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### 1

#### A. Financial incentives are distinct from feed-in tariffs, and the aff adds restrictions

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.

#### B. Negative Interpretation is Superior

1-Limits-Our interpretation provides a clear bright line with a large list of core affirmative mechanisms like grants, loans, loan guarantees, and tax credits. Their interpretation explodes the topic by allowing indirect incentives like regulations.

2-Ground-Their interpretation makes the topic bidirectional. Our interpretation makes regulations and mandates core negative ground. Creating a fair balance of affirmative and negative ground is important for manageable research burdens and clash.

### **2**

The fifty states and all relevant territories should establish Public Utility Commissions which shall establish feed in tariff programs for each electric utility.

The cp allows states to wiggle through federal preemption---solves the case

Gleason 12 (Jennifer Gleason, Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide “Available Paths for Designing Strong State Feed-in Tariffs1”https://www.elaw.org/system/files/model.FIT\_.paths\_.feb29.pdf)

\*purpa = public utility regulatory policies act

A state can implement a FIT under PURPA and require separate payment for RECs generated along with the purchased electricity. This can be accomplished two ways. The state could proceed without requiring utilities to procure specific amounts of electricity from particular sources or it can require this procurement (as above under the more straightforward implementation under PURPA). Possible language for a state law implementing a FIT under the first scenario: Renewable Energy Certificates Along with the purchase of electricity from qualified facilities at the utility’s avoided cost as required under PURPA, each electric utility must purchase the associated renewable energy certificate. The electric utility will pay:  $X for each renewable energy certificate that accompanies electricity generated from wind;  $Y for each renewable energy certificate that accompanies electricity generated from solar photovoltaic systems with installed capacity up to and including 30kW; and  $Z for each renewable energy certificate that accompanies electricity generated from solar photovoltaic systems with installed capacity up to and including 1 MW. [Under this scenario avoided cost would be the traditional calculation of avoided cost that would be set for any available electricity that the utility could purchase. A cap could be set by simply stating that these prices for RECs apply until a utility has X MW of electricity from each of the sources the state wants to include.] [Note that generators would need to be qualified facilities.] Possible language for a state law implementing a FIT under the second scenario: The Public Utility Commission shall establish a feed-in tariff program for each electric utility. [Omitting other provisions of a FIT, not relating to setting rates.] Renewable Energy Capacity Requirements On or before [X date], each electric utility shall procure electricity equivalent to five percent of the electricity sold by the utility to retail electricity customers from wind energy, two percent of the electricity sold by the utility to retail electricity customers from solar photovoltaic systems with installed capacity up to and including 30kW, and two percent of the electricity sold by the utility to retail electricity customers from solar photovoltaic systems with installed capacity up to and including 1 MW.12

#### States solve and are modeled

Rabe 6 (Barry G. Rabe is a professor of public policy at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan. “Second Generation Climate Policies in the American States: Proliferation, Diffusion and Regionalization” http://208elmp02.blackmesh.com/sites/default/files/paperrabe1.pdf)

Much of the existing infrastructure of state climate programs has been individually tailored to the needs of a particular state. However, there is increasing evidence that some policies enacted in one state ultimately are being replicated in one or more additional states. There is, in fact, precedent in other policy arenas for such “policy diffusion” to spread across the nation and become, in effect, a de facto national policy (Mossberger 2000). Under such circumstances, it may be possible for the states to simply negotiate inter-state differences and implement these inter-related programs. There may also be some tipping point at which diffusion reaches sufficient numbers of states that the federal government concludes that it should respond by drawing from these state models and establishing some version of this on a national basis. In the late 1980s, for example, the Reagan Administration actively opposed a federal role in increasing energy efficiency standards for a wide range of household appliances. After more than two dozen states responded with some form of state-specific regulation, the Congress and President Reagan negotiated a federal bill that drew heavily on state experience but preempted all existing state laws in the process. There are several areas in which enactment of a climate policy in one jurisdiction has already been duplicated elsewhere. In 2000, Nebraska enacted carbon sequestration legislation, designed to promote changes in agricultural practice that could result in less use of fossil fuels in farming and increase the capacity of state-grown crops to sequester carbon through growing plant material. Shortly thereafter, three other states adopted essentially identical legislation, although there was virtually no contact between officials in the respective states during this period. However, the policy tool that appears to be diffusing most rapidly is the renewable portfolio standard (RPS), which has been establish in 22 states and the District of Columbia as of mid-2005. The first RPS was enacted in 1991 in Iowa, with little if any attention to greenhouse gas impacts. Subsequently, the pace of adoption has intensified, with four new RPS programs approved in 2005 and three existing ones significantly expanded during that period.

A national FiT does NOT require a federal policy---cp is MORE THAN ENOUGH

Energy Trend 11 (“Feed-In Tariff: Does the United States Need a National Policy?” http://www.energytrend.com/US\_FeedinTariff)

Adopting an American FIT Policy The adoption of a national feed-in tariff in the US does not have to involve a full-scale feed-in tariff. Neither does a FIT preclude RPS, but works in tandem with RSP and other programs. Last year, Jay Inslee (D-WA) introduced a national FIT bill modeled after Germany's successful policy. In July 2010, H.R.5883 - Renewable Energy Jobs and Security Act- made its way to the House Ways and Means Committee. The bill has yet to resurface. Until policy makers catch up to the desires of informed US people, it seems states, such as California, Wisconsin, and local municipalities like Gainesville, Florida, will need to continue taking the lead in enacting FIT strategies at the local level. When visiting Gainesville in February 2009, Murray Cameron, vice president of the European Photovoltaic Industry Association, stated Germany's road to success with feed-in tariffs began at the local level.

### 4

Comprehensive immigration reform will pass but the situation is precarious

CNBC 1/27 (“Obama Turns Focus This Week to Immigration Reform” http://www.cnbc.com/id/100410666)

Immigration reform will take center stage this week with President Barack Obama giving a major policy speech to relaunch his push for reform while a bipartisan group of senators is also expected to release its own ideas for new legislation. Amid the fiercely partisan discussions over fiscal issues that have dominated Washington since the election, there are indications of solid cross-party support for some form of immigration reform, with several leading Republicans urging the party to back significant changes. The center piece of any new legislation is likely to be the establishment of a mechanism for the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants currently in the US to obtain legal status. However, previous reform efforts have foundered despite enjoying strong support, and the tense atmosphere between the White House and some congressional Republicans could yet present an insurmountable obstacle. Mr Obama, who pledged to introduce new legislation during the election campaign, will give a speech on immigration reform on Tuesday in Las Vegas, the first major policy address of his second term. Bob Menendez, the New Jersey senator who met the president on Friday to discuss the issue, said Mr Obama had made it clear that it was "a top legislative priority for him in this session of the Congress" and that creating a pathway to "earned legalization" would be a central part of any immigration reform bill. Mr Menendez is part of a group of six senators from both parties expected this week to introduce their own set of ideas for what a reform package will contain. On the Republican side, some of the groundwork has already been laid by Florida senator Marco Rubio. "There's a new appreciation on both sides of the aisle including, maybe more importantly on the Republican side of the aisle, that we have to enact comprehensive immigration reform," John McCain, another of the Republican senators in the bipartisan group, said on ABC's This Week. Mr McCain added: "Look at the last election. We are losing dramatically the Hispanic vote, which we think should be ours, for a variety of reasons, and we've got to understand that."

#### Plan costs political capital – renewables push causes backlash

Leone 12 Steve is the Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World. "Part 2: Political Reality and the Way Forward for Renewable Energy," April 3, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/04/part-2-political-reality-and-the-way-forward-for-renewable-energy

In Washington, it’s hard enough to craft legislation even in relatively amicable times. In the tense atmosphere on the Hill today, meaningful legislation takes a ringside seat, and the game becomes theater. That’s where we are now. In one corner is the House budget, essentially the Republican Party’s line in the sand that’s been drawn over the size of the federal government. A key component of this is the federal government’s more limited role in supporting a clean energy future. In the other corner is the White House and the Democrat-controlled Senate, which has vowed to stonewall any legislation that it says caters to the super-wealthy and the entrenched fossil fuels industry. Like two tired boxers in the ring, they’re content to leave it in the hands of the judges — in this case the voters, who will in many ways determine the force with which our federal government pursues a national policy built on clean energy. But the real prospects for any meaningful legislation is likely to come after the election, when the rhetoric cools and when political capital comes due. Until then, most industry observers don’t expect much chance of any real federal renewable energy legislation passing through a divided Congress. That means no Clean Energy Standard, no revival of the 1603 Treasury grant program, no extension of the Production Tax Credit until the end of the year at the earliest. There are just too few vehicles that can be used to pass any of the measures, and too little trust between key negotiators to find find common ground. One of the last best hopes — the transportation bill — included an amendment that addressed some of these concerns. Ultimately, the amendment went nowhere, and the renewable industry was left looking months down the road to when something could get resolved. The question now is will it be too late. For 1603 to be brought back to life, it would require a major shift in thinking, especially in the House. The PTC has a better shot, but international players in the wind industry are already indicating that they’ll get out of the market if the credit tied to energy produced expires. Will they wait around until the end of the year to see if it can be revived? It’s increasingly looking like the answer may be no.

Resources are limited – Obama doesn’t have time and energy to get energy and immigration reform

Davenport-energy correspondent for National Journal-12/6/12

How Obama and Congress Could Find Common Ground on Energy

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/how-obama-and-congress-could-find-common-ground-on-energy-20121206>

AGAINST THE CLOCK One big obstacle is time. A second-term president has about two years to push through major legislation before the next presidential campaign begins. In addition, two huge issues are already on the docket: immigration and tax reform. A sweeping overhaul of the nation’s tax code, which could easily absorb Congress through 2014, offers the first opportunity for major energy reform. Some lawmakers will probably insert a carbon-tax swap proposal in a broader tax-reform package, although for now the carbon tax seems unlikely to succeed. Democrats will also try to end tax breaks for the oil industry while extending those for renewable energy. But if the tax-reform debate ends without comprehensive new energy provisions, it may be too late to enact an energy overhaul. “If President Obama has victories on immigration and the deficit, that’s two potentially momentous victories for the president in a second term, where victories are not typical,” says historian Alfred Zacher, author of Trial and Triumph: Presidential Power in the Second Term. “It’s difficult to believe he’d win three.” Still, Zacher says, “because of his desire for a legacy, and the fact that he won’t need to worry about his base or reelection, he could come up with some unexpected environmental solutions. He’ll have to be a very capable politician, but if he can pull it off, he’ll be revered.” Ultimately, as Dorgan puts it, “there needs to be a will to do it, and it needs to come from the president and the leaders of Congress. If there’s not a will on the part of the president and the leaders of the House and Senate, it won’t happen. He needs to make it a priority.” If President Obama wants a legacy on energy, he’ll have to bring to the issue the same passion that candidate Obama once did.

Obama needs political capital to pass comprehensive reform---Democrats will block high skilled only legislation

Politico.com 1/15/13

HEADLINE: Lawmakers divided over immigration Jessica Meyers

Key lawmakers see opportunity this session to address immigration reform but remain stymied on a central issue: whether to tackle it in chunks or in one complete package. "Every member of Congress will find something in a comprehensive bill that they will not like," Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) said at Tuesday's POLITICO Pro Tech Deep Dive focused on Immigration, Technology and the 113th Congress. "We should have a series of bills -- four, five or six bills -- that we debate separately but that we vote together on the House floor." (PHOTOS: 20 quotes on immigration reform) Labrador accused the White House of aiming for a "political victory" instead of a "policy victory." Silicon Valley Democrat Zoe Lofgren redirected the blame to Congress. "I have had Republicans say they don't want Obama to do a bill because they want flexibility, but if he doesn't do a bill, he's criticized," she said. "I'm waiting for a signal from the speaker on what he wants to do. It's not that tough, it's just the decision to do it." Tech companies are lobbying hard for immigration reforms that would allow foreign employees to fill unmet demand and ensure they maintain global competitiveness. And all three lawmakers agree the system needs fixing. The difficulty lies in figuring out how to do it. But the issue is a special challenge for Republicans, who must reconcile shifting demographics and a history of no-mercy enforcement. "The Republicans have been really pathetic, quite frankly, to communicate our position on this," Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) said. Chaffetz pushed a bill last session that would have lifted the country caps on visas for high-skilled workers. Tech companies like Microsoft and Google embraced the bill. The legislation passed the House but failed in the Senate. And Labrador has become a leading GOP voice on immigration changes, saying his decision to run for governor hinges on whether Congress implements reforms. He and Chaffetz advocated last session for legislation that would have granted up to 55,000 visas to noncitizens who complete certain science, technology, engineering and math degrees at American universities. Democrats lambasted the bill, known as the STEM Jobs Act, as a token Republican move to garner minority support. The Senate shot the bill down. "I want us to be known as the pro-immigration party," Labrador said. "I want us to be known that we welcome people to this country, that we want people to be successful. I want our party to take this lead on immigration reform." Democrats in both chambers are pushing for more overarching legislation, calling smaller attempts political posturing. "Everybody wants their piece," Lofgren said. "You talk to the ag people, you can't do the tech thing because we need migrant farm workers. You've got husbands and wives separated for half a decade. What's that do for our country? We have 2 million migrant farm workers who don't have their papers, and without them we don't have an agricultural industry." Lofgren has advocated for encompassing legislation that would grant citizenship to some undocumented immigrants who came to the United States at an early age and go on to college or the military. "I know these guys want to get something done," she said. "The Republicans are going to lose, lose, lose if they don't change on this issue. But it's not the same political calculation within districts." President Barack Obama has vowed to prioritize the issue this session, likely in one comprehensive bill. This would avoid Republican attempts to break it into smaller bits and address highly skilled workers, younger illegal immigrant and farm workers in separate bills. Immigration groups have voiced angst that the president has not moved faster to enact substantial reform. The administration has deported record numbers of illegal immigrants. But it also has started to make significant strides to expedite changes -- even without Congress. Obama signed an executive order in June that ordered Homeland Security officials to halt deportation proceedings against immigrants who entered the country as children and who have finished high school or joined the military. Similar legislation known as the DREAM Act has stalled in Congress. Obama is expected to lay out his plans as soon as his State of the Union speech next month. A bipartisan group of senators also is working on a reform bill.

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

Nye 12/10 Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. His most recent book is The Future of Power. 12/10/12, Project Syndicate, Immigration and American Power, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>

Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US. Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both. Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US. That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### American primacy reduces the likelihood of every scenario for great power war.

**Kagan 2007**

Robert, End of Dreams, Return of History, Hoover Institute, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6136>

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.

#### Reform is key to the economy and high skilled workers

Farrell 12/13/12 (Chris, a contributing editor for Bloomberg Businessweek. From 1986-97, he was on the magazine's staff, as a corporate finance staff and department editor and then as an economics editor. Farrell wrote Right on the Money: Taking Control of Your Personal Finances and Deflation: What Happens When Prices Fall? Among Farrell's many awards are a National Magazine Award, two Loeb Awards, and the Edward R. Murrow Award. Farrell is a graduate of the London School of Economics and Stanford University. “Obama’s Next Act: Immigration Reform” <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-12-13/obamas-next-act-immigration-reform>)

Washington won’t get much of a reprieve from verbal pyrotechnics once the drama of the fiscal cliff is over. Up next: major immigration reform. President Obama has made it clear that a comprehensive overhaul of the nation’s badly frayed immigration system is a second-term priority. Many Republican lawmakers are convinced the big takeaway from the 2012 election results is that conservatives need to rethink their hard-line stance on immigration—including illegal immigrants. Here’s what Washington should do before tackling the tough job of rewriting the immigration laws: Create a quicksilver path to citizenship for the 11 million to 12 million undocumented workers in the U.S. (excluding the small number convicted of violent crimes or multiple felonies). The shift in status acknowledges that these foreign-born newcomers, like previous generations of immigrants, overcame significant obstacles to come to the U.S. to make a better life for their families. Illegal immigrants are neighbors heading off to work, sending their kids to school, and attending church. Their everyday lives would vastly improve by moving from the shadows of society into the mainstream. More important from a public-policy perspective, the change would give a boost to the economy’s underlying dynamism. “What you’re doing in the short run is making it easier for workers to move between jobs, a relatively small effect,” says Gordon Hanson, a professor of economics at the University of California at San Diego. “The larger effect from eliminating uncertainty for these immigrants is creating incentives for them to make long-term investments in careers, entrepreneurship, education, homes, and community.” Let’s state the obvious: A rapid transformation of illegal immigrants into legal immigrants isn’t in the cards. Amnesty—let alone citizenship—is an anathema to large parts of the electorate. Too bad, since the scholarly evidence is compelling that immigrants—documented or not, legal or illegal—are a boon to the net economy. “Competition fosters economic growth,” says Michael Clemens, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development in Washington. The economic return from attracting skilled immigrants to the U.S. is well known. Foreign-born newcomers account for some 13 percent of the population, yet they are responsible for one-third of U.S. patented innovations. The nation’s high-tech regions such as Silicon Valley, the Silicon Hills of Austin, Tex., and Boston’s Route 128 rely on immigrant scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs, and employees. Better yet, economist Enrico Moretti at the University of California at Berkeley calculates that a 1 percent increase in the share of college-educated immigrants in a city hikes productivity and wages for others in the city. Less appreciated is how much the economy gains from the efforts of less-skilled immigrants, including illegal workers. Throughout the country, foreign-born newcomers have revived beaten-down neighborhoods as immigrant entrepreneurs have opened small businesses and immigrant families have put down stakes. Immigrant workers have played a vital role keeping a number of industries competitive, such as agriculture and meatpacking. Cities with lots of immigrants have seen their per capita tax base go up, according to David Card, an economist at UC Berkeley. Despite the popular impression that a rising tide of immigrants is associated with higher crime rates, research by Robert Sampson of Harvard University and others offer a compelling case that it’s no coincidence that the growing ranks of immigrants tracks the reduction in crime in the U.S. But don’t newcomers—legal and illegal—drive down wages and job opportunities for American workers? Not really. A cottage industry of economic studies doesn’t find any negative effect on native-born wages and employment on the local level. On the national level the research shows the impact on native-born Americans doesn’t drift far from zero, either positively or negatively. “In both cases, immigrants are more likely to complement the job prospects of U.S.-born citizens than they are to compete for the same jobs as U.S.-born citizens,” Giovanni Peri, an economist at the University of California at Davis, writes in Rationalizing U.S. Immigration Policy: Reforms for Simplicity, Fairness, and Economic Growth. The counterintuitive results reflect a numbers of factors. Immigrants expand the size of the economic pie by creating new businesses, new jobs, and new consumers. Middle-class families find it easier to focus on careers with affordable immigrant labor offering gardening, child care, and other services. Many illegal immigrants aren’t fluent in English, so they don’t compete for the same jobs as native-born workers. Another factor behind the lack of direct competition is the higher educational level of native-born Americans. In 1960 about half of U.S.-born working-age adults hadn’t completed high school, while the comparable figure today is about 8 percent. The real downside concern is on the fiscal side of the immigrant ledger. Yes, more taxes would go into Social Security, Medicare, and the like with legalization, but more people would qualify for Medicaid, welfare, and other benefits. At the local level, many school districts are strained financially from educating immigrant children, legal and illegal. That said, the prospect of fiscal costs would diminish as newly legalized immigrant workers move freely around the country seeking jobs, entrepreneurs are comfortable expanding their payrolls, and immigrant parents push their children to live the American Dream. “Over time, as entrepreneurs emerge and families are better able to get their kids through high school and college, you’re reducing the long-run fiscal claim of the group,” says Hanson. There is no economic evidence that making roughly 6 percent of the workforce illegal will benefit the economy. Plenty of research supports the opposite case. A fast track to legality offers Washington a rare twofer: a just move that’s economically efficient.

