or rubber, this has as much as a 20x impact when you roll it through the whole GDP of the country,” Biltz said. “And you get export products at the end of that value chain too.” Dow’s chairman and CEO, Andrew Liveris, said in a statement late Thursday that the report ignores that “manufacturing is the largest user of natural gas in the U.S. and creates more jobs and more value to the U.S. economy from natural gas than any other sector.” He added: “Policymakers have been given a flawed report that overlooks vital dynamics, including a manufacturing renaissance that is already underway and much needed by this country.” Manufacturers aren’t universally opposed to exports. And any rise in natural gas prices from exporting the commodity could be within the bounds of what the sector believes it can absorb. In testimony before Congress four years ago, a Dow executive noted that petrochemical production “landed in the U.S. at the natural gas equivalent price of $4 to $4.50/MMBtu.”) The government-backed report predicted that natural gas prices could jump as much as 33 cents per thousand cubic feet initially and up to $1.11 per thousand cubic feet after five years of gradually increasing exports. Some manufacturers whose products are used in drilling and processing also stand to take in some benefit from expanded natural gas development that could be spurred by exports that modestly bump up prices. A Dow Chemical subsidiary, Texas LNG Holdings, has a stake in the Freeport LNG project planned for Texas, among those awaiting the Energy Department’s export approval. **The new report doesn’t guarantee the Energy Department will green light new natural gas exports**, beyond the license it already gave to Houston-based Cheniere Energy to sell liquefied natural gas from its Sabine Pass terminal in southwest Louisiana. The Obama administration has promised to carefully weigh the impact of allowing more exports on domestic consumers and the manufacturing sector. The Energy Department stressed that it would be conducting its own review of the NERA study and accepting public comments through Jan. 24 before making any decisions on export licenses on a case-by-case basis. And the department is expected to devise some kind of roadmap for its decisionmaking — probably an internal guidance or regulatory plan that sets factors that will be considered when it reviews applications. Otherwise, there are few real options in current law and regulation for the Energy Department to approve some of the permit applications and reject others. Current law presumes that exports of natural gas are in the public interest, so rejecting them requires a demonstration that the foreign sales would harm the public. The flood of applications now pending before the Energy Department “creates a challenge for the administration in calculating the cumulative economic impact of projects, potentially limiting and rationing approvals to prevent adverse impacts,” FBR Capital Markets said in a research note to clients. But “without a rationing mechanism, operators would risk having export licenses reconsidered in the future if economic consequences materialize.” None of this is going to move quickly, suggests Kevin Book, managing director of ClearView Energy Partners. He predicts the first approval of a new license to export natural gas to a non-free trade country will late in the third quarter of 2013. According to Book’s ClearView Energy, in a research note to clients: “The DOE website says it will ‘begin to act’ at the close of the comment period, but it doesn’t establish any finite end-point for action, nor does DOE identify when its own review of the NERA study will conclude. Similarly, DOE does not mention plans to propose any formal rule or guidance, but we would be surprised if none were offered.” The fights will be bigger this time around. While Cheniere’s project garnered relatively muted opposition, the company’s export approval was a wake-up call to environmental opponents of the hydraulic fracturing process instrumental in unlocking natural gas reserves. Ever since, FBR Capital Markets analysts note, industrial and environmental groups have filed to intervene in pending applications, with the Sierra Club insisting that the Energy Department is required under existing federal laws to conduct environmental impact analyses of the proposed export projects and the extent to which they would expand hydraulic fracturing and domestic drilling. Critics also will be able to press their case before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which takes the lead in vetting the siting of LNG facilities, even new export and liquefaction operations at existing sites. There may be more legal challenges, including petitions asking FERC to rehear cases it has already decided. And Book notes it’s possible public comments challenging the new government-backed study could be submitted as part of each application reviewed by the Energy Department, “conceivably (slowing) approvals down even more.” Dow’s Biltz did not rule out Dow pushing its argument before FERC. “It’s not going to surprise me to see more action on the FERC permits up front,” he said. “It’s certainly something Dow will have to look at.” Critical manufacturers also may have a chance to air their concerns early in the new year, if the House and Senate energy committees move quickly to schedule hearings on the issue. The incoming chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee has been critical of exporting natural gas and has called for a “time out” on foreign sales.

## Warming

### 2NC Warming Irreversible

#### Extend warming’s irreversible – scientists and long term predictions – 4.3 degrees is inevitable, that assumes zero emissions – that’s ANI.

#### Strong consensus that it’s too late

Edwards 12 (Rich, PhD in Communication – Baylor University, “A Preliminary Analysis of the IPFF Resolution for 2012-2013,” http://www.bickelbrewer.com/pdf/IPPF\_Topic\_Primer\_2012\_13.pdf)

This position argues that it is already too late for mitigation efforts to meaningfully change the course of climate change. Matthew Baca, writing in the Summer 2010 issue of the New York University Journal of International Law and Politics, offers the following rationale for prioritizing adaptation: “Climate change is already occurring, and some of its effects will be felt before mitigation can have any impact. Even if emissions are stabilized relatively soon (an unlikely prospect), sea level rise and anthropogenic warming will likely continue for many years to come. While mitigation is critical to the welfare of later generations, . . . adaptation is critical to our generation” (Baca, 2010, pp. 1343-1344). Jacqueline Peel and Lee Godden, both professors of law at Melbourne Law School, conclude that prevention should now be regarded as impossible: “Although future warming and its likely effects may be reduced if an effective agreement on deep emissions cuts emerges from the current post-Kyoto negotiation process, it is becoming increasingly clear that climate change impacts cannot be entirely prevented. In this context, climate change mitigation, in the sense of ‘implementing policies to reduce [greenhouse gas] emissions and enhance sinks,’ will not be sufficient to avert serious environmental damage. Instead there is a need for adaptation ‘initiatives and measures to reduce the vulnerability of natural and human systems against actual or expected climate change effects’” (Peel & Godden, 2009, p. 37). Eric Klinenberg, professor of public policy at New York University, believes that the fight to stop global warming is already lost; attention must now turn to how we should deal with it: “The question is no longer what’s happening with the climate but what we can do about it. The macro challenge is inescapable: Dramatically reducing our carbon footprint and quickly reversing the environmental damage that we’ve already inflicted. Whether and how we do that is the problem of our time. But as the fossil-fuel industry and the politicians it bankrolls do everything in their power to slow that transition, the rest of us have no choice but to adapt. If the mercury is going to keep rising, we need to start protecting ourselves from its consequences” (Klinenberg, 2012). Kevin Anderson, a scientist at the Tyndal Centre for Climate Change Research at the School of Mechanical Aerospace and Civil Engineering, and Alice Bows of the University of Manchester’s Sustainable Consumption Institute, conclude that the battle to stop global warming is already lost: “The analysis within this paper offers a stark and unremitting assessment of the climate change challenge facing the global community. There is now little to no chance of maintaining the rise in global mean surface temperature at below 2°C, despite repeated high-level statements to the contrary” (Anderson & Bows, 2011, p. 41).

