## T – Procurement

### 1NC

#### Procurement is not a financial incentive

Czinkota et al, 9- Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. Fiscal incentives are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives** offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. **Nonfinancial incentives** include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

#### Feed-in tariffs are distinct from financial incentives – they are government procurement

Marie Wilke (International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development) November 2011 “Feed-in Tariffs for Renewable Energy and WTO Subsidy Rules” http://ictsd.org/downloads/2011/11/feed-in-tariffs-for-renewable-energy-and-wto-subsidy-rules.pdf

Feed-in tariffs differ substantially from the classical examples of a subsidy such as loan guarantees above market standard, research and development funds and direct investment. In fact, whether a FIT scheme can qualify as ‘financial contribution by a government or any public body’ is disputed. A FIT scheme could potentially qualify as a financial contribution in the form of ‘a governmental purchase of goods’ because, as established before, a FIT programme essentially is a purchasing guarantee for electricity.49 This may seem counterintuitive at first as some consider electricity a service rather than a good. However, irrespective of its physical properties, GATT 1947 defined electricity as a good in its Harmonized System (HS) Nomenclature.50 Concession schedules continue to follow this definition. Likewise, after years of debate, there seems to be a general recognition that the generation of electricity is a good while the transmission, distribution and related services are services.51 Certainly transmission and distribution services also play a role in FIT systems as the purchasing guarantee also involves a guarantee to feed that electricity into the general network – i.e. to ensure transmission. In fact, in FIT systems this guarantee takes the form of a right. Yet, the relationship that a FIT mechanism establishes between the electricity generator and the distribution companies concerns the purchase of electricity and not the services of transmission,52 the latter remains an issue that only distributing companies are concerned with. In theory, in line with their contractual obligations, they are probably free to not transmit the energy as long as the purchase is guaranteed. In either case, if one was to argue that the subsidy also entails the transmission guarantee, this could potentially be covered under the option to ‘provide a service’ within the same alternative (iii). For comparison of this provision with WTO government procurement provisions, see box 3 below.

The advantage to our interp is limits- there are almost infinite incentives- only by limiting to financial incentives can the neg have any hope of keeping up with the number of mechanisms procurement is uniquely bad because it does not require commercialization- key to energy DA’s which are fundamental to the topic- also key to energy market DA’s like electricity prices

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### They expand limits to any rule that also requires spending by the government

**Schoofs ‘4** (Sam Schoofs, Calvin College, 2004, Washington Internships for Students of Engineering Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, 6 August 2004 “A federal Renewable Portfolio Standard: Policy Analysis and Proposal”)

D. Renewable Energy Policy Overview There are two main categories of renewable energy policies. The first category gives some financial incentives to encourage renewable energy that includes tax incentives, grants, loans, rebates, and production incentives [13]. Tax incentives cover personal, sales, property, and corporate taxes and they help to reduce the investment costs and to reward investors for their support of renewable energy sources [12], [13]. As an example, 24 states currently have some form of grant program in place that ranges from as small as $500 up to $1,000,000 [13]. The second category of renewable energy policies is called rules and regulations, which mandate a certain action from an obligated entity. Included within this category are renewable portfolio standards, equipment certification, solar/wind access laws, **and green power purchasing**/aggregation polices [13]. As an example, equipment certification allows the states to regulate the performance criteria that equipment is required to meet in order to be eligible for financial incentives [12]. Seven states currently have equipment certification programs in place

#### Limits outweigh –

#### A. Most logical—the significance of one-of-many issues is minimal. Constraints inherently increase meaning.

#### B. It’s a precursor—education is inevitable, unfocused education isn’t productive. Limits determine the direction and productivity of learning.

#### Small schools- Huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities- Big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

#### Key to fairness- essential to ensure that debates at the end of the year have meaningful clash over the mechanism

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

#### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

### 2NC Reasonability

#### Reasonability begs the question of which interpretation is more correct - if we win a link to precision or limits it outweighs

#### It’s subjective—the difference is impossible to quantify—debate should emphasize 2 competing claims—that encourages debate—best for education.

#### Judge intervention may be inevitable – but offense/defense is key to prevent the worst and most arbitrary form

#### Explodes limits—dozens of exceptions to our interpretation can be made to explode the topic.

#### Reasonability is impossible – it’s arbitrary and undermines research and preparation

Resnick, assistant professor of political science – Yeshiva University, ‘1

(Evan, “Defining Engagement,” Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 54, Iss. 2)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

## CP

### 1NC

#### The United States Federal Government should establish a coordinating body within the Department of Energy to develop a competitive, performance-based procurement standard for technology for qualifying facilities that is distributed generation and has no carbon emissions.

#### The DOE should create a reverse auction for contracts with energy project developers to supply the technology that meets these requirements at lowest cost. Contracts should be awarded through a series of six monthly auctions, with contracts awarded to any companies that meet these performance requirements at the lowest cost, and demonstrate decreasing costs and continued performance over multiple auction rounds.

#### Solves the aff without picking winners—competition over a portfolio of tech substantially reduces energy cost

**Wood, 12** – Gratten Institute Program Director (Australia) (Tony, “Building the bridge: A practical plan for a low-cost, low-emissions energy future” <http://grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/a8778779/Building_the_bridge_report.pdf>

Governments must address these market failures, beyond putting a price on carbon. They must provide the credible financial return and predictable policy settings that companies need to make substantial, risky investments. But how can they support new technologies without `picking winners’ or, conversely, gambling that the market alone will do the job? This report sets out an innovative proposal to build a bridge between the current market and the market for low-emissions technologies Australia needs.¶ Here is how it would work: Government enters into long-term contracts with project developers to buy electricity at a price that makes low-emission projects viable. It awards contracts through a series of six-monthly auctions, held over 10 years. Competition to win contracts delivers the lowest price for low-emission power. Developers can invest knowing the contracts will be honoured irrespective of government policy on the carbon price. A 10-year timeframe and clear rules provide companies with a predictable investment environment, and multiple opportunities to invest. The scheme may produce about 5 per cent of Australia’s power. ¶ The auctions will award power contracts in specific technology categories. Over multiple rounds, technologies must deliver both low costs and show that their costs are falling. Those that do will gain more opportunities to build projects; those that do not will have opportunities withdrawn. The outcomes clarify the current uncertainty about which technologies will best meet Australia’s long-term needs. It is too soon to punt on just one or two horses. Instead, government should pay to develop a portfolio of options from which a proven set of technologies can emerge. ¶ Government should still fund technology R&D. But learning what works on the ground is the only way to identify the best mix for reliable, low-cost, low-emissions energy supply. The auction process gives companies the chance to gain practical deployment experience, and thereby to cross the bridge to commercial viability. Once technologies are viable, government should withdraw support, beyond a well-managed carbon price.

#### Early lifecycle competition is key to innovation – plan is procurement disaster and causes lock-in

**Hansen, 3** – LTC, US Army (Richard, “COMPETITION: A MEANS TO TRANSFORM THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE,” USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT,

http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA415099&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

Increased industrial competition can be beneficial throughout the defense acquisition lifecycle, provided the benefits outweigh the costs. There may be times when the savings generated are less than the costs of a second competitor, for example, a second competing production line. However, leveraging competitive market forces early in the R&D process has proven very beneficial. Furthermore, this **competition** early in the lifecycle may be imperative given the growing enthusiasm for evolutionary acquisition and a procurement trend that suggests more frequent but smaller production lots and less total production quantity. Early competition stimulates efforts to mature technology and solve system integration challenges. The lack of this technological maturity has certainly been a factor that has contributed to our dissatisfaction with the defense acquisition system. Consider multiple studies from the Government Accounting Office:¶ · DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Best Practices, 2002.¶ · Better Matching of Needs and Resources Will Lead to Better Weapon Systems Outcomes, 2001.¶ · Employing Best Practices Can Shape Better Weapon System Decisions, 2000.¶ · Better Management of Technology Development Can Improve Weapon Systems Outcomes, 1999.¶ · Best Commercial Practices Can Improve Program Outcomes, 1999.¶ · Improved Program Outcomes Are Possible, 1998.¶ A consistent theme in these studies indicates DoD’s inclination to commit to a formal program start too early.15 Those unsuccessful program initiations were characterized by a lack of systems engineering and resulting immature technology. **That** lack of upfront systems engineering **coupled with a lack of competition can** lead to disaster.

#### Innovation key to solve great power war

Baru 9 - Visiting Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore (Sanjaya, “Year of the power shift?,”

http://www.india-seminar.com/2009/593/593\_sanjaya\_baru.htm

In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the foundation of power was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. ‘Victory (in war),’ Kennedy claimed, ‘has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base.’6 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others.¶ ‘The fact remains,’ Kennedy argued, ‘that all of the major shifts in the world’s *military-power* balance have followed alterations in the *productive* balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources.’7¶ **I**n Kennedy’s view the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis or even decline would be transmitted through a nation’s inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and military power – the classic ‘guns vs butter’ dilemma.

### 1NR Perm Do Both

#### Perm produces massive cost overruns- tanks solvency

Cantarelli, 11 (11/28, Chantal, Delft University of Technology, “Cost Overruns in Large-Scale Transport Infrastructure Projects,” Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment)

Moreover, cost overruns are considered problematic for the following four reasons (Flyvbjerg et al., 2007, p.6). First of all, “they lead to a Pareto-inefficient allocation of resources, i.e., waste”. Cost forecasts are often inaccurate but the large standard deviations show that the margin by which costs are “wrong” differs across projects. As a consequence, the ranking of projects is affected and “decision makers are likely to implement inferior projects”. Additional budget is required as projects become more expensive than was initially estimated. The budget for other projects can therefore be affected, particularly as the total budget for infrastructure investments is often fixed in a given period. Cost overruns thus result in both financial wastage but also in fewer infrastructure projects being realised than planned. Secondly, cost overruns can “lead to delays and further cost overruns”. When confronted with cost overruns, attempts must be made to secure additional funding and projects must often be renegotiated or reapproved. This inevitably takes time and cost overruns increase with each additional year before implementation (Flyvbjerg et al., 2004). Thirdly, cost overruns “destabilize policy, planning, implementation, and operations of projects”. Cost overruns can lead to continuous reapproval and unrest in the project organisation and parliament. Fourthly, “the problem is getting bigger because projects get bigger”. When projects become more and more expensive and still involve cost overruns, the financial consequences can become so large that it even may destabilise the finances of a whole country or region.

#### Perm eliminates competition- that’s the key factor in innovation

**Eland, 1** - director of defense policy studies at the Cato Institute (Ivan, “Reforming a Defense Industry Rife with Socialism, Industrial Policy, and Excessive Regulation” 12/20, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-421es.html>)