### 3

China assuming leadership role in clean energy-exploiting weak US incentives policy

Bloomberg Business Week 4/11/12

http://www.businessweek.com/printer/articles/42246?type=bloomberg

U.S. government policies are creating a “boom-and-bust” in renewable energy investment, threaten a lead the nation regained over China for the technologies last year, the Pew Charitable Trusts said. U.S. investment reached $48.1 billion in 2011, largely in wind and solar power, the Washington-based research group said today in a report based on Bloomberg New Energy Finance data. Those funds trumped the $45.5 billion China allocated to renewables, for lead for the U.S. since 2008. The jump to the top of the G-20 ranking followed developers' efforts to finish projects before incentives expire. With China taking on long-term renewable energy targets and an American tax-break for wind lapsing in 2012, the U.S. again risks losing its edge, said Phyllis Cuttino, Pew’s clean energy director. “China is sending that important policy signal which the United States is failing to do to investors,” Cuttino said in an interview. “Even though China has fallen to number two, it seems as though investment there is going to continue at a very significant level for the foreseeable future. They are going to continue to be a dynamic clean-energy hub for the world.” The U.S. doesn’t have any comparable targets to China’s goals of installing a total of 160 gigawatts of wind power and 50 gigawatts of solar power by 2020, she said. At the same time, a production tax credit benefiting wind producers expires at the end of the year. That’s a threat to the wind industry and has prompted Vestas Wind Systems A/S (VWS), the world’s largest wind turbine maker, to say 1,600 U.S. factory jobs are at risk. Germany, Italy “In the absence of long-term policy, it’s hard to see how the U.S. can grow significantly in the future,” Cuttino said. “The boom-and-bust cycle of U.S. energy policy sends a very different signal to investors” from China. U.S. President Barack Obama took office three years ago pledging to generate jobs in the wind and solar industries. Since then, carbon cap-and-trade legislation has stalled and lawmakers have attacked assistance to renewables after solar manufacturer Solyndra LLC filed for bankruptcy in September. Globally, the installed capacity for renewable power now totals 565 gigawatts, 133 of it in China, 93 in the U.S. and 61 in Germany, according to today’s report. Cuttino said Pew had expected an increased deployment of renewables in 2011, with investment falling, and was surprised spending rose. “This sector is like the little engine that could -- it just keep growing somewhere, somehow,” she said. Germany ranked third for investment in clean energy in 2011, with $30.6 billion, followed by Italy on $28 billion, India on $10.2 billion and the U.K. with $9.4 billion, Pew said.

#### FIT crowds out china leadership

Gipe 10 (Paul Gipe, Contributor “NREL: Feed-in Tariffs Legal in US When Certain Conditions Met” http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2010/02/nrel-feed-in-tariffs-legal-in-us-when-certain-conditions-met)

Other Exemptions Hempling notes that Hawaii, Alaska, and most of Texas are exempt from the Federal Power Act. Long-Term Solutions While the use of RECs or SBC funds to pay for the portion of feed-in tariffs above avoided-cost is administratively more complex and consequently more costly than simply setting a tariff and putting the cost in the rate base, it can be done. Regulatory commissions and the utilities themselves are fully capable of administering such funds — and in fact do so — in several states. While such a system can work, FIT analysts feel that such an approach treats renewable energy differently than other utility-owned conventional generation that is put into the rate base. It sets renewables apart as costs to the system (and subsequently to ratepayers) as opposed to renewables being treated as integral parts of the utility system as they are in Ontario and Germany. That the principle federal law governing renewable energy, PURPA, treats renewable energy in this second-class way shouldn't be surprising, considering that the law passed more than three decades ago. Even then the first major wind farms were not erected in California until several years later when the PUC created the world's first feed-in tariff, California's famous Interim Standard Offer Contract No. 4. It’s All in How You Look at It The answer to the bigger question of whether U.S. law will continue to treat renewable energy as a burdensome addition to the existing utility system remains to be seen. Unless these legal precedents in the U.S. are clarified or revised, many feel that the U.S.' competitive position will continue to erode in comparison to countries such as China, India, Germany, and Japan that look at renewable energy differently.

Chinese lead in renewable energy markets key to economic growth strategy

CNET News 12/1/10 LaMonica

Ernst & Young: China clear leader in renewable energy

<http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-20024232-54.html>

Driven by a surge in wind power installations, China is building on its lead in Ernst & Young's ranking of top renewable energy countries. Wind investment in China this quarter is nearly half of global spending, ensuring that one out of every two wind turbines to go live this year will be in China, according to consultants at Ernst & Young which does a quarterly "country attractiveness" index. The U.S. will see a jump in large solar installations before the end of year because developers are rushing to start projects before the end of the year. In place of a tax credit subsidy, renewable energy projects can now get a grant but that policy may not be renewed. Federal policy uncertainty and the financial markets have hurt the U.S. wind industry which is second in the global wind index. Low natural gas prices have also made solar and wind projects harder to finance. The Ernst & Young report noted that South Korea, which is a large consumer of energy, has risen significantly based on a national policy and well developed supply chain. Beyond solar and wind, China has elevated clean technology to a national strategic level, making it core to its future economic growth, said Ben Warren, the infrastructure advisory leader at Ernst & Young's UK Energy and Environmental, in a statement. "Since reaching top spot in our Index in September, China has opened up a healthy gap from other markets. Cleantech, including renewable energy, represents a significant part of the country's future economic growth plans," he said. "The Chinese solar industry is also fast becoming of great importance in the global market place." The report highlighting China's advances in renewable energy and green tech comes two days after Energy Secretary Steven Chu calling China's push into new energy technologies a "Sputnik moment" for the U.S. He said the U.S. needs to invest in clean energy research and development for economic reasons. As "significant" up-and-coming entrants in clean energy, the Ernst & Young report cites South Korea, Romania, Egypt, and Mexico for their energy technology programs.

#### Nuclear war with Russia

Sharavin 2001

Alexander Sharavin, Director of the Institute of Military and Political Analysis, WHAT THE PAPERS SAY, October 3, 2001, pg. online

China's economy is among the fastest-growing economies in the world. It remains socialistic in many aspects, i.e. extensive and highly expensive, demanding more and more natural resources. China's natural resources are rather limited, whereas the depths of Siberia and the Russian Far East are almost inexhaustible. Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China's population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for "the final throw to the north." The strength of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from late 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China's air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our "eastern brethren" will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

Chinese market domination reducing cost-key to global transition

Financial Times 11/28/11

China’s rush into renewables: The way the world turns

<http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/0502a28a-15c9-11e1-a691-00144feabdc0.html#axzz26682tjcd>

Whatever its elements, the approach brought about a sea change not just in China but around the world. The “China price” for solar panels and wind turbines has up-ended the economics of renewable energy. The cost of a wind turbine today is roughly one-third of what it was in 2007, while solar panel prices have fallen about 40 per cent in the past year alone. The falls have been particularly steep in solar because the increase in Chinese capacity has come on stream just as austerity programmes brought subsidy cuts for solar power in several large markets, including Spain, Italy, Germany and now the UK. The resulting drop in demand has left the world with enough capacity to produce about twice as many modules as will be sold this year. Cheaper panels have been a gift to renewable power generators, bringing their costs down to the point where they can compete against coal- or gas-fired plants in some parts of the world. Wind turbine makers have also benefited from sourcing components in China. “Today our end products are getting cheaper, thanks to China,” says Wolfgang Jussen, the China chief executive of Repower, a German turbine maker. “China was a game-changer.”

Chinese leadership on renewable energy key to global scaling

Runyon-editor renewable energy.com-11/16/07

Worldwatch Report Looks at The Role of Renewables in China's Future

Source: <http://www.renewableenergyaccess.com/rea/news/story?id=50585>

Worldwatch Institute President, Christopher Flavin, drives home the impact China may have on the world. "How this story ends up may have as large an impact on the world's future as it does on China's. If China is able to scale up its renewable energy technologies to the levels needed to have an impact domestically, and if it is able to achieve the low prices needed to succeed in the local market (known in manufacturing circles as the "China price"), it may be virtually inevitable that these same technologies will soon be adopted on a massive scale around the globe." Flavin continues, "the future of the global climate may rest in large measure on China's ability to lead the world into the age of renewable energy, much as the United States led the world into the age of oil roughly a century ago." The fact of the matter is this: there is significant renewable energy potential in China and the time to do something about it is now. Says Schwatrz, "while government and business leaders in the United States dally, the high ground of renewable energy development is being occupied by the Chinese; if we are to meet this challenge and not cede more ground to the Chinese we too must move aggressively to seize the moment."

### Solvency

Fits don’t solve renewable energy---

1. No support

Cory 9 (Karlynn Cory, Toby Couture, and Claire Kreycik “Feed-in Tariff Policy: Design, Implementation, and RPS Policy Interactions” http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy09osti/45549.pdf)

Second, in contrast to other financial incentives for renewables, FITs do not decrease a developer’s up-front costs. Policy makers enact investment tax credits, grants, and rebates to reduce the high, up-front capital costs of RE installations. As seen in the U.S. context, grants and rebates can be integral in increasing the market penetration of small, customer-sited projects. Unlike production incentives or FITs, grants and rebates do not require a long-term policy and financial commitment to a specific project, allowing for flexible support based on changes in the market (Wiser and Pickle 1997). However, these mechanisms may not be effective at spurring broad market adoption, and they have often failed to provide stable conditions for market growth (Lantz and Doris 2009).

1. Price determination and complexity

Cory 9 (Karlynn Cory, Toby Couture, and Claire Kreycik “Feed-in Tariff Policy: Design, Implementation, and RPS Policy Interactions” http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy09osti/45549.pdf)

As with most policies, the FIT policy has some notable challenges. The first is the up-front administrative requirement: Detailed analysis is required to properly set the payment level at the outset. The payment level must ensure revenues will be adequate to cover project costs. If the FIT payments are set too low, then little new RE development will result. And if set too high, the FIT may provide unwarranted profits to developers. To achieve the right balance across a wide range of technologies and project sizes, many levels of differentiation are used. However, if the FIT policy is too complex with too many bonuses, exemptions, and qualifications, it may hinder program implementation. And as costs change and markets shift due to technological innovation and increasing market maturity, the FIT policy needs periodic revision to reflect evolving costs and market conditions.

1. Too narrow and no rps---their solvency author concludes the plan text’s picking of solar and wind means they can’t solve

Kofetsky 2008, "DEUTSCHLAND OBER ALLES: WHY GERMAN REGULATIONS NEED TO CONQUER THE DIVIDED U.S. RENEWABLE-ENERGY FRAMEWORK TO SAVE CLEAN TECH (AND THE WORLD)", https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v%26pid=gmail%26attid=0.1%26thid=13955f78a3a8375d%26mt=application/pdf%26url=https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui%3D2%26ik%3Db62fd2ee4a%26view%3Datt%26th%3D13955f78a3a8375d%26attid%3D0.1%26disp%3Dsafe%26zw%26sig=AHIEtbRX3GpQtnAMY29zWdsBnFGFuWibbA

Reforms to the U.S. renewable-energy framework should build on the prior success of both state portfolio standards and the German Renewable Energy Act. Specifically, the United States should first implement a feed-in tariff to expand clean-tech equipment distribution and allow for innovation and economies of scale.301 The United States should then add a renewable portfolio standard. The cumulative effect of these measures will give both utilities and their customers an incentive to champion broad clean-tech development and therefore draw innovators and investors to the space. The feed-in tariff implemented in the United States must contain a broad definition of renewable energy. Specifically, the tariff should define renewable energy as those processes generating electricity from hydrodynamic, wind, solar radiation, or geothermal energies; or gas from landfills, sewage treatment plants, mines, or biomass; or any other means which (1) consumes no tangible resource as fuel, or (2) produces no waste product which itself is not a productive resource in contemporary commerce.302 This definition would be broad enough to encompass all existing clean tech, as well as to leave the door open for significant future innovation.303 The broad definition would also allow for a maximum adoption rate304 and avoid the myopic favoring of one technology over another.305 Cumulatively, these factors make the cleantech industry more attractive to investors, which is ultimately a boon for innovation.

#### Renewables don’t solve---

#### Substitutability

Fridley- Energy Analysis Program, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory-10

<http://www.postcarbon.org/report/127153-energy-nine-challenges-of-alternative-energy>

Ideally, an alternative energy form would integrate directly into the current energy system as a “drop-in” substitute for an existing form without requiring further infrastructure changes. This is rarely the case, and the lack of substitutability is particularly pronounced in the case of the electrification of transportation, such as with electric vehicles. Although it is possible to generate the electricity needed for electrified transportation from wind or solar power, the prerequisites to achieving this are extensive. Electric-car development would require extensive infrastructure changes, including: . Retooling of factories to produce the vehicles . Development of a large-scale battery industry. Development of recharging facilities . Deployment of instruments for the maintenance and repair of such vehicles . A spare-parts industry . “Smart-grid” monitoring and control software and equipment . Even more generation and transmission facilities to supply the additional electricity demand The development of wind and solar-power electricity also requires additional infrastructure; wind and solar electricity must be generated where the best resources exist, which is often far from population centers. Thus, extensive investment in transmission infrastructure to bring it to consumption centers is required. Today, ethanol can be blended with gasoline and used directly, but its propensity to absorb water and its high oxygen content make it unsuitable for transport in existing pipeline systems, 6 and an alternative pipeline system to enable its widespread use would be materially and financially intensive. While alternative energy forms may provide the same energy services as another form, they rarely substitute directly, and these additional material costs need to be considered.

#### Intermittency

Fridley- Energy Analysis Program, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory-10

<http://www.postcarbon.org/report/127153-energy-nine-challenges-of-alternative-energy>

5. intermittency Modern societies expect that electrons will flow when a switch is flipped, that gas will flow when a knob is turned, and that liquids will flow when the pump handle is squeezed. This system of continuous supply is possible because of our exploitation of large stores of fossil fuels, which are the result of millions of years of intermittent sunlight concentrated into a continuously extractable source of energy. Alternative energies such as solar and wind power, in contrast, produce only intermittently as the wind blows or the sun shines, and even biomass-based fuels depend on seasonal harvests of crops. Integration of these energy forms into our current system creates challenges of balancing availability and demand, and it remains doubtful that these intermittent energy forms can provide a majority of our future energy needs in the same way that we expect energy to be available today.One indication of intermittency challenges in electric power generation is the capacity factor, or the average percentage of time in a year that a power plant is producing at full rated capacity. As shown in table 18.2, photovoltaic systems produce at full capacity only 12 to 19 percent of the time over the course of a year, compared to an average of 30 percent for wind systems. In contrast, a coal-thermal plant will typically run at full capacity 70 to 90 percent of the time, while nuclear power operates at over a 90 percent capacity factor in the United States. Our current electricity system is dominated by large baseload coal- and nuclear-power generation. The integration of intermittent energy forms such as solar and wind is increasingly seen as a matter of expanding transmission capacity and grid interconnections to extend the area over which these variations are felt, as well as implementing more complex operations controls. Thisapproach in effect relies on strengthening and expanding the large centralized energy production and distribution model that has characterized the fossil-fuel era, but may not necessarily be suitable for a future of renewable energy generation. The key to evening out the impact of intermittency is storage; that is, the development of technologies and approaches that can store energy generated during periods of good wind and sun for use at other times. Many approaches have been proposed and tested, including compressed-air storage, batteries, and the use of molten salts in solar-thermal plants. The major drawbacks of all these approaches include the losses involved in energy storage and release, and the limited energy density that these storage technologies can achieve.

#### c. Energy Density

Fridley- Energy Analysis Program, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory-10

<http://www.postcarbon.org/report/127153-energy-nine-challenges-of-alternative-energy>

The consequence of low energy density is that larger amounts of material or resources are needed to provide the same amount of energy as a denser material or fuel. Many alternative energies and storage technologies are characterized by low energy densities, and their deployment will result in higher levels of resource consumption. As shown in figure 18.1, the main alternatives under development to supplant gasoline use in cars are dramatically lower in energy density than gasoline itself. Lithium-ion batteries—the focus of current research for electric vehicles—contain only 0.5 MJ per kilogram of battery compared to 46 MJ per kilogram for gasoline. Advances in battery technology are being announced regularly, but they all come up against the theoretical limit of battery density of only 3 MJ per kilogram. Low energy density will present a significant challenge to the electrification of the car fleet and will raise challenges of adequate material supply: Today, the advanced Tesla Roadster has a lithium-ion battery pack weighing 900 pounds, which delivers just 190 MJ of energy. In contrast, a 10-gallon tank of gasoline weighs 62 pounds and delivers 1,200 MJ of energy. To provide the equivalent energy to a typical gasoline car, an electric-car battery pack would need to consume resources weighing 5,700 pounds, nearly the weight of the last Hummer model. The more dense an energy form is, the less land is needed for its deployment. Because many alternative energies are far less energy dense than fossil fuels, largescale deployment will incur considerable land costs. For example, a single 1,000-megawatt coal-fired power plant requires 1 to 4 square kilometers (km2 ) of land, not counting the land required to mine and transport the coal. In contrast, 20–50 km2 , or the size of a small city, would be required to generate the equivalent amount of energy from a photovoltaic array or from a solar-thermal system. For wind, 50–150 km2 would be needed; for biomass, 4,000–6,000 km2 of land would be needed. The sprawling city of Los Angeles, in comparison, covers 1,200 km2 . The land-use issue is thus a problem not only of biofuels production; siting of alternative energy projects will likely be a constant challenge because of the inherent high land footprint.

#### Timeframe

Fridley- Energy Analysis Program, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory-10

<http://www.postcarbon.org/report/127153-energy-nine-challenges-of-alternative-energy>

Closely related to the issue of scalability and timing is commercialization, or the question of how far away a proposed alternative energy source stands from being fully commercialized. Often, newspaper reports of a scientific laboratory breakthrough are accompanied by suggestions that such a breakthrough represents a possible “solution” to our energy challenges. In reality, the average time frame between laboratory demonstration of feasibility and full large-scale commercialization is twenty to twenty-five years. Processes need to be perfected and optimized, patents developed,demonstration tests performed, pilot plants built and evaluated, environmental impacts assessed, and engineering, design, siting, financing, economic, and other studies undertaken. In other words, technologies that are proved feasible on the bench top today will likely have little impact until the 2030s. This reality is reflected in the key message of the now-famous Hirsch Report, which noted that to properly mitigate the economic impacts of peak oil, we would have needed to start fundamentally redesigning our national energy infrastructure twenty years in advance of the peak. 5

### Warming

Status quo solves warming---epa regs

Baltimore Sun 12 (“EPA's climatic victory” http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/editorial/bs-ed-epa-climate-20120627,0,7041174.story)

Tuesday's victory by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in federal appeals court in the District of Columbia has once again demonstrated that the science of climate change, while famously "inconvenient," is virtually impossible for fair and reasonable people to deny. In upholding the agency's right to regulate the emission of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, under a handful of cases, the three-judge panel recognized climate change as the legitimate threat to public health and safety that it is, and that the Clean Air Act gives the agency appropriate authority to regulate it. This shouldn't have come as much surprise to opponents, as the decision is in line with the Supreme Court's 2007 decision affirming the EPA had that power. It would be nice, of course, if we lived in a world where coal and other fossil fuels could be burned without regard to the pollution they emit, but that's not real life. Unfortunately, the longer the U.S. and other developed countries wait to address climate change, the less chance they can do much about it. We would be sympathetic to polluters' complaints that climate change should be addressed by Congress and not by a regulatory agency if those same opponents had not worked so hard to thwart that very effort two years ago. They now must reap what they sowed: a less political and more science-driven regulatory process. The court's decision means the EPA can move forward with clean car standards that are, incidentally, already supported by industry and labor, and the issuance of restrictive permits to power plants and other major industrial polluters. There are, of course, winners and losers in this transition. Coal-producing states like West Virginia will be hurt economically as they gradually lose a market for their product. But until power plants and other major users of coal develop a reliable and economical method to capture carbon emissions (or at least offset them), this is unavoidable. Yet that setback for coal is a potential boon for alternative sources of energy. Much of the attention now will be on generating power from natural gas, which is less harmful to the environment (though hardly carbon-free), and on improving biofuels, solar and wind technologies. Conservatives can grouse all they want that the transition will inevitably cause consumer prices to rise. Coal was relatively cheap compared to the alternatives — if the harmful effects of greenhouse gas emissions are not factored into its price. Mitt Romney is already running ads in critical states like Ohio attacking the EPA, always a favorite Republican whipping boy, and promising to strip the agency of its authority to regulate carbon. But Mr. Romney may also find himself politically vulnerable on this issue. He has admitted in the past that the earth's climate is changing, that humans are contributing to the problem and that he favored reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Yet his refusal to endorse the EPA's regulatory role would seem to put him in a political no-man's land of recognizing that global warming is real and distressing but declining to do anything worthwhile about it. Even with the mountain of evidence supporting the reality of climate change and now a growing number of court opinions endorsing it, it's hard to believe a politically gridlocked Congress is capable of taking appropriate action on its own. Thus, the EPA represents the best hope for responsible behavior — and for the U.S. to set an example for countries that have been similarly reluctant to embrace reforms. This week's ruling may yet be appealed to the Supreme Court, but experts say there's little chance of reversal there, particularly given the high court's related 2007 decision and the slam-dunk nature of the appeals court's unanimous findings. Opponents would be better served putting their energy where it should have been in the first place — in developing methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. From Western fires and Southern flooding to severe weather, threatened animal and plant species and melting ice caps, the impact of global warming is real and distressing. A recent study from the U.S. Geological Survey suggests the East Coast is a "hot spot," as sea levels are rising more rapidly than previously thought. All of which strongly suggests it's time Washington stopped bickering over global warming and started supporting the EPA's efforts.