#### 6 degree warming’s inevitable

AP 9 (Associated Press, Six Degree Temperature Rise by 2100 is Inevitable: UNEP, September 24, <http://www.speedy-fit.co.uk/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=168>)

Earth's temperature is likely to jump six degrees between now and the end of the century even if every country cuts greenhouse gas emissions as proposed, according to a United Nations update. Scientists looked at emission plans from 192 nations and calculated what would happen to global warming. The projections **take into account** 80 percent emission cuts from the U.S. and Europe by 2050, which are not sure things. The U.S. figure is based on a bill that passed the House of Representatives but is running into resistance in the Senate, where debate has been delayed by health care reform efforts. Carbon dioxide, mostly from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, is the main cause of global warming, trapping the sun's energy in the atmosphere. The world's average temperature has already risen 1.4 degrees since the 19th century. Much of projected rise in temperature is because of developing nations, which aren't talking much about cutting their emissions, scientists said at a United Nations press conference Thursday. China alone adds nearly 2 degrees to the projections. "We are headed toward very serious changes in our planet," said Achim Steiner, head of the U.N.'s environment program, which issued the update on Thursday. The review looked at some 400 peer-reviewed papers on climate over the last three years. Even if the developed world cuts its emissions by 80 percent and the developing world cuts theirs in half by 2050, as some experts propose, the world is still facing a 3-degree increase by the end of the century, said Robert Corell, a prominent U.S. climate scientist who helped oversee the update. Corell said the most likely agreement out of the international climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December still translates into a nearly 5-degree increase in world temperature by the end of the century. European leaders and the Obama White House have set a goal to limit warming to just a couple degrees. The U.N.'s environment program unveiled the update on peer-reviewed climate change science to tell diplomats how hot the planet is getting. The last big report from the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out more than two years ago and is based on science that is at least three to four years old, Steiner said. Global warming is speeding up, especially in the Arctic, and that means that some top-level science projections from 2007 are already out of date and overly optimistic. Corell, who headed an assessment of warming in the Arctic, said global warming "is accelerating in ways that we are not anticipating." Because Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets are melting far faster than thought, it looks like the seas will rise twice as fast as projected just three years ago, Corell said. He said seas should rise about a foot every 20 to 25 years.

#### Low threshold—less than 2 degrees is sufficient to cause their impacts

Harvey 11 (Fiona, Environment Reporter – Guardian, 11/9, “World headed for irreversible climate change in five years, IEA warns,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>)

Climate scientists estimate that global warming of 2C above pre-industrial levels marks the limit of safety, beyond which climate change becomes catastrophic and irreversible. Though such estimates are necessarily imprecise, warming of as little as 1.5C could cause dangerous rises in sea levels and a higher risk of extreme weather – the limit of 2C is now inscribed in international accords, including the partial agreement signed at Copenhagen in 2009, by which the biggest developed and developing countries for the first time agreed to curb their greenhouse gas output.

#### Their own Lorinc evidence concludes neg – it says

#### “if all **270** mitigation measures, including the American Clean Energy Security Act, achieve the expected reductions, global emissions a decade out will still be 5 to 7 Gt higher than the level needed to keep atmospheric carbon concentrations below 450 parts per million”

#### They’ve read no evidence that those 270 mitigation measures would be successful. Plan’s necessary, not sufficient.

#### Even the IPCC agrees

ENS 12-17 (Environment News Service, “Leaked UN Report Predicts ‘Irreversible’ Climate Change,” 2012, http://ens-newswire.com/2012/12/17/leaked-un-report-predicts-irreversible-climate-change/)

A leaked early draft of the UN’s latest climate change study shows human activities to be responsible for climate warming that will take centuries to reverse, even if greenhouse gas emissions were to stop right now. “Many aspects of climate change will persist for centuries even if concentrations of greenhouse gases are stabilised. This represents a substantial multi-century commitment created by human activities today,” states the draft report by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. “For scenarios driven by carbon dioxide alone, global average temperature is projected to remain approximately constant for many centuries following a complete cessation of emissions,” the draft states. “Thus a large fraction of climate change is largely irreversible on human time scales, except if net anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions were strongly negative over a sustained period.”

## Case

### 2NC Nat Gas Wins

#### There is no price spike – cheap natural gas blocks solar power – energy decisions are made on long-term contracts – investors like the predictability of natural gas over solar – that’s Dumaine. Prefer it – it’s predictive, cites insiders about the energy industry, and is comparative. Solar is more expensive and economies of scales are too far off.

#### natural gas still wins out

Hunt 12 -- President of Tech and Creative Labs, more than 30 years experience as a utility executive, state utility regulator and as a strategic energy consultant and for the last 20 years years, he has been a strategic energy strategy consultant serving as global division president for energy analytics and advisory services as Ventyx/Global Energy Advisors; and in Standard & Poor’s Regional and Energy Economics Group; Master’s Degree in Public Administration, University of Kansas (Gary, 7/10/12, "The Importance of Balancing Energy Economics for the Success of Sustainability," http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/The-Importance-of-Balancing-Energy-Economics-for-the-Success-of-Sustainability.html)

The question is what will replace it? Environmental advocates hope it will be renewable wind and solar. We are certainly building plenty of it. But volatility happens and it does not spare the politically correct. Oversupply of photovoltaic panels and wind turbines from China flood world markets to suction up subsidies and feed in tariff supports to capture market share. Today we have two times more PV supply than demand and PV producers and wind manufacturers are feeling the pain. This market imbalance is rapidly bankrupting the solar and wind producers we are counting on to meet the next wave of growth in the energy business cycle. And then there is this. Despite environment policies opposing fossil fuels, the least cost, best fit, most sustainable alternative to coal is not solar and wind but natural gas fired generation. That is why we are fighting over fracking because low gas prices force renewable energy to compete despite rules jury rigged to favour it.