In DoD and congressional circles, so-called competition has become an end in itself. Genuine competition is a means to lower costs, enhance quality, and spur innovation. But in the defense industry, “competition” usually means having two or more producers making the same defense article, regardless of whether the quantities purchased by the U.S. military are so low that they could be produced more efficiently by only one firm. (For example, although General Electric and Pratt and Whitney both produce aircraft engines, the Pentagon buys enough of them to support only one company efficiently.)7 If both producers know that, regardless of which one wins the design competition, they will both probably get to participate in some of the production run (during which big profits are earned), they have less incentive to develop a cutting-edge design and innovative manufacturing technologies to improve quality and hold costs down. Such pseudocompetition has few of the advantages of genuine competition; it also has many disadvantages that are not present when real market forces are present.¶ The main disadvantage is cost. Industrial policy in the name of national security is very expensive to the taxpayer. The government frequently is forced to pay the overhead needed to keep excess defense industrial capacity open. The military bureaucracies are spending taxpayers’ money to keep production facilities open across the country to retain grass-roots political support for a larger military by providing jobs. They are also keeping the facilities open to pressure Congress to use them to build more weapons.¶ In contrast, winner-take-all competitions are most efficient when small quantities of a defense article are demanded by the military. In the post–Cold War world, for major weapons, that situation is the norm; the war against low-tech terrorism and the destitute countries that sponsor it will not require a ramping up of production of conventional weapons (such as tanks, ships, submarines, and aircraft). In a legitimate winner-take-all competition, the company that wins produces all the finished articles at its factory or factories. The loser gets nothing and will probably close or mothball its unneeded capacity. Thus, as a result, the government pays the overhead on only one facility. Also, if two factories are producing small quantities that could be handled by one, they cannot get economies of scale when buying inputs of equipment, material, and labor. Furthermore, when a company produces a high-tech defense item, it experiences a learning curve— that is, as more articles are produced, the company learns how to produce them more efficiently and at a lower unit cost. If two companies are producing items that one firm could handle, their combined learning curve is less steep than that for a single, combined production run. Finally, if the government wants to keep a second producer alive, costs of transferring technology from one company to the other are likely to arise. Thus, if two firms produce the item, costs are likely to be higher than if one does.¶ Winner-Take-All Competitions Should Be Conducted¶ Considerations of overhead, economies of scale, and learning curves all point to conducting winner-take-all competitions for major weapons systems. The bad news is that winnertake- all competitions may prevent future competition by knocking one of the competitors out of the market permanently (as the government feared would happen with the JSF program). The good news is that not much will be lost by going to winner-take-all awards because the current industrial policy provides scant real competition on major weapons and that situation is unlikely to improve.¶ In arguing against winner-take-all competitions, the government maintains that keeping two firms designing and producing a defense article will result in more innovation. But, as noted earlier, such industrial policy attenuates innovation because the companies believe that they will get a piece of the production pie even if they are not innovative in the design of weapons. The same disincentives apply for cost reduction. In addition, the companies know that the results of any R&D they do will likely be given to the other firm at no cost.8 Furthermore, without winner- take-all contracts, firms will innovate less because they know they will not be allowed to maximize their profits by winning the whole purchase.9 Research by Leitzel and Riardon and Sappington suggests that if the winnertake- all contract for development and production is truly competitive, keeping around more than one producer is unlikely to improve weapons purchasing in the future.10 Even if after a winner-take-all competition only one major defense firm (a monopolist) were producing a particular defense article, the government would remain in a uniquely powerful position as the sole buyer (a monopsonist) of defense equipment and regulator of the defense market. (Although the Navy was overruled by DoD, it made such an argument in 1999 when it advocated allowing General Dynamics to buy Newport News shipyard and thereby gain control of four of the six private shipyards.)11 The government has the option of channeling its resources into production of weapons other than the one built by the monopolist. Rarely is only one weapon suitable for a combat mission. The ability to shift funds from one weapons system to the next gives the government leverage over the monopolist producer of any one weapon. In addition, a study by Columbia University economist Jagdish Bhagwati showed that even a monopolistic firm is restrained in its pricing behavior by large firms in other sectors (in this case, other defense subsectors) that have the potential to enter its market.12 Similarly, William Baumol and others noted that company performance was determined by the threat of a competitor’s entry into an industry rather than by the number of firms already in it.13 The findings of those studies have been confirmed in the defense industry; the huge companies that remain in the defense industry do not act like monopolists.14 Therefore, the Pentagon should not be afraid of replacing its industrial policy with winner-take-all competitions at the prime contractor level.

### 1NR Perm Do the CP (Procurement Affs)

#### The CP is less than the plan- it doesn’t specify which technology will accomplish the goals and thus which tech will be bought- the aff gets solvency deficits based on the governments ability to pick the right tech and externalities of a less cost competitive tech

#### A wide array of possible technology exists – the CP induces competition between all of them, and reduces overall costs – even if the plan is eventually adopted – it’s adopted with greater overall innovation

**Jenkins et al, 11** – Director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute (Jesse, “A NATIONAL CLEAN ENERGY TESTBEDS PROGRAM” November, <http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/Testbeds.pdf>)

N-CET’s first step would be an assessment of the status of advanced energy technologies and a determination as to which broad technology categories would benefit from centralized demonstration sites. DOE staff would lead this process, with input from DOD on technical assessment and military energy technology needs, based on DOD experience with energy technology development, procurement, and use. The assessment process should consider the following criteria in selection of eligible technology categories:¶ 1. Eligible technologies should generally not be considered commercially ready as a result of high perceived technology risk or similar factors;¶ 2. Eligible technologies will require large-scale demonstration before proceeding to commercialization;¶ 3. Accelerating permitting and siting and establishing key infrastructure (e.g., transmission connection) would accelerate demonstration and assessment of technology risks, reduce technology uncertainty, and hasten commercialization for eligible technologies; and¶ 4. Eligible technologies will have the long-term potential to:¶ A. Contribute to the diversification of sources of United States energy supply and reduce the nation’s reliance on fossil energy sources, with a favorable balance of environmental effects if the entire technology system is considered; or¶ B. Help strengthen and enhance US military capabilities and reduce the military’s operational reliance on fossil energy sources; or¶ C. Contribute to reducing, avoiding, or sequestering energy-related greenhouse gas emissions.¶ Under such criteria, technologies that might be suitable for selection include CSP, wave power, floating¶ deep-water wind turbine designs, enhanced/engineered geothermal energy production methods, modular¶ nuclear reactor designs, carbon capture and storage technologies for fossil fuel and biomass-fired power¶ plants, and grid-connected energy storage technologies, among others. The decision of the technology¶ assessment panel would direct N-CET as to what kinds of demonstration sites would be necessary.¶ After an initial period of time (e.g., several years), N-CET would re-asses technology needs and consider¶ new demonstration zones and/or alterations or closures for existing N-CET zones.¶ Demonstration Site Selection and Preparation¶ Based on the results of the technology assessment and selection, N-CET would identify potential demonstration sites on federal lands and waters. This task would fall to DOI and DOD, as the primary stewards of suitable public lands and waters, although DOE-managed sites throughout the country would also be considered. The process would ensure that the best possible sites are identified for each technology type, while minimizing costs to the government.¶ Of the possible sites, DOE and DOD would select the sites best suited to be a “demonstration zone” for each technology category. Some necessary qualities—size, geology, and weather, for example— would vary by technology type, but all sites would require electricity grid interconnection or suitable indigenous, on-site demand (e.g., from military or industrial facilities or other large-scale energy consumers). Therefore, sites with advantageous existing infrastructure, such as electricity substations, large on-site energy demand, and/or proximity to long-distance transmission lines would be favored.¶ Each demonstration zone would ideally house a number of individual “testbeds”—ready-to-use sites suitable for large-scale demonstration of a given technology design—in order for multiple designs to undergo demonstration simultaneously. If an appropriate number of testbeds cannot be accommodated in a single demonstration zone, multiple demonstration zone locations may be selected for a given technology category.¶ In addition to identifying suitable sites, N-CET would facilitate demonstration by pre-permitting testbeds and conducting programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS) assessments for demonstration zones. DOI would head this effort with support from DOE. 25 Similar actions are already underway on public lands. For example, as part its efforts to comply with the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which calls for greater use of public lands for energy production, BLM has completed programmatic environmental impact statements for commercial, utility-scale wind and geothermal plant siting on BLM-managed lands and is currently conducting a programmatic EIS for solar energy plants. 26¶ N-CET would further lower the barriers to demonstration by supplying the appropriate basic infrastructure for the demonstration zones, according to technology type. This would include access roads or port facilities, water supply as needed for plant cooling, and basic testbed site preparation to prepare for construction activities.¶ In order to provide true performance evaluations, all N-CET demonstration zones would be grid-connected or serve suitable indigenous, on-site energy load centers. As needed, N-CET would build or upgrade substations and transmission grid interconnection infrastructure. N-CET would also prenegotiate interconnection and transmission capacity allocation agreements with transmission line owners, to be finalized after specific technology designs have been selected.¶ By establishing plug and play testbeds at N-CET demonstration zones, the program will greatly reduce the demonstration hurdles faced by new and innovative clean energy technologies. By reducing the cost, time, and permitting burdens associated with finding and preparing sites for demonstration, N-CET will allow more designs to reach demonstration and accelerate the commercialization of promising clean energy technologies.¶ Competitive Application Process¶ After establishing an operational demonstration zone, N-CET would oversee a competitive application process to select the designs that would be granted use of the testbeds. Applicants could be any private firms, public-private partnerships, or consortia whose technology fits the qualities outlined above for technology assessment. The design must have long-term potential to reach a market-competitive price and/or should meet military procurement requirements. Applicant designs must be sufficiently advanced to conduct a grid-connected, large-scale pilot or full-scale demonstration. Applicants must also prove their ability to meet their share of the project-specific financing, discussed further below.¶ Financing¶ N-CET could be housed within DOE, but with a separate congressional authorization and high level of autonomy so that it can most freely function as a productive collaboration between DOE, DOD, and DOI. N-CET’s budget would provide funding for technology assessment, site selection, pre-permitting, programmatic EISs, construction of basic common infrastructure, applicant selection, and program administration.¶ Securing project-specific financing to cover the cost of demonstration project construction and installation, operation, testing, validation, and monitoring would be the responsibility of the project applicant. While applicants may draw on existing federal programs designed to finance or reduce risk for innovative energy technology demonstrations, at least 35 percent of project financing costs should be provided by private sector participants in the project. 27 This cost share requirement will ensure private sector involvement, a necessary step to reduce technology risk and spur commercialization.¶ While N-CET is a novel concept that will reduce key barriers to financing the demonstration and commercialization of nascent clean energy technologies, it remains one piece of the larger puzzle of securing financing for these early-stage energy technologies. This proposal will need to be considered along with other financing mechanisms to address the wide range of financing challenges that face innovative clean energy companies along the entire technology innovation lifecycle. 28¶ Department of Defense Participation¶ As the nation’s single largest energy consumer, the DOD has strong motivation to optimize its energy use. As discussed earlier, the military has an acute need for non-fossil fuel alternatives and to enhance the resiliency of electricity grids at military facilities at home and abroad. As a result, DOD is motivated to explore new options and is already accelerating the demonstration of biofuels for Air Force aircraft and Navy vessels and opening military lands for clean energy generation. 29¶ N-CET will provide DOD further opportunities to engage in dual-use energy technology demonstrations to meet civilian and military energy needs. As part of the N-CET technology assessment and selection process, DOD will be able to highlight and recommend technologies it deems necessary and beneficial. DOD may also opt to make its own lands available for demonstration zones. In addition, the military is likely to be a willing and effective partner in clean energy innovation efforts.¶ The CNA Military Advisory Board finds that “in the course of addressing its most serious energy challenges, the Department of Defense can contribute to national solutions as a technological innovator, early adopter, and testbed.” 30 Because of its unique structure, leadership culture, and experience with technology innovation, DOD “can be a powerful catalyst of energy innovation,” especially when collaborating with other agencies. 31 N-CET will provide an invaluable opportunity for DOD to act on these advantages in collaboration with DOE, serving as a guide and testbed in the country’s search for effective advanced energy technologies.

#### Process over product – this counterplan encourages the development of better researched and planned policies and is vital to being a competent advocate for energy policy – the alternative is policy failure

**Nolon 11** – Associate Professor of Law and Dispute Resolution Program Director, Vermont Law School

(Sean, “NEGOTIATING THE WIND: A FRAMEWORK TO ENGAGE CITIZENS IN SITING WIND TURBINES”, <http://cojcr.org/vol12no2/327-372.pdf>, dml)

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

#### resolved --- it means permanence and certainty

Google Dictionary, 12-

[“Define Resolved” <https://www.google.com/search?q=define+resolved&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a>]

Firmly determined to do something.

#### It must be definite

**Dictionary.com** ([www.dictionary.com/browsed/resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/browsed/resolved)

Resolve:

to come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full.

#### should requires immediate legal effect

Summers, 94-

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

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  [CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE] [13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "Should" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with ought but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an obligation and to be more than advisory); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an obligation to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

### 1NR Certainty Solvency Deficit

#### Uncertainty about whether your tech will get picked is a good thing- that’s what drives competition in the reverse auction process- the CP just has to create sufficient certainty that some tech will be commercialized

#### Reverse auctions provide political certainty to drive widespread commercial investment

**ACORE, 12** – American Council on Renewable Energy “Reverse Auctions for Renewable Energy Smart Policy in Everyone’s Best Interest” 5/29, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CDcQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.acore.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2012%2F06%2FReverse-Auctions-for-Renewable-Energy-5.29.12.docx&ei=Hf-LUMjuELTI0AHDiIHQCQ&usg=AFQjCNG4jwxCIPdfUR8s7ctf4QNhSb5mJw>

The renewables sector should look beyond its support of tax-based support policy mechanisms to more market driven support policies, such as reverse auctions, that work in the best interest of all stakeholders by driving volume and installations and further reducing costs to the consumer. The policy proposal to create a Reverse Auction Authority that has the power to distribute support monies from an “American Energy Trust Fund”, for example, would provide the political certainty that the renewables sector needs and further assist renewable energy technologies along their respective cost curves towards grid parity, enabling sustainable long-term growth of this industry in the U.S.

#### Plan links more – the CP establishes a more predictable framework

**Trabish, 12** – edits NewEnergy News (Herman, “TODAY’S STUDY: THE BACKING NEW ENERGY IS GETTING AND THE BACKING IT NEEDS” 5/7, <http://newenergynews.blogspot.com/2012/05/todays-study-backing-new-energy-is.html>)

Cost competitiveness is achievable, but until technological innovation and cost declines can secure independence from ongoing subsidy, clean tech segments will remain continually imperiled by the threat of policy expiration and political uncertainty. Continual improvement in price and performance is thus the only real pathway beyond the cycle of clean tech boom and bust.