#### No impact – recent data proves CO2 escapes

Taylor 11 (James, is a senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News. “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/>)

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict.

No extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### Ocean ecosystem resilient –

#### A. deep-sea floor checks.

SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE, October 19, ‘95, p. A10

Rough estimates for the number of species on the deep-sea floor have now soared to 10 million or even 100 million, hundreds of times larger than the old projections of 200,000 species for all types of marine life. The new figures also contrast starkly with the sum of the earth's plants, animals and microbes that scientists have so far named, about 1.4 million species in all. And they match the 10 million to 100 million that experts had projected as possible totals for the number of terrestrial species. "It's changing our whole view about biodiversity," said Dr. P. John D. Lambshead, a marine biologist at the Natural History Museum in London who studies the abundance of deep ocean species. "The quantity of life we've found is incredible," he added in an interview. "All sorts of ecologic theories that looked good, based on terrestrial models, suddenly fall apart. We're having to change all our ideas."

#### B. massive size of oceans checks snowball and ensures slow timeframe.

Bjørn Lomborg, Director, Environmental Assessment Institute, THE SKEPTICAL ENVIRONMENTALIST, ‘1 p. 189

But the oceans are so incredibly big that our impact on them has been astoundingly insignificant - the oceans contain more than 1,000 billion liters of water. The UN’s overall evaluation of the oceans concludes: “The open sea is still relatively clean. Low levels of lead, synthetic compounds and artificial radionuclides, though widely detectable, are biologically insignificant. Oil slicks and litter are common among sea leans, but are, at present, a minor consequences to communities of organisms living in ocean waters.

#### No disease impact

David G. Victor, professor of law at Stanford Law School & director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development & senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations—task force on energy security. 11-12-2007, “What Resource Wars?” National Interest online, <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020>

The dangers of disease have caused particular alarm in the advanced industrialized world, partly because microbial threats are good fodder for the imagination. But none of these scenarios hold up because the scope of all climate-sensitive diseases is mainly determined by the prevalence of institutions to prevent and contain them rather than the raw climatic factors that determine where a disease might theoretically exist. For example, the threat industry has flagged the idea that a growing fraction of the United States will be malarial with the higher temperatures and increased moisture that are likely to come with global climate change. Yet much of the American South is already climatically inviting for malaria, and malaria was a serious problem as far north as Chicago until treatment and eradication programs started in the 19th century licked the disea**se**. Today, malaria is rare in the industrialized world, regardless of climate, and whether it spreads again will hinge on whether governments stay vigilant, not so much on patterns in climate. If Western countries really cared about the spread of tropical diseases and the stresses they put on already fragile societies in the developing world, they would redouble their efforts to tame the diseases directly (as some are now doing) rather than imagining that efforts to lessen global warming will do the job. Eradication usually depends mainly on strong and responsive governments, not the bugs and their physical climate**.**

#### **No super diseases or extinction**

Lafee 2009

Scott, Union-Tribune Staff Writer, “Viruses versus hosts: a battle as old as time”, May 3rd, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2009/may/03/1n3virus01745-viruses-versus-hosts-battle-old-time/?uniontrib

Generally speaking, it's not in a virus's best interest to kill its host. Deadly viruses such as Ebola and SARS are self-limiting because they kill too effectively and quickly to spread widely. Flu viruses do kill, but they aren't considered especially deadly. The fatality rate of the 1918 “Spanish flu” pandemic was less than 2.5 percent, and most of those deaths are now attributed to secondary bacterial infections. The historic fatality rate for influenza pandemics is less than 0.1 percent. Humans make “imperfect hosts” for the nastiest flu viruses, Sette said. “From the point of view of the virus, infecting humans can be a dead end. We sicken and die too soon.”

### -Econ Growth

The economy isn’t doing great but there is no recession on the horizion

The Economist 2/2/13 (“The little dipper With luck, the fourth quarter was an aberration” http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21571181-luck-fourth-quarter-was-aberration-little-dipper)

Defence spending is always lumpy (planes and destroyers are not purchased on a daily basis), but its behaviour recently has been especially strange. Ben Herzon of Macroeconomic Advisers, a consultancy, said the fluctuations were concentrated in contracts for installation, weapons and personnel support services, which rose by the largest on record in the third quarter and fell by the largest on record in the fourth. Finally, exports fell, a victim of the febrile state of the global economy. There had been widespread fears a few months ago that business investment and consumer spending would crumble as the fiscal cliff, a collection of steep year-end tax increases and spending cuts, approached. Yet Mr Herzon notes those were in fact the strongest sectors of the economy, growing at a combined brisk 3.3% rate, faster than in the third quarter. Housing construction and machinery investment were especially robust. The “underlying acceleration in private domestic consumption is the silver lining,” he said. More timely indicators such as first-time claims for unemployment benefits and the stock market show, if anything, an increase in momentum. The Federal Reserve, which wrapped up a meeting on January 30th, blamed the “pause” in growth on “weather-related disruptions and other transitory factors.” (Superstorm Sandy, which devastated parts of New Jersey and New York in October is a case in point.) Employment growth in the last year has been much more stable than GDP (see chart). Yet it would be unwise to dismiss the fourth-quarter weakness as pure anomaly. Economists did the same when Britain’s economy posted a surprise contraction at the end of 2010. Yet within a year Britain was back in recession and with another surprisingly large contraction last quarter, may be once again. While America is almost certainly not slipping back into recession, the ease with which special factors tipped it into negative territory is a reminder of the recovery’s underlying fragility.

#### AND---the housing market is recovering

Seeking Alpha 1/30/13 (“Housing Is Recovering: Can You Trade The Trend?” http://seekingalpha.com/article/1148581-housing-is-recovering-can-you-trade-the-trend?source=google\_news)

Something is going on in the housing market. Something we haven't seen for a long time. The economic forces that created an epic boom during the mid-2000s and an epic crash during the late-2000s appear to be rising once again.

Housing - arguably the greatest economic force in America - has probably bottomed and is beginning to rise again. The shift in direction is subtle, but so is every shift at first. And the shift in the housing market is coming from the fringes, but that's OK. In particular, a decent portion of demand for housing is coming from offshore buyers, speculators and property investors. Many will argue that this isn't real demand. However, in this scenario I would expect speculators and investors to be the first to dip their toes back into the U.S. housing pool. But with marginal demand comes price support (see Case-Shiller Home Price Index below), and with price support comes greater mainstream confidence.

There are many other indicators suggesting renewed strength in the crippled U.S. housing market. Not only is this recovery about demand...the supply-side of the equation is also strengthening. In particular, the inventories of U.S. homes on the market are approaching levels not see since before the U.S. housing crisis began.

**Decline doesn’t cause war**

Morris Miller, Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa, ‘2K

(Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

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 under- taken 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 semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

**Low growth makes politicians cautious—they don’t want to risk war because it makes them vulnerable**

**Boehmer 2007** – political science professor at the University of Texas (Charles, Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict”, WEA)

Economic Growth and Fatal MIDs

The theory presented earlier predicts that lower rates of growth suppress participation in foreign conflicts, particularly concerning conflict initiation and escalation to combat. To sustain combat, states need to be militarily prepared and not open up a second front when they are already fighting, or may fear, domestic opposition. A good example would be when the various Afghani resistance fighters expelled the Soviet Union from their territory, but the Taliban crumbled when it had to face the combined forces of the United States and Northern Alliance insurrection. Yet the coefficient for GDP growth and MID initiations was negative but insignificant. However, considering that there are many reasons why states fight, the logic presented earlier should hold especially in regard to the risk of participating in more severe conflicts. Threats to use military force may be safe to make and may be made with both external and internal actors in mind, but in the end may remain mere cheap talk that does not risk escalation if there is a chance to back down. Chiozza and Goemans (2004b) found that secure leaders were more likely to become involved in war than insecure leaders, supporting the theory and evidence presented here. We should find that leaders who face domestic opposition and a poorly performing economy shy away from situations that could escalate to combat if doing so would compromise their ability to retain power.

#### We are trapped in global trade

Paal 10 (Douglas H. Paal is vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He previously served as vice chairman of JPMorgan Chase International (2006–2008), and as unofficial U.S. representative to Taiwan as director of the American Institute in Taiwan (2002–2006).“The Growing Threat of Global Trade Protectionism” http://carnegieendowment.org/2010/09/28/growing-threat-of-global-trade-protectionism/40ef)

It increasingly looks like the answer will be that governments will try to get away with protecting their own workers while avoiding the consequences of getting caught. This is the paradoxical good news embedded in the structures of trade that prevail today. If countries try methods that are illegal under WTO rules, they will pay a price in penalties and equity market reactions. And if countries nonetheless continue to try to violate the rules, they will lose the markets that keep their people employed. So, countries are trapped in the global trade structure and cannot escape at an acceptable price.

#### No war from economic decline

Deudney 1999

Daniel, Asst Prof of Poli Sci at Johns Hopkins, Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics

The international consequences of these domestic changes may be increased conflict and war. If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because of their lack of democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are war-prone because of their ideological fervor and lack of socialization into international norms and processes, then a world political system containing more such states is likely to be more violent. **The historical record from previous economic depressions supports the general proposition that widespread economic stagnation** and unmet economic expectations **contributes to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has flaws** as well. First, **the pessimistic interpretation of the relationship between environmental sustainability and economic growth is** arguably **based on unsound economic theory. Wealth formation is not so much a product of cheap natural resource availability as of capital formation via savings and more efficient ways of producing. The fact that so many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resource endowments are poor, demonstrates that there is no clear and direct relationship between abundant resource availability and economic well-being**. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing raw material through-puts, rather than an end to growth in the output of goods and services. **Second, even if economic decline does occur, interstate conflict may be dampened, not stoked.** In the Neo-Malthusian scenario, domestic political life is an intervening variable connecting environmentally induced economic stagnation with interstate conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may in large measure depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. A compensating factor here is the possibility that **as people get poorer they will be less willing to spend increasingly scarce resources for military capabilities. In this regard, the experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may not be relevant, because such depressions were characterized by underutilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930s increased military spending had a stimulative effect, but in a world in which economic growth had been retarded by environmental constraints military spending would exacerbate the economic problem**

We can never be energy secure or independent

Levi 12 (Michael Levi is the David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change. “Think Again: The American Energy Boom” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom?page=0,4)

"The United States Could Be Energy Independent." No. This massive new U.S. oil and gas output has brought talk of American energy independence back into vogue. Energy economist Adam Sieminski, the new EIA administrator, captured the shift in a February interview: "For 40 years, only politicians and the occasional author in Popular Mechanics magazine talked about achieving energy independence," he observed. "Now it doesn't seem such an outlandish idea." The numbers would appear to back up this sentiment. Just five years ago, the experts were bracing for the United States to become dependent on imported liquefied natural gas, with uncertain geopolitical consequences, such as dependence on vulnerable Middle Eastern suppliers and entanglement in a global gas market in which Moscow plays a troubling role. That now seems like ancient history, as record gas production has spared the United States the need for large-scale imports. According to one only somewhat hyperbolic headline, "We've Fracked So Much Gas We've Got No Place to Put It." The math is shakier when it comes to oil. The most bullish projections foresee around 15 million barrels a day of U.S. liquid fuels production by 2020, while the consultancy Wood MacKenzie claims that U.S. production could rise to about 10 million barrels a day by the close of this decade and 15 million before the end of the next. In any case, U.S. consumption is vastly greater. As of 2009, Americans burned through nearly 19 million barrels of oil-based liquid fuels each day to power their cars, trucks, and factories, and although that figure has edged down over the past couple of years, domestic supply is still a long way from matching U.S. demand. That said, U.S. demand for oil appears to have peaked. While part of the recent fall can be chalked up to slow economic growth, sustained high oil prices and improving automobile technology are also at work. New fuel- economy standards, if they stick, could drive U.S. consumption down much further. Ultimately, though, it's a massive stretch to think the United States will eliminate the gap

 between oil supply and demand anytime soon. In any case, energy independence requires more than impressive arithmetic. As long as the United States is fully integrated into the world oil market, U.S. fuel prices will rise and fall along with events on the other side of the globe -- say, a war with Iran. Greater domestic production will blunt the economic shock of rapidly rising prices -- better to suddenly be sending massive sums to North Dakota than to Saudi Arabia -- but because oil producers everywhere are relatively slow to spend their windfalls, skyrocketing prices could still knock the economy on its back.

## \*\*\*2NC

### \*\*\*States

### 2nc-States implement better

#### States solve---

#### Flexibility: states can moderately tailor policies to best fit regional interests,

#### Innovation: states are not bound to one uniform code, so they can come up with new ways to do the aff, empirically prove, most energy innovation has come from the states, they act faster and draw outside support

Katz and Rodin 12 (Bruce Katz is a vice president at Brookings Institution. He is the founder and co-director of the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program, and leads the Brookings-Rockefeller Project on State and Metropolitan Innovation Dr. Judith Rodin is the president of the Rockefeller Foundation.“Innovative State and City Government Solutions to Watch in 2012” http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2012/01/innovative-local-government-solutions-watch-2012/951/)

The next economy will be fueled by innovation and advanced manufacturing, so that the U.S. can stay on the cutting edge of invention and production. It will be powered by a next-generation workforce that’s well-prepared for employment opportunities in emerging fields. This will require the United States to take the lead in the clean economy, developing the renewable energy and energy-efficiency technologies necessary for a low carbon future. The next economy will also be export intensive, producing goods and services that are in demand in the global marketplace. And all this will demand a new approach to governance, predicated on public-private collaboration and cooperation. In an ideal world, the federal government would take action to help make this new economic vision a reality. Indeed, most Americans would like to see Washington do just that. A recent poll by the Pew Charitable Trusts’ Economic Mobility Project found that 83 percent of Americans want the government to play a role in promoting economic upward mobility. But as long as party infighting and partisan gridlock rule the day, the likelihood of major federal action remains slim. Fortunately, the United States is a federal republic. When the federal government cannot or will not act, states, cities, and metropolitan areas have the power to step into the breach and get things done themselves. That’s what we’re seeing right now. Throughout the nation, governors and state legislatures and mayors and city councils are crafting innovative solutions to the problems facing their economies. They are joining together with leaders from private industry, philanthropy and advanced research to boost exports, strengthen the clean economy, expand innovation capacity and train the next generation of workers. They are adopting new styles of governance that emphasize collaboration over conflict and partnership over partisanship. Unwilling to wait for Washington, they are taking the reins and forging a pragmatic caucus capable of leading the transition to the next economy.

#### And, states are the best experimenters

Stepp 12 ( Matthew Stepp is a Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) specializing in climate change and clean energy policy. His research interests include clean energy technology development, climate science policy development, transportation policy, and the role innovation has in economic growth. “What Role Should the States Play in Boosting the Clean Economy?” http://www.innovationfiles.org/what-role-should-the-states-play-in-boosting-the-clean-economy/)

States must focus on supporting the energy innovation ecosystem, but also leverage their individual strengths. The energy innovation ecosystem includes the entirety of clean technology development – everything from R&D, testing, and pilot projects to demonstration, manufacturing, and commercialization. Public support at each phase is vital for potentially transformative technologies to make it to market and to create a robust green economy. Some states are capable of investing and supporting the entire ecosystem, such as California (and its great PIER Program), Massachusetts (the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center), and New York (the suite of programs at NYSERDA). In each case, state resources in addition to a diverse set of institutions such as university networks and business clusters allow for a clean energy innovation ecosystem approach. But I’d be naïve to think that every state can mimic an ecosystem approach given limited resources. Instead, many states should focus on the phases of clean energy innovation that play to their strengths. For instance, some states could leverage their relationships with utilities to support the demonstration and testing of emerging technologies. Other states with significant public land could implement programs to create test beds for new clean energy ideas. And many states with active federal lab and university research communities could provide significant clean energy fund investments in research and development. And in many instances, states could collaborate on a regional level to complement each state’s strengths and investments. In other words, states should move away from a deployment-only approach and instead leverage their strengths to support clean energy innovation. States should test new ideas and implement best practices. If there is one role the federal government – namely the Department of Energy – could play right now (and spend very little federal dollars) it would be to act as a clearinghouse for best practices in state clean energy innovation policies, especially those that complement federal efforts. There are 50 states implementing a diverse set of policies each year. So providing states with guidance on what approaches are working best is a key tool clean energy funds and policymakers can use to ensure that they are effectively supporting innovation. Without any sort of federal clearinghouse, it’s up to the states to test new ideas and not be afraid to implement best practices used elsewhere. In fact, it’s imperative. As the report points out, one way the states could do this would be to invest in industry market data to analyze what strengths and weaknesses exist in each state to narrow down where policy support is needed as well as if policies are having a positive impact. This would drive states to move away from stale and often ineffective subsidy approaches and instead produce fresh new ways of building an environment for energy innovation and long-term industry growth Transforming the energy system requires significant investment, innovation, and coordination. A strong federal government role is absolutely necessary to provide the level of investment needed as well as an overarching national energy strategy. Under ideal circumstances, the states and federal government collaborate and complement each other’s efforts to maximize public investments. But the federal government is in no hurry to implement a robust national clean energy strategy, making the state’s role that much more important. In absence of strong federal policymaking, states could potentially wield significant leverage in supporting the long-term growth of the clean economy and capture the potential economic benefits of the new industry. But doing so requires states to shake off traditional energy policy dogmas and take the long-view by investing in transformative clean technology innovation and economic development.

#### Modeling: if all 50 states do the plan the it will be inevitable that congress follows on, that’s Peterson, this obviously happens after politics so that is still a net benefit---here is more evidence, there is too much pressure not too.

Peterson and Rose 6 (Thomas D. Peterson, Adam Z. RosePennsylvania State University, “Reducing conflicts between climate policy and energy policy in the US: The important role of the states” http://www.solarvalleycoalition.net/files/02-17-06\_Perterson\_Rose\_EP.pdf)

Since the change in the US administration in 2001, the pace and depth of US state, local and regional climate mitigation actions has risen sharply, with the launch of nine comprehensive state plans, four regional agreements, major local government plans, and a wide array of individual policies and measures at the sub federal level. The results of these efforts is significant in terms of the number of new policy actions, the level of GHG reductions they can achieve, and the level of technical and political consensus that has emerged. This wave of activity has generally defied the notion that climate policy and energy policy face irreconcilable conflicts in the US, and instead found a number of ways to reduce conflicts and identify alternative solutions that work at the state and regional level. In coming years this trend is likely to be translated upward to Congress, with more specific delineation of state and federal roles, and stronger national legislative and policy initiatives. Pennsylvania stands at a unique crossroads in this process as a potential leader that is a highenergy producer and proximate to both the nation’s most environmentally progressive regions and its greatest energy producers.

#### Cooperation: Groups such as the NEG/ECP, the RGGI The Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, and the West Coast Climate Initiative show states work together when they implement similar policies, that means absent fiating uniformity the cp results in the same policy

#### Efficiency---states have an incentive to get it right in the first shot---they solve better

Loris 9/18/12 (Nicolas (Nick) Loris, an economist, focuses on energy, environmental and regulatory issues as the Herbert and Joyce Morgan fellow at The Heritage Foundation. “Let States Oversee the Energy Revolution” http://blog.heritage.org/2012/09/18/let-states-oversee-the-energy-revolution/)

One of the reasons why hydraulic fracturing has been so successful in promoting oil and gas development, while maintaining a strong environmental record, is the state regulatory regime. States in which fracturing takes place each have comprehensive regulation that ensures that oil and gas companies operate safely and in an environmentally sensible manner, and administer fines and implement punitive measures to correct any wrongdoing. In November 2011, Lisa Jackson, the head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, acknowledged the state’s role, stating that, “States are stepping up and doing a good job. It doesn’t have to be EPA that regulates the 10,000 wells that might go in.” But states are not just now stepping up. They’ve effectively regulated oil and gas production and hydraulic fracturing for decades. In Ohio, fracking has been taking place since the 1960s, with more than 70,000 oil and gas wells fracked with no instances of contaminated groundwater. Despite the state’s effectiveness in regulating hydraulic fracturing, the EPA is pursuing onerous and duplicative regulations that would unnecessarily drive up the costs of production for little environmental benefit. In April 2012, the EPA announced its first air-emission rules for hydraulic fracturing. But the rule miserably fails the cost-benefit test; the agency’s own analysis projects $745 million in annual costs and just $11 million to $19 million in environmental benefits. Moreover, the EPA has grossly overestimated methane emissions, a greenhouse gas, from the wells. Plus, reducing methane emissions would have no noticeable impact on the earth’s temperature. Ohio has long been a fracking state and is on the cusp of an American energy revolution. While the wells fracked in Ohio have mostly been vertical wells, the horizontal drilling permits issued to Ohio operators have skyrocketed over the past two years. When it comes to energy production, the states have the most to gain economically but also the most to lose environmentally — which is why state regulators have been successful in balancing both. Let’s keep it that way.