#### Natural gas solve China’s coal transition

Brown 12 (Lester, President – Earth Policy Institute, “Chapter 5. Building the Solar/Hydrogen Economy: Natural Gas: The Transition Fuel,” *Eco-Economy: Building an Economy for the Earth, Earth Policy Institute*, http://www.earthpolicy.org/mobile/books/eco/eech5\_ss6?phpMyAdmin=1d6bec1fea35111307d869d19bcd2ce7)

Over the last half-century, the use of natural gas has increased 12-fold. Indeed, in 1999 natural gas eclipsed coal as a world source of energy, making it second only to oil. (See Figure 5-5.) This growth in natural gas use is fortuitous, because as this energy source grows, the storage and distribution system—whether long-distance pipelines or the detailed distribution networks within cities that supply natural gas to individual residences—is also expanding, setting the stage for the eventual switch to a hydrogen economy.53 Natural gas could overtake oil as the world's leading source of energy within the next 20 years, particularly if an anticipated downturn in oil production comes in this decade rather than the next. Natural gas has gained in popularity both because it is a clean-burning source of energy and because it is less carbon-intensive than either coal or oil. It emits scarcely half as much carbon as coal does for each unit of energy produced. In contrast to both coal and oil, which often emit sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxides when burned, gas burns cleanly.54 It is this clean-burning quality that has appealed to governments as a way of reducing air pollution. In China, for example, shifting from coal to natural gas for both industrial and residential uses is reducing the urban air pollution that has claimed literally millions of lives in recent years. As part of its long-term planning, China is building a new pipeline from gas fields discovered in its far northwest to the city of Lanzhou in Gansu Province. The government has also approved the import of natural gas and is now planning to build a pipeline linking Russia's Siberian gas fields with Beijing and Tianjin, both leading industrial cities.55 Natural gas's potential to play a central role in the transition from the fossil fuel era to the solar/hydrogen era has not escaped the more progressive leaders in this industry. For example, Gasunie, the Netherlands natural gas utility, expects to be a major player in this transition. Although Gasunie now transports natural gas from the North Sea gas fields across the Netherlands to other countries in Europe, the firm plans eventually to use offshore wind power to generate electricity, converting it into hydrogen that will then be moved through the pipeline system now used for natural gas.56 In the United States, Enron, a Texas-based natural gas company that in recent years has become a global energy company, is also keenly aware of the part it can play in the transition to the new energy economy. In recent years, it has purchased two wind companies, which gives it the capacity to exploit the vast wind resources of Texas. This abundance of wind to generate cheap electricity and produce hydrogen gives Enron the option of one day feeding the hydrogen into the same distribution network of pipelines that it now uses to distribute natural gas in the Northeast and Midwest.57 A similar situation exists in China, where the development of natural gas fields in the northwest and the pipelines used to carry the gas eastward to industrial cities could one day be used to carry hydrogen produced with the region's wealth of wind resources. (The installation of wind turbines along with the more traditional windbreaks of trees in areas where soil is vulnerable to wind erosion could also help control erosion and the dust storms that blow across the country to Beijing and other cities.) Natural gas companies are well positioned to be leaders in building the solar/hydrogen economy. They may someday invest in wind electric generation in remote regions that have a wealth of wind, and then use that electricity to electrolyze water and produce hydrogen. This could then be exported in liquid form, much as natural gas is now compressed into liquid form for shipping in tankers.

### 2NC Asia War – Regional Coop

1NC evidence indicates regional multilateral structures prevent any escalation of any conflict in Asia – they will be able to intervene and check in- zero answer to this

#### Multilateral structures check escalation

Desker 8 (Barry, Dean – S Rajaratnam School of International Studies, “Why War is Unlikely in Asia: Facing the Challenge from China”, 6-4, http://www.iiss.org/conferences/asias-strategic-challenges-in-search-of-a-common-agenda/conference-papers/fifth-session-conflict-in-asia/why-war-in-asia-remains-unlikely-barry-desker/)

War in Asia is thinkable but it is unlikely.  The Asia-Pacific region can, paradoxically, be regarded as a zone both of relative insecurity and of relative strategic stability.  On the one hand, the region contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of resulting in a major war.  The region is replete with border issues, the site of acts of terrorism (the Bali bombings, Manila superferry bombing, Kashmir, etc.), and it is an area of overlapping maritime claims (the Spratly Islands, Diaoyutai islands, etc).  Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance, sitting astride key sea lines of communication (SLOCS) and important chokepoints. Nevertheless, the Asia-Pacific region is more stable than one might believe.  Separatism remains a challenge but the break-up of states is unlikely.  Terrorism is a nuisance but its impact is contained.  The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearization of the peninsula.  Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict (especially after the KMT victories in Taiwan).  The region also possesses significant multilateral structures such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the nascent Six Party Talks forum and, in particular, ASEAN, and institutions such as the EAs, ASEAN + 3, ARF which ASEAN has conceived.

### 2NC US/China War – Economics

1NC – economics means China will never go to war with the market with which they have the highest clout with. Even if solar demand is low they still sell all of their other products to the US which is probably what’s key

#### No war – China abides by international law and keeps a low profile

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Keeping Low Profile China's strategy of keeping low profile constitutes the political foundation of the superficial friendship between the United States and China. After 1989, in the face of sanctions and blockades from the West, Deng Xiaoping told Chinese policy makers: ‘In short, my views about the international situation can be summed up in three sentences. First, we should observe the situation coolly. Second, we should hold our ground. Third, we should act camly. Don’t be impatient; it is no good to be impatient. We should be calm, calm and again calm, and quietly immerse ourselves in practical work to accomplish something – something for China.’48 Deng Xiaoping's counterstrategy was later summed up as ‘keeping a low profile’. It was in 1995 that then Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen first introduced this principle of Chinese policy to the world.49 In 1998, President Jiang Zemin summarized the policy as ‘observe calmly, cope with affairs calmly, never seek leadership, hide brightness and cherish obscurity, get some things done.’50 The white paper on China's Peaceful Development issued in 2011 notes that, ‘As a responsible member of the international community, China abides by international law and the generally recognized principles governing international relations, and eagerly fulfills its international responsibility. China has actively participated in reforming international systems, formulating international rules and addressing global issues. It supports the development of other developing countries, and works to safeguard world peace and stability.’51

### 1NC CCP Instability

#### No CCP collapse—the government represses instability

Pei 9(Minxin, Senior Associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3/12. “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.

#### Even if, no escalation

Copley 7 – Award-winning historian and global strategist; founding Director of Future Directions International Pty. Ltd. and its Acting Chief Executive; Editor, GIS

(Gregory, 3/30. "Avoiding an Economic Pandemic: The Critical Global Significance of the Health of the PRC Economy," Defense & Foreign Affairs Special Analysis, Lexis.)