### 1NR Tech Spec Bad

#### Specifying models in advance creates massive cost overrun and performance breakdown – can’t predict which tech is best

**Hansen, 3** – LTC, US Army (Richard, “COMPETITION: A MEANS TO TRANSFORM THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE,” USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT,

http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA415099&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

Our current defense acquisition environment has received much harsh criticism. The population of skeptics continues to grow and includes senior Department of Defense (DOD) leaders. Consider the recent comments by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld: I worry about the technology base in this country. The degree of competition is declining in the defense industry. The longer the large defense contractors deal with the Defense Department, the more they become like the Defense Department—and I don’t say that as a compliment. They get big and slow and sluggish and bureaucratic. …That means that the government tends not to have the kind of interaction with the **creativity and innovation** that exists in our society.1 Such skepticism is understandable. The weapon systems development cycle is frequently characterized by cost overruns and schedule delays. These cost and schedule setbacks are sometime quite significant and measured in billions of dollars and years of delays. Furthermore, while some technologies are clearly superior to threat capabilities, other technologies are less state-of-the art than commercial equivalents. Although it may be convenient to point the finger at a “Cold War” industry, they are not solely to blame. The defense research, development, and acquisition process is methodical, disciplined, thorough, safe, and compliant if not obedient at times to government legislation and regulations. All of these are arguably valuable qualities of scientific research and system engineering, but are, in a word, slow. This same methodical process is cumbersome to many, submissive or at best acquiescent to various stakeholders, and predominately risk averse. While this risk aversion is not necessarily preferred, it too is understandable.

Some risk is always inherent in developing a new technology: It may not work as expected; it may be more costly than expected; planned production techniques may not be appropriate. Despite these inherent risks, the process and its **players can be** overly optimistic in the planning stages. That optimism can and often does influence our perceptions of the technological maturity of the effort and the costs and schedule required to develop a product. Our optimism can and often does influence us to underestimate the risks associated with the technical solutions and integration required to develop a product. When critiquing warfighting plans, General Richard E. Cavazos, one of the Army’s great warfighters and now a senior army mentor, always offered, “The enemy has a vote.” Similarly, in the weapons research, development, and acquisition process, “technology has a vote.” When operating at the technological frontier, uncertainty—about both cost and performance—makes it difficult, if not impossible, to specify in advance precisely what is required of particular systems and how much such systems are likely to cost.2 When technology is not as mature as we perceive it to be, our optimism turns to pessimism at slowed progress and partial results. The weapon system development is suddenly short on resources to mature the technology and long on risk. A competitive environment reduces the cost and schedule risks by stimulating technology maturation and its integration. When working with a sole source developer this stimulus is missing. Despite some past and recent weapons, platforms, and munitions successes, all of these aspects have exposed the defense acquisition process and our industrial base to extremely harsh criticism and created a lack of confidence among some of our most senior leaders.

### 1NR Net Benefit

#### Turns case and solves better

**Hansen, 3** – LTC, US Army (Richard, “COMPETITION: A MEANS TO TRANSFORM THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE,” USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT,

http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA415099&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

Competition can help reduce cycle times, lower costs, and improve innovation and weapon systems performance. It can be beneficial throughout the product lifecycle, from development through sustainment and retirement. Moreover, competition will become imperative, particularly early in the research and development (R&D) phases, given the growing enthusiasm for evolutionary acquisition and quicker development and production cycle times. This increased competition might allow us to achieve our objectives of fixing the process and concurrently developing the products and services that the warfighter requires. In the commercial sector and in many defense industry examples, competition not regulation compels industry to integrate advanced technologies into producible systems and deploy them to the marketplace—-in this case the warfighter--in the shortest time practicable.

#### The impact is heg

Martino 7 – founder and chairman of the board of Cyber Technology Group, author of numerous books on finance (Rocco, A Strategy for Success: Innovation Will Renew American Leadership, <http://www.fpri.org/orbis/5102/martino.innovationamericanleadership.pdf>,)

The United States of course faced great challenges to its security and economy in the past, most obviously from Germany and Japan in the first half of the twentieth century and from the Soviet Union in the second half. Crucial to America’s ability to prevail over these past challenges was our technological and industrial leadership, and especially our ability to continuously recreate it. Indeed, the United States has been unique among great powers in its ability to keep on creating and recreating new technologies and new industries, generation after generation. Perpetual innovation and technological leadership might even be said to be the American way of maintaining primacy in world affairs. They are almost certainly what America will have to pursue in order to prevail over the contemporary challenges involving economic competitiveness and energy dependence. 

#### Key internal link to heg- Explains last five centuries of global hegemons

Drezner 2001 Daniel Drezner (professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University) 2001 “State structurdae, technological leadership and the maintenance of hegemony” http://www.danieldrezner.com/research/tech.pdf

In this decade, proponents of globalization argue that because information and capital are mobile, the location of innovation has been rendered unimportant.6 While this notion has some popular appeal, the globalization thesis lacks theoretical or empirical support. Theoretically, even in a world of perfect information and perfect capital mobility, economists have shown that the location of technological innovation matters. Empirically, the claims of globalization proponents have been far-fetched. Capital is not perfectly mobile, and increased economic exchange does not lead to a seamless transfer of technology from one country to another.8 The location of innovation still matters. Long-cycle theorists have paid the most attention to the link between technological innovation, economic growth, and the rise and fall of hegemons.9 They argue that the past five hundred years of the global political economy can be explained by the waxing and waning of hegemonic powers. Countries acquire hegemonic status because they are the first to develop a cluster of technologies in leading sectors. These innovations generate spillover effects to the rest of the lead economy, and then to the global economy. Over time, these ‘technological hegemons’ fail to maintain the rate of innovations, leading to a period of strife until a new hegemonic power is found.

### 1NR A2 Add-On

#### Their EPA and other thumpers establish he’s going to be doing stuff on energy now, there’s no real reason why that doesn’t solve--- their evidence is just some commie smart planet blogger ranting about the aff

#### Obama takes credit for the CP--- solves, does functionally the same thing but better

#### Obama gets the credit for the CP

Nicholas and Hook 10 **Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, “Obama the Velcro President,” LOS ANGELES TIMES, 7—30—10,** [**http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3**](http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3)**, accessed 8-22-11.**

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. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

#### No spillover

#### No risk of great power conflict in Central Asia: incentives to de-escalate and stable balance of power

Zhao Huasheng, director of the Center for Russia and Central Asia Studies at Fudan University, February 2005, CEF Quarterly, http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/docs/CEF/CEF\_Quarterly\_Winter\_2005.doc.pdf, p. 31

China, Russia, and the United States will not go to open confrontation for several reasons. Generally speaking, the relations of the three powers in Central Asia depend on their general relations. In other words, if their general relations sour, their relations in Central Asia will go tense or intensify. Otherwise, if their general relations are good, their relations in Central Asia will not be hostile and openly confrontational. Conversely, in spite of the tripartite configuration among the three powers, especially the confrontation between Russia and the United States, like two tigers gazing at each other in their military bases in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, none of the three powers wants to undermine bilateral relations on the parochial issue of Central Asia. The coexistence of the three powers in Central Asia restrains their open confrontation as well. None of the three powers intends to ally with one against the other. Or, none is pleased to see a united front formed by two against one. At the same time, none wants to see Central Asia to be monopolized by one power. Therefore, the game played by three powers is good for the balance of power and not for open confrontation in any forms.

## Electricity Prices DA

### 1NC

#### Electricity prices are dropping and will stay low

Dallas Burtraw, one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector, and studies electricity restructuring, competition, and economic deregulation, “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom,” Common Resources, August 21, 2012, <http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency. For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### Feed in tariffs jack up prices by $500 a person

IER 2012 “Spain Halts Feed-In-Tariffs for Renewable Energy” April 9, 2012 http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/04/09/spain-halts-feed-in-tariffs-for-renewable-energy/

Beginning next year, Spain will halt new feed-in-tariff (FIT) contracts for renewable energy. Feed-in-tariffs are used to accelerate renewable investment by providing long-term contracts that pay the owners of these projects above-market rates for the electricity produced. Because renewable technologies generally cost more than conventional fossil fuel technologies, the government guarantees that renewable firms get the higher cost for their technologies. Consequently, utilities or consumers or both pay more for electricity. Similar policies have been proposed in the United States. Spain is changing its position on renewable energy FIT contracts due to fiscal challenges and lower credit ratings. The electricity system deficit due to the higher cost of electricity is over 24 billion Euros and that amount is growing. To put this in context, this is $520 per Spaniard.

#### This causes a depression

**Entine, 9** – adjunct fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (Jon, “U.S. and Climate Change--Rescue of the Planet Postponed?”, 2/24, <http://aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.29333/pub_detail.asp>)

The correlation between economic growth and energy costs is high and negative; when energy costs go up, productivity takes a nosedive. In these extraordinary times, arguably the top priority must be to ensure that a secular financial downturn doesn't turn into a worldwide structural depression. If that happens, both the economy and the environment will be losers.

#### Global war

Harris and Burrows, 9 – \*counselor in the National Intelligence Council, the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025, \*\*member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, Washington Quarterly, http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_burrows.pdf)

Increased Potential for Global Conflict¶ Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier.¶ In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn.¶ The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises**.¶ Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

## Politics (CIR)

### 1NC

#### Immigration reform will pass now but political capital key

Gary Martin Published 7:40 pm, Thursday, March 28, 2013 Immigration reform gaining support in Congress Read more: <http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/Immigration-reform-gaining-support-in-Congress-4393187.php#ixzz2OtaMmqbj>

A Republican Party in desperate search for relevance to Latino voters. An expanded Democratic advantage in the Senate. A second-term President with his legacy on the line.¶ Does all that add up to enough to break decades of impasse and produce comprehensive immigration reform? As expectations -- and tensions -- rise, the answer won't be long in coming.¶ A bipartisan bill could be filed in the Senate as early as next week, followed in relatively short order by a House bill, also crafted by a bipartisan group, aiming at a compromise on the key issue of citizenship.¶ The efforts are being applauded by President Barack Obama, who is using every ounce of his political clout to try to get comprehensive reform.¶ Obama said the time has come "to work up the political courage to do what's required to be done."¶ "I expect a bill to be put forward. I expect a debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible," Obama said at a White House naturalization ceremony.¶ In addition to the issue of eventual citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, Congress is expected to address the need for temporary or guest worker programs.¶ Congress last passed comprehensive bipartisan reform legislation in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan signed a law that granted citizenship to several million undocumented immigrants and created a guest worker program.¶ Up until now, Republicans have opposed citizenship programs as an "amnesty" for lawbreakers who entered the country illegally, and labor has chafed at guest worker programs.¶ But Republican losses in the 2012 elections and increased public support for reform have many in the GOP talking compromise.¶ "If there is one issue that the two parties could produce something meaningful on in this Congress, it would be immigration," said Stephen Hess, a political expert at The Brookings Institution.¶ Hess said an eventual bill "will have lots of provisos, and it will go back and forth, but it would be hard not to produce something given the general feeling that something has to be produced."¶ More and more Republicans are moving toward immigration-reform measures as the party seeks to reach out to Latinos, the nation's largest -- and growing -- minority voting bloc.¶ Public opinion is behind them.¶ A recent poll showed 63 percent of Americans supported a path to citizenship for undocumented workers provided they meet certain requirements, according to a survey by the Public Religion Research Institute.¶ Notable Republicans who have recently spoken in favor of compromise on citizenship proposals include Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky.; former Mississippi Gov. Haley Barbour; and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis.¶ And a March report by the National Republican Committee, considered a "post mortem" on the 2012 elections, recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive immigration reform to shore up its shaky standing with minorities -- Latinos, in particular.¶ Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, which advocates lower numerical numbers on immigration, predicted a majority of Republican senators would oppose citizenship.¶ Groups like Numbers USA are working to hold GOP senators in line. They sent 13,000 emails to Kentucky voters that claimed Paul's position was "more radical and pro-immigration than anything proposed by President Obama."¶ The group has targeted Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., one of the "Gang of Eight" senators writing the Senate bipartisan bill, as a lawmaker who favors foreign workers over unemployed South Carolinians.¶ Democrats from conservative-leaning states could also feel political heat.¶ Beck said if five to 10 Democrats in the Senate oppose a bill, proponents would need 10 to 15 Republicans to reach the 60 votes needed to cut off debate and vote on legislation.¶ "You do the math," Beck said.¶ In 2007, an effort to cut off debate on a Senate immigration reform bill died on a 46-53 vote.¶ But immigrant reform proponents, such as America's Voice, say there is a "tectonic shift" in the GOP, and the Democrats also have expanded their Senate majority to 53-45, plus two independents who caucus with them. They predict the Senate will muster the votes necessary to pass a reform bill.¶ Still, it won't be easy.¶ "We will have not only a few potholes, but a few near-death experiences along the way," said Frank Sharry, America's Voice executive director.¶ All eyes are on Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a Republican who like Paul was elected with Tea Party support.¶ Cruz joined Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, who is up for re-election in 2014, in a measure to stall the fast-moving process in the Senate. Both say they oppose "amnesty."¶ In a letter to Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., the Texas Republicans urged the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to open up the legislative process with hearings.¶ The "Gang of Eight" senators -- four Democrats and four Republicans -- are expected to introduce their bill when Congress returns from Easter recess.¶ Overall, the new Senate bill is expected to grant undocumented immigrants a path to citizenship within 13 years, similar to a proposal put forth by the White House, according to those familiar with the discussions.¶ Undocumented immigrants would have to pay fines, back taxes, learn English and have no criminal record to work legally and become eligible for naturalization.¶ Although no specific details have been released, senators involved in the process say the citizenship proposals would be contingent upon border-security benchmarks and high-tech measures to curb illegal crossings.¶ Congress will return to an expected throng of thousands of immigrants, labor and immigrant rights supporters on the West Lawn of the Capitol next week.¶ Advocates are also holding more than 200 events in 35 states during the congressional recess to rally support, said Sue Chinn, campaign manager for Alliance for Citizenship.