### **at: links to politics**

States avoid politics

Rabe, 7

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, “Beyond Kyoto: Climate Change Policy in Multilevel Governance Systems,” Governance, Vol. 20, Issue 3, July)

Those more active states include many that have conventionally been among the most innovative in environmental and energy policy, particularly those lodged along the respective national coasts, but they increasingly include a diverse set from other regions such as the Southwest and Midwest (Rabe 2006). Most of the initiatives have been enacted with **minimal partisan rancor** and have not been dominated by a single political party. Most of these also appear quite **capable of enduring once partisan control of a state government**, including the governorship, **changes hands, and have not proven very controversial to enact** or implement. Clearly, state agencies have played a central role in policy development, building coalitions rather quietly around policies that are tailored around relatively inexpensive reduction opportunities. This is entirely consistent with a pattern of “bureaucratic autonomy” and agency-based entrepreneurship that has been established in other American policy contexts (Carpenter 2001; Mintrom 2002). These steps have often been linked to early signs of climate change as manifest in a particular state, thereby framed as a response to a specific environmental problem facing the state. A further source of bipartisan appeal for these initiatives has been the promise of multiple benefits, whereby agency advocates demonstrate the potential of a program not only to reduce greenhouse gases but also to achieve other goals, such as reduction of conventional air pollutants, reduced reliance on imported fossil fuels, and longer term regulatory predictability to electrical utilities and other regulated entities, as well as economic development opportunities (Rabe 2004). Hence, a considerable part of the appeal of state-based climate policy initiatives has been the simultaneous pursuit of environmental protection and potential contribution to economic growth or stability. Indeed, much of this comports with Eugene Bardach's definition of smart practice: “What makes a practice smart is that the method also involves taking advantage of some latent opportunity for creating value on the cheap” (Bardach 1998, 36). In contrast, climate policy initiatives, whether or not they meet the definition of smart practices, are simply much harder to find at the Canadian provincial level. Only one of the 10 provinces, Manitoba, begins to approach the 15 most active American states in terms of the breadth and rigor of its greenhouse gas reduction strategy. Instead, most provinces remain focused on preliminary study of the issue and consideration of alternative policies that might be established at some future point. Among the three or four more active provinces, climate policy is almost exclusively confined to nonbinding “goals” and voluntary efforts. Any regulatory provisions, or exact rules to guide reduction, are focused narrowly on provincially funded activity, such as a mandate in Alberta to purchase a set of hybrid vehicles for government use. Fifteen years after Rio and nearly a decade after the signing of Kyoto, it remains very difficult to discern much of a pulse on serious climate policy development in most provinces, quite contrary to the experience of a growing and diverse set of American states. American state engagement on climate policy may be every bit as surprising as Canadian provincial disengagement. Given conventional depictions of the United States as a North American climate policy laggard and Canada as a devoted adherent to Kyoto, why are so many—and such diverse—states apparently taking the lead in devising policies to reduce greenhouse gases? Why do the American states offer an increasingly large and robust set of policy initiatives where there is no evidence of a comparable trend in Canada? Subsequent discussion will explore three distinct factors that emerged through the comparative case analysis to explain this variability. Differing Intergovernmental Context The divergent paths of the respective federal governments on Kyoto served to create very distinct contexts for states and provinces to consider their own policy development options. These differing contexts were clearly unintended by-products of the very different ways in which the debate over Kyoto, involving both those steps leading toward final negotiations and consideration of possible ratification, played out in Washington and Ottawa. In turn, they illustrate the very differing roles that subnational units—states and provinces—played in these processes, with attendant impacts on their own involvement in climate policy development. A hallmark of the American federal government through the two Clinton administrations and the second Bush presidency has been **a consistent inability to reach agreement** on legislation related to environmental protection, energy, and other areas vitally important to climate change. During this period, every possible partisan configuration within the American two-party system has existed for at least some period of time and yet a consistent outcome has been lack of domestic policy consensus, even in terms of needed updating of established legislation such as air quality (Binder 2003). This divide is equally evident in the international climate realm, as the Clinton administration agreed to Kyoto in December 1997 even though a number of its key provisions directly contradicted a Senate resolution that passed by a 95–0 vote six months earlier. A few states sent representatives to Kyoto and earlier rounds of negotiation but they were not formally consulted either in developing the treaty or in examining ways in which the Senate might be persuaded to ratify it. Instead, Kyoto was widely recognized through the remaining three years of the Clinton administration as doomed politically, so much so that the administration never submitted it to the Senate for ratification nor actively developed a strategy seeking ratification. In many respects, the 2001 actions by the Bush administration were anticlimactic and neither the 2000 nor 2004 Democratic presidential nominees offered any blueprint for jump-starting Kyoto. In many respects, Kyoto was politically “dead on arrival” but nonetheless attracted tremendous division and controversy in Washington during subsequent years. As states were essentially excluded from this process, they had a relatively quiet decade in which to think about climate change, in terms of both how it might affect them in distinct ways and how they might fashion their own policies to reduce greenhouse gases and simultaneously promote economic development. In some instances, states have clearly responded to a perception that climate change poses serious threats to their residents—such as sea-level rise in coastal states and severe droughts in agricultural states—and that there is a significant environmental need to craft responsive policies as soon as possible. But these responses have also been coupled with efforts to design policy that “fits” the economic and political realities of a particular state. These are intended to minimize any economic disruptions that might occur during implementation and to take maximum advantage of economic development opportunities that may stem from early action on climate change. What has been missing in these state policy processes is the kind of anguished, often moralistic, rhetoric that has polarized national debate and made any semblance of consensus at that level so elusive. Instead, state policy deliberations over climate change have benefited from a kind of **“political cover”** provided by the widely held presumption that states lacked the incentives, resources, or authority necessary to play any serious role. Many states used this extended period to reflect seriously about the issue of climate change and how they might begin to respond to it. Many began with symbolic initiatives and analytical exercises, gradually moving toward policy development as ideas converged and opportunities arose. At various points, these efforts took institutional form, such as creation of a cross-agency task force or designation of a unit with a lead role in policy development. All of this continued apace, receiving surprisingly little attention from environmental groups, the media, or federal policymakers, while the latter continued to dominate public attention by thrashing over the details of Kyoto and its aftermath. This served to give state officials considerable time to contemplate climate policy options, including the forging of policies that made considerable political, economic, and environmental sense for them to pursue unilaterally, with the reasonable expectation that no federal action of any consequence was in the offing.

Avoids political consequences

Prasad, 12

(Sociology Prof-Northwestern, “State-level renewable electricity policies and reductions in carbon emissions,” Energy Policy, Volume 45, June)

Despite the hesitant pace of environmental policy at the national level, there is a proliferation of environmental policy at the state level, where ‘‘an almost stealth-like process of policy development’’ has been underway for over two decades (Rabe, 2004:11). Many state governments have determined that envir- onmental policy is necessary and feasible, and have experimented with several different policy approaches, particularly on the question of facilitating alternative energy. These state policies are surprising in many ways. For example, they are often driven by bipartisan coalitions, and, perhaps because of their **lower visibility**, they seem to have **escaped** the **partisan wrangling** that has limited national-level policy. Both George W. Bush and Christine Todd Whitman were pioneers of alternative energy policy at the state level, as governors of Texas and New Jersey respectively, before they went on to obstruct environmental policy at the federal level as president and head of the EPA (Rabe, 2004: 1). Texas, a state that produces reliably conservative and anti-environmental contingents at the national level, is a leader in wind energy (Rabe, 2004: 50). Environmental policy-making at the state level is pragmatic and catholic, with many different approaches being tried. Because electricity generation accounts for 41% of all CO2 emissions and is the largest single source of CO2 emissions (EPA, 2011:ES-8; Carley, 2011), many states have focused their efforts on the electric power sector. One of the main sites of policy innovation has been the attempt to increase the generation of electricity from renewable sources.

Low political visibility

Rabe, 4

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, Statehouse and Greenhouse, P. 22)

But this is not what occurred in the states examined in this study. Instead, a much quieter process of policy formation has emerged, even during more recent years, when the pace of innovation has accelerated and the intent of many policies has been more far-reaching. This is not to suggest that climate-related episodes have been irrelevant or that leading environmental groups have played no role in state policy development. Contrary to the kinds of political brawls so common in debates about climate change policy at national and international venues, however, state-based policymaking has been far less visible and contentious, often cutting across traditional partisan and interest group fissures. It has, moreover, been far more productive in terms of generating actual policies with the potential to reduce greenhouse gas releases.

Informal nature allows states to escape backlash

Rabe, 4

(Prof of Public Policy-Ford School at Michigan, Statehouse and Greenhouse, P. 27)

Second, state-level policymaking is often quite different from what occurs in Washington. As at the federal level, state governments can bog down in partisan squabbles and succumb to the powers of influential interest groups. But in many states, policymaking is far more informal, and entrepreneurial opportunities may be considerably greater, than in Washington. In the absence of particularly strong opposition from interest groups, entrepreneurs may have a much better opportunity to establish and sustain supportive networks. These may involve other agencies, interest groups, or allied elcted officials and may have been established over an extended period, over a decade in some of the state climate change cases. Consequently, many state capitals may offer particularly promising entrepreneurshi. The mezzo level in many state agencies, such as environmental protection and energy, is much less densely staffed than in their federal counerparts, and the layers between an agency and the governor’s office are likely to be much thinner. This allows and individual to emerge as the trusted resident expert on a particular topic, such as climate change, able to get important messages to prominent places in the state governance structure p opportunities, particularly for relatively “new” issues for which and infrastructure of established policies and interest group positions has not been created.

### **at: federal preemption**

---Fiat solves: we mandate the fifty states establish analogous feed in tariff programs, fiating through legal barriers is the same as fiating past ideological barriers, key to prevent would debates which ruin education and imagination

---the cp allows the states to wiggle past FERC regulations, states could proceed without requiring utilities to procure specific amounts and use Public Utility Commissions which requires the purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates, that’s Gleason, prefer our evidence, it assumes your regulations and writes language around it.

FERC can’t stop the states---they can use supplemental payments

Bloom et al 12 (David I. Bloom J. Paul Forrester Nadav C. Klugman“State Feed-in-Tariffs: Recent FERC Guidance for How to Make Them FiT under Federal Law” http://www.mayerbrown.com/Files/Publication/35b914a5-7582-4405-acd9-f377e6009839/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/7444bd26-1fd5-4508-9ba2-fd2439a7bd6a/State-feed-in-tariffs.pdf)

The California IOUs objected to FERC’s ruling, arguing that PURPA does not permit states to establish different avoided cost rates to reflect varying resource procurement requirements.11 According to the California IOUs, PURPA requires that the avoided cost analysis consider all available alternatives; allowing multiple avoided cost rates to reflect differentiated procurement requirements under state law would render the very notion of an “avoided” cost meaningless. Plainly stated, the California IOUs failed to convince FERC. In a January 2011 “clarification” order, FERC rejected the argument that a multi-tiered avoided cost rate structure was inconsistent with PURPA, reiterating that state procurement laws impact the assessment of the costs which a utility avoids by purchasing from a QF.12 FERC noted again, however, that it was not reviewing the AB 1613 FIT price for conformity with PURPA’s avoided cost requirement (since this had not been briefed and argued and that, accordingly, required information was not available to FERC to make this determination); it was simply providing guidance to CPUC on how it could implement AB 1613. Where Does this Leave FITs? Since the guidance provided in this case by FERC is general only and not based on the details of a specific PURPA implementing program, it is speculative to predict what might action a state might take in reliance on the guidance. However, there are some interesting opportunities that now appear available or that at least can be investigated further. First, FERC has clearly indicated that a PURPA-compliant avoided cost can reflect state requirements for particular types of energy resources and can reflect avoided congestion and similar benefits provided. Thus, a state conceivably could require a utility to implement a RPS for a specified portion of its supply portfolio (as noted, RPS differ considerably and may specify dozens of combinations of input source, facility size, efficiency and location, among others). Although it is unclear whether states would be required to do so, they apparently could establish an avoided cost standard for PURPA-qualifying generators within each discrete supply tranche. Similarly, a state facing major congestion charges could specify a particular type of energy resource at a particular location and set an avoided cost rate reflecting avoided congestion debottlenecking costs. Either approach would seem to be consistent with FERC’s guidance.2 There are other possible options to consider. Could a state offer additional incentive incremental rates of return for a project’s difficulty? For a project’s novelty? For carbon reduction or other environmental or similar benefits? FERC has found these rate of return “adders” to be appropriate in certain cases. Would a competitive auction for the project (which might still have an effective rate of return in excess of a traditionally set rate, especially if higher than traditional utility leverage is employed) support a PURPA-compliant determination? It would appear so. However, in addition to the caution that the guidance by FERC is advisory and not binding, taking the guidance to its (il)logical extreme indicates that it raises some problems as well. For example, if a state required a specific resource at a specific location, wouldn’t the utility’s “avoided cost” be self-defining (i.e., there would be a certain cost to the utility to build that specific resource at that specific location, and, in an endless loop, the “avoided costs” would be the costs proposed by the only entity able to serve that location)? Taken to its logical extreme, FERC’s guidance in this case does appear to vitiate the limitation that “avoided cost” was thought (at least as loudly proclaimed by the CA IOUs, EEI and others in this case) to represent – namely, that the concept of avoided cost was intended to ensure that QFs, having become favored sources of energy under PURPA, would not be entitled to receive prices in excess of those available to non-QFs. This strongly suggests that this will not be the final word from utilities and other industry participants (and therefore from FERC) on this subject. First, there appears to be considerable room to craft future FIT programs into the PURPA guidelines established by FERC. Second, states could take a direct route to support such projects. Nothing in the decision affected the ability of a state to provide “supplemental payments” to eligible facilities as authorized by FERC if the related funds to make the supplemental payments are collected separately from a utility’s general rates – e.g., through a special charge to customers or if the utility is “made-whole” by a tax credit or other effective taxpayer-funded means13 for any above-avoided cost payments. Indeed, FERC has specifically allowed such payments, but widespread use of such supplemental payments seems unlikely given the revenue constraints faced by many states and the general opposition to new taxes that might support such payments.

Empirically denied

---cali

EnergyBiz October 2012 (“California Leads on Feed-in Tariffs” http://www.energybiz.com/magazine/article/281617/california-leads-feed-tariffs)

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, long at the cutting edge of a number of renewable energy initiatives, is now turning its efforts to another controversial area: feed-in tariff or FIT programs for solar energy. The state legislature, the public utilities commission and individual investor-owned and municipal utilities are all moving in various degrees toward instituting FIT programs designed to boost small-scale renewable generation. Although the result of these various efforts has so far been limited and confusing, they have the potential within a few years to place California at the forefront of FIT programs in the United States, which has lagged behind other nations in their deployment. "As usual, California is out in front on doing this," said Tom Stanton, principal researcher for renewable resources and energy at the National Regulatory Research Institute. "So far, the impact has been very small. By U.S. standards, it is a huge program. There hasn't been anything else that big. But by world standards it is still a small program."

---michigan, Vermont and Hawaii

Critical Systems 10/4 (“Feed-In-Tariff Slowly Catches on in the U.S.” http://www.criticalsystemsinc.com/blog/advancements-in-high-purity-processing/feed-in-tariff-slowly-catches-on-in-the-u-s/)

Unlike other nations, the U.S. does not have a national feed-in-tariff. Currently, the federal government offers incentives for solar PV, and other renewable energy renewable energy systems, in the form of tax credits and depreciation. State and local governments have developed their own FiT policies. California has the most aggressive renewable energy policy in the United States. The state has the goal obtaining 33 percent of its electricity from solar PV and other renewable energy by 2020. The state’s FiT allows solar power facility owners, with systems up to a specific size to enter into 10-, 15-, or 20-year agreements. Los Angeles is the largest city in the world with a FiT program. Sacramento also has a tariff. Gainesville, Florida passed a FIT program in 2011, after the city’s Assistant General Manager Ed Regan visited Germany to evaluate their FiT model up close. Early signups for the program receive a price of $0.32/kWh for a 20-year period. Washington State’s FiT scheme pays electricity generators $0.15/kWh. The amount increases to $0.54/kWh for systems built with components manufactured in the state. Other states that have feed-in-tariff include Vermont, Michigan, and Hawaii.

Specifically Vermont proves they states can bypass preemption

Alliance for Renewable Energy 10 (The Alliance for Renewable Energy’s mission is to build support in North America for bold, proven, renewable energy policies that will rapidly increase our shift from fossil fuels to decentralized, clean, renewable energy. These policies call for 15-20 year contracts, with set rates and no limit on production, between all renewable energy producers and buyers. “Vermont Sees No Conflict between Feed-in Tariffs and Federal Law” http://www.allianceforrenewableenergy.org/2010/10/vermont-sees-no-conflict-between-feed-in-tariffs-and-federal-law.html)

In a big win for Vermont's nascent feed-in tariff program, the state's Public Service Board (PSB) ruled today that they see no conflict between the state's program and the federal government. A challenge by Vermont's Department of Public Service (DPS) had jeopardized several megawatts of solar PV projects that were awaiting financing and threatened to derail Vermont's precedent-setting program. DPS is a part of the executive branch of Vermont's government that is led by Republican Governor Jim Douglas. Though Governor Douglas opposed Vermont's feed-in tariff program, he let the policy become law without his signature. The state agency argued that a recent FERC decision ruling that a California program had violated Federal law "could potentially affect" Vermont's program as well, and that the Vermont "Standard Offer Program" should be suspended. The PSB, Vermont's highest regulatory authority, ruled that it will not seek clarification from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), thus ending the debate for the Green Mountain state. Jennifer Gleason, an attorney with the Environmental Law Alliance, said she was "thrilled to see that the Public Service Board found that "no party has demonstrated that [Vermont's] standard-offer program violates federal law." Gleason has been active in the feed-in tariff campaign in the US and has been besieged with requests for assistance since FERC's ruling on California's so-called feed-in tariff. In North America, the term "standard offer" is used interchangeably with the more commonly used expression "feed-in tariffs". To further confuse matters, Vermont's feed-in tariffs are part of the state's Sustainably Priced Energy Development Program, dubbed SPEED. Defense of Vermont's SPEED program was led by Renewable Energy Vermont (REV). The advocacy group successfully argued that the PSB has no authority to rule whether the program violates Federal law. REV further argued that FERC's California decision had little "legal significance" beyond that specific case. REV also noted that FERC has ruled previously that it will not void contracts that were not challenged during the state's rate-setting process. No contracts have been challenged in Vermont. The PSB, the regulatory authority, ruled that no challenger, including DPS, had "demonstrated that the standard offer program is invalid". Under Vermont law, the PSB has the "obligation to implement statutes passed by the legislature," it said, and, thus, it was their duty to do so if the law is valid. Some challengers suggested that the PSB suspend the program while it seeks clarification from FERC. The PSB ruled definitively saying that to seek clarification from FERC; the PSB would be making a determination that the program is invalid. The program is valid, says the PSB, therefore there's no need to seek clarification. Vermont's SPEED program is the most sophisticated in the US. Tariffs are differentiated by technology and, for wind energy, also by size. Though Vemont's feed-in tariff program pales in comparison to that in Ontario, Canada, it has rejuvenated the renewable energy industry in Vermont. REV led the campaign for feed-in tariffs in Vermont and recently held its largest annual conference ever. As evidence of the organization's growing political clout, Vermont's two US Senators were in attendance. While the PSB's decision will not end the debate about Federal pre-emption of feed-in tariffs in the US, it clearly sends a signal to other states that they can set feed-in tariff policy that avoids overt conflicts with the Federal government.