There is scope or flexibility for the PRC to somewhat transform its energy demands in the global marketplace. Amb. Freeman makes the point that domestic and international pressures seem likely to cause the PRC to improve its energy efficiency through internal innovation. He noted that despite the PRC's "very low rates of per capita energy consumption (which are only about 14 percent of US per capita consumption), China consumes between seven and 111/2 times more energy than Japan to produce one dollar of gross domestic product (GDP), and it's about 41/2 times less efficient than is the United States". And many of the innovations which the PRC is exploring are in the area of clean coal and nuclear energy. It seems clear that it is in the interests of the international community to help the PRC stabilize its energy situation, and to improve energy usage efficiency, in order to minimize risks to the global security framework, within the framework of competing energy needs. The only alternative, from the standpoint of external powers, to assisting in the process of stabilizing the PRC's energy supply, currency credibility, and population unrest is to plan for the containment of any implosion of political stability within the PRC should its transition during the next two decades to entrenched power status be interrupted.

### 2NC Russia/China War

#### Border deal cemented relations and eradicated the possibility of war

AFP 08(Agence France-Presse, 7/22. “China, Russia finally fix long-disputed border.” http://www.defencetalk.com/news/publish/wars/China\_Russia\_finally\_fix\_long-disputed\_border130016228.php)

China and Russia signed an agreement Monday that ended a decades-long territorial dispute and finally determined their borders, in the latest sign of warming ties between the former Cold War foes. The protocol, signed by the two countries' foreign ministers in Beijing, added to an existing agreement on their 4,300-kilometre (2,700-mile) boundary, meaning all of the frontier is now set. "China and Russia have discussed their border for over 40 years. It's no simple matter that we have now demarcated the border in its entirety," Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi said, after the agreement was signed. "At a political level, it's a mutually beneficial, win-win result," he told reporters at a briefing at the Diaoyutai State Guest House in the Chinese capital. A bitter rift during the Cold War saw the one-time communist allies fight skirmishes along their border. For years, both nations deployed enormous tank armies on both sides of the border, and if full-scale war had broken out, it could have led to one of the largest land battles in history. Recently, however, Russia and China have drawn closer together, motivated partly by a joint ambition to prioritise economic growth. "As we preserve domestic stability in our respective societies, we have now created a very good external environment for social and economic development, which is of huge benefit to us both," Yang said. Yang's Russian counterpart, Sergei Lavrov, described how the border -- once one of the world's most heavily fortified frontiers -- would gradually come to bring the two nations closer. "From a legal point of view we have created the preconditions for the border to become a link of stability, openness, mutual benefit, friendship and cooperation," Lavrov said. There were no specific details given to the press about the agreement, but the state-run China Daily newspaper said the agreement involved Russia handing back 174 square kilometres (69.6 square miles) of island territory to China. All of Yinlong island, known as Tarabarov in Russian, and half of Heixiazi island, Bolshoi Ussuriysky in Russian, in the rivers that border the countries in China's far northeast were returned, according to the paper. The area will now become the "first place on the mainland to see sunlight", forming the easternmost tip of the country, the China Daily said. The area, long claimed by China, was occupied by the former Soviet Union in a border skirmish as early as 1929, according to the paper. After his meeting with Lavrov, Yang spoke positively about the future of bilateral relations. "We exchanged views about how to further promote our bilateral strategic relationship and strengthen our cooperation at the regional and global levels. We reached a broad consensus. I think our discussions were positive," Yang said.

### 1NC Central Asia War

#### -- Shocks cause cooperation – not escalation

Collins and Wohlforth 4 (Kathleen, Professor of Political Science – Notre Dame and William, Professor of Government – Dartmouth, “Defying ‘Great Game’ Expectations”, Strategic Asia 2003-4: Fragility and Crisis, p. 312-313)

Conclusion The popular great game lens for analyzing Central Asia fails to capture the declared interests of the great powers as well as the best reading of their objective interests in security and economic growth. Perhaps more importantly, it fails to explain their actual behavior on the ground, as well the specific reactions of the Central Asian states themselves. Naturally, there are competitive elements in great power relations. Each country’s policymaking community has slightly different preferences for tackling the challenges presented in the region, and the more influence they have the more able they are to shape events in concordance with those preferences. But these clashing preferences concern the means to serve ends that all the great powers share. To be sure, policy-makers in each capital would prefer that their own national firms or their own government’s budget be the beneficiaries of any economic rents that emerge from the exploitation and transshipment of the region’s natural resources. But the scale of these rents is marginal even for Russia’s oil-fueled budget. And for taxable profits to be created, the projects must make sense economically—something that is determined more by markets and firms than governments. Does it matter? The great game is an arresting metaphor that serves to draw people’s attention to an oft-neglected region. The problem is the great-game lens can distort realities on the ground, and therefore bias analysis and policy. For when great powers are locked in a competitive fight, the issues at hand matter less than their implication for the relative power of contending states. Power itself becomes the issue—one that tends to be nonnegotiable. Viewing an essential positive-sum relationship through zero sum conceptual lenses will result in missed opportunities for cooperation that leaves all players—not least the people who live in the region—poorer and more insecure. While cautious realism must remain the watchword concerning an impoverished and potentially unstable region comprised of fragile and authoritarian states, our analysis yields at least conditional and relative optimism. Given the confluence of their chief strategic interests, the major powers are in a better position to serve as a stabilizing force than analogies to the Great Game or the Cold War would suggest. It is important to stress that the region’s response to the profoundly destabilizing shock of coordinated terror attacks was increased cooperation between local governments and China and Russia, and—multipolar rhetoric notwithstanding—between both of them and the United States. If this trend is nurtured and if the initial signals about potential SCO-CSTO-NATO cooperation are pursued, another destabilizing shock might generate more rather than less cooperation among the major powers. Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan are clearly on a trajectory that portends longer-term cooperation with each of the great powers. As military and economic security interests become more entwined, there are sound reasons to conclude that “great game” politics will not shape Central Asia’s future in the same competitive and destabilizing way as they have controlled its past. To the contrary, mutual interests in Central Asia may reinforce the broader positive developments in the great powers’ relations that have taken place since September 11, as well as reinforce regional and domestic stability in Central Asia.

#### Instability is inevitable.

Richard A. Boucher, Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs, 4/26/2006. “U.S. Policy in Central Asia: Balancing Priorities (Part II),” Statement to the House International Relations Committee, <http://www.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rm/2006/65292.htm>.

Central Asia faces numerous threats to its stability, including Islamic extremism, a population that remains poor and has little economic opportunity, the post-Soviet legacy of authoritarianism, public perceptions of injustice, and high levels of corruption. As a consequence, nurturing both economic and democratic reform in the region is difficult, even daunting. Furthermore, the repressive and backward-looking authoritarian regimes in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan may further challenge our efforts to integrate the region and encourage reform and development.