#### Feed in tariffs cost capital

ANNE C. MULKERN, Greenwire¶ Published: March 24, 2009 http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/03/24/24greenwire-some-see-daylight-at-last-for-us-feedin-tariff-10271.html?pagewanted=all

A feed-in tariff offers an incentive for ramping up renewable energy. Utilities pay above-market rates for energy generated by homeowners or businesses that install solar panels and connect to the grid. In Europe, lucrative rates and long-term contracts are offered for such arrangements.¶ A feed-in tariff that started in Germany in 1991 is credited with powering an expansion of solar there. At about the size of Montana, Germany has five times the number of installed solar panels that the United States has and is second only to Japan in terms of photovoltaic power generation, according to the German government.¶ A similar program could be a boon to U.S. solar power. Largely because of cost, solar has generated little interest here. In 2007, it made up less than 0.02 percent of the country's electricity generation.¶ But feed-in tariffs are controversial. They are blamed for sharply higher electricity prices in countries where they exist. Some question whether Americans accustomed to comparatively low electricity costs would tolerate paying more.¶ Utility companies also argue that they are not needed, since Congress is poised to pass legislation that would set financial penalties for carbon emissions from traditional power sources. And there might not be a political appetite for a fight over a national tariff.

#### CIR key to Latin American stability

**Gittelson ‘9** (Citation: 23 Notre Dame J.L. Ethics & Pub. Pol'y 115 2009 THE CENTRISTS AGAINST THE IDEOLOGUES: WHAT ARE THE FALSEHOODS THAT DIVIDE AMERICANS ON THE ISSUE OF COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM Robert Gittelson has been a garment manufacturer in the Los Angeles area for over twenty-five years. His wife, Patricia Gittelson, is an immigration attorney with offices in Van Nuys and Oxnard, California. Robert also works closely with Patricia on the administrative side of her immigration practice. Throughout his career, Mr. Gittelson has developed practical, first-hand experience in dealing with the immigration issues that are challenging our country today.

In the alternative, should we fail to pass CIR, and instead opt to deport or force attrition on these millions of economic refugees through an enforcement-only approach to our current undocumented immigrant difficulties, what would be the net result? Forgetting for now the devastating effect on our own economy, and the worldwide reproach and loss of moral authority that we would frankly deserve should we act so callously and thoughtlessly, there is another important political imperative to our passing CIR that affects our national security, and the security and political stability of our neighbors in our hemisphere. That is the very real threat of communism and/or socialism. First of all, the primary reason why millions of undocumented economic refugees migrated to the United States is because the economies of their home countries were unable to support them. They escaped extreme poverty and oppression, and risked literally everything they had, including their lives and their freedom, to come to this country to try to work hard and support themselves and their families. Deporting our illegal immigrant population back to primarily Latin America would boost the communist and socialist movements in that part of our hemisphere, and if the anti-immigrationists only understood that fact, they might rethink their "line in the sand" position on what they insist on calling 'amnesty. Communism thrives where hope is lost. The economies of Latin American nations are struggling to barely reach a level of meager subsistence for the population that has remained at home; Mexico, for example, has already lost 14% of their able-bodied workers to U.S. migration.3" Without the billions of dollars in remissions from these nations' expatriates working in the United States that go back to help support their remaining family members, the economies of many of these countries, most of whom are in fact our allies, would certainly collapse, or at least deteriorate to dangerously unstable levels. The addition of millions of unemployed and frustrated deported people who would go to the end of the theoretical unemployment lines of these already devastated economies would surely cause massive unrest and anti-American sentiment. The issue of Comprehensive Immigration Reform is not simply a domestic issue. In our modern global economy, everything that we do, as the leaders of that global economy, affects the entire world, and most especially our region of the world. If we were to naively initiate actions that would lead to the destabilization of the Mexican and many Central and South American governments, while at the same time causing serious harm to our own economy (but I digress ... ), it would most assuredly lead to disastrous economic and political consequences. By the way, I'm not simply theorizing here. In point of fact, over the past few years, eight countries in Latin America have elected leftist leaders. Just last year, Guatemala swore in their first leftist president in more than fifty years, Alvaro Colom.3" He joins a growing list. Additional countries besides Guatemala, Venezuela,32 and Nicaragua33 that have sworn in extreme left wing leaders in Latin America recently include Brazil,34 Argentina,3 5 Bolivia,36 Ecuador,37 and Uruguay.3s This phenomenon is not simply a coincidence; it is a trend. The political infrastructure of Mexico is under extreme pressure from the left.39 Do we really want a leftist movement on our southern border? If our political enemies such as the communists Chavez in Venezuela and Ortega in Nicaragua are calling the shots in Latin America, what kind of cooperation can we expect in our battle to secure our southern border?

#### Extinction

**Manwaring ‘5** (Max G., Retired U.S. Army colonel and an Adjunct Professor of International Politics at Dickinson College, venezuela’s hugo chávez, bolivarian socialism, and asymmetric warfare, October 2005, pg. PUB628.pdf)

President Chávez also understands that the process leading to state failure is the most dangerous long-term security challenge facing the global community today. The argument in general is that failing and failed state status is the breeding ground for instability, criminality, insurgency, regional conflict, and terrorism. These conditions breed massive humanitarian disasters and major refugee flows. They can host “evil” networks of all kinds, whether they involve criminal business enterprise, narco-trafficking, or some form of ideological crusade such as *Bolivarianismo.* More specifically, these conditions spawn all kinds of things people in general do not like such as murder, kidnapping, corruption, intimidation, and destruction of infrastructure. These means of coercion and persuasion can spawn further human rights violations, torture, poverty, starvation, disease, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, trafficking in women and body parts, trafficking and proliferation of conventional weapons systems and WMD, genocide, ethnic cleansing, warlordism, and criminal anarchy. At the same time, these actions are usually unconfined and spill over into regional syndromes of poverty, destabilization, and conflict.62 Peru’s *Sendero Luminoso* calls violent and destructive activities that facilitate the processes of state failure “armed propaganda.” Drug cartels operating throughout the Andean Ridge of South America and elsewhere call these activities “business incentives.” Chávez considers these actions to be steps that must be taken to bring about the political conditions necessary to establish Latin American socialism for the 21st century.63 Thus, in addition to helping to provide wider latitude to further their tactical and operational objectives, state and nonstate actors’ strategic efforts are aimed at progressively lessening a targeted regime’s credibility and capability in terms of its ability and willingness to govern and develop its national territory and society. Chávez’s intent is to focus his primary attack politically and psychologically on selected Latin American governments’ ability and right to govern. In that context, he understands that popular perceptions of corruption, disenfranchisement, poverty, and lack of upward mobility limit the right and the ability of a given regime to conduct the business of the state. Until a given populace generally perceives that its government is dealing with these and other basic issues of political, economic, and social injustice fairly and effectively, instability and the threat of subverting or destroying such a government are real.64 But failing and failed states simply do not go away. Virtually anyone can take advantage of such an unstable situation. The tendency is that the best motivated and best armed organization on the scene will control that instability. As a consequence, failing and failed states become dysfunctional states, rogue states, criminal states, narco-states, or new people’s democracies. In connection with the creation of new people’s democracies, one can rest assured that Chávez and his Bolivarian populist allies will be available to provide money, arms, and leadership at any given opportunity. And, of course, the longer dysfunctional, rogue, criminal, and narco-states and people’s democracies persist, the more they and their associated problems endanger global security, peace, and prosperity.65

## Warming

### 1NC

#### Climate alarmism is founded on faulty science – their methods violate 81% of forecasting principles – their approach is apocalyptic, not scientific

J. Scott Armstrong et. al, 2011, is an author, forecasting and marketing expert, and a professor of Marketing at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Founder of the International Journal of Forecasting, Kesten C. Green is a PhD, Senior Lecturer, Managerial Economics, International Graduate School of Business, and Senior Research Associate of the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, University of South Australia, and Willie Soon is an astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, has been chief science adviser to the Science and Public Policy Institute, Energy & Environment, Vol. 22 Issue 8, “Research on Forecasting for the Manmade Global Warming Alarm,” p. 1091-2, Ebsco Host

The validity of the manmade global warming alarm requires the support of scientific forecasts of (1) a substantive long-term rise in global mean temperatures in the absence of regulations, (2) serious net harmful effects due to global warming, and (3) cost-effective regulations that would produce net beneficial effects versus alternatives policies, including doing nothing. Without scientific forecasts for all three aspects of the alarm, there is no scientific basis to enact regulations. In effect, the warming alarm is like a three-legged stool: each leg needs to be strong. Despite repeated appeals to global warming alarmists, we have been unable to find scientific forecasts for any of the three legs. We drew upon scientific (evidence-based) forecasting principles to audit the forecasting procedures used to forecast global mean temperatures by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) — leg “1” of the stool. This audit found that the IPCC procedures violated 81% of the 89 relevant forecasting principles. We also audited forecasting procedures, used in two papers that were written to support regulation regarding the protection of polar bears from global warming — leg “3” of the stool. On average, the forecasting procedures violated 85% of the 90 relevant principles. The warming alarmists have not demonstrated the predictive validity of their procedures. Instead, their argument for predictive validity is based on their claim that nearly all scientists agree with the forecasts. This count of “votes” by scientists is not only an incorrect tally of scientific opinion, it is also, and most importantly, contrary to the scientific method. We conducted a validation test of the IPCC forecasts that were based on the assumption that there would be no regulations. The errors for the IPCC model long-term forecasts (for 91 to 100 years in the future) were 12.6 times larger than those from an evidence-based “no change” model. Based on our own analyses and the documented unscientific behavior of global warming alarmists, we concluded that the global warming alarm is the product of an anti-scientific political movement. Having come to this conclusion, we turned to the “structured analogies” method to forecast the likely outcomes of the warming alarmist movement. In our ongoing study we have, to date, identified 26 similar historical alarmist movements. None of the forecasts behind the analogous alarms proved correct. Twenty-five alarms involved calls for government intervention and the government imposed regulations in 23. None of the 23 interventions was effective and harm was caused by 20 of them.