#### Their evidence doesn’t assume the newest clarification---FERC will let it past---their 2012 evidence references a rule from 2010 that this card says was changed

IREC 10 (International Renewable Energy Council, “FERC provides clarification on Feed-in Tariff options for states”http://www.irecusa.org/2010/10/ferc-provides-clarification-on-feed-in-tariff-options-for-states/)

In an order issued Oct. 21, 2010, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provided clarification as to how a state might be able to structure a “feed-in tariff” requirement. Generally, a feed-in tariff requires electric distribution companies to purchase the power produced by a specific resource class, usually renewable, under government-established rates designed to encourage the use of such power resources. Some states have shown an interest in mandating feed-in tariffs for their electric utilities to encourage the use of renewable power resources. However, the federal government’s exclusive jurisdiction over the prices for wholesale power sales has stymied the states’ efforts in this regard. FERC has now offered guidance as to how states may achieve some of their objectives. Background FERC’s order had its genesis in a California state law that established a feed-in tariff requirement for power from certain cogeneration facilities of 20 megawatts (MW) or less, with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) charged with establishing the rate. The CPUC asked FERC for a declaration that this program was not pre-empted by federal law, but the three major investor-owned utilities in California asked FERC to declare that the program was pre-empted. The CPUC argued that it was not setting a price for wholesale power sales, but was only requiring the utilities under its jurisdiction to offer to purchase power from eligible cogenerators at the price set by the CPUC. In an order issued July 15, 2010, FERC rejected the CPUC’s argument that it was only setting an offering price. FERC held that the program amounted to impermissible wholesale price-setting, which is solely within the jurisdiction of FERC. However, FERC stated that the CPUC program might pass muster if it was set up pursuant to the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), under which a state is authorized to require utilities to purchase power from “qualifying facilities” (QFs) at state-established rates that are no higher than the utilities’ “avoided costs.” In response to FERC’s July 15 order, the CPUC asked FERC for clarification regarding the flexibility it had to establish “avoided costs” for specific power resources that it wished to encourage. In earlier FERC precedent, it had been unclear whether different “avoided costs” could be established for different resources. FERC’s clarification In its Oct. 21 order, FERC provided the requested clarification. FERC, emphasizing that states had wide latitude in establishing avoided costs, held that a “multi-tiered avoided cost rate structure” was consistent with PURPA. FERC reasoned that where a state requires a utility to procure a certain percentage of energy from generators with certain characteristics, those types of generators “constitute the sources that are relevant to the determination of the utility’s avoided cost for that procurement requirement.” FERC also clarified that the state may also include in its avoided cost calculation the costs of transmission upgrades that would be avoided by purchasing power from closer resources. Additionally, FERC noted that a state is free to reward favored resources through other mechanisms outside of the avoided cost rate, such as the creation of renewable energy credits. Continued limitations under PURPA FERC’s Oct. 21 order was a clear effort to give the states more leeway with respect to feed-in tariffs, and is more state friendly than FERC’s July 15 order. However, that leeway is still limited by necessary compliance with PURPA. This limitation has three implications. The only resources that could be beneficiaries of such a feed-in tariff would be those that meet FERC’s definition of a QF, which encompasses certain cogeneration, renewable, geothermal, biomass, waste, and geothermal resources. Although the state will have a fair amount of discretion, the rate established for the tariff must have a demonstrable relationship to the costs a utility would avoid for that class of resources. This PURPA-type feed-in tariff may only be used where utilities remain under an obligation to purchase from QFs. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 allowed utilities to end their mandatory purchase obligation under specific circumstances if the QFs in their area had access to competitive markets for their power. A number of utilities located within Regional Transmission Organizations with day-ahead markets have been relieved of their mandatory purchase obligation for QFs above 20 MW in size.

### at: 50 state fiat bad

#### Counterintreptatation---the judge is a policy analyst and the negative can fiat state action when the aff defends the usfg---

#### Offense---

#### Advocacy skills---being forced to defend the federal government as the best actor teaches the aff how to defend their policy choice from all angles and encourages through research before deciding to read it, that kind of education outweighs because it is more portable.

Energy policy making---the cp is grounded in the lit and key to good decision making

Brownt, JD-Seattle, 08 (Daniel, Executive Constraint, Judicial Uncertainty, and Legislative Complacency: Washington Responds with a Progressive Approach to Climate Change, Seattle University Law Review, Spring, 31 Seattle Univ. L. R. 707, lexis)

B. Congressional Intervention Is Critical Given the Grave Danger Posed by Global Warming

Congress should empower the states to combat global warming through their use of tax incentives. Global warming poses a grave danger, not only to this nation, but to the international community as well. 207 Moreover, climate change is not strictly an environmental problem; rather it is a "scientific, diplomatic, technological, educational, social, economic, political, and ethical problem unlike any issue that decision makers or society previously have tackled." 208 States should be permitted to address this complex issue with a wide assortment of interrelated policies. Indeed, while energy policy, tax policy, and global warming may seem like unrelated topics at first glance, they are, in fact, inextricably linked. 209 Many states, including Washington, have recognized the inextricable link between energy and tax policy and have begun to combat global warming by promoting renewable energy. Commentators have noted that "a properly designed energy-efficiency policy, including a market incentive to reduce fossil fuel consumption, together with cuts in other taxes, would be beneficial to a substantial majority of U.S. businesses." 210 Significantly, states like Washington have created a hybrid [\*732] approach that combats climate change while stimulating economic growth via tax incentives at the same time.

#### Neg flex---the aff gets the first and last speech and as much prep as they want to find the best cards for their aff, their ground is always more specific and familiar, this counterplan is necessary to reign that in.

#### Future academics---learning about state policy is of vital importance, its increasingly relevant

Watkins 12 – Thesis for partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Departmental Honors in Economics at Wesleyan University [Miles, April 2012, “Party in the House? Examining the Effects of Political Control on State Government Spending,” Page 3-4, <http://wesscholar.wesleyan.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1796&context=etd_hon_theses>]

Focusing on American state governments, rather than those at the national or local levels, offers *several methodological advantages*. The states together provide a cross-section of data that is consistent over time, where all units face a “common institutional framework and cultural milieu” (Dye 1966 p. 11). This would not be available in a study of federal spending, and allows for the use of more powerful and precise econometric techniques; for example, I am able to eliminate from my regressions the perturbing effects of a state’s culture, geography, and political history. State data also trumps that of local governments, which suffer from incomplete and highly disaggregated information. Especially pertinent to my study is the fact that the majority of municipalities hold nonpartisan elections; this would prevent me from using an unbiased sample in my regressions (Ferreira & Gyourko 2009). Overall, little is sacrificed by choosing to study the states; the results of my study of state governments are largely applicable to local and federal ones as well, since in general there are great similarities in politics between different levels of American government (Gray et al. 1985 p. 89). Beyond those statistical issues, state public policy is also worthy of analysis in and of itself. States provide residents with crucial public goods and services, such as welfare, higher education, and transportation infrastructure. Further, in light of an increasingly polarized and gridlocked Washington, in the coming years state governments will likely take on more importance in determining the economic and social future of the United States (Katz & Bradley 2011).

#### Defense---

#### Reciprocal---they fiat multiple actors as well, the Congress passing the funding, the president signing it and the DOE enforcing it.

#### Predicable, states is on every domestic topic, our 1nc evidence proves people write about it

#### Err neg, this topic is huge and restrictions affs make qpq and free market cp’s impossible, the counterplan is key to check topic explosion which creates ill planned and poorly researched debates.

#### Reject the argument not the team, cp theory is a scope of fiat question, punishment is the wrong method to discourage certain strategies, trying to win the debate is just doing our job

### at: unconstitutional if uniform

#### States can collab and are federally and internationally modeled---past action disproves rollback

Rabe 6 (Barry G. Rabe is a professor of public policy at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan. “Second Generation Climate Policies in the American States: Proliferation, Diffusion and Regionalization” http://208elmp02.blackmesh.com/sites/default/files/paperrabe1.pdf)

Third, as a growing number of states become active players in climate policy development and implementation, inevitable questions emerge regarding inter-state collaboration. This is most apparent in cases such as RGGI, which require considerable cooperation between multiple states where turnover of elected officials is a constant. Despite the substantial body of agreement reached among RGGI states, a number of questions concerning long-term viability have emerged. Whereas New York launched the negotiations and has footed much of the bill to date, some states have begun to complain that it has become too dominant in inter-state deliberations. Even issues such as locating a RGGI office or the degree of collaboration with existing regional environmental authorities, such as the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM), become points of contention, before getting to even trickier issues such as defining offsets and carbon emissions allocations among the states. The late 2005 decisions of Massachusetts and Rhode Island to refrain from joining RGGI, at least for now, further underscored the fragility of such a complex intergovernmental network being established in the absence of any constructive input from a hostile federal government. Despite these potential impediments, all indicators suggest that climate policy has not only reached the agenda of most state capitals but is moving forward in constructive ways that are in vivid contrast to the federal government. This chapter has attempted to explain some of the underlying rationale behind this robust and rather unexpected set of developments, as well as highlight possible future trends. Indeed, one can further envision other forms of policy development, including indicators that clusters of states are beginning to work formally with other foreign governments at various levels. All of this suggests that the political context for climate policy is far more complex—and far less fruitless—than many conventional depictions would suggest. Moreover, there remain abundant precedents in other areas of public policy for states to take the lead and often remain active in continuing policy development and implementation. Consequently, there is considerable reason to suspect that states will remain central players in the evolution of American climate policy, with considerable potential for achieving emission reductions as well as offering a host of lessons and models worthy of consideration in Washington, D.C., and around the world.

#### States can unofficially work together---solves the case without violating

Rabe 6 (Barry G. Rabe is a professor of public policy at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan. “Second Generation Climate Policies in the American States: Proliferation, Diffusion and Regionalization” http://208elmp02.blackmesh.com/sites/default/files/paperrabe1.pdf)

There is also ample precedent in American federalism for states to work cooperatively on common concerns and, in some instances, formalize regional approaches involving two or more states (Derthick 1975; Zimmerman 2002). Some regional strategies take a formal structure, such as interstate compacts, which involve a formal agreement ratified by participating states and ultimately Congress. These have been used extensively among states that share responsibility for an ecosystem, such as the Great Lakes Commission which was established in 1955 to promote the environmental well-being of the Basin. Other strategies may entail establishing a multi-state organization or commission to facilitate ongoing negotiation over particular issues or memoranda-of-understanding concerning reciprocal policy commitments. An obvious rationale for regional action involves those instances in which participating jurisdictions see a common advantage to working cooperatively rather than independently on a particular policy issue. As state climate policies proliferate and diffuse, it is entirely possible that certain clusters of states may become, in practice, regions even in the absence of formal agreements. All Southwestern states between California and Texas, for example, have an RPS program. It is increasingly possible to envision inter-state trading of renewable energy credits and other forms of cooperation that link these state boundaries and programs. But more formal regional arrangements are also under consideration, perhaps most notable among Northeastern states, where relatively small physical size and heavy population densities foster considerable economic and environmental interdependence. States in this region have a strong tradition of working together on issues, whether campaigning for federal air emission standards to deter acid rain or common regional standards negotiated with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s office for the region (Scheberle 2004). For more than three decades, the New England Governors have further formalized this partnership through an organization that links them in cooperative ventures with the five eastern provinces of Canada (Quebec and the four Maritime provinces). In fact, the respective premiers (provincial government heads) and governors meet annually, with environmental and energy concerns often paramount. In 2001, the leaders of these jurisdictions, representing five different political parties, agreed to common greenhouse gas reduction goals, beginning with a pledge to stabilize at 1990 levels by 2010, reach “at least” 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, and achieve more significant reductions thereafter (Selin and VanDeveer 2005). These goals are not formally binding, even in Canada where provinces are in fact obligated by Kyoto after federal ratification of the Protocol in 2002. But they have triggered exploration of common strategies and prodded some jurisdictions, such as Connecticut and New Hampshire, to take more aggressive steps on climate policy than ever before. Perhaps the most vibrant regional initiative that involves American states is the so-called Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). This effort was launched in April 2003, when New York Governor Pataki invited his counterparts from 10 regional states and the mayor of the District of Columbia to explore the possibilities of establishing a regional cap-and-trade program for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from all fossil fuel-burning power plants located within the region. At this point, states such as Massachusetts and New Hampshire had already taken formal action to cap greenhouse gas emissions from their own coal-burning plants and similar steps were under consideration elsewhere. New York completed a multi-year review to confront climate change, which included a number of renewable energy initiatives and a pledge to reduce emissions five percent below 1990 levels by 2010 and 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020. But state policy analysts concluded that a regional approach to cap-and-trade might be most cost-effective given the strong inter-state linkages noted above in the electricity generation sector. In response, New York has reached agreement in December 2005 with six other states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Vermont) on a regional cap-and-trade program. Massachusetts and Rhode Island were active in negotiations but have decided at present not to join the regional group, while Maryland, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia and the province of New Brunswick continue as formal observers in the process and may ultimately decide to join the initiative. Development of a model rule addressing all key provisions continues through 2006, with the goal of formally launching the cap-and-trade program in January 2009. RGGI would cap regional emissions at 2009 levels through 2014, and then reduce these 10 percent below that level by 2018. This process would follow some of the framework for interstate coordination in reducing nitrogen oxides emissions in the northeastern Ozone Transport Region (Burtraw and Evans 2004), although RGGI entails almost exclusively a negotiation among states with no significant input of any sort from federal officials. One formal RGGI goal is to establish and implement a regional cap on carbon emissions, while “accommodating, to the extent feasible, the diversity in policies and programs in individual states” (RGGI 2005). In that regard, it bears a rather significant resemblance to the European Emissions Trading System (ETS) that was launched in February 2005 and has triggered “informal contacts between state officials and representatives of the European Commission and European member states” (Kruger and Pizer 2005, 6).Yet another variant of a multi-state approach involves an extension of “regionalism” to include states that are not necessarily contiguous with one another. Under federal air pollution legislation, for example, California enjoys unique status among the 50 states that it can parlay to establish a network of states with regulatory standards more stringent than those of the federal government. This exemption stems from Congressional recognition in the 1970s that California had acted in an early and assertive way on confronting air emissions and so was entitled to take any emerging federal air standard as a minimum from which it could establish its own regulations. The remaining states would then be free to adhere to federal standards or join forces with California, often setting up a dynamic of “upward bidding” in air regulatory standards.

This is the most conservative court in decades---they will clearly side with the states

NYT 10 (“Court Under Roberts Is Most Conservative in Decades” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/25/us/25roberts.html?pagewanted=3&\_r=0)

Chief Justice Roberts has not served nearly as long as his three most recent predecessors. The court he leads has been in flux. But five years of data are now available, and they point almost uniformly in one direction: to the right. Scholars quarrel about some of the methodological choices made by political scientists who assign a conservative or liberal label to Supreme Court decisions and the votes of individual justices. But most of those arguments are at the margins, and the measures are generally accepted in the political science literature. The leading database, created by Harold J. Spaeth with the support of the National Science Foundation about 20 years ago, has served as the basis for a great deal of empirical research on the contemporary Supreme Court and its members. In the database, votes favoring criminal defendants, unions, people claiming discrimination or violation of their civil rights are, for instance, said to be liberal. Decisions striking down economic regulations and favoring prosecutors, employers and the government are said to be conservative. About 1 percent of cases have no ideological valence, as in a boundary dispute between two states. And some concern multiple issues or contain ideological cross-currents. But while it is easy to identify the occasional case for which ideological coding makes no sense, the vast majority fit pretty well. They also tend to align with the votes of the justices usually said to be liberal or conservative.

#### The court will go out of its way to make a pro federalism ruling.

Friedman and Lithwick 11 (Barry Friedman is the Jacob D. Fuchsberg Professor of Law at New York University School of Law and the author of The Will of the People: How Public Opinion Has Influenced the Supreme Court and Shaped the Meaning of the Constitution. Dahlia Lithwick writes about the courts and the law for Slate. “Not your Gingrich’s Supreme Court” http://www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/jurisprudence/2011/12/the\_supreme\_court\_rediscovers\_federalism\_just\_in\_time\_for\_2012\_election\_.single.html)

When the Rehnquist Court flexed its own states rights muscles, the legal and ideological left went nuts over the court’s supposed radicalism, but most of these cases were peanuts compared to what’s on the table now. United States v. Lopez said the federal government couldn’t ban possession of guns near schools. Guess what? The federal government wasn’t really doing anything about guns near schools, most states had their own laws, and adding a federal crime stood in the way of letting states address the problem their own way. United States v. Morrison said Congress could not make violence against women a federal crime. Guess what? This legislation, too, was largely symbolic (federal cases were nearly nonexistent); symbols matter of course, but still this sort of violence fell squarely at the heart of what states do on a daily basis. And those 11th Amendment decisions—you’ll be excused if you don’t remember them or couldn’t figure out what the hell they were about anyway—raised questions about the ability to enforce federal law against states, but states had been immune from money damages in private federal lawsuits for years. Besides, nothing kept the federal government from going after the states itself. When, in South Dakota v. Dole, the court had a real issue in front of it, a doozy of an issue—can the federal government get states to do its bidding by using money as a hook—the Fearsome Federalism Five (excepting Justice Sandra Day O’Connor) crumbled like a stale cookie. Compared with the federalism issues once faced by the Rehnquist Court, this stuff coming down the pike now is serious business. When the court agreed to weigh in on redistricting, immigration and health care, it announced that the new national obsession with how government works, and which level of government is best suited to address what problems, will be fought out in the highest court, as well as on the streets. But oh what a fight it will be. Unlike the symbolic laws of the 1980s and 1990s, this stuff matters hugely to people’s everyday lives: Will we have national health care? Can states pick and choose who will be subject to law enforcement and tossed out of the country? Will courts draw election districts or the state legislature—especially when real seats in the House of Representatives are at stake? Complicating matters, federalism cases have always made for fickle friends. They put people in an awkward spot: Either choose some rule regarding state (versus federal) power and apply it no matter what issue is at stake, or pick an outcome you like on any given issue, then assign governmental power. The former looks principled but creates dissonant outcomes; the latter makes federalism look like a dog’s breakfast. This problem became clear during the failed Rehnquist federalism revolution when the choice was between states’ rights or drugs. California legalized medical marijuana. John Ashcroft said no way. If one took the rhetoric of the federalism revolution seriously, this was an easy case: Why shouldn’t California get to choose its own drug policy? But Fearsome Federalism Five’s charter members Antonin Scalia and Anthony Kennedy hopped off the ship of state’s rights very quickly when toking pot was the issue. Sic transit federalism. The new states rights cases are bound to trip over the culture war in ways that make things messy both for the justices and for those—like the gaggle of GOP candidates—who will be quick to judge them. You’re a states’ righter, you say? Great, let’s wipe out Obamacare, permit Arizona do whatever it wants with people who look Hispanic, and allow Texas to elect whomever it wants without federal court supervision. Um, but if the federal government can’t regulate a multibillion dollar economy in health care and health insurance, why should it get to adopt the Defense of Marriage Act? If states get to decide how to treat their residents, why can’t they opt for gay marriage? The Roberts Court has barely begun to be a “court” at all, if doing so means standing up for some set of clear principles. It’s been generally pro-business, and campaign finance has been contentious, but by and large things have been quiet (unless you are a criminal defendant—and then you really are taking it on the chin). The remainder of this term may prove defining. We will certainly get to see, in the coming months, whether, as Charles Pierce suggested, “this particular court's majority would like to leave a permanent stamp on the law, and I think that rejiggering the balance between state and federal powers back to where it was before the New Deal would be the kind of thing that would appeal to it.” Whatever happens, it’s fair to say that the court against which the current crop of Republicans are furiously campaigning is not the court that will make headlines this spring. While the Supreme Court didn’t time these cases to arrive on the eve of a hotly contested presidential election, the fact that the court is poised to flex its federalism muscles at precisely the moment that the Tea Party has organized itself around the principle of states’ rights, and Occupy Wall Street has raised fundamental questions about government accountability, is a marvelous coincidence. The court isn’t just up to its neck in election-year politics. It is also hearing cases that raise issues more salient and more immediately relevant to voters on both sides of the aisle than the worn-out culture war clichés politicians have been shadow-boxing for decades.