## Politics

### Impact 2NC

#### Draws in Russia.

**Tarpley 5** (Webster Griffin,- activist and historian, 8/29/ <http://inn.globalfreepress.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=743> )

In the case of Iran, the use of nuclear weapons by the US would have a dangerous complication: Iran is an important neighbor and trading partner of the Russian Federation, which is helping with Iran’s nuclear power reactor program. The threatened US/Israeli raid on Iran might kill Russian citizens as well. Such a US attack on Iran might prod the Russian government into drawing its own line in the sand, rather than sitting idle as the tide of US aggression swept closer and closer to Russia’s borders, as one country after another in central Asia was occupied. In other words, a US attack on Iran bids fair to be the opening of World War III, making explicit was already implicit in the invasion of Iraq. The Iran war project of the neocons is the very midsummer of madness, and it must be stopped.

#### Iran war causes natural gas volatility --- turns the economy.

**Blas**, 10/4/**2012** (Javier, Energy: Corridor of Power, Financial Times, p. <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/2/b4f57138-0ca7-11e2-b175-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2HJcfCqeZ>)

It is hard to overstate the waterway’s role in energy markets. Cyrus Vance, former US secretary of state, once called it “the jugular vein” of the global economy. Strangling that jugular would push oil and natural gas prices to levels that would endanger economic growth worldwide. David Goldwyn, a Washington-based consultant and, until recently, the US state department’s top diplomat for oil affairs, says the strait is at “the top of the risk list” for energy and military planners. “It is one of the single, largest vulnerabilities that we have in terms of oil supply.” Last year, roughly 17m b/d of oil produced in the UAE, Qatar, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq and Iran passed through the channel. Moreover, about 2tn cubic feet per year of liquefied natural gas – or supercooled gas turned into a liquid so it can be shipped – sailed through the strait, equal to almost 20 per cent of global LNG trade. Trade on such a scale hands preponderant leverage to the Iranian military. Only last month, General Mohammad Ali Jafari, head of the Revolutionary Guards, said: “If war occurs in the region and [Iran] is involved, it is natural that the Strait of Hormuz, as well as the energy [market], will face difficulties.” Last year, one admiral quipped Iran could close the strait “more easily than drinking a glass of water”.

Nuke war turns warming

Carl Sagan, B.A., B.S., and PhD University of Chicago, former professor of biology and genetics at Stanford and professor of astronomy and astrophysics at Harvard, former Director of the Laboratory for Planetary Studies at Cornell, two-time winner of the NASA medal for scientific achievement, Peabody award recipient, and Pulitzer prize winning author, 1984 (*Foreign Affairs*, “Nuclear War and Climatic Catastrophe” p. Lexis)

 Recent estimates of the immediate deaths from blast, prompt radiation, and fires in a major exchange in which cities were targeted range from several hundred million to 1.1 billion people -- the latter estimate is in a World Health Organization study in whch targets were assumed not to be restricted entirely to NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. n7 Serious injuries requiring immediate medical attention (which would be largely unavailabe) would be suffered by a comparably large number of people, perhaps an additional 1.1 billion. n8 Thus it is possible that something approaching half the human population on the planet would be killed or seriously injured by the direct effects of the nuclear war. Social disruption; the unavailability of electriaity, fuel, transportation, food deliveries, communication and other civil services; the absence of medical care; the decline in sanitation measures; rampant disease and severe psychiatric disorders would doubtless collectively claim a significant number of further victims. But a range of additional effects -- some unexpected, some inadequately treated in earlier studies, some uncovered only recently -- now make the picture much more somber still. Because of current limitations on missile accuracy, the destruction of missile silos, command and control facilities, and other hardened sites requires nuclear weapons of fairly high yield exploded as groundbursts or as low airbursts. High-yield groundbursts will vaporize, melt and pulverize the surface at the target area and propel large quantities of condensates and fine dust into the upper troposphere and stratosphere.The particles are chiefly entrained in the rising fireball; some ride up the stem of the mushroom cloud. Most military targets, however, are not very hard. The destruction of cities can be accomplished, as demonstrated at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, by lower-yield explosions less than a kilometer above the surface. Low-yield airbursts over cities or near forests will tend to produce massive fires, some of them over areas of 100,000 square kilometers or more. City fires generate enormous quantities of black oily smoke which rise at least into the upper part of the lower atmosphere, or troposhere. If firestorms occur, the smoke column rises vigorously, like the draft in a fireplace, and may carry some of the soot into the lower part of the upper atmosphere, or stratosphere. The smoke from forest and grassland fires would initially be restricted to the lower troposphere. The fission of the (generally plutonium) trigger in every thermonuclear weapon and the reactions in the (generally uranium-238) casing added as a fission yield "booster" produce a witch's brew of radioactive products, which are also entrained in the cloud. Each such product, or radioisotope, has a characteristic "half-life" (defined as the time to decay to half its original level of radioactivity). Most of the radioisotopes have very short half-lives and decay in hours to days. Particles injected into the stratosphere, mainly by high-yield explosions, fall out very slowly -- characteristically in about a year, by which time most of the fission products, even when concentrated, will have decayed to much safer levels. Particles injected into the troposphere by low-yield explosions and fires fall out more rapidly -- by gravitational settling, rainout, convention, and other processes -- before the radioactivity has decayed to moderately safe levels. Thus rapid fallout of tropospheric radioactive debris tends to produce larger doses of ionizing radiation than does the slower fallout of radioactive particles from the stratosphere. Nuclear explosions of more than one-megaton yield generate a radiant fireball that rises through the troposphere into the stratosphere. The fireballs from weapons with yields between 100 kilotons and one megaton will partially extend into the stratosphere. The high temperatures in the fireball chemically ignite some of the nitrogen in the air, producing oxides of nitrogen, which in turn chemically attack and destroy the gas ozone in the middle stratosphere. But ozone absorbs tlhe biologically dangerous ultraviolet radiation from the Sun. Thus the partial depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer, or "ozonosphere," by high-yield nuclear explosions will increase the flux of solar ultraviolet radiation at the surface of the Earth (after the soot and dust have settled out).After a nuclear war in which thousands of high-yield weapons are detonated, the increase in biologically dangerous ultraviolet light might be **several hundred percent**. In the more dangerous shorter wavelengths, larger increases would occur. Nucleic acids and proteins, the fundamental molecules for life on Earth, are especially sensitive to ultraviolet radiation. Thus, an increase of the solar ultraviolet flux at the surface of the Earth is potentially **dangerous for life**. These four effects -- obscuring smoke in the troposphere, obscuring dust in the stratophere, the fallout of radioactive debris, and the partial destruction of the ozone layer -- constitute the four known principal adverse environmental consequences that occur after a nuclear war is "over." There may be others about which we are still ignorant. The dust and, especially, the dark soot absorb ordinary visible light from the Sun, **heating the atmosphere** and cooling