#### No biodiversity impact\*\*\*

Kareiva 2012 (Peter Kareiva, Michelle Marvier, professor and department chair of Environment Studies and Sciences at Santa Clara University, Robert Lalasz, director of science communications for The Nature Conservancy, Winter, “Conservation in the Anthropocene,” http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/journal/past-issues/issue-2/conservation-in-the-anthropocene/)

2. As conservation became a global enterprise in the 1970s and 1980s, the movement's justification for saving nature shifted from spiritual and aesthetic values to focus on biodiversity. Nature was described as primeval, fragile, and at risk of collapse from too much human use and abuse. And indeed, there are consequences when humans convert landscapes for mining, logging, intensive agriculture, and urban development and when key species or ecosystems are lost.¶ But ecologists and conservationists have grossly overstated the fragility of nature, frequently arguing that once an ecosystem is altered, it is gone forever. Some ecologists suggest that if a single species is lost, a whole ecosystem will be in danger of collapse, and that if too much biodiversity is lost, spaceship Earth will start to come apart. Everything, from the expansion of agriculture to rainforest destruction to changing waterways, has been painted as a threat to the delicate inner-workings of our planetary ecosystem.¶ The fragility trope dates back, at least, to Rachel Carson, who wrote plaintively in Silent Spring of the delicate web of life and warned that perturbing the intricate balance of nature could have disastrous consequences.22 Al Gore made a similar argument in his 1992 book, Earth in the Balance.23 And the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment warned darkly that, while the expansion of agriculture and other forms of development have been overwhelmingly positive for the world's poor, ecosystem degradation was simultaneously putting systems in jeopardy of collapse.24¶ The trouble for conservation is that the data simply do not support the idea of a fragile nature at risk of collapse. Ecologists now know that the disappearance of one species does not necessarily lead to the extinction of any others, much less all others in the same ecosystem. In many circumstances, the demise of formerly abundant species can be inconsequential ¶ to ecosystem function. The American chestnut, once a dominant tree in eastern North America, has been extinguished by a foreign disease, yet the forest ecosystem is surprisingly unaffected. The passenger pigeon, once so abundant that its flocks darkened the sky, went extinct, along with countless other species from the Steller's sea cow to the dodo, with no catastrophic or even measurable effects.¶ These stories of resilience are not isolated examples -- a thorough review of the scientific literature identified 240 studies of ecosystems following major disturbances such as deforestation, mining, oil spills, and other types of pollution. The abundance of plant and animal species as well as other measures of ecosystem function recovered, at least partially, in 173 (72 percent) of these studies.25**¶** While global forest cover is continuing to decline, it is rising in the Northern Hemisphere, where "nature" is returning to former agricultural lands.26 Something similar is likely to occur in the Southern Hemisphere, after poor countries achieve a similar level of economic development. A 2010 report concluded that rainforests that have grown back over abandoned agricultural land had 40 to 70 percent of the species of the original forests.27 Even Indonesian orangutans, which were widely thought to be able to survive only in pristine forests, have been found in surprising numbers in oil palm plantations and degraded lands.28¶ Nature is so resilient that it can recover rapidly from even the most powerful human disturbances. Around the Chernobyl nuclear facility, which melted down in 1986, wildlife is thriving, despite the high levels of radiation.29 In the Bikini Atoll, the site of multiple nuclear bomb tests, including the 1954 hydrogen bomb test that boiled the water in the area, the number of coral species has actually increased relative to before the explosions.30 More recently, the massive 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was degraded and consumed by bacteria at a remarkably fast rate.31¶ Today, coyotes roam downtown Chicago, and peregrine falcons astonish San Franciscans as they sweep down skyscraper canyons to pick off pigeons for their next meal. As we destroy habitats, we create new ones: in the southwestern United States a rare and federally listed salamander species seems specialized to live in cattle tanks -- to date, it has been found in no other habitat.32 Books have been written about the collapse of cod in the Georges Bank, yet recent trawl data show the biomass of cod has recovered to precollapse levels.33 It's doubtful that books will be written about this cod recovery since it does not play well to an audience somehow addicted to stories of collapse and environmental apocalypse.¶ Even that classic symbol of fragility -- the polar bear, seemingly stranded on a melting ice block -- may have a good chance of surviving global warming if the changing environment continues to increase the populations and northern ranges of harbor seals and harp seals. Polar bears evolved from brown bears 200,000 years ago during a cooling period in Earth's history, developing a highly specialized carnivorous diet focused on seals. Thus, the fate of polar bears depends on two opposing trends -- the decline of sea ice and the potential increase of energy-rich prey. The history of life on Earth is of species evolving to take advantage of new environments only to be at risk when the environment changes again.¶ The wilderness ideal presupposes that there are parts of the world untouched by humankind, but today it is impossible to find a place on Earth that is unmarked by human activity. The truth is humans have been impacting their natural environment for centuries. The wilderness so beloved by conservationists -- places "untrammeled by man"34 -- never existed, at least not in the last thousand years, and arguably even longer.

#### Solar doesn’t reduce emissions – empirics

Marques et al., University of Beira Economics Department, 12

(António Cardoso Marques and José Alberto Fuinhas, University of Beira Interior, Management and Economics Department and NECE, "Is renewable energy effective in promoting growth?," Energy Policy, Vol. 46, July 2012, p. 434-442, Science Direct)

With regard to the connection between reducing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) and economic growth, the literature also reaches unexpected results. Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010) found no evidence about causality running from RE to CO2, whereas the authors found unidirectional causality from CO2 to RE. Likewise, Apergis et al. (2010) conclude that the consumption of RE does not contribute to reducing CO2 emissions. Their explanation is the well-known difficulty of storing energy associated with the intermittency of renewables. Moreover, the inability to store, for example wind or solar energy, implies the simultaneous use of traditional pollutant sources of energy, such as coal and natural gas. This may be at the basis of different effects. On the one hand, it implies the maintenance of productive capacity that becomes idle in most time periods. This fact generates inefficiencies in the economy to the extent that large investments become idle over long periods. On the other hand, this intermittency may not even contribute to the reduction of countries’ energy dependence goals, as suggested by Frondel et al. (2010).

#### Doesn’t reduce emissions – intermittency

Livermore et al, Scientific Alliance Director, 11

(Martin, Science communications consultant and commentator, Hugh Sharman, Principal of Incoteco ApS, an energy consulting and brokering company, and cofounder of DimWatt.eu, a webbased campaign for energy security, Bryan Leyland, New Zealand-based Consulting Engineer specialising inhydropower, power systems and markets, “Renewable Energy Vision or Mirage?,” <http://www.adamsmith.org/sites/default/files/research/files/ASI_renewables_report_colour_web.pdf>)

As renewable energy sources produce power intermittently, they cannot replace gas, coal and nuclear generation, even with further development.¶ Solar and wind energy have no prospect of becoming economically competitive in an unrigged market. Government intervention will lead to higher energy costs and jeopardize energy security.¶ Increased investment in wind turbines will do little to reduce carbon emissions and fossil fuel consumption.¶ The report ‘Renewable Energy: Vision or Mirage?’, released today by the Adam Smith Institute and Scientific Alliance, reveals that the government’s focus on renewable energy sources is misguided. The UK’s plans for renewables are unrealistic, and these technologies cannot provide the secure energy supply the country needs. Present policies will lead to an energy crisis by the middle of this decade. The key points from the report are detailed below:¶ Wind and solar power do little to reduce carbon emissions, as they need large-scale back up generating capacity to compensate for their intermittency.¶ With the decommissioning of many of the UK’s coal-fired stations – and nearly all existing nuclear reactors – over the coming decade, energy security is now a priority for policymakers alongside the drive to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. However, even ignoring cost issues, problems of intermittency mean that renewable technologies are incapable of making a major contribution to energy security.¶ The Renewable Energy Roadmap for 2020 is hugely overambitious. Renewable energy generation is currently 28% below its already reduced target. Subsidising renewable energy also comes at a cost to consumers who pay for it through higher electricity prices. Nuclear and gas are the most viable energy sources to avoid a capacity crisis in the near future.¶

### 2NC

#### CO2 not key – scientific consensus against catastrophic warming – doesn’t collapse the environment

Walter Cunningham (United States Marine Corps, National Aeronautics and Space Administration - pilot of Apollo 7, graduate degrees from UCLA in physics and the Harvard Graduate School of Business, member of the Advisory Board for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory) 2010 “Global Warming: Facts versus Faith” The Heartland Institute

More than 31,000 scientists in the United States have signed a petition saying “there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.”3 Debating Carbon DioxideThe advocates of AGW say the United States must impose a devastating tax scheme to force industry to emit less carbon dioxide, thereby reversing the warming trend. This policy prescription is based on three assumptions: (1) that CO2 is the cause of changes in the Earth’s temperature; (2) that a warmer Earth would be bad for the planet’s flora and fauna, including humans; and (3) that humans are capable of controlling the temperature of the Earth.In reality, water vapor has more than twice the impact on temperature as atmospheric CO2, aided and abetted by other greenhouse gases, like methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O). With CO2 representing just 3.6 percent of greenhouse gases, by volume, and human activity responsible for only 3.2 percent of that, we can influence only a tiny portion of the total greenhouse gases. Some studies have found CO2 levels are largely irrelevant to global warming. The true believers in AGW base their case on a broad and weak correlation between CO2 and global temperature in the last half of the twentieth century. They cannot be sure which is cause and which is effect. Looking at much longer periods of the Earth’s history, it becomes clear that temperature increases have preceded high CO2 levels by anywhere from 100 to 800 years, suggesting that higher temperatures cause CO2 levels to rise, rather than vice versa. The only other time in history that temperature and CO2 levels were this low, together, was 300 million years ago. There have been periods when atmospheric CO2 levels were as much as 16 times higher than they are now—periods characterized not by warming but by glaciations. (See Figure 4.) You might have to go back half-a-million years to match our current level of atmospheric CO2, but you have to go back only to the Medieval Warm Period, from the tenth to the fourteenth century, to find an intense global warming episode, followed immediately by the drastic cooling of the Little Ice Age. Neither of those events can be attributed to variations in CO2 levels. Since CO2 is a relatively minor constituent of “greenhouse gases,” and human activity contributes only a tiny portion of atmospheric CO2, why have alarmists made it the whipping boy for global warming? Probably because they know how fruitless it would be to propose controlling other atmospheric drivers of climate—water, methane, and nitrous oxide—notto mention volcanic eruptions, or ocean temperature, or solar activity, etc. So they wage war on man-made CO2, no matter how ridiculous it makes them appear. Without the greenhouse effect to keep our world warm, the planet would have an average temperature of -18 degrees Celsius. Because we do have it, the temperature is a comfortable +15 degrees Celsius. Other inconvenient facts ignored by the activists: Carbon dioxide is a non-polluting gas that is essential for plant photosynthesis. Higher concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere produce bigger crop harvests and larger and healthier forests— results environmentalists used to like.

#### No proof of tipping points – we’ve recovered from worse temp increases

Thomas Fuller July 6, 2010. “Global warming, uncertainty, tipping points and the precautionary principle” Environmental Policy Examiner. http://www.examiner.com/environmental-policy-in-national/global-warming-uncertainty-tipping-points-and-the-precautionary-principle

Others are more optimistic, and say that if we act right now, but really right now, we can avoid crossing the line and making permanent changes. They say that because we don't know where the tipping point really is and because we do not know the extent of damage that could be caused by a permanently warmer planet, the Precautionary Principle more or less compels us to take drastic action to fight climate change. There are opposing arguments to this. One of the best arguments against the Precautionary Principle is the error it led us into the last time it was used. Then Vice President Dick Cheney argued that if there was even a 1% chance that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, then it was important to us to invade Iraq, find the weapons and institute regime change. What's important to understand about that is that Cheney was wrong, not because Hussein didn't have WMD. He was wrong in his application of logic. The first step in dealing with this type of situation is reducing the uncertainty in your calculations. For Cheney, this would have meant first, quantifying the type and amounts of WMD Hussein might realistically possess, Hussein's realistic delivery options for WMD, and his propensity to use them. Second, in a Strangelovian way, Cheney would have used existing Pentagon scenarios to calculate the damage to life and the political framework of the Middle East if Husseing used these weapons and compared it very cold-bloodedly to the losses certain to result from our intervention. The problem is Cheney didn't do any of the math. He merely pronounced that Hussein's possible possession of WMD meant that a Tipping Point had already been reached, and that the Precautionary Principle mandated our intervention. But pronouncing it doesn't make it so. There are solid philosophical arguments against both the Tipping Point and the Precautionary Principle, and well-educated and intelligent people on both sides of the fence. And this argument extends to the application of both concepts to climate change. One argument from skeptics is that the Earth has warmed before without reaching a Tipping Point. It may have been warmer than today during Medieval Times, and it certainly has been warmer for most of the period since the end of the last Ice Age. And yet temperatures did eventually decline. In the more remote past, temperatures were dramatically warmer during several periods, but again, temperatures declined. Another argument is that if we rigorously applied the Precautionary Principle to poorly understood phenomena, we would halt all technological progress and innovation. If our society is paralysed by fear of the unknown, we may reject the next invention that might dramatically improve our lives.What disturbs me is that we are willing to discuss in endless detail with incredible amounts of name-calling the causes and effects of global warming, without discussing the validity of using Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle as guiding lights for how we should react. From what I have seen in the popular media, the use of those terms is very Cheney-esque. People mention the existence of Tipping Points and the Precautionary Principle and assume that that closes the conversation.