### Funding

**As feed-in tariffs are independent from governmental spending they have proven to be an effective tool in overcoming the current economic and financial crisis**

### \*\*\*Solvency

### Solvency

#### Solar depends on rare earth elements---can’t solve energy demand

Fridley- Energy Analysis Program, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory-10

<http://www.postcarbon.org/report/127153-energy-nine-challenges-of-alternative-energy>

Unlike what is generally assumed, the input to an alternative energy process is not money per se: It is resources and energy, and the type and volume of the resources and energy needed may in turn limit the scalability and affect the cost and feasibility of an alternative. This is particularly notable in processes that rely on advanced technologies manufactured with rare-earth elements. Fuel cells, for example, require platinum, palladium, and rare-earth elements. Solar-photovoltaic technology requires gallium, and in some forms, indium. Advanced batteries rely on lithium. Even technology designed to save energy, such as light-emitting diode (LED) or organic LED (OLED) lighting, requires rare earthsindium, and gallium. Expressing the costs of alternative energy only in monetary terms obscures potential limits arising from the requirements for resources and energy inputs. Because alternative energy today constitutes only a small fraction of total energy production, the volume of resources and energy demanded for its production has so far been easily accommodated. This will not necessarily be the case with large-scale expansion. For example, thin-film solar has been promoted as a much lower-cost, more flexible, and more widely applicable solar-conversion technology compared to traditional silicon panels. Thin-film solar currently uses indium because of its versatile properties, but indium is also widely used as a component of flat-screen monitors. Reserves of indium are limited, and a 2007 study found that at current rates of consumption, known reserves of indium would last just thirteen years. 7 Can greatly increased demand for these resources be accommodated? As shown in table 18.1, successful deployment to 2030 of a range of new energy technologies (and some non-energy advanced technologies) would substantially raise demand for a range of metals beyond the level of world production today. In the case of gallium, demand from emerging technologies would be expected to reach six times today’s total global production by 2030; for indium, more than three times today’s production—compared to just fractional increases in the demand for ruthenium and selenium. Although alternative metals and materials exist for certain technologies (albeit often with performance tradeoffs), embarking on a particular technology deployment path without consideration of long-term availability of material inputs can substantially raise risks. These risks are not limited to physical availability and price; they include potential supply disruptions as a consequence of the uneven geographical distribution of production and reserves. Currently, China is the dominant world source (over 95 percent) of the rare-earth element neodymium, a key input in the production of permanent magnets used in hybrid-vehicle motors and windmill turbines. In 2009, the Chinese government announced restrictions on the export of rare earths, ostensibly to encourage investment within China of industries using the metals. Whether for the rare earths themselves or for final products made from them, import dependency in the face of such a high concentration of production would do little to alleviate energy security concerns now seen in terms of import dependency on the Middle East for oil. Alternative energy production is reliant not only on a range of resource inputs, but also on fossil fuels for the mining of raw materials, transport, manufacturing, construction, maintenance, and decommissioning. Currently, no alternative energy exists without fossil-fuel inputs, and no alternative energy process can reproduce itself—that is, manufacture the equipment needed for its own production—without the use of fossil fuels. In this regard, alternative energy serves as a supplement to the fossil-fuel base, and its input requirements may constrain its development in cases of either material or energy scarcity.

#### Costs are far too high---their studies are too optimistic

Morriss et al 9 (Andrew P. Morriss H. Ross and Helen Workman Professor of Law & Professor of Business University of Illinois William T. Bogart Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Economics York College of Pennsylvania Andrew Dorchak Head of Reference and Foreign/International Law Specialist Case Western Reserve University School of Law Roger E. Meiners John and Judy Goolsby Distinguished Professor of Economics and Law University of Texas-Arlington “Green Jobs Myths” http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1358423)

Solar power is a second favored technology in the green jobs literature. As with wind energy, substantial – and largely unacknowledged – hurdles to a significant expansion exist in solar electric generation. First, despite decades of effort and high subsidies,474 the current contribution of solar to meeting the nation’s energy needs is only 0.05 percent.475 Most of this (95 percent) is from solar thermal and hot water production rather than electricity generation. The remainder is from solar PV.476 By 2030, the contribution of solar to energy consumption is projected by the EIA to rise to just 0.13 percent, with only half of that from solar PV.477 Although solar PV is projected to grow faster than other forms of solar energy, current technical analyses suggest that the costs of current solar PV installations so far exceed their benefits. Indeed, no reasonable valuation of the benefits of greenhouse gas reductions would result in positive estimates for the total net benefits from solar PV.478 A comprehensive analysis of this issue by Borenstein accounts for the fact that in California and in most U.S. locations, solar electric power is produced disproportionately during summer peak demand hours, that is, at times when the value of electricity is high. Second, Borenstein considers that energy losses from electricity transmission and distribution from PV sources is low because it is primarily generated on-site. Despite taking into consideration these factors that favor solar technology, Borenstein finds that: the net present cost of installing solar PV technology today far exceeds the net present benefit under a wide range of assumptions about levels of real interest rates and real increases in the cost of electricity. Lower interest rates and faster increases in the cost of electricity obviously benefit solar PV, but even under the extreme assumption of a 1% real interest rate and 5% annual increase in the real cost of electricity, the cost of solar PV is about 80% greater than the value of the electricity that it will produce. It is worth noting that even without further technological progress in energy generation from wind, geothermal, biomass, and central station solar thermal, with a 5% annual increase in the real cost of electricity, all of these technologies would be economic (without subsidies or recognition of environmental externalities from fossil fuels) well before the 25year life of the solar panels was over. Under more moderate assumptions about the real interest rate and the escalation in the cost of electricity, the net present cost of a solar PV installation built today is three to four times greater than the net present benefits of the electricity it will produce. 479 Borenstein estimates for a range of scenarios that the market costs of solar PV exceed market benefits by $148/MWh to $492/MWh, in 2007 dollars.480 This cost-benefit gap is, he notes, “much greater than plausible estimates of the value of greenhouse gas reduction.”481 In a meta-analysis of over 200 estimates, economist Richard Tol concludes that there is a 1 percent probability that the social cost of carbon exceeds $78 per tonne of carbon in 1995 dollars, based on a 3 percent pure discount rate of time preference.482 And in a response to critiques of his analysis, Borentein concludes that: the current cost of solar PV, as it is being installed in California and the rest of the U.S. today, is extremely high not just compared to fossil fuel generation, but also compared to generation from wind, central station solar thermal, geothermal and other renewable resources.483 Finally, Borenstein makes other points with respect to solar PV, but which are applicable across the board to many alternative energy technologies: if solar PV costs are coming down very rapidly for reasons exogenous to the solar PV subsidy policy, then it is more likely to make sense to delay investment. If solar PV costs are declining by 20% per year, for instance, the same amount of investment (in present value terms) made 5 years from now will yield much more renewable energy than today. Given that the damage from GhGs is cumulative over time, it makes almost no difference whether the gasses are released in 2007 or 2012.484 Just as with our other examples, the green jobs literature’s treatment of the technical challenges facing solar power suffer from selective technological optimism. Even more problematically, the literature forecasts substantial increases in solar power generation without a serious discussion of the hurdles.

### \*\*\*Economy

### Econ

#### brisk 3.3% rate, faster than in the third quarter. Housing construction and machinery investment were especially robust. Cites this as an increase in momentum which means America is almost certainly not slipping back into recession---the brinky nature of this evidence proves the link controls uniqueness.

#### They can’t solve any of their economy uniqueness warrants, they are all about how we need to reduce restrictions on the market, open up federal lands for oil and give people better mortgages---they have no reason they would do anything, the cross-x proves their evidence is not up to par on this question, it says that new renewable jobs can be created not that those jobs are sufficient to solve the economy

####

Feed in tariffs distort the market---collapses the economy

Schrider 11 (William Alex Schrider is currently a member of the Young Leaders Program at The Heritage Foundation. “Feed-in Tariffs: Just Another Renewable Energy Subsidy” http://blog.heritage.org/2011/12/08/feed-in-tariffs-just-another-renewable-energy-subsidy/)

As of 2010, more than two dozen European countries had implemented feed-in tariffs, with Germany’s being the most widely recognized. In Germany, the tariff dictates that utilities must purchase electricity from renewable energy producers at a rate that guarantees a 5 percent to 7 percent profit. These costs are then passed on to the consumers, who pay higher energy bills to reimburse the utilities for the extra expense. Germany’s tariff is guaranteed for 20 years, with gradual reductions in rates over time to promote innovation and efficiency. Given such lavish incentives—profits without worrying about market competition—it’s easy to see why the program is a “success” in Germany, where renewable energy production has increased from 6 percent in 2000 to 15 percent in 2008. But forcing renewable energy also brought increased electricity prices. According to Germany’s Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, the extra cost of the “Renewable Energy Sources Act” in 2008 was €4.6 billion. While the Ministry expects the extra costs to ultimately decline, it bases that expectation on the assumption that renewable energy costs will decrease, while traditional energy costs will increase. Given that subsidies generally remove the incentive to reduce costs, this assumption is dubious at best. Beyond the obvious problem of government distortion of the market, there is also the fact that there is little incentive to innovate. A report by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) points to the limitations of predetermined tariff reduction, stating that such a scheme could pose problems for policymakers faced with technologies that experience rapid changes in cost, either up or down. Consider this real-world example. After a sudden reduction in the cost of solar energy, Germany reacted by reevaluating its solar energy tariff rates to prevent windfall profits for solar energy producers. Why innovate, then? If rapid cost reduction causes a tariff readjustment (and keeps your profits around the government-determined 5 percent to 7 percent), there is no reason to waste resources attempting to develop technology any faster. And if the government is willing to adjust a tariff down, what is going to prevent a tariff increase if costs “unexpectedly” rise? After all, the objective of a feed-in tariff is not to make production affordable, but to increase the contribution of renewable energy to the energy portfolio. It is a political goal, not an economic one. Increased consumer costs are the least concern. But consumer costs should be much more than an afterthought. Increased energy costs are inherently regressive, as lower-income households spend a greater portion of their budget on electricity bills. In a time of worldwide economic turmoil, should lawmakers consider a policy that punishes those who struggle to make ends meet? A feed-in tariff is a regressive, government-imposed, consumer-funded (as opposed to taxpayer-funded) subsidy for renewable energy interests, and it is just one more example of the government choosing winners and losers. The free market should be allowed to encourage competition and innovation in all energy technologies, not just a chosen few. If proponents of renewable energy really want to prove that renewables are worth pursuing, they should personally invest in those technologies. Forcing consumers to subsidize their pet industries is not the answer.

Skews eletricity prices---messes up the econ

RealClearEnergy 12 (“Solar Subsidies Raise Electric Prices in Germany” http://www.realclearenergy.org/charticles/2012/08/06/solar\_subsidies\_raise\_prices\_106641.html)

"Feed-in tariffs" is a fancy name for price supports - the kind that have produced agricultural surpluses and large wealth transfers to farmers in the US for almost a century. Europe got into feed-in tariffs early. As far back as 1990, Germany enacted a feed-in tariff that guaranteed providers of solar electricity a price well above market level. Consequently, it has been very easy for solar producers to make a profit. The idea was to foster domestic industries but much of transfer has ended up going to Chinese firms. The less obvious downside, however, is that consumers end up paying more for electricity. The high solar prices are averaged in with all other sources and consumers end up paying the bill, both as taxpayers and consumers. In the graph above, the Institute for Energy Research has charted the comparative impact of feed-in tariffs in the United States and Germany. The blue bar is the feed-in tariff and the red bar is the overall price of electricity in cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh), with the scale on the left. The United States pays an average of 11 c/kWh and has no national feed-in tariff, although California, Florida, Hawaii, Maine, New York, Oregon and Vermont all have state variations. Germans pay 35 c/kWh for their electricity and a 25 c/kWh feed-in tariff for solar. As IER notes, Germans pay more on the feed-in tariff than American pay for electricity. Although IER does not say it outright, the suggestion that the Germans pay high electrical prices because of the feed-in tariff. They support this by noting that the only country that pays more for electricity is Denmark, which has splurged even more on feed-in tariffs for wind. Several comments on the IER website, however, argue that solar's contribution is too small to have such an impact. Germany did report that that it is got 26 percent of its electricity from renewables in the first quarter and solar was 21 percent of that, making it 5 percent of all electricity. IER argues that the German solar industry is about to suffer now that Germany has found it too expensive to maintain the feed-in tariffs. They say Spain has had a worse experience, with $50 billion in wind and solar-related debt now floating around the country. Spain's solar bubble, which soon popped, has played a large role in its overall debt crisis as well

### EXT-Squo solves

Increased EPA emission authority will displace fossil fuels in favor of renewable energy, that gives the US climate credibility to stop warming with diplomacy and does so by decreasing emissions, that’s Baltimore sun.

And, a new department of the interior ruling is favoring renewables over fossil fuels now

Casey 11/12/12 (Tina is a career public information specialist and former Deputy Director of Public Affairs of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection, and author of books and articles on recycling and other conservation themes. “November Surprise? Obama Resets “All of the Above” Energy Policy” http://www.triplepundit.com/2012/11/november-surprise-obama-resets-all-above-energy-policy/)

Over the past four years, President Obama has delivered on his all-of-the-above energy policy with a healthy dose of clean energy initiatives alongside staunch support for fossil fuels. In fact, the President’s support for fossil fuels has been quite a bit more emphatic than clean energy advocates would desire. His first term saw a natural gas boom and a renewal of offshore oil leases along with new federal funding for “clean coal” technology. However, just three days after winning re-election, there’s an indication that the President is heading off in a new direction: Last Friday, the Department of the Interior proposed a steep cutback on the amount of federal land available for oil shale development. The move comes on the heels of several other initiatives that clear the way for increased clean energy production on public property, and it could set up an epic showdown with certain members of Congress when the next legislative session begins. *Putting the squeeze* on fossil fuels According to Zack Colman of thehill.com, last Friday the Department of the Interior finalized a proposal to shut oil shale development out from 1.6 million acres of federal land in several western states. The land is part of a larger area that had been previously slated for oil shale by the Bush Administration. It’s important to note that oil shale is not the same thing as shale oil. As we explained in an earlier article, oil shale refers to a type of rock that contains a significant amount of organic material called kerogen. Basically, kerogen rock is a form of low-grade fuel. When subjected to high heat, it produces a vapor that can be cooled and then reduced to oil. That’s entirely different from shale oil. Shale oil refers to oil that can be extracted from shale formations by the drilling method called fracking or hydraulic fracturing. Fracking is also used to extract natural gas from shale formations.There is another important difference. Putting aside environmental issues for the moment, fracking is a cost-effective technology that has proven itself in the marketplace. In contrast, oil shale processing is still in the experimental phase and there are significant operational obstacles to surmount before it’s ready for prime time. In addition to ripping up virgin landscapes, the production of oil shale involves copious amounts of water, a scarce commodity in the western U.S. these days. As matter of rational public policy for the use of federal property, oil shale faces steep competition from other new energy technologies, namely wind, solar and other renewable forms of energy. Opening the door for clean energy The Obama Administration’s recent energy moves weren’t all bad news for fossil fuels. For example, on October 25, the administration announced a continuation of last year’s offshore oil leases in the Gulf of Mexico. However, on balance, the last few weeks saw a flurry of activity in favor of alternative energy. On October 23, the administration announced an initiative that will open 96,000 acres of waters off the coast of Delaware for commercial alternative energy development. On October 12, the administration announced that it had put the finishing touches on an environmental impact statement for utility-scale solar energy development on public land in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah, complete with access to existing or planned transmission lines. Just a few days earlier, on October 9, the administration announced that it had approved public lands for wind power development consisting of the Chokecherry and Sierra Madre Wind Energy Project in Wyoming. That complex alone has the potential for up to 3,000 megawatts. Pushing the timeline back a couple of months, in August the Departments of the Interior and Defense signed a memorandum of understanding that makes 13 million acres of public land available as potential sites for clean energy development. The land had previously been set aside for military use, including training. Aside from reserving more public land for alternative energy, the first term of the Obama Administration was marked by a series of initiatives aimed at leveraging private dollars and public resources for alternative energy. Last year, the Department of Defense launched the Energy Initiatives Task Force, to streamline the process for private companies to build utility-scale alternative energy installations on military property. Another recent initiative is the Re-Powering America’s Land program, which aims to reclaim Superfund sites, brownfields and other classified lands for wind and solar production. In the summer of 2011, the administration also launched an initiative that marries rural economic development with a full-bore advanced biofuels program, including research and development as well as support for building refineries and growing biofuel crops. The initiative is supported by a memorandum of understanding between the Departments of Agriculture and Energy. The Navy is a partner in the effort, serving as a large-scale customer to help kickstart the commercial market for new biofuel products.

Renewable energy is competitive now---will be 80 per cent of our energy by 2050

Cunningham 8/27/12 (Nicholas Cunningham “U.S. Has Potential for 80% Renewables by 2050” http://americansecurityproject.org/blog/2012/u-s-has-potential-for-80-renewables-by-2050/)

A June report from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) estimated that renewable energy could provide 80% of the nation’s electricity demand by 2050 (Check out this really cool animated map that shows how our electricity mix changes over time under this scenario). In July, NREL put out another report that looked at the renewable potential state by state. The results were interesting in that all states have large potential for renewable energy. Even the Southeast, where many politicians believe renewable energy is more difficult to pull off, has large potential. A mix of solar, offshore wind and biomass could provide a big chunk of electricity demand for states in the Southeast. Although a theoretical exercise, the report highlights an important point. Some politicians dismiss renewable energy as a niche market, but the upside is huge. Costs are rapidly coming down for solar and wind power. The average price for solar has dropped by nearly 50% since the beginning of 2011, for example. The rate of solar and wind installations are strong in 2012. The solar industry installed over 500 megawatts (MW) in the first quarter of this year, its second highest quarter on record. The wind industry installed 2,896 MW in the first half of 2012, a 34% increase from the year before. (It should be noted, however, that despite this progress, the wind industry faces an uncertain future with the expiration of the production tax credit, a key policy incentive, looming over the industry). Renewable energy critics point to the fact that many renewable energy technologies are not ready to compete with coal and natural gas. It is true that low natural gas prices are making it extremely difficult for the renewable energy industry. However, natural gas prices have historically been quite volatile. If natural gas prices rise, renewable energy will suddenly look very attractive. Bloomberg New Energy Finance predicts that the average wind farm will reach grid-parity by 2016. Fang Peng, an executive at JA Solar, a large Chinese solar manufacturer, predicts that solar will be cost-competitive with fossil fuels in most places by 2015. He said this will lead to a “second wave of growth.”

Experts agree

Hsu 10 (Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. <http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>)

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

Previous temperature spikes disprove the impact

Singer, PhD physics – Princeton University and professor of environmental science – UVA, consultant – NASA, GAO, DOE, NASA, Carter, PhD paleontology – University of Cambridge, adjunct research professor – Marine Geophysical Laboratory @ James Cook University, and Idso, PhD Geography – ASU, ‘11

(S. Fred, Robert M. and Craig, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

Research from locations around the world reveal a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period. A discussion of this topic was not included in the 2009 NIPCC report, but we include it here to demonstrate the existence of another set of real-world data that do not support the IPCC‘s claim that temperatures of the past couple of decades have been the warmest of the past one to two millennia. In one of the more intriguing aspects of his study of global climate change over the past three millennia, Loehle (2004) presented a graph of the Sargasso Sea and South African temperature records of Keigwin (1996) and Holmgren et al. (1999, 2001) that reveals the existence of a major spike in surface air temperature that began sometime in the early 1400s. This abrupt and anomalous warming pushed the air temperatures of these two records considerably above their representations of the peak warmth of the twentieth century, after which they fell back to pre-spike levels in the mid-1500s, in harmony with the work of McIntyre and McKitrick (2003), who found a similar period of higher-than-current temperatures in their reanalysis of the data employed by Mann et al. (1998, 1999).