### U – AT: Thumpers

#### Hagel nomination comes first --- it’s Obama’s top priority.

**Karl**, **1/4**/2013 (Jonathan, Obama Poised to Name New Defense, Treasury Chiefs, ABC News, p. <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/obama-poised-defense-treasury-chiefs/story?id=18133924>)

With the "fiscal cliff" crisis behind him, President Obama is poised to name two new key players to his cabinet, with both announcements expected to come next week. Obama will name the replacement for outgoing Defense Secretary Leon Panetta as soon as Monday, sources told ABC News. Former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel is the likely nominee, they said. Meanwhile, the president is also eyeing a replacement for outgoing Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, the longest-serving member of Obama's first-term economic team and one-time lead negotiator for the administration in the "fiscal cliff" talks. Current chief of staff Jack Lew is all but certain to get the nod for Treasury, according to people familiar with Obama's thinking. A White House spokesman cautioned that the president has not yet made a final decision on either post, calling reports about Hagel and Lew "merely guessing." Still, when Obama returns from his Hawaiian vacation on Sunday, he's expected to waste little time filling out his team for a second term.

#### Only nomination matters --- the best chance of stopping Hagel is to prevent nomination.

**Larison**, **12/24**/2012 (Daniel – Ph.D. in History, What Obama's cabinet choices say about his second-term foreign policy, The Week, p. http://theweek.com/bullpen/column/238199/what-obamas-cabinet-choices-say-about-his-second-term-foreign-policy)

Because of his occasional criticisms of Israel, skepticism about military action against Iran, and opposition to Iran sanctions during his career in the Senate, Hagel has been under a steady assault of character assassination and misrepresentation from hawkish Republicans who are increasingly desperate to derail Hagel's nomination before it happens. But make no mistake: Despite the unprecedented smear campaign directed against Sen. Hagel over the last two weeks, he remains the most likely nominee for the defense post. Hagel's confirmation hearings will be more difficult and contentious than anything Kerry will have to face. But it also seems very unlikely that there are enough senators in both parties prepared to deny him confirmation once Obama formally selects him. While Hagel's detractors are very energized and vocal, they do not seem to be in a position to prevent him from being confirmed. What these detractors evidently hope to do is discourage Obama from nominating him in the first place.

#### Gun control isn’t anywhere close to being on the docket

**The Republic**, **1/4**/2013 (‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight, p. http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html)

Brent Wilkes, national executive director of LULAC, is hopeful Congress will introduce a comprehensive immigration bill by March or April and vote on it by August. After that, lawmakers facing midterm elections in 2014 will be less willing to take on controversial issues such as immigration reform out of fear their vote could hurt their chances of re-election, he said. After the midterm election, the 2016 presidential election immediately will begin to heat up, and by then, the impact of the 2012 Latino vote may have worn off, he said. Although still optimistic that Obama and Congress will move forward on immigration reform early this year, Wilkes said he is concerned that the protracted battle over spending cuts and the debt ceiling will divert the president’s attention from immigration reform. A drawn-out debate over spending cuts could also divert the attention of pro-comprehensive-reform advocacy groups like LULAC that don’t want to see spending cuts to domestic programs that help Hispanic families, he said. Wilkes said he is less worried about gun control because that issue will have to travel through different subcommittees from immigration reform. He also thinks gun-control legislation won’t be introduced until next year.

### AT: Debt Ceiling/Gun Control Thumper

#### Biden will head gun control not Obama.

**Mandel**, **1/4**/2013 (Seth, Obama’s Immigration Dilemma, Commentary Magazine, p. <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/04/obamas-immigration-dilemma/>)

But what’s the administration’s excuse for delaying reform yet again? It’s that they really, really wanted to do immigration reform early, but Obama’s “timetable has been complicated by the prospect of another round of fiscal negotiations over the debt ceiling in February and the president’s pledge to support a gun-control bill in the wake of the mass school shooting in Newtown, Conn.” Of course the president cannot control events. And sure, man plans while God laughs, and all that. But this is a bit disingenuous. Judging by the way the “fiscal cliff” compromise was reached, Vice President Joe Biden is the White House’s negotiator with Congress, not the president–who not only wasn’t participating constructively in the last-minute dealmaking but was happy to demonstrate as much by holding a campaign-style photo op/stand-up comedy routine while Biden and the GOP leadership were busy working. And speaking of Joe Biden, he’s the one in charge of the gun control issue as well, with the president designating Biden to lead a commission to figure out what legislation, if any, is needed or politically possible in the wake of the shooting. Since “Prime Minister” Biden (as Jonathan so aptly dubbed him yesterday) is working on all the issues that are supposedly taking up the president’s time, Obama went back to finish his Hawaii vacation.

#### Obama will push solar initiatives.

**Colman**, 8/7/**2012** (Zack, Obama fast-tracks federal wind, solar energy projects, The Hill, p. <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/242505-white-house-expedites-solar-energy-projects-as-part-of-green-push>)

President Obama is fast-tracking seven federal wind and solar projects as the administration touts its energy policies amid GOP criticism over green investments and rising gas prices. The projects in Arizona, California, Nevada and Wyoming will produce 5,000 megawatts of power, enough to run 1.5 million homes, the White House said in a statement announcing the decision. “These seven proposed solar and wind projects have great potential to grow our nation’s energy independence, drive job creation, and power economies across the west,” Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said in a written statement. While the expedited projects announced Tuesday deal with electricity, rather than direct fuel substitutes for gasoline, it's nonetheless part of a wider push to promote the administration's policies on alternative energy and energy security.

### FIT – 2NC

#### 1NC Dong evidence indicates that FIT’s are very unpopular and will be an obstacle in congress. Prefer our evidence because it is specific ti FiT’s and their perception.

#### Plan unpopular

Rickerson 08

[Wilson Rickerson- Wind-Works, May 2008, <http://www.wind-works.org/FeedLaws/USA/Feed-in_Tariffs_and_Renewable_Energy_in_the_USA_-_a_Policy_Update.pdf>]