#### Climate change doesn’t collapse the economy or cause conflict

Thomas Bernauera et al (Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS) and Institute for Environmental Decisions (IED) and b University of Bern Department of Economics and Oeschger Institute for Climate Change Research) 2010 “Climate Change, Economic Growth, and Conflict” http://climsec.prio.no/papers/Climate\_Conflict\_BKKR\_Trondheim\_2010.pdf

Despite many claims by high-ranking policy-makers and some scientists that climate change breeds violent conflict, the existing empirical literature has so far not been able to identify a systematic, causal relationship of this kind. This may either reflect de facto absence of such a relationship, or it may be the consequence of theoretical and methodological limitations of existing work. We revisit the climate–conflict issue along two lines. First, at the theoretical level we specify the mechanism through which climate change is likely to affect the risk of armed conflict. We focus on the causal chain linking climatic conditions, economic growth, and armed conflict, and also argue that the growth–conflict part of this chain is contingent on political system characteristics. Second, at the methodological level we develop an approach that takes care of endogeneity problems in the climate–economy–conflict relationship. We test our theoretical argument on a global data set for 1950-2004. The results show that the climate change–conflict hypothesis rests on rather shaky empirical foundations: we do find some negative effects of climate change on economic growth, while stronger economic growth is associated with a lower probability of civil conflict. But the climate change effect on growth is not robust to changes in climate indicators and samples. Our results also show that non-democratic countries are more likely to experience armed conflict when economic conditions deteriorate. Our results suggest that investing in climate-friendly economic growth and democracy can qualify as a no-regrets strategy.

#### Marine biodiversity is more resilient than terrestrial

Nicholas K. Dulvy, Canadian Research Chair in Marine Biodiversity and Conservation @ Simon Frasier U, Yvonne Sadovy, Prof. of Ecology and Biodiversity @ U of Hong Kong, and John D. Reynolds, Prof. and BC Leadership Chair @ Simon Frasier U, 2003 “Extinction Vulnerability in Marine Populations” Fish and Fisheries Vol. 4 Iss. 1 Pg. 25-64 Wiley InterScience

It has been suggested that marine taxa might be less vulnerable to extinction than terrestrial taxa based on their higher average duration in the fossil record (McKinney 1998). In support of this hypothesis, taxa with the longest fossil record durations also appear to have a lower proportion of threatened species (McKinney 1998). The best test of this hypothesis would be to compare extinction rates between related pairs of well-studied marine and terrestrial taxa, to overcome major phylogenetic differences and sampling biases. This has not yet been done. Anecdotally, we note that some relict taxa or 'living fossils' are in trouble, such as the coelacanth (Latimeria chalumnae), sturgeons (Acipenseriformes) and many marine turtles (Cheloniidae). Therefore, while such elderly taxa, which are analogous to those with a long fossil record, may be specialized survivors, on a contemporary scale they may still be at risk.

#### The marine environment is resilient. Human actions have very small impact.

Easterbrook 95, Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation (Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25) MI

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

## Grids

### 1NC

#### Grid resilient

Koerth-Baker 2012 (Maggie Koerth-Baker, science editor at Boing Boing and NYT columnist, August 3, 2012, “Blackout: What's wrong with the American grid,” http://boingboing.net/2012/08/03/blackout-whats-wrong-with-t.html)

But this is about more than mere bad luck. The real causes of the 2003 blackout were fixable problems, and the good news is that, since then, we’ve made great strides in fixing them. The bad news, say some grid experts, is that we’re still not doing a great job of preparing our electric infrastructure for the future.¶ Let’s get one thing out of the way right up front: The North American electric grid is not one bad day away from the kind of catastrophic failures we saw in India this week. I’ve heard a lot of people speculating on this, but the folks who know the grid say that, while such a huge blackout is theoretically possible, it is also extremely unlikely. As Clark Gellings, a fellow at the Electric Power Research Institute put it, “An engineer will never say never,” but you should definitely not assume anything resembling an imminent threat at that scale. Remember, the blackouts this week cut power to half of all Indian electricity customers. Even the 2003 blackout—the largest blackout in North America ever—only affected about 15% of Americans.¶ We don’t know yet what, exactly, caused the Indian blackouts, but there are several key differences between their grid and our grid. India’s electricity is only weakly tied to the people who use it, Gellings told me. Most of the power plants are in the far north. Most of the population is in the far south. The power lines linking the two are neither robust nor numerous. That’s not a problem we have in North America.¶ Likewise, India has considerably more demand for electricity than it has supply. Even on a good day, there’s not enough electricity for all the people who want it, said Jeff Dagle, an engineer with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s Advanced Power and Energy Systems research group. “They’re pushing their system much harder, to its limits,” he said. “If they have a problem, there’s less cushion to absorb it. Our system has rules that prevent us from dipping into our electric reserves on a day-to-day basis. So we have reserve power for emergencies.”

#### National blackout impossible- isolated regional grids

Jaeger 2012 (Michael Jaeger, August 1, 2012, “Lights out for the U.S. power grid?,” Washington Times, Lights out for the U.S. power grid?)

In terms of number of people affected, the largest power grid failure in history occurred in India this week, and it raises a question for America: Is the U.S power grid susceptible to a nationwide collapse?¶ To answer that question, we must understand the layout of the North American power grid. It is divided into four regional power systems, called interconnections, as depicted in the main picture above. On the west coast there is the Western interconnection. On the east coast, you guessed it, the Eastern interconnection, as well as the Quebec interconnection. The last is the ERCOT interconnection (the Electric Reliability Council of Texas). Texans always seem to do things their way, and electricity is no different. They chose to operate differently than the rest of the grid, and that decision has been both an asset and a liability. But that is another story.¶ These three main interconnections (Western, Eastern and ERCOT) are electrically isolated from each other. They are electrical “islands,” with no wires making connections between each region. If the Western Interconnection were to blackout, it would not have an impact on the ERCOT or Eastern interconnections. If ERCOT were to go dark, only the Texans would complain. The Eastern interconnection has had its share of difficulties over the last 60 years because it is so highly interconnected (this explains why the Eastern interconnection system frequency was affected by the loss of transmission lines in Florida), but again, there is no tie operationally and its operations do not affect the Western or ERCOT interconnections. This inherent isolation is the saving grace of our power network, but it was born that way out of logistical hurdles, not ingenious forethought. Crossing the north-south running Rocky Mountains with east-west transmission lines would prove too costly to build and maintain in the long run, creating a “natural” segregation in the power grid.¶ Outside of the isolation of the regions, the U.S. has plenty of generating capacity online, and plenty of capability on standby called “operating reserves.” The grid operators have a reserve margin calculation and keep approximately 14 to 17 percent of the forecasted peak load available as generation on standby, in case a large transmission line or a large generator unexpectedly shuts down, or “trips.” Grid operators look at these large facilities and model them in their networks as contingencies that must be taken into consideration at all times. They must know how the system would react if a tornado took down a large transmission tower that was delivering massive amounts of power, or knocked a large generating station, like Indian Point Energy Center, offline. ¶ It will take some time to discover the cause of the blackouts in India, just as it did to discover the cause of the August 2003 blackout which rendered much the northeast powerless. Some blackouts are necessary to avoid equipment failure, and some can be prevented by proper communication and operations. As a result of the August 2003 blackout that left some 50 million Americans without power, the National Electric Reliability Corporation mandated that companies follow reliability protocols that were, up until the blackout, voluntary. ¶ If the entire U.S. were to go dark, it would not be the result of regional connectivity, or cascading interconnection issues. All three interconnections, along with Quebec would have to suffer a catastrophic failure simultaneously. Could it happen? Yes, anything is possible. Is it likely to happen? No, not likely at all.

#### Intermittency collapses the grid

PACE 2012 (Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy, coalition of researchers/consumers/trade groups focused on clean energy, January 4, 2012, “U.S. Must Take Reliability Threats Seriously,” http://goo.gl/yOZ20)

Among domestic policy issues, electricity policy is unique in a number of ways. Consider that the availability of electricity, unlike fuel supplies, is almost exclusively under domestic control. International politics plays virtually no role in the price of power. Consider also that discussions about electricity are essentially conversations about physical systems. When we speak about the future of the American power grid, we are referring to a mechanical structure with real moving parts. Contrast this to more abstract policy references to a “healthcare safety net” or a “social welfare system.” The distinction should be clear. Sadly, too many discussions about American energy policy fail to recognize this reality, pretending instead, for example, that intermittent power sources can provide continuous power or that degrading the nation’s baseload power supply (largely fossil-based today) won’t affect our power system’s ability to function as designed. The latter oversight is foolish and potentially dangerous, realizations with which Europeans, perhaps a decade ahead of the U.S. in terms of carbon policy and renewable experimentation, are beginning to come to grips. A recent report conducted by the Emerging Risk Initiative, an effort by European risk officers, focuses on power reliability risks and reaches some troubling conclusions. The report, entitled Power Blackout Risks, finds that the risk of electrical grid failure is “generally underestimated” and that governments should “establish clear frameworks for the governance of power supply infrastructures.” Although we are at greatest threat from blackouts due to heat waves or major storms, phenomena unlikely to change, the report also finds that the volatility of renewable power supplies also pose a new threat. Especially in places such as Europe with aggressive outlays of renewable power, the intermittency of solar and wind power can make grids more vulnerable to blackouts. “Not only may a scarcity of electricity result in a power blackout,” the report states, “but an oversupply can also lead to grid instabilities as they alter the frequency within the network. Maintaining uninterrupted power supply is not just a matter of convenience. As the report finds, blackouts have huge ripples through economic systems, disrupting supply chains and halting production altogether in major industries. Blackouts can also put lives at risk, presenting immediate danger to vulnerable populations, in contrast to the vague “premature deaths” often cited by official cost-benefit analyses from U.S. government agencies. Records of nearly every major blackout in history bear witness to that unfortunate truth. Europe is beginning to grapple with the consequences of two decades of energy policy that has made electricity more expensive and more unwieldy. As some in the U.S. argue that our nation should chart a similar course, we should heed reports like this and continue to ask whether new policies will make power more or less reliable. Reliability is far too important to overlook.

#### Cyberterror threats are exaggerated – too many vested interests for accurate predictions

Jerry Brito (senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center and directs the Technology Policy Program at George Mason University) and Tate Watkins (research associate for the Technology Policy Program and the State and Local Policy Project at George Mason University) April 26, 2011 “Loving the Cyber Bomb? The Dangers of Threat Inflation in Cybersecurity Policy” <http://mercatus.org/sites/default/files/publication/WP1124_Loving_cyber_bomb.pdf>

An industrial complex reminiscent of the Cold War‘s may be emerging in cybersecurity today. Some serious threats may exist, but we have also seen evidence of threat inflation. Alarm raised over potential cyber threats has led to a cyber industry build-up and political competition over cyber pork. 1. Build-up In many cases, those now inflating the scope and probability of cyber threats might well benefit from increased regulation and more government spending on information security. Cybersecurity is a big and booming industry.163 The U.S. government is expected to spend $10.5 billion per year on information security by 2015, and analysts have estimated the worldwide market to be as much as $140 billion per year.164 The Department of Defense has also said it is seeking more than $3.2 billion in cybersecurityfunding for 2012.16In recent years, in addition to traditional information security providers like MacAfee, Symantec, and Checkpoint, defense contractors and consulting firms have recognized lucrative opportunities in cybersecurity.166 To weather probable cuts on traditional defense spending, and to take advantage of the growing market, these firms have positioned themselves to compete with information security firms for government contracts.167 Lockheed Martin, Boeing, L-3 Communications, SAIC, and BAE Systems have all launched cybersecurity business divisions in recent years.168 Other traditional defense contractors, like Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, and ManTech International, have also invested in information security products and services.169 Such investments appear to have positioned defense firms well. In 2009, the top 10 information technology federal contractors included Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics, Raytheon, SAIC, L-3 Communications, and Booz Allen Hamilton.170 Traditional IT firms also see more opportunities to profit from cybersecurity business in both the public and private sectors.171 Earlier this year, a software security company executive noted ―a very large rise in interest in spending on computer security by the government.‖172 And as one IT market analyst put it: ―It‘s a cyber war and we‘re fighting it. In order to fight it, you need to spend more money, and some of the core beneficiaries of that trend will be the security software companies.‖173 Some companies from diverse industries have also combined forces in the cybersecurity buildup. In 2009, a combination of defense, security, and tech companies, including Lockheed, McAfee, Symantec, Cisco, Dell, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Juniper Networks, and Microsoft, formed a cybersecurity technology alliance to study threats and innovate solutions.174 IT lobbyists, too, have looked forward to cybersecurity budget increases, to the dismay of at least one executive at a small tech firm, who claimed, ―Money gets spent on the vendors who spend millions lobbying Congress.‖175 There are serious real online threats, and security firms, government agencies, the military, and private companies clearly must invest to protect against such threats. But as with the Cold War bomber and missile gap frenzies, we must be wary of parties with vested interests exaggerating threats, leading to unjustified and superfluous defense spending in the name of national security.