## \*\*\*1NR

### \*\*\*Politics

### 1NR Overview

#### Nye says immigration reform is critical to diplomatic triangulation and economic and military competitiveness – that’s necessary to maintain U.S. hegemonic flexibility and deter possible counter-balancers that fill in the power vacuum such as China, Russia, Iran, India, North Korea, etc that increase the risk of global nuclear miscalculation – that’s Kagan

#### And we turn the economy – our Farell evidence cites a conglomerate of economists at esteemed universities that indicates new low and high skilled immigration is critical to new demand, entrepenuership, investment, and all other macroeconomic indicators

And high skilled immigrants solve clean tech

Norris 10--Teryn, "Racing for Clean Tech Jobs: Why America Needs an Energy Education Strategy", Daily Kos, March 18th, [http://www.dailykos.com/story/2010/3/18/847363/-Racing-for-Clean-Tech-Jobs:-Why-America-Needs-an-Energy-Education-Strategy](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2010/3/18/847363/-Racing-for-Clean-Tech-Jobs%3A-Why-America-Needs-an-Energy-Education-Strategy)

In the aftermath of the Great Recession, the United States faces serious questions about the future of its economy and jobs market. Where will the good jobs of the future come from, how do we prepare the American workforce, and what is our strategy to maintain economic leadership in an increasingly competitive world? A growing consensus suggests that clean tech will be one of our generation's largest growth sectors. The global clean-tech market is expected to surpass $1 trillion in value within the next few years, and a perfect storm of factors - from the inevitability of a carbon-constrained world, to skyrocketing global energy demand, to long-term oil price hikes - will drive global demand for clean-energy technologies. That is why the national debate about global clean-tech competitiveness is so important, sparked by the rapid entry of China and other nations. My colleagues and I recently contributed to the discussion with "Rising Tigers, Sleeping Giant," a large report providing the first comprehensive analysis of competitive positions among the U.S. and key Asian challengers. In order to compete, we found, "U.S. energy policy must include large, direct and coordinated investments in clean-technology R&D, manufacturing, deployment, and infrastructure." But even if the United States adopts a real industrial policy for clean energy, there is little evidence that our workforce is skilled enough to compete. Unfortunately, according to the Department of Energy, "The U.S. ranks behind other major nations in making the transitions required to educate students for emerging energy trades, research efforts and other professions to support the future energy technology mix." A competitive energy workforce requires much more than technicians and building retrofitters. Scientists, engineers, high-tech entrepreneurs, and advanced manufacturers will play a critical role, just as they have in strategic sectors like infotech, aerospace, and biotech. The federal government has started to address the need for green technician and efficiency retrofit training, such as with the Green Jobs Act, but it has not implemented an education strategy to keep the U.S. at the leading edge of energy science, technology, and entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, the majority of our colleges and universities lack degree programs focused on energy, and the U.S. power engineering education system is on the decline. Over the next five years, 45 percent of electric utility engineers will be eligible for retirement, along with 40 percent of key power engineering faculty at U.S. universities, according to a report by IEEE. "Engineering workforce shortages are already occurring," the report concludes. "We need more electrical engineers to solve industry challenges, and to build the 21st century electric power grid... Meeting these needs requires long-term investment now." Meanwhile, other countries are producing a substantially larger portion of scientists, engineers, and researchers that will benefit their clean-tech industries. Science and engineering make up only about one-third of U.S. bachelor's degrees, compared to 63 percent in Japan, 53 percent in China and 51 percent in Singapore, and the number of Chinese researchers is now on par with the United States (though some have pointed out that the quality of these graduates and researchers is not always comparable). "Over time," stated a recent report by the National Science Board, "the United States has fallen from one of the top countries in terms of its ratio of natural science and engineering degrees to the college-age population to near the bottom of the 23 countries for which data are available." The energy workforce deficit and STEM education gap will substantially limit the nation's ability to lead the clean-tech industry and accelerate clean energy development. As Nobel Laureate Paul Krugman put it, "If you had to explain America's economic success with one word, that word would be 'education.'" In order to succeed in the clean-tech industry, the U.S. must develop an energy education strategy to develop tens of thousands of advanced energy scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs, as well as technicians.

#### Turns warming, the environment, and resource wars

Klarevas 9 –Louis Klarevas, Professor for Center for Global Affairs @ New York University, 12/15, “Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy_b_393223.html>

As national leaders from around the world are gathering in Copenhagen, Denmark, to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference, the time is ripe to re-assess America's current energy policies - but within the larger framework of how a new approach on the environment will stave off global warming and shore up American primacy. By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to secure its global primacy for the next few generations to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to outmaneuver potential great power rivals seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. Climate change leaves no alternative. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually have no choice but to adopt such technologies. And this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom, while simultaneously providing it with means of leverage that can be employed to keep potential foes in check. The bottom-line is that the U.S. needs to become green energy dominant as opposed to black energy independent - and the best approach for achieving this is to promote a national strategy of greengemony.

#### Reform solves an aging crisis – the impact is collapse of the U.S.

Weissmann 12 (Jordan Weissmann is an associate editor at The Atlantic. He has written for a number of publications, including The Washington Post and The National Law Journal. “Here's an Idea That Could Save America's Economy: More Americans” http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/11/heres-an-idea-that-could-save-americas-economy-more-americans/265776/

As Congress crawls its way towards what might well be a historic debate on immigration reform, there's one, easy-to-repeat point our legislators need to keep in mind: The United States needs more people. Truly, it does. Our birth rates are falling as our population is aging. That means fewer workers and more retirees. Even if you completely ignore the challenge of paying for Medicare and Social Security, that combination makes a poor recipe for long-term economic success. Just ask Japan what it's like when your country turns into a nation-sized nursing home. None of this seems to have registered with some of our policy makers. This morning, the House of Representatives came within just a nose hair of accomplishing something constructive when it passed a bill that would create 55,000 new annual visas for foreign students who earn graduate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (aka, the STEM fields). That was not controversial. The idea of stapling greencards to diplomas is possibly the single biggest consensus issue in Washington at this moment. Heck, it's practically the only consensus issue. Who, after all, doesn't want to keep around brilliant engineers our tax dollars have helped educate? Nonetheless, the legislation approved by House Republicans drew widespread opposition from Democrats, who criticized it for treating immigration as "zero-sum game." In order to make room for the STEM grads, the bill's authors nixed another visa program aimed at countries that traditionally send low numbers of migrants to the U.S. Why force the trade-off and risk alienating liberals from what would otherwise be a rare moment of bipartisan accord? As a House Judiciary Committee aide explained to me in September, Republican leaders "did not want to increase legal immigration at a time when 8 percent of Americans are unemployed." Zero sum indeed. The United States already welcomes more than a million immigrants each year. The idea that rolling out the welcome mat for 55,000 more would actually exacerbate unemployment here is laughable on its face, especially considering that many of these grads specialize in fields suffering a skills shortage and will pump more spending into their local economies. But what's most worrisome about the GOP's line of thinking isn't the wretched reasoning or what it portends for the STEM bill, which may well not make it past the Democratic controlled Senate. Rather, it's the possibility that this is a preview of what the GOP's negotiating stance will be when it comes time to talk about comprehensive immigration reform next year, as Capitol Hill looks likely to do. Even if we give undocumented immigrants who are currently in the country a path to citizenship, it will be a horrible missed opportunity if we fail to raise the overall ceiling for legal immigration. This could be a once-in-a-generation chance to revamp our system in a way that ensures we have enough young workers flowing into the country years from now to support our graying population. And without question, that will be one of our most pressing challenges in the decades to come. Yesterday, the Pew Research Center reported that America's birthrate fell 8 percent last year to its lowest level since 1920, when the country started keeping accurate records of the data. Although the drop-off can largely be blamed on the recession -- when the economy turns sour, families very reasonably tend to hold off on having kids -- it was both a brusque reminder of the demographic trouble the United States may one day face, and why we won't be able to fix it if we keep legal immigration at the same level it is now. As Pew explained, immigrant women today have children about 50 percent more often than native women. The reason the U.S. birth rate dropped as much as it did during the recession was that those immigrant families, whose finances don't offer a lot of cushion from the economy, had drastically fewer babies than in years past. The birthrate among U.S. born Americans fell just 6 percent from 2007 to 2010. Among the foreign-born, by comparison, it fell 14 percent. Among Mexican-born females, the dropoff was an astounding 23 percent. In short, we've been relying on working class immigrants to have lots of children to keep our country young(ish). And over the past few economically disastrous years that fact came back to bite us in our birth rates. When the economy recovers, hospital nurseries should fill back up too, especially as couples that held off on getting pregnant for financial reasons decide to make up for lost time. But over the long run, there's a chance we'll never return to the fertility levels of even the recent past. Birth rates among immigrants had been on a downward slope for most the two decades before the crash. Thank the double edged sword of family planning: great for individual families, terrible for our long-term economic plans. Chances are, then, that if we keep letting in the same number of new immigrants each year, we're looking at lower birth rates in the future. And, as a result, we're looking at fewer young people to support the aging Americans as they gobble up entitlement benefits. By 2030, about 19 percent of America's population is likely to be over the age of 65, up from about 13 percent just a few years ago. For reference, that would put us in 18 years exactly where doddering, demographically challenged Japan is today. There are two ways to deal with this problem. One is to sit around and pray that 3-child families suddenly come back into vogue among American couples, even at a time when wages are stagnant, healthcare is becoming ludicrously expensive, and careers are more volatile than ever. If that's your preferred approach, good luck. The other option is to let more immigrants into the country. Let in more ambitious immigrant families who have the desire to move to a abroad and work hard to make a better life. Let in more mothers and fathers who will likely want bigger broods than American born couples. It will mean more workers shopping, buying cars, and paying into social security and medicare, and it will mean more economic growth.

#### The aging crisis outweighs – controls the probability of all their impacts

Peterson 99, (Blackstone Group Chairman, Institute for International Economics Chairman, NY Federal Reserve Deputy Chairman, Concord Coalition President, Co-Founder, CFR Chairman, February 1999, Peter, "Gray Dawn: The Global Aging Crisis," Foreign Affairs, Lexis)

THE LIST of major global hazards in the next century has grown long and familiar. It includes the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, other types of high-tech terrorism, deadly superviruses, extreme climate change, the financial, economic, and political aftershocks of globalization, and the violent ethnic explosions waiting to be detonated in today's unsteady new democracies. Yet there is a less-understood challenge -- the graying of the developed world's population -- that may actually do more to reshape our collective future than any of the above.

Over the next several decades, countries in the developed world will experience an unprecedented growth in the number of their elderly and an unprecedented decline in the number of their youth. The timing and magnitude of this demographic transformation have already been determined. Next century's elderly have already been born and can be counted -- and their cost to retirement benefit systems can be projected.

Unlike with global warming, there can be little debate over whether or when global aging will manifest itself. And unlike with other challenges, even the struggle to preserve and strengthen unsteady new democracies, the costs of global aging will be far beyond the means of even the world's wealthiest nations -- unless retirement benefit systems are radically reformed. Failure to do so, to prepare early and boldly enough, will spark economic crises that will dwarf the recent meltdowns in Asia and Russia.

How we confront global aging will have vast economic consequences costing quadrillions of dollars over the next century. Indeed, it will greatly influence how we manage, and can afford to manage, the other major challenges that will face us in the future.

For this and other reasons, global aging will become not just the transcendent economic issue of the 21st century, but the transcendent political issue as well. It will dominate and daunt the public-policy agendas of developed countries and force the renegotiation of their social contracts. It will also reshape foreign policy strategies and the geopolitical order.

### 1NR K/T Hegemony

#### Comprehensive reform is key to readiness

Lawrence ’10 (A way forward for immigration reform Stewart J Lawrence o guardian.co.uk, Tuesday 13 July 2010 17.30 BST Stewart J Lawrence is a Washington, DC-based public policy analyst and writes frequently on immigration and Latino affairs. He is also founder and managing director of Puentes & Associates, Inc., a bilingual survey research and communications firm. Stewart J. Lawrence has worked as an immigration policy analyst with the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Inter-American Institute on Migration and Labor and the American Immigration Law Foundation.

And then there’s the US military, which is starved for fresh recruits thanks to its prolonged counterinsurgency wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Pentagon’s been lobbying behind the scenes for Dream’s passage, and earlier this year, incorporated some of Dream’s legalisation projections into its own force structure planning estimates.

### 2NC Link Wall

#### FITs are controversial – regulations anger the house GOP because they’re perceived as a new tax mechanism and the fossil fuel lobby will give political incentives for key lawmakers to backlash against the plan – kills the only possibility Obama has for getting GOP members on the fence for reform

#### Davenport says that Obama has limited resources to focus on immigration – energy debates would sap his limited capital before the primaries when he essentially becomes a lame duck

#### FIT’s sap capital

Carus 12 (Felicity Carus is the only UK journalist to be regularly reporting on clean energy policy and finance from California for a global audience. Before arriving in San Francisco in 2010, Felicity was on the Guardian's environment desk in London after stints at the Sydney Morning Herald in Australia and Interfax in Russia.“Bill Clinton: fan of solar feed-in-tariffs thinks we should “get” the clean energy tattoo” 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." Set it too low, and nobody will want to invest. Palo Alto's Clean Local Energy Accessible Now (CLEAN) programme still has its full 4MW of capacity available and has extended its deadline. Added to which, tariffs also sound a bit like the dreaded ‘T’ word — taxes. So attempts to introduce them at the distributed commercial level have required a creative rebranding to the dramatically under-descriptive CLEAN programmes designed by the Clean Coalition.

#### Industry opposition means it wastes capital – oil and gas lobbies get the GOP against the plan

Nelder 11 (Chris, “Why America needs a feed-in tariff” http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/energy-futurist/why-america-needs-a-feed-in-tariff/174)

The only reason we wouldn’t follow the example of the rest of the world with an aggressive renewable FiT is because we, like the UK, are deeply beholden to the incumbent industries. Utilities, coal and natural gas producers, railroads, and pipeline companies make a great deal of money under the fossil fuel regime by shipping natural gas and coal to power stations, then shipping the electricity to consumers, then marking up that power for retail sale. Solar PV on sunny rooftops cuts all of that out of their businesses. It benefits them to bend federal regulations to their favor, drag their feet on installations, disperse a cloud of squid ink around climate change science, and throw up as many bureaucratic hurdles as possible.

#### And, the renewable lobby is bad at fighting for the plan

Wright 11 (Matthew, Who's afraid of feed-in tariffs?, http://www.climatespectator.com.au/commentary/whos-afraid-feed-tariffs)

Feed-in tariffs were always set to be controversial – they turn the electricity market on its head by opening it for true competition. But they got more controversy than they deserved thanks to the mistake of green groups who only lobbied for feed-in tariffs for small-scale generators, and the incompetence of state government energy departments for managing to draft legislation that didn’t learn from the spectacular success of the German feed-in tariff legislation, the Renewable Energy Sources Act – legislation that has undergone 10 years of tweaking, overhaul and improvement. There are two ways that a feed-in tariff will turn the market on its head. The first is through guaranteeing to any private investor/generator (be it big or small, private, bank or equity backed) that they can have a connection to the electricity grid and a guaranteed buyer of their electricity.

#### Even if the plan is generally bipartisan, it still drains capital

McEntee 12 (Christine McEntee Executive Director and CEO, American Geophysical Union “Science, Politics and Public Opinion” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/08/finding-the-sweet-spot-biparti.php)

We know that objective scientific knowledge is needed to inform good policy decisions – and that objective knowledge exists – but all too often we are allowing politics and ideology to take precedence over, or be pitted against, science. This not only risks the legitimacy of the science, but also the strength of the policy and its ability to protect the security, health and welfare of the American people, and support a healthy and thriving economy. The current rhetoric on climate change is a perfect example. We also know that the biggest obstacles to passage of energy and environmental legislation are disagreements about the extent to which the federal government can and should regulate business, and reluctance to launch new initiatives that will add to the deficit. The science tells us that small initiatives that require only nominal investments can't begin to address the environmental and energy challenges we face; and legislation big enough to achieve significant results will cost more than Congress is willing to spend. Environmental legislation is also held prisoner to partisan gridlock, with far less bipartisan support than many energy proposals. Even environmental legislation that saves many times its cost in medical and health care savings cannot advance in the current Congress. One recent example is the defeat of legislation to limit the release of airborne particulates proven to adversely affect the respiratory health of children and seniors. Dissonance about the role of federal regulation, its cost-effectiveness, and potential to impose costs on private sector that might adversely impact economic recovery further complicate energy/environmental legislative calculus. For these reasons, it is difficult for Congress to pass new energy and/or environmental initiatives, even where there is wide bipartisan support for a given bill.

### 1NR A2: Public

#### Public not perceived in Congress, if anything, political motivations will outweigh and the republicans already believe that they were voted in office to hate renewable energy regulations – your public link is only something that democratic constituents would care about, not the anti-renewables republican party

Popularity doesn’t boost support for policies

Paul Light, founder of the Brookings Institution Center for Public Service, 1999 (The President’s Agenda, p27)

Further, Presidents and staffs tend to view party support as critical in the day-to-day conduct of domestic affairs. Public approval can be used to sway congressional votes, but with only limited success. “Everyone has a poll,” one aide noted. “You can find any number of groups which can present a poll to support a given proposal. Depending upon how you word the questions and how you select the sample, you can get a positive result. Congress is fairly suspicious of polls as a bargaining tool, and public approval ratings are too general to be of much good.” Public opinion is important over the term; it affects both midterm losses and the President’s chances for reelection. Yet, public opinion is not easily converted into direct influence in the domestic policy process. Most often it is an indirect factor in the congressional struggle. Presidents cannot afford to ignore public opinion, but in the closed world of Washington politics, the party comes into play virtually every day of the term. Party support thereby becomes the central component of the President’s capital.

Popularity irrelevant – it can’t help sway congressional votes

Paul Light, founder of the Brookings Institution Center for Public Service, 1999 (The President’s Agenda, p28)

Electoral margin may have a similar impact on presidential capital. If the President is elected by a slim percentage, congressional support may be undermined. Yet, a decisive victory may result in only limited advances. As before, the basis for political exchange is the key. If the President does not have the seats in Congress, electoral margin may have little effect. “Congress doesn’t want to trade with someone who only made it by the skin of his teeth,” one Kennedy assistant argued. “If the President can’t help you, why help him?” A Johnson aide agreed: “It is the coattail that is important. If the congressmen are indebted to you for pulling them in, you’re bound to have greater support. Hell, we had a whole group of freshman in 1965 who owed their seats to the President.” Unless presidential coattails appear, electoral margin rarely creates capital. By itself, the President’s electoral margin cannot turn a Democratic seat into a Republican seat or transform a minority coalition into a majority one. As one Nixon assistant lamented, “Nineteen seventy-two did not help us. It was similar to Eisenhower in 1956. We had tremendous public and electoral support. But that and a dime couldn’t buy a cup of coffee. It was still a question of what we didn’t have: what we didn’t have was enough Republican congressmen.”

### 1NR A2: Fiat Takes Out the link

### 1NR A2: Uniqueness

#### Group 2ac 5 and 6 – Obama care is irrelevant to the debate because Obama’s political capital could probably result in a compromise or an amendment to the gang of eight bill that exempts immigrants from garnering access to healthcare – solves GOP backlash

#### And their Klien evidence says details will be hammered out – that probably means obamas political capital is key – it says quote”

But it's unclear that the law as currently written would actually prevent newly legalized immigrants from accessing such benefits. In outlining the requirements for the exchanges, for instance, the legislative text of Obamacare references "alien(s) lawfully present in the United States" as being eligible. Alex Conant, a spokesman for Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., one of the leading backers of the bipartisan Senate proposal, said that lawmakers still needed to work out the legislative details, but he emphasized there was an agreement in the general principle regarding benefits. Of course, even a deal to prevent those given probationary legal status from accessing Obamacare wouldn't apply to those who eventually do become citizens

CIR will pass---there is bipartisan support for a bill now, but historically controversy that divides the white house and congress can collapse a deal, that’s CNBC, the Gang of eight will propose an comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship, but thorny issues still exist

ABC 1/30 (“Obama Confident Immigration Reform Passes This Year” http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/Politics/president-obama-confident-immigration-reform-passes-year/story?id=18358660&page=2)

President Barack Obama expressed confidence on Wednesday that he would sign comprehensive immigration reform into law by the end of this year. In an interview with Univision's Maria Elena Salinas, Obama explained that significant details of a bill still must be worked out by lawmakers, including the structure of a pathway to citizenship for many of the 11 million undocumented immigrants. But Obama said that the progress made by a bipartisan group of lawmakers in the Senate has given him hope that a deal can get done. When asked by Salinas if we will have immigration reform by the end of the year, Obama said, "I believe so." "You can tell our audience, 'Sí, se puede?'" Salinas asked. "Sí, se puede," Obama responded. Later in the interview, Obama said that he hopes a bill could be passed as early as this summer. But cognizant of deep divisions a topic like immigration has sewn in the past, Obama said that's contingent on bipartisan negotiations continuing to proceed well. "The only way this is going to get done is if the Republicans continue to work with Democrats in Congress, in both chambers, to get a bill to my desk," he said. "And I'm going to keep on pushing as hard as I can. I believe that the mood is right." Although the president threatened to introduce his own bill if negotiations in Congress stall during his speech in Las Vegas, Nevada, on Tuesday, he said he is content to let lawmakers hash out the details among themselves for the time being. "If they are on a path as they have already said, where they want to get a bill done by March, then I think that's a reasonable timeline and I think we can get that done. I'm not going to lay down a particular date because I want to give them a little room to debate," he said. "If it slips a week, that's one thing. If it starts slipping three months, that's a problem." The president's principles and the Senate's principles on immigration broadly align with one another, but there are still thorny issues that could spark a division between Obama and Republicans, such as the pathway to citizenship. The Senate's path to citizenship would allow many undocumented immigrants to obtain legal status immediately upon passage of the law. But their ability to then seek legal permanent residency would be contingent upon the U.S.-Mexico border being deemed secure. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a member of the bipartisan "Gang of Eight" on immigration, has been particularly vocal in stating that border security is a precondition for gaining legal permanent residence, and then citizenship. While the White House has said that it is withholding judgment on that plan until actual legislative language is drafted, Obama said that he wants a bill that makes it clear from the outset that undocumented immigrants eligible to earn their way to citizenship can eventually obtain it. "What we don't want to do is create some kind of vague prospect in the future that somehow comprehensive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship will happen, you know, mañana," Obama said. "We want to make sure we are very clear this legislation provides a real pathway." The president said that enhancing border security measures and workplace enforcement provisions are a part of his plan, as well as the Senate's, and cited his administration's efforts to bulk up border security during the past four years, saying that illegal crossings have dropped 80 percent since 2000. "We have done almost everything that Republicans asked to be done several years ago as a condition to move ahead with comprehensive immigration reform," he said. "It's not as if we haven't been attentive to border security and we will continue to be attentive to border security." Obama also reiterated that his path to citizenship would be earned, meaning that undocumented immigrants would have to pass a background check, pay fines and back taxes, learn English and go to the back of the line. "That pathway will take some time. Even under our proposal, this is not a situation where overnight people are suddenly going to find themselves a citizen," he said. Obama also suggested that he wouldn't accede to a demand from immigrant-rights groups that a moratorium be placed on deportations of undocumented immigrants who otherwise do not have criminal records, saying it would amount to executive overreach. "I'm not a king," he said. But he said that passing comprehensive reform would allow him to address the record levels of deportations, which have been a grave concern to many in the Latino community.