In addition to the state-level feed-in tariff bills, there is a significant effort to move feed-in tariff legislation forward at the federal level. In May, 2008, Congressman Jay Inslee (WA-1 st -D) introduced a national feed-in tariff bill, which he refers to as a renewable energy payment (REP). The bill includes three main design elements that are modeled on the most successful national policies in Europe: 1) guaranteed interconnection through uniform minimum standards, 2) a mandatory purchase requirement through fixed-rate 20-year contracts and 3) rate recovery through a regionally partitioned national system benefits charge. ) Under the proposed law, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) would set standards for the priority interconnection and transmission of power from new “renewable energy facilities”, which include renewable energy facilities 20 MW or less. The FERC and the states would then be required to implement these standards within their own respective areas of jurisdiction when renewable energy facility owners request interconnection. 2) The bill would then require all electric utilities in the US to enter into fixed-rate, 20-year power purchase agreements at the request of any new renewable energy facility owner. The FERC would set minimum national REP rates at levels designed to provide for full cost recovery, plus a 10% internal rate of return on investment, for commercialized technologies under good resource conditions. REP rates would be differentiated on the basis of energy technology, the size of the system, and the year that the system was placed in service. Utilities would earn any associated RECs in order to help meet RPS requirements. As with interconnection, the FERC and the states would each implement the rules of the Inslee bill for all renewable energy facilities that fall within their respective regulatory jurisdictions. 3) The bill would facilitate cost recovery through a private renewable energy utility organization (called, “RenewCorps”) that would be independent, yet subject to FERC oversight. Utilities would be reimbursed by RenewCorps for the additional cost of their power purchases, plus all costs associated with interconnection and network upgrades needed to accommodate these new facilities. To reimburse utilities, RenewCorps would raise revenues through a regionally partitioned national system benefits charge on every electric customer in the US 14 . Given its success in Europe, there are multiple reasons for introducing a national feed-in tariff bill in the US, but Inslee’s primary motivation is to create long-term investment security for the rapid deployment of renewable energy technologies (Inslee, 2008). Furthermore, with renewable energy tax credits on track to expire again at the end of 2008, there is a growing interest in establishing a more stable policy support mechanism for the US renewable energy industry. From a regulatory perspective, the three design elements central to Inslee’s proposal challenge state-federal jurisdictional boundaries and arguably conflict with certain trends toward market competition in the US electric sector. For example, any attempt to guarantee or prioritize the interconnection and transmission of electricity from renewable energy sources would mark an exception to existing “open access” rules, which are designed to be non-discriminatory. On the other hand, there is a growing recognition that existing, first-in-first-out interconnection queuing practices have become a serious impediment to renewable energy deployment throughout the country 15 . Another concern is that states are generally protective of their ratemaking authority. This precedent goes back to at least 1935, when the Federal Power Act assigned interstate wholesale transmission of electricity to federal authority, while reserving legal authority over ratemaking for retail service and over utility cost recovery to the states. This precedent changed somewhat in 1978, when Congress passed PURPA. PURPA’s Section 210 requires all electric utilities to interconnect "qualifying facilities" (non-utility renewable and cogeneration power producers) and to purchase their electricity at an "avoided cost" rate. Implementation of this "avoided cost" requirement was left to the States, with mixed results from the renewable generation perspective (Guey-Lee, 1999). Inslee’s bill seeks to avoid a politically untenable expansion of FERC jurisdiction wherever possible. It is arguable that providing flexibility to states could risk the potential for a national policy to not be properly adopted and implemented in every state. From a practical standpoint, however, FERC lacks the capacity on its own to effectively manage a new national renewable energy policy on the scale of Inslee’s proposal. Furthermore, there are significant benefits to preserving local control over interconnection and transmission, especially since an increasing number of states are actively engaged in the technical challenge of regional planning and integration of renewable electricity generation into the grid. Since the program is optional for new generators, the Inslee bill would not preempt state programs. Under current law, utility cost recovery for investments in new generation is also mostly left up to each state’s authority. State utility commissions generally review proposed projects and approve the ones that serve customers in the most cost-effective manner. Though the Inslee bill would impose a national system benefits charge, this would be done as a transparent line item on each electric customer’s bill. Since the federal tax credits have not been entirely reliable, some states and utilities may welcome a rate recovery mechanism for new generation and network upgrades. Also, to limit the amount of interstate wealth transfer, cost sharing under the bill would be done regionally. From a political perspective, moving the Inslee PBI bill through the US Congress is not expected to be easy (Tezak and Stanco, 2008), despite the bill’s attempts to balance federal and state jurisdictional concerns. In addition to resistance to national renewable energy legislation from the conventional energy industry, there is not unanimity among solar industry stakeholders that the Inslee proposal is the best place for limited lobbying efforts to be focused (Browning, 2008; Hering, 2008 Hoexter, 2008; Kho, 2008). On the other hand, there is substantial grass-roots support for the concept from investors, renewable energy companies, and non-governmental advocacy groups (Inslee, 2008).

#### FIT is controversial --- even its support is limited.

**PV Tech**, 8/12/**2012** (Bill Clinton: fan of solar feed-in-tariffs thinks we should “get” the clean energy tattoo, p. http://www.pv-tech.org/editors\_blog/bill\_clinton\_fan\_of\_solar\_feed\_in\_tariffs\_thinks\_we\_should\_get\_the\_clean\_en)

Feed-in-tariffs are a controversial subject in the US where the energy industry likes to pretend that free market economics applies to this sector. You might expect clean energy antagonists to baulk: "Let the government set the price for electricity — are you crazy? Let the market decide." But even clean energy protagonists are divided about the true value of FiTs in sustainable markets: "Set the mandated rate too high and we'll have a Spanish boom and bust scenario on our hands. We don't want that."

#### Draws Obama in.

**Llorens**, 10/23/**2012** (Dave – Founder of One Block Off the Grid, A Better Solyndra – How to Double U.S. Solar Power for No Extra Money, The Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-llorens/a-better-solyndra-how-to-\_b\_1974797.html)

The Solyndra debacle grabs so much attention because it's such a sensational example of the government picking winners and losers, and because it's loudly wielded as a weapon against the Obama administration. The latter fact is silly considering that the Department of Energy Loan program, what funded Solyndra's loan guarantee, was actually started by President G.W. Bush. The program's mission is to "accelerate the domestic commercial deployment of innovative and advanced clean energy," -- and provides loan guarantees to certain companies it chooses to. This means that private banks can fund the companies at low-interest rates because, in the event of bankruptcy, Uncle Sam will foot the bill (the program actually set aside $10 billion to cover these losses). So far, including Solyndra, the losses are about half a billion. Private capital was lost as well, as it's difficult for investors to sit on the sidelines and not play ball with a company that just got $500 million in effectively free money, regardless of whether it's a good business or not.

### A2: Link Turn

#### Support is diminishing - Solyndra

Cart, 12 (Julie, LA Times Staff Writer, April 26, “Public split over elimination of U.S. energy subsidies, poll finds,” Los Angeles Times, April 26, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/26/local/la-me-enviro-poll-20120426)

The Yale-George Mason University poll being released Thursday found that 76% of Americans support regulating carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas pollutant and that two-thirds believe the U.S. should pursue policies to reduce its carbon footprint. Support for federal funding of renewable energy appears to be slipping, perhaps in response to the bankruptcy of the solar manufacturing company Solyndra, which had received federal loan guarantees.