#### Even new cyberterror therats are exaggerated

Tom Espiner (writer for ZDnet) January 2011 “Cyber-war risk is exaggerated, says OECD study” http://www.zdnet.co.uk/news/security/2011/01/17/cyber-war-risk-is-exaggerated-says-oecd-study-40091451/

In a cyber-warfare report released on Monday, the OECD said that the risk of a catastrophic attack on critical national systems has been exaggerated. The majority of cyberattacks are low level and cause inconvenience rather than serious or long-term disruption, according to report co-author professor Peter Sommer of the London School of Economics. "There are many scare stories, which, when you test, don't actually pan out," Sommer said. "When you analyse malware, a lot is likely to be short term, or fail." Sophisticated malware such as Stuxnet, which targets industrial control processes, is the exception, not the norm, according to Sommer. Stuxnet used a number of zero-day vulnerabilities to target programmable logic controllers in frequency converter drives used mainly to control motors in uranium-enrichment facilities. Policy makers should be aware that a number of different cyber-events, disasters or physical attacks could come together to create a "perfect storm", says the report. However, a pure cyber-war would be unlikely to occur, with attacks on computer systems more likely to be used in conjunction with other, physical types of attacks.

#### Internet is insufficient to solve pandemics--- turn--- more likely to download a virus than to download a vaccine--- haha

#### Extinction impossible

Gregg Easterbrook (a senior fellow at The New Republic) July 2003 “We're All Gonna Die!” http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=

Germ warfare!Like chemical agents, biological weapons have never lived up to their billing in popular culture. Consider the 1995 medical thriller Outbreak, in which a highly contagious virus takes out entire towns. The reality is quite different. Weaponized smallpox escaped from a Soviet laboratory in Aralsk, Kazakhstan, in 1971; three people died, no epidemic followed. In 1979, weapons-grade anthrax got out of a Soviet facility in Sverdlovsk (now called Ekaterinburg); 68 died, no epidemic. The loss of life was tragic, but no greater than could have been caused by a single conventional bomb. In 1989, workers at a US government facility near Washington were accidentally exposed to Ebola virus. They walked around the community and hung out with family and friends for several days before the mistake was discovered. No one died. The fact is, evolution has spent millions of years conditioning mammals to resist germs. Consider the Black Plague. It was the worst known pathogen in history, loose in a Middle Ages society of poor public health, awful sanitation, and no antibiotics. Yet it didn't kill off humanity. Most people who were caught in the epidemic survived. Any superbug introduced into today's Western world would encounter top-notch public health, excellent sanitation, and an array of medicines specifically engineered to kill bioagents. Perhaps one day some aspiring Dr. Evil will invent a bug that bypasses the immune system. Because it is possible some novel superdisease could be invented, or that existing pathogens like smallpox could be genetically altered to make them more virulent (two-thirds of those who contract natural smallpox survive), biological agents are a legitimate concern. They may turn increasingly troublesome as time passes and knowledge of biotechnology becomes harder to control, allowing individuals or small groups to cook up nasty germs as readily as they can buy guns today. But no superplague has ever come close to wiping out humanity before, and it seems unlikely to happen in the future.

### 1NR

#### Threat assessments are overblown

Rid 3/13 (Thomas Rid, Reader in War Studies at King’s College London. He also is a non-resident fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, “The Great Cyberscare,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/13/the\_great\_cyberscare)

The White House likes a bit of threat. In his State of the Union address, Barack Obama wanted to nudge Congress yet again into passing meaningful legislation. The president emphasized that America's enemies are "seeking the ability to sabotage our power grid, our financial institutions, and our air traffic control systems." After two failed attempts to pass a cybersecurity act in the past two years, he added swiftly: "We cannot look back years from now and wonder why we did nothing in the face of real threats to our security and our economy." Fair enough. A bit of threat to prompt needed action is one thing. Fear-mongering is something else: counterproductive. Yet too many a participant in the cybersecurity debate reckons that puffery pays off.¶ The Pentagon, no doubt, is the master of razzmatazz. Leon Panetta set the tone by warning again and again of an impending "cyber Pearl Harbor." Just before he left the Pentagon, the Defense Science Board delivered a remarkable report, Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat. The paper seemed obsessed with making yet more drastic historical comparisons: "The cyber threat is serious," the task force wrote, "with potential consequences similar to the nuclear threat of the Cold War." The manifestations of an all-out nuclear war would be different from cyberattack, the Pentagon scientists helpfully acknowledged. But then they added, gravely, that "in the end, the existential impact on the United States is the same."¶ A reminder is in order: The world has yet to witness a single casualty, let alone fatality, as a result of a computer attack. Such statements are a plain insult to survivors of Hiroshima. Some sections of the Pentagon document offer such eye-wateringly shoddy analysis that they would not have passed as an MA dissertation in a self-respecting political science department. But in the current debate it seemed to make sense. After all a bit of fear helps to claim -- or keep -- scarce resources when austerity and cutting seems out-of-control. The report recommended allocating the stout sum of $2.5 billion for its top two priorities alone, protecting nuclear weapons against cyberattacks and determining the mix of weapons necessary to punish all-out cyber-aggressors. Then there are private computer security companies. Such firms, naturally, are keen to pocket some of the government's money earmarked for cybersecurity. And hype is the means to that end. Mandiant's much-noted report linking a coordinated and coherent campaign of espionage attacks dubbed Advanced Persistent Threat 1, or "APT1," to a unit of the Chinese military is a case in point: The firm offered far more details on attributing attacks to the Chinese than the intelligence community has ever done, and the company should be commended for making the report public. But instead of using cocky and over-confident language, Mandiant's analysts should have used Words of Estimative Probability, as professional intelligence analysts would have done.

#### No interregional connectivity

Barrett 2012 (Michael Barrett, Lexington Institute, October 2012, “ensuring the Resilience of the U.s. electrical Grid¶ Part I: Fixing It Before It Breaks,” http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Energy/ElectricalGrid-Barrett\_PartI.pdf)

While the power generation and delivery process ¶ described above seems reasonably straightforward, ¶ in practice many economic, geographic and historical practicalities complicate the interoperability of our ¶ “national power grid”, as manifested in the fact that the ¶ U.S. and Canada are served not by a single grid as much ¶ as by four inter-locking regional grids, the Eastern, ¶ Western, Texas, and Quebec systems, as depicted below: Significantly, while these regional grids are technically ¶ connected to a small degree they are not in fact integrated ¶ in terms of the ability to share large amounts of power. ¶ As a result, in the event of a prolonged disruption to any ¶ of the single discrete segments of the North American ¶ power grid today it would be both very desirable and ¶ essentially technically impossible to have the remaining ¶ grids share their power across and into the affected grid. ¶ There are some pilot projects looking to test the feasibility ¶ of making these systems more interoperable, the capability ¶ is not there at this time. ¶ While this does have the potential benefit of limiting ¶ any cascading failure from taking out the entire nation’s ¶ power supply, that will be of little comfort to any of the ¶ tens of millions of individuals and businesses that may ¶ be affected for weeks or months until the problems in ¶ any given affected regional grid are remedied.

#### Grid would be down for weeks at most

Marusek 2007 (James A. Marusek, Nuclear Physicist and Engineer, Impact, “Solar Storm Threat Analysis,” 2007, http://www.breadandbutterscience.com/SSTA.pdf)

But as the intensity of a solar storm increases it develops the capacity to create a major disaster on Earth. A Great ¶ solar storm has the potential of seriously damaging the North American electrical power grid. The resulting ¶ blackout will be focused on the northern tier of states and the East and West coast of the U.S. and throughout ¶ Canada. The damaged equipment in the power infrastructure would generally have a replacement lead time of over ¶ a year due to its uniqueness. But the scope of the outage will be so great that governments will quickly elevate its ¶ repair to the level of a national imperative. As a result, restoration that might normally take over a year will occur ¶ in a matter of weeks. Critical elements affected by the blackout will include water, sewage, commerce, industry, ¶ banking, transportation, communications, and in the winter, heating. Because modern society relies so heavily on ¶ sophisticated technology, a long-term blackout will have a very profound effect on the fabric of society.

#### We could rebuild in weeks

Marusek 2007 (James A. Marusek, Nuclear Physicist and Engineer, Impact, “Solar Storm Threat Analysis,” 2007, http://www.breadandbutterscience.com/SSTA.pdf)

There is a singular aspect present in the very largest solar storms that has the potential for creating a global disaster, ¶ potentially knocking civilization to its knees. The very largest solar storms have the potential for simultaneously ¶ destroying key elements of the electrical power grid infrastructure. These elements are unique, expensive and have ¶ long lead times (greater than 1 year) for replacement. The Great Solar Storm of September 1859, if it were to ¶ reoccur today, has the potential of simultaneously damaging our electrical infrastructure in the East and West Coast ¶ of the United States and the power grids along the northern tier of States. This could produce an unexpected longduration electrical power blackout affecting approximately 50% of the U.S. population. This type of massive storm ¶ would also affect high latitude and mid-latitude countries in both the northern and southern hemisphere, such as ¶ Europe, Central Asia, Russia, Canada, China, New Zealand, and South America (Southern Argentina & Chile). As ¶ the crisis evolves, partial restoration will likely occur and hard blackouts will transition to rolling blackouts and ¶ brownouts. This is the primary nature of the global threat. Herein lies the danger! Our society is technology driven ¶ and technology dependent. Without electrical power, the modern world will come crashing down. ¶ Should this threat materialize, I also expect the crisis would quickly elevate to the level of a national imperative. ¶ All available expertise, manpower, equipment and facilities would be brought to bear to fabricate and install key ¶ damaged infrastructure elements and move the electrical power grid back into operational status. Normally one ¶ might expect a year or two to replace this equipment but under a concerted effort and governmental mandate, I ¶ believe the damaged infrastructure could be resolved in the order of weeks rather than in years.

## FDI Advantage
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#### China will remain dependent on coal

Chameides 2013 (Bill Chameides, Dean, Duke University's Nicholas School of the Environment, February 18, 2013, “Old Wang Coal?,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-chameides/old-wang-coal\_b\_2711152.html)

Because coal is cheap and abundant, it is one of the world's most widely used fuels. In 2008, the Energy Information Administration reports, "coal accounted for 28 percent of world energy consumption." But China's coal dependence is considerably larger -- accounting for about 70 percent of its total energy production and forming the very backbone of its economy. And so, as China's economy has grown (at an annual GDP rate of about 10.5 percent since 2000), so has its consumption of coal, which has increased by an average of nine percent per year over the same period. By comparison, average coal demand growth for the rest of the world has been about one percent per year.¶ In 2011, China accounted for 87 percent of the global increase in coal consumption, and now accounts for almost one half of all the coal consumed in the world. To put it in its starkest terms, as per the EIA: "China consumes nearly as much coal as the rest of the world combined."¶ Incredible? Sure, but perhaps not all that surprising given that the China's economy provides consumers in the United States and elsewhere with so many low-cost goods. (See here and here.)¶ If you're concerned about climate change, all that coal-burning is not welcome news, but a change may be in the offing. Earlier this month, Beijing announced it will cap total coal usage at essentially its current rate. But I wouldn't pop the corks just yet. Given that 70 percent of China's rapidly growing economy is powered by coal, stopping the rapid rise in China's coal usage while maintaining that economic growth will be no easy feat.

#### But coal imports solve environmental protests

Tu 2012 [Kevin Tu senior associate energy and climate program Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 2-16-2012 “Understanding China's Rising Coal Imports” http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/16/understanding-china-s-rising-coal-imports#]

The environment could also play a part in China’s coal-importing decisions. Importing coal from overseas markets might enable the Chinese central government to close down many small and inefficient mines and prevent similar mines from being opened up, thereby protecting local environments.