#### ---Obama is using his political capital from the reelection to shift the political consensus

Washington Post 1/29 (“Obama makes his immigration push” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-unveils-his-own-proposal-for-immigration-reform/2013/01/29/b27dcb78-6a47-11e2-95b3-272d604a10a3\_story\_1.html)

President Obama on Tuesday put the weight of his administration behind efforts to pass legislation allowing many of the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants to earn citizenship, seeking to build on a rapidly shifting political consensus around the issue. Obama dedicated the first trip of his second term to calling for an overhaul of immigration laws, making clear that it is one of his top domestic priorities. The president — who has said that not passing an overhaul in his first term was his biggest failure — also suggested he has little patience for Congress and would demand that lawmakers vote on his more permissive plan if they do not swiftly pass their own. “Now is the time,” Obama said, eliciting chants of “Si, se puede” — roughly translated as “Yes, it’s possible” — from the crowd at a majority Hispanic high school here. “We can’t allow immigration reform to get bogged down in an endless debate.” Fresh off a decisive reelection, Obama is seizing this moment as one in which both sides could come together to address widespread anxieties within rising demographic groups, particularly Hispanics and Asian Americans. But obstacles still loomed large Tuesday on Capitol Hill, fueled by continued unease among conservative Republicans over going too far to loosen immigration restrictions. One of the biggest disputes centers on whether illegal immigrants would have to wait to seek a green card — the first step to full citizenship — until the U.S. border with Mexico is secure and other enforcement measures are in place. A bipartisan Senate plan released Monday would tie the possibility of citizenship to several such enforcement measures, including a system to verify the immigration status of employees. The president did not comment explicitly on that proposal in his speech, but the administration suggested in its own guidelines released Tuesday that it does not want to link the citizenship process to other goals. “It must be clear from the outset that there is a pathway to citizenship,” Obama said, adding that the administration has made great strides in an effort to toughen enforcement. Some key Republicans expressed concern with any approach that does not link border security with the proposal to offer illegal immigrants a way to become citizens.

#### Obama holds all of the cards---assures passage

Weigant 1/23 (Chris WeigantPolitical writer and blogger at ChrisWeigant.com “Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda”

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term\_b\_2537802.html

The second big agenda item is immigration reform. President Obama holds virtually all the cards, politically, on this one. All Republicans who can read either demographics or polling numbers know full well that this may be their party's last chance not to go the way of the Whigs. Their support among Latinos is dismal, and even that's putting it politely. Some Republicans think they have come up with a perfect solution on how to defuse the issue, but they are going to be proven sadly mistaken in the end, I believe. The Republican plan will be announced by Senator Marco Rubio at some point, and it will seem to mirror the Democratic plan -- with one key difference. Republicans -- even the ones who know their party has to do something on the immigration problem -- are balking at including a "path to citizenship" for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in America. The Republicans are trying to have their cake and eat it too -- and it's not going to work. "Sure," they say, "we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." This just isn't going to be good enough, though. There are essentially two things citizens can do which green card holders cannot: serve on juries, and vote. The Republicans are not worried about tainted juries, in case that's not clear enough. Republicans will bend over backwards in an effort to convince Latinos that their proposal will work out just fine for everyone. Latinos, however, aren't stupid. They know that being denied any path to citizenship equals an effort to minimize their voice on the national political stage. Which is why, as I said, Obama holds all the cards in this fight. Because this is the one issue in his agenda which Republicans also have a big vested interest in making happen. Obama and the Democrats will, I believe, hold firm on their insistence on a path to citizenship, and I think a comprehensive immigration bill will likely pass some time this year, perhaps before the summer congressional break. The path to citizenship it includes will be long, expensive and difficult (Republicans will insist on at least that), but it will be there.

#### Bipartisan compromise and Boehner magic

Johnson 1/28 (Fawn Johnson is a correspondent for National Journal, “The 3 Big Hurdles Obama Has to Clear to Pass Immigration Reform” http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/the-3-big-hurdles-obama-has-to-clear-to-pass-immigration-reform/272584/)

House Republicans. No one expects "regular order" in the House on immigration. Any broad bill that comes to the floor under normal proceedings would certainly be doomed. The House has killed Senate immigration legislation before (in 2006), and forces are gathering to do so again. The Judiciary Committee counts several bomb throwers as members; Rep. Steve King, R-Iowa, is the most well known in immigration circles. The committee also includes ruby-red conservatives like Rep. Jim Jordan, R-Ohio, whose actions are closely scrutinized by other Republicans. Its former chairman, Rep. Lamar Smith, R-Texas, is feverishly opposed to increasing immigration, particularly for low-skilled workers. But that doesn't mean an immigration bill can't get through. A bipartisan group of House lawmakers has been quietly working on an immigration bill that would satisfy conservatives and liberals. The Republican participants are a closely-held secret, but whisperers say they include serious conservatives like Paul Ryan of Wisconsin, Ted Poe of Texas, and Raul Labrador of Idaho. House Speaker John Boehner is among the Republicans who desperately want the GOP's hand-wringing on immigration to end. He has already demonstrated that he is willing to flout party rabble-rousers with the House's recent votes on fiscal cliff taxes and Hurricane Sandy, which passed with more Democrats than Republicans. Boehner has to be careful. He only has so many chances to put incendiary legislation on the floor before his caucus stages an all-out revolt. To appease them, he will probably offer one or two high-profile House votes, where Democrats will protest like crazy, on enforcement-only immigration legislation. That gets the dealmakers to the next step, a conference committee where anything can happen. As Kennedy was fond of saying, "We'll fix it in conference." If Boehner wants the issue to go away, he might be willing to put a conference report up for a vote despite a raucous caucus. It's possible that enough Republicans could join with Democrats to support it.

#### Spending his PC on it now

TMP 1/3 (“Report: Obama To Make Push For Immigration Reform This Month” http://livewire.talkingpointsmemo.com/entry/report-obama-to-make-push-for-immigration-reform)

President Barack Obama is prepared to use his political capital to pursue immigration reform this month, according to a report published Wednesday in the Huffington Post.

The report cited an anonymous official in the Obama administration, who suggested that the president is unlikely to be deterred by the protracted fiscal cliff debate that will be revisited in the coming months. As such, the administration will reportedly move quickly on both immigration reform and gun control.

The report also quoted an unnamed Senate Democratic aide, who gauged the likelihood of immigration reform to pass Congress. Citing the fiscal cliff deal that passed the House of Represenatives this week with a combination of Republican and Democratic votes, the aide expressed confidence that House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) will be able to overcome expected opposition from the conservative wing of his caucus.

"He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide said.

### 1NR A2: Link Uniqueness

#### The solar thumper is old and doesn’t assume Obama’s new political capital from winning the election and high popularity levels – that’s Davenport. Prefer issue specific uniqueness and link contextualization because it’s the only way to understand the complexity behind political details

#### Obama has already won and has high political capital, polls prove but the plan can re-spark battles

The Inquisitr 1/30 (“Obama’s More Popular Than Ever, Even If Everything Else Is Awful [Poll]” http://www.inquisitr.com/502313/obamas-more-popular-than-ever-even-if-everything-else-is-awful-poll/)

President Obama recently enjoyed a surge in popularity that he hasn’t experienced since his first year in office, according to recent polls. The US economy is down, the deficit is high, and the fiscal cliff still looms, but President Obama is completely immune to the dilemmas of our country, reports The Washington Post. A recent WaPo/ABC poll shows that 60 percent of Americans hold a favorable view of the president, up from his mid-to-low 50s during 2012. He also now has more “strongly positive” ratings than “strongly negative,” breaking a two-year stretch of mediocre-to-positive public perception. Obama’s boost primarily comes from his base, with a double-digit increase in popularity among traditionally left-leaning demographics. However, Obama’s popularity has improved some with the majority of Americans (the ever-elusive Independents and Moderates) as well. So, was it the speech that did it? This is where the polls get interesting. Obama’s second inaugural address, which has been criticized by his opponents as being one of the most partisan and radically liberal in history, was a home-run with his base. No surprise there, but what was interesting was that a full quarter of Americans had no opinion whatsoever on the address. Around 50 percent approved of it to various degrees, a quarter hated it, and a quarter just didn’t have an opinion. That’s eight in 10 Democrats in approval and three in 10 Republicans and Independents with zero reaction. Balanced against the popularity poll results, only 3 percent of Americans have no opinion of Obama altogether. Either way, the poll results represent a clear win for President Obama, which he will likely use to push legislative victories in the next year. Still, we face some dense partisanship in upcoming battles, which will make it difficult for him to solidify support among Republicans and conservative Democrats in his second term.

#### Polls prove---he has the capitalfor it all now, the plan drains it

Business Insider 1/30 “Obama Is More Popular Now Than At Any Point In The Last Three Years” http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-favorability-rating-high-poll-2013-1)

President Barack Obama's favorability rating has reached a three-year high in a new, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll released Wednesday.

The poll found that 60 percent of Americans hold a favorable view of the President, while only 37 percent view him unfavorably. He has an especially strong image among his base of Democrats (92 percent) and among Independents (also 60 percent).

The amount of people who view Obama "strongly" favorably (39 percent) also outpaces the amount that view him "strongly" negatively (28 percent) for the first time in two years.

Overall, it's the best image for Obama since 61 percent of Americans said they viewed him favorably in a Nov. 15, 2009, poll taken a year after the 2008 election. It could continue to give the President advantages on key legislative issues he's trying to push in the first few months of his new term — immigration, gun control, and on key fiscal battles.

Obama's favorability mark is up 6 points from a Washington Post-ABC poll taken right before the election in November. It's also up 12 points from this point one year ago, when it stood at only 48 percent.

### 1NR A2: Winners Win

#### Illogical – if this was true, Obama would’ve gotten immigration reform, cap and trade, RPS, and a stronger financial reform bill in his first term

#### Cross apply the inquisitor evidence from above – Obama has already won from the fiscal cliff, the magnitude of the link means that the plan derails his current perception as a strong and heavy-handed leader that strategically doesn’t upset the GOP too much

Political capital is key to the agenda and finite for Obama in the second term, he can’t do a replay of his first term

Schultz 1/22/13 (David Schultz is a professor at Hamline University School of Business, where he teaches classes on privatization and public, private and nonprofit partnerships. He is the editor of the Journal of Public Affairs Education (JPAE) “Obama's dwindling prospects in a second term” http://www.minnpost.com/community-voices/2013/01/obamas-dwindling-prospects-second-term)

Presidential power also is a finite and generally decreasing product. The first hundred days in office – so marked forever by FDR’s first 100 in 1933 – are usually a honeymoon period, during which presidents often get what they want. FDR gets the first New Deal, Ronald Reagan gets Kemp-Roth, George Bush in 2001 gets his tax cuts. Presidents lose political capital, support But, over time, presidents lose political capital. Presidents get distracted by world and domestic events, they lose support in Congress or among the American public, or they turn into lame ducks. This is the problem Obama now faces. Obama had a lot of political capital when sworn in as president in 2009. He won a decisive victory for change with strong approval ratings and had majorities in Congress — with eventually a filibuster margin in the Senate, when Al Franken finally took office in July. Obama used his political capital to secure a stimulus bill and then pass the Affordable Care Act. He eventually got rid of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and secured many other victories. But Obama was a lousy salesman, and he lost what little control of Congress that he had in the 2010 elections. Since then, Obama has be stymied in securing his agenda. Moreover, it is really unclear what his agenda for a second term is. Mitt Romney was essentially right on when arguing that Obama had not offered a plan for four more years beyond what we saw in the first term. A replay wouldn't work Whatever successes Obama had in the first term, simply doing a replay in the next four years will not work. First, Obama faces roughly the same hostile Congress going forward that he did for the last two years. Do not expect to see the Republicans making it easy for him. Second, the president’s party generally does badly in the sixth year of his term. This too will be the case in 2014, especially when Democrats have more seats to defend in the Senate than the GOP does. Third, the president faces a crowded and difficult agenda. All the many fiscal cliffs and demands to cut the budget will preoccupy his time and resources, depleting money he would like to spend on new programs. Obama has already signed on to an austerity budget for his next four years – big and bold is not there. Fourth, the Newtown massacre and Obama’s call for gun reform places him in conflict with the NRA. This is a major battle competing with the budget, immigration, Iran and anything else the president will want to do. Finally, the president is already a lame duck and will become more so as his second term progress. Presidential influence is waning One could go on, but the point should be clear: Obama has diminishing time, resources, support and opportunity to accomplish anything. His political capital and presidential influence is waning, challenging him to adopt a minimalist agenda for the future. What should Obama do? Among the weaknesses of his first term were inattention to filling federal judicial vacancies. Judges will survive beyond him and this should be a priority for a second term, as well as preparing for Supreme Court vacancies. He needs also to think about broader structural reform issues that will outlive his presidency, those especially that he can do with an executive order. Overall, Obama has some small opportunities to do things in the next four years – but the window is small and will rapidly close.

Winners lose

Ryan, 2009 (Selwyn Professor of Social Science at the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies, University of West Indies, Ph.D. in Political Science from Cornell, http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968)

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised, let alone all of it. Reality will force him to make many "u" turns and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a vast accumulation of political capital, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and fast diminishing asset in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is rarely ever renewable. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who did not know how to husband the political capital with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, some promises have to be deferred beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics is not a winner-take-all system. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything done politically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading. No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

### 1NR A2: Not Until July

#### Doesn’t assume the magnitude of the link – we’ve already proven the plan is so unpopular that it will be literally impossible for Obama to generate political capital

#### Doesn’t assume the fact that political capital is uniquely finite in a second term – Obama only has a short timeframe to do anything because the republicans will want to focus on the primaries instead of cooperating with him and will start to think he is a lame duck president – that’s inquisitor

#### And new issues derail obama’s high political capital which he is using on immigration reform.

NBC News 12/30/12

Immigration and gun violence top president's post-fiscal cliff agenda

http://nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/\_news/2012/12/30/16239613-immigration-and-gun-violence-top-presidents-post-fiscal-cliff-agenda?lite

While all eyes remain fixated on the nation’s budget woes and the so-called fiscal cliff negotiations, President Barack Obama told NBC News on Sunday that he has more ambitious goals in mind for his second term. In an exclusive interview with NBC’s “Meet the Press,” Obama said that there are several major issues sitting atop his agenda for the next four years, including immigration, economic growth, energy issues, the environment, and gun violence. The president discussed efforts to address gun violence and immigration with particular urgency on Sunday. "I've said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority," he said. "I will introduce legislation in the first year to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough." And in the aftermath of December's deadly elementary school shooting in Newtown, Conn., the president vowed to put his "full weight" behind the gun violence recommendations he asked Vice President Joe Biden to generate. Recommended: Obama on Benghazi: 'This was a huge problem' Obama said that battle would also be fought during the first year of his second term, the success of which the president suggested would hinge upon just how searing the deadly shooting was to the public psyche. President Barack Obama says "I think anybody who was up in Newtown, who talked to the parents, who talked to the families understands that something fundamental in America has to change." "Will there be resistance? Absolutely there will be resistance," the president told NBC's David Gregory. "And the question then becomes whether we are actually shook up enough by what happened here that it does not just become another one of these routine episodes where it gets a lot of attention for a couple of weeks and then it drifts away. It certainly won't feel like that to me. This is something that was the worst day of my presidency. And it's not something that I want to see repeated." Obama also said he was "skeptical" of the National Rifle Association's proposal to put an armed guard in every school, though he said he would not "prejudge" any proposals to address mass shooting events. Those items alone might constitute an ambitious agenda for a second-term president, who, history suggests, has a limited timetable to accomplish top goals before the waning powers of a lame-duck presidency set in.

 Key staffers huddle behind closed doors against the backdrop of a snowy capital as they attempt to hammer a last-minute deal to avoid going over the so-called fiscal cliff. NBC's Kristen Welker reports. But Obama added to that list two other priorities which eluded him in his first term. He said energy and the environment would be a "third thing" on his second term agenda, for instance. "We've got a huge opportunity around energy. We are producing more energy and America can become an energy exporter," the president said. "How do we do that in a way that also deals with some of the environmental challenges that we have at the same time?" The president acknowledged, though, that his top priority is preventing automatic tax hikes on all Americans come Jan. 1 as part of the fiscal cliff. That battle has been playing out vividly in Washington during the final days of 2012, and directly involves the fourth priority as described by Obama: stabilizing and growing the economy. "Part of that is deficit reduction. Part of it is also making sure that we're investing, for example, in rebuilding our infrastructure, which is broken," he said, arguing that the combination of spending cuts elsewhere and new investments would help stabilize the economy. But Obama's ability to accomplish those four priorities — and then some — could be sapped by the protracted fiscal cliff battle, or any of the other legislative battles he might encounter along the way.

### 1NR Public Lands Link

#### Renewables on public lands piss of republicans

Bowen 12 (Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions, “Western public lands could produce renewable energy for 7 million homes” http://www.examiner.com/article/western-public-lands-could-produce-renewable-energy-for-7-million-homes)

Much of the renewable energy being developed in the west is already on public land, excluding national parks and Monuments, managed by the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Land Management. This agency oversees a large amount of the acreage in all six states: about 17% of Arizona, 15% of California, 12% of Colorado, 68% of Nevada, 17% of New Mexico, and 43% of Utah according to the study. Public lands are already leased to gas, oil, coal, and other mining operations. They are used for grazing of cattle, horses, and sheep. Use of these lands for renewable energy would not be a reinvention of the wheel. That is what is realistically possible? What will it take to make this happen? It will take political will, followed by policy changes, and of course, financing. If policies are changed, private capital could provide financing according to the report. The New York Times reported in June that banks are poised to invest in green technology firms. What are the obstacles? As presently constituted, Congress is the biggest problem. Republicans do not favor renewable energy and are not likely to enact any policies to facilitate it. Mitt Romney, should he win the election, is also not a fan of renewable energy either. His policies would essentially be dictated by big oil.

### 1NR A2: Not Congress

#### ---The word “Establish” means Congress --- Constitutional requirement.

Watson 2012

Mark, Legal journalist, EXTRAORDINARY INSIGHT, Views from Flyover Country: Politics on the Right Side, http://www.flyover-country.net/2012/03/extraordinary-insight.html

But, one would ask, “Since under the Constitution only Congress can establish laws, how can a president think he is authorized to enforce the laws not passed by Congress?

#### Severing out of the mandates of the plan is a voting issue – moots the most predictable site of offense for the negative by becoming a moving target

#### Agencies don’t shield and no risk of a turn---Obama is velcro and will only get blamed---no credit

**Nicholas & Hook 10** Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.¶** Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to **better insulate Obama**, White House aides have sought to **give other Cabinet officials a higher profile** and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ **But Obama remains the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ What's **not sticking to Obama** is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. **Political dividends** from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill **have been fleeting**.¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. **Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss**.¶ But **the Obama administration is about one man**. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. **No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, **more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.

#### Obama will be blamed for agency action

Wallison 3 Resident Fellow @ A.E.I. “A Power Shift No One Noticed”, AEI Online, 1-1, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15652/pub\_detail.asp

To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of **all parties**--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was **fully accountable for an agency** that has always been viewed as independent.¶ The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can **hardly be overstated**. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become **electorally responsible** for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the **die is now cast**. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the **attitude of Congress**. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be **difficult to convince them otherwise**. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."