### Political Capital Key – A2: Dickinson

#### He concludes Neg

Dickinson 9 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212). To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power. Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto and finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents do influence the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, Matthew Beckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.).

#### Capital determines Obama’s will to fight for Hagel.

**Golinkin**, **12/21**/2012 (Jeb – 3L at the University of Texas School of Law, Does President Obama know what he wants? The Week, p. <http://theweek.com/article/index/238164/does-president-obama-know-what-he-wants>)

Let us begin with Chuck Hagel and Susan Rice. The president wanted to nominate Susan Rice to be secretary of state (she withdrew because of GOP opposition), and he seems prepared to nominate Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense (Hagel faces similar opposition). Of course, the president has the constitutional authority to nominate members of his cabinet as well as enough Democratic votes in the Senate to confirm virtually any nominee he can get past a potential filibuster. But that he can pick whoever he wants does not mean that he should, which is where Rice and Hagel raise questions. Being the secretary of either state or defense is undoubtedly a powerful and important position. But in the grand scheme of things, getting the exact nominee a president wants is not vital. Why? Because cabinet members serve directly under the executive (i.e. they answer to the president), and their decisions will mirror the president's wishes. This contrasts quite radically from judicial nominees — especially Supreme Court appointees — who, if confirmed, gain life tenure and play an incredibly important role in shaping the legal landscape while not answering to any political body. The bottom line is that a president with limited political capital has far less incentive to fight for a specific individual to serve in his cabinet than he might for a specific judge. So why is the president bothering with Rice and Hagel? It is utterly puzzling. Obama has limited political capital. Thinking strategically about his long-term political goals, why on Earth would he deliberately rankle GOP senators when he could select a similarly valuable candidate without fostering ill will on the right? Might the Hagel/Rice sagas merely reflect poor political judgment? Perhaps. But one of the dirty little secrets of the 2012 presidential campaign is that Barack Obama provided almost no vision for his next four years in office — his campaign focused almost entirely on destroying Mitt Romney's character. The result: We know almost nothing about what the president really intends to focus on. The fact that President Obama never took the time or effort to paint a clear picture of his vision for the next four years, coupled with the quixotic way he is handling seemingly uncomplicated nomination processes on the Hill, makes me wonder whether that vision even exists, or whether it is being cobbled together on the fly. Either way, the conclusion is troubling. If the vision does exist, then the fact that he has been so aggressive in pushing potential nominees to which the GOP is overtly hostile suggests that the president failed to learn the most important political lesson of his first four years, which is that he can do very little without Republican support. If, on the other hand, the president is only now thinking about what he wants to do with his next four years, he had better come up with a vision quickly, because trying to navigate from event to event without any comprehensive vision is apt to create an incoherent jumble of policy decisions that result in no real legacy and, more importantly, no real progress in any one direction.

### Political Capital Key – 2NC

#### Presidential leadership shapes the agenda

Kuttner 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>)

As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, the essence of a president’s power is “the power to persuade.” Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt’s classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.

### A2: Winners Win – 2NC

#### Obama thinks that pol cap is finite – he’ll back off controversial issues even if he’s winning

Kuttner 9 (Robert – , co-editor of The American Prospect and a senior fellow at Demos, author of "Obama's Challenge: America's Economic Crisis and the Power of a Transformative Presidency, 4/28/9, “Obama Has Amassed Enormous Political Capital, But He Doesn't Know What to Do with It,” [http://www.alternet.org/economy/138641/obama\_has\_amassed\_enormous\_political\_capital,\_but\_he\_doesn%27t\_know\_what\_to\_do\_with\_it/?page=entire](http://www.alternet.org/economy/138641/obama_has_amassed_enormous_political_capital%2C_but_he_doesn%27t_know_what_to_do_with_it/?page=entire))

We got a small taste of what a more radical break might feel like when Obama briefly signaled with the release of Bush's torture memos that he might be open to further investigation of the Bush's torture policy, but then backtracked and quickly asked the Democratic leadership to shut the idea down. Evidently, Obama's political self wrestled with his constitutional conscience, and won. Civil libertarians felt a huge letdown, but protest was surprisingly muted.

Thus the most important obstacle for seizing the moment to achieve enduring change: Barack Obama's conception of what it means to promote national unity. Obama repeatedly declared during the campaign that he would govern as a consensus builder. He wasn't lying. However, there are two ways of achieving consensus. One is to split the difference with your political enemies and the forces obstructing reform. The other is to use presidential leadership to transform the political center and alter the political dynamics. In his first hundred days, Obama has done a little of both, but he defaults to the politics of accommodation.

#### Winners lose – any major win is the quickest way to kill future proposals. The GOP will backlash

**The Economist**, 2/16/**2011** (What’s the equilibrium here?, p. lexis)

The Obama administration's theory of policymaking amid divided government is a frustrating one. What most people want from the president is to lead. And leading, in this case, means giving a speech, getting behind some unpopular ideas, trying to change public opinion... But the White House has come to the conclusion that that type of leadership doesn't work. It believes that the **quickest way to kill a controversial proposal** in a polarized political system is to have the president endorse it. Once a high-profile proposal is associated with the White House, Republicans (correctly) view its passage as a **threat to their political fortunes**. That's why the Obama administration didn't endorse a payroll tax holiday until after the election, when it emerged as part of the tax deal. Endorsing it before the election would've "**poisoned the well**," one administration official told me after. Republicans would have had to attack it, and that would have made it impossible for them to endorse it later. The Obama administration may have a point here. Consider one item that the president has repeatedly, openly pushedinvestment in America's long-neglected intercity rail system. Republican governors are cancelling rail plans as fast as they can. Florida Governor Rick Scott just scrapped a Florida plan, despite the fact that the federal government was going to cover most of the capital costs, while private companies were offering to cover the rest in exchange for the right to operate the line. On the other hand, Mr Obama responded to Republican budget proposals that avoided addressing entitlements by...releasing a budget that avoided addressing entitlements. And lo and behold, Republican congressional leaders are now scrambling to include entitlement reforms in new budget plans. Maybe the president has this whole reverse psychology thing figured out. But I doubt this is a stable equilibrium. The GOP's reflexive **anti-Obama streak** is motivated, one presumes, by a desire to win elections. One supposes that they feel they must **deny him legislative victories** in order to be successful at the ballot box. So for a while, presidential abdication of leadership may create political space for something like honest legislative negotiations over policy. But a grand bargain that takes place under Mr Obama's watch is a **political victory** for Mr Obama, whether or not he led the charge. And the GOP is **unlikely to let the president have such a win**.

#### Controversial wins bleed momentum not build it.

**Politico**, 1/20/**2010** (Obama's first year: What went wrong, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9)

Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.