**CCP is extremely resilient**

**Mattis 2012** (Peter Mattis, Editor of China Brief at The Jamestown Foundation, M.A. in Security Studies from the Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service, February 9, 2012, “The Foundations of China’s Future Stability,” Asia Pacific Bulletin, East-West Center, http://www.eastwestcenter.org/sites/default/files/private/apb149\_1.pdf)

Point predictions offer little value unless the factors underpinning the state’s power and the CCP’s ability to manipulate socio-political dynamics are assessed. China’s future will depend more on Beijing’s ability to prevent local crises from cascading nationally, than preventing the emergence of a political rival to the CCP. While the vagaries of the economy may raise or lower the pressure, revolutionary unrest in a country the size of China requires more than just resentment. Some modicum of connectivity and coordination is necessary to prevent Beijing from secretly applying differing doses of coercion and co-option.¶ The CCP leadership understands the nature of this challenge and has responded accordingly with a variety of public order policies that increase its internal monitoring capabilities and ability to shape public discourse. These policies amount to a three- pronged strategy for maintaining control and countering dissent. The first is to prevent localized grievances from congealing into a national crisis like what happened in 1989. The second prong is the resuscitation of the domestic intelligence system. The final element is guiding and controlling the public discourse.¶ The first element regarding stability maintenance is to encourage the perception that local grievances have local causes and that the central government will side with the demonstrators. So long as the protestors still believe their problems do not have roots in the national system, the belief is that there is less likelihood of unrest stirring up in neighboring localities. This first element is a guiding principle for maintaining stability, and there are specific policy choices associated with it. For example, local governments control the police while Beijing controls the military. The buildup of paramilitary capabilities gives provincial and local governments more capability to deal with incidents of unrest, but also shields Beijing from any ostensible responsibility for the violence.¶ Since the early 2000s, rebuilding the domestic intelligence apparatus has been a priority for Beijing. After several years of local-level experimentation, the Ministry of Public Security (MPS) in 2008 held a ministry-wide conference to establish “public security informatization” as a guiding principle of police work. This included both human and technical components. The former included a new Domestic Security Department and new spending on domestic informant networks. These measures supplement the electronic integration of records on individuals’ movements and automated systems, like the “Golden Shield” network and databases, that alert local police when persons of interest register in hotels, buy plane tickets, or anything else requiring identification. While these capabilities give local authorities greater awareness, most importantly they supplement the political means to isolate grievances by tracking activists across different geographic localities.¶ Finally, modern communication technology has forced the central government propaganda system to evolve to the new environment. Controlling the public discourse now requires more than just pre-publication censorship of newspapers and, arguably, the system has moved toward post-publication crackdowns to encourage self-censorship through uncertainty. Beijing also has moved to reduce the anonymity of the Internet— most recently, requiring true name registration for microblogging—and deployed increasingly sophisticated systems to scrub or discredit unpalatable information. More importantly, the expanded sphere for public discourse has forced the government at all levels to expose itself by engaging society through microblogs, editorials, and selective open government initiatives more frequently to try to shape how the public converses.¶ While the aforementioned policies will affect how well the Chinese government deals with civil unrest, the failure of these strategies does not necessarily mean the CCP will lose power. The longevity of police-states has confounded some observers, but states generally survive while the government maintains legitimacy and control over mass violence. Put into observables, the key questions revolve around central government credibility and the loyalty of the military.¶ Despite the tens of thousands of protests each year—many related to official corruption— Chinese demonstrators like those in Wukan still appeal to Beijing for succor. Continuing appeals indicate two things. First, the central government maintains some popular legitimacy. Second, Beijing’s strategy of localizing grievances while insulating the center from blame is working. When protestors no longer appeal to Beijing, then the CCP’s ability to maintain control will rest on the state’s coercive power to keep the cork in the bottle.¶ Secondly, the final arbiter of CCP power is the armed might of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) with the People’s Armed Police (PAP). Their professionalism has long been defined by contribution to the survival of the CCP—as Mao Zedong said, “political power grows out of the barrel of the gun.” The PLA may still be the “Party’s army” and not the Chinese nation’s, but the technical requirements of modern war may be pushing the PLA toward the latter. The threshold for political change will move higher or lower by the direction of PLA professionalism toward creating military or political power, respectively. An apolitical PLA devoted to the technical expertise of creating military power will have a different set of institutional priorities distinct from the political leadership, potentially creating a reluctance to support the PAP.¶ These points should caution against reading too much into the succession politics of the 18th Party Congress later this year. The CCP has created a powerful apparatus—military, intelligence, and propaganda—that will operate short of total breakdown in leadership cohesion, i.e. the decision of some elites to contest the decisions of the party congress. The debates are over how best to maintain CCP power—not whether the party should govern. Both Beijing’s strategies for preserving stability and the key factors underpinning the CCP’s power relative to society can and should be assessed regularly. So far, Beijing has performed remarkably well using coercion and co-option. And before prematurely condemning the CCP to the dustbin of history, it is worth noting some moribund Chinese dynasties survived for several centuries using these tactics.

**CCP collapse is peaceful**

**Li 9/14** (Li Jianfeng, September 14, 2012, “The Instability of China’s Authoritarian Regime,” Epoch Times, http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/opinion/the-instability-of-chinas-authoritarian-regime-292354.html)

Some worry that if the CCP were to collapse it would lead to large-scale unrest. But in view of China’s current situation, I believe that will not occur. There are three main reasons: ¶ One, China’s instability originates from the CCP’s own internal problems and manifests as the CCP’s internal struggles, rather than coming from outside factors. ¶ Two, the Chinese people themselves have never made a single destabilizing move. Petitions and mass incidents are merely self-protective grassroots acts allowed within the law. The CCP has lost people’s support since its corrupt, dictatorial nature has been totally exposed, and has incurred the people’s widespread opposition. This is the biggest crisis the CCP is facing in 60 years. Some people have summarized it as “a crisis of legitimacy of the CCP’s ruling authority.” ¶ Three, since the 2004 publication of the Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party, an editorial series by The Epoch Times, there has been a surging tide of Chinese nationals quitting from the CCP. This has paved the way to dissolve the CCP peacefully, and has created a transition to a peaceful and democratic society. When Chinese people abandon the CCP from their hearts, a period without the CCP will peacefully arrive. ¶ The developments after the release of the Nine Commentaries show that even a dictatorship as seemingly fearless and mighty as the CCP can become helpless in the face of the peaceful quitting movement. The CCP hasn’t responded with even one word to the publication of the Nine Commentaries. Does it not want to refute the accusations therein? Obviously not, since there is nothing it can say when confronted with the facts of its 60-years of rule of terror.

#### Shared interests keep relations stable, overwhelm all other issues.

Winny Chen, 2010 (Testing Time for U.S.-China Relations, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/02/china\_relations.html)

Unfortunately, President Obama’s conciliatory approach just postponed the already existing friction in U.S.-China relations. But like the times before, this rough patch will pass, too. The tone may have changed, but the challenges and shared interests ultimately remain the same. The United States and China need each other now more than ever. China needs America’s innovation and purchasing power just as much as the United States needs China’s economic growth to boost its exports and key cooperation on important global issues. China needs American-provided stability in the Asia Pacific in order to sustain its own development, and the United States needs China’s help on pressing regional and international security issues such as North Korea, piracy, and Iran. Continuing to focus on these areas of shared interests, aligning policies where we share objectives, and working through current disagreements, no matter how long it takes is the only way forward. Global problem solving on the hardest issues is made exponentially harder without China. Our national interests require a continued partnership. So even as the two countries brace for a bumpy ride through the next few months, it is important not to lose sight of the shared interests we have across a panoply of issues economic rebalancing, nonproliferation, climate change, and regional security. The key is not to overreact to the mercurial tone, but to stay focused on our shared interests and to keep working toward a mature relationship.

#### No US/China war—It’s in neither country’s best interest

Ackerman 2011 (Robert Ackerman, May 10, 2011, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/)

The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other because neither country wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests. That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, noted that China actually wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism. And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that above all China fears instability, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own.
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#### No Regime Risk - CCP Concessions, Scattering Blocks Protest Consolidation, and Economic Problems will be Short

Dinah Gardner, @ Al Jazeera English, 2009 [Chinese brace for financial fallout, <http://english.aljazeera.net/focus/2009/01/20091782430904431.html>, January 7, 2009,FOCUS: CHINA]

The government will employ a mixture of force and concessions to control any protests, says He Baogang, but he does not foresee unrest escalating out of control. Return to the countryside A few weeks ago 4,000 officials were called to the capital to be trained on how to deal with "sudden emergencies" such as protests, He Baogang said. "They are adopting very cautious, very proactive measures," and they will also dole out money to ease the suffering of the unemployed. The fact that the bulk of those laid off will be migrant workers from the countryside will cushion the blow, says Andrew Nathan, a professor of political science at Columbia University in the US. "One advantage that the Chinese economy and regime still have is that the laid off workers have the option of returning to the countryside since they are still rooted there," explains Nathan. Industrialised countries suffer more because their unemployed are trapped in the cities. "The rural areas have considerable absorptive capacity, even though people would be unemployed there and living standards would suffer." 'Concessions and repression' Even if social unrest were to escalate, he adds, the Chinese Communist Party is in no danger of being toppled. "There has been and will continue to be a trend of increasing strain in society - demonstrations, strikes, petitions, and so on," he says. "However, I do not think these will easily cumulate into the kind of nationwide movement that could really challenge the China Communist Party's hold on power." The pockets of discontent are too "scattered", he says, and the government's strategy of using "a combination of concessions and repression," is very effective at containing unrest. Local authorities have "considerable financial resources" and the party maintains "a very effective police system that is able to crack down on opposition." Furthermore, if the protests do not hit Beijing, then the threat is not significant. Allan Behm, an Australian security analyst and former government official, also believes that China has the crisis under control. "With its foreign reserves, industrial capacity, low cost workforce and tight central control, China will come out of the global financial crisis in a better position than most countries," says Behm. "China has a pretty rosy future, even though the year ahead will be difficult."

#### CCP regime is stable and resilient

Friedman 2007 (Edward Friedman, PhD Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, "China's Rise, Democracy's Decline." April 20, 2007. Online)

In the post-WW I era, east and central Europe were dominated by right, populist authoritarian regimes.5These polities were very stable, even through the era of the Great Depression. They were only undone by the armies of WW II that conquered these lands. In like manner, I expect the PRC’s right populist authoritarianism to be very stable, even if the regime is struck by downturns in business cycles or the bursting of real estate bubbles, events which do seem inevitable. The rulers of China have already proved themselves quite successful in grappling with numerous crises so as to maintain their monopoly of power. They have also performed brilliantly in managing the currency and building infrastructure. They seem almost unique among authoritarians in seeking analyses about potential threats to the regime, such as a rising middle class, and then finding ways to defeat or coopt the potential threat. Those who instead see the regime as fragile offer a well-known laundry list of challenges to the regime. This list of “horribles,” however, seems to me to be no worse than what confronted Britain in its 19th-20thcentury industrialization. That Dickensian world produced anti-regime movements and general strikes. Through it all, the regime survived

#### The regime can coopt any opposition

Friedman 2007 (Edward Friedman, PhD Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, "China's Rise, Democracy's Decline." April 20, 2007. Online)

In sum, China will reform within its own authoritarian parameters. It will not become a second Singapore. But it will continue to reform. It will try to find ways to recruit more educated and technically competent personnel. It will pour money into potential hot spots to buy off or coopt trouble. The result will be a more polarized, single Party presidentialism similar to PRI Mexico in the authoritarian era. But it will, in addition, have a weighty military and state sector more like South Korea in its military authoritarian era. This regime will continue to promote the market, allow international openness, and meet consumer demands, much as did Kadar’s reformist CCP dictatorship in Hungary. China is a synthesis of all these tendencies, with some peculiarities of its own. Although it is not the highest likelihood, there even is a possibility that the military and the party hardliners could appeal to the marginalized, mobilize chauvinistic passions, and win a succession struggle without an internationally induced crisis. At least temporarily that would constrain China’s economic rise. It might even produce a more war-prone outcome. But the highest likelihood is that the ruling group, while not capable of becoming like Singapore, has the smarts and resources to buy off and coopt diverse oppositions and keep on rising at an amazingly rapid rate. It will not break-down. It will not soon democratize

#### The CCP regime is resilient

Friedman 2007 (Edward Friedman, PhD Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, "China's Rise, Democracy's Decline." April 20, 2007. Online)

In stressing differences with the consensus, I will argue against the mainstreamview that today’s CCP governance is fragile because of the many deep challenges facing ruling groups. I believe today’s authoritarian China is strong, stable and resilient, a view I believe is shared by a diverse minority of analysts including Andrew Nathan, Jim Mann and Anthony Kroeber. I will, in addition, argue against the consensus that China’s economic rise has set loose forces of inevitable democratization. This position was again argued in early 2007 in a Brookings paper by the truly able Jeffrey A. Bader and Richard C. Buss III.2Gradual and unstoppable democratization was the conventional wisdom when Hu Jintao took power in 2002. Since he turned out not to be a liberalizer, many have recently backed away from this inevitablist analysis of China’s gradual democratization. Finally, believing that China’s strong and stable authoritarian regime is here to stay, I will argue that the CCP regime is not narrowly pragmatic. Instead, I expect China to become – indeed, I believe it already is – a global challenge to democracy and human rights. Contrary to the dominant view, the CCP regime is not peacefully integrating with global norms. Instead, it is trying to build and shape international institutions and normsin harmony with the CCP’s authoritarian polity. It seems strange to expect CCP ruling groups to do anything but try to build a world which is safe for them.