# 1AC

### 1AC – Grid Advantage

#### CONTENTION 1: GRID

#### Scenario A --- Cyber-terror

**Cyber-attack is coming ---actors are probing grid weaknesses**

**Reed 12** John, Reports on the frontiers of cyber war and the latest in military technology for Killer Apps at Foreign Policy, "U.S. energy companies victims of potentially destructive cyber intrusions", 10/11, killerapps.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/10/11/us\_energy\_companies\_victims\_of\_potentially\_destructive\_cyber\_attacks

Foreign actors are probing the networks of key American companies in an attempt to gain control of industrial facilities and transportation systems, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta revealed tonight.¶ "We know that foreign **cyber actors are probing America's critical infrastructure networks**," said Panetta, disclosing previously classified information during a speech in New York laying out the Pentagon's role in protecting the U.S. from cyber attacks. "They are targeting the computer control systems that operate chemical, **electricity** and water plants, and those that guide transportation thorough the country."¶ He went on to say that the U.S. government knows of "specific instances where intruders have gained access" to these systems -- frequently known as Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (or SCADA) systems -- and that "they are seeking to create advanced tools to attack these systems and cause panic, destruction and even the loss of life," according to an advance copy of his prepared remarks.¶ The secretary said that **a coordinated attack on enough critical infrastructure could be a "cyber Pearl Harbor" that would "cause physical destruction and loss of life, paralyze and shock the nation, and create a profound new sense of vulnerability.**"¶ While there have been reports of criminals using 'spear phishing' email attacks aimed at stealing information about American utilties, Panetta's remarks seemed to suggest more sophisticated, nation-state backed attempts to actually gain control of and damage power-generating equipment. ¶ Panetta's comments regarding the penetration of American utilities echo those of a private sector cyber security expert Killer Apps spoke with last week **who said that the networks of American electric companies were penetrated, perhaps in preparation for a Stuxnet-style attack**.¶ Stuxnet is the famous cyber weapon that infected Iran's uranium-enrichment centrifuges in 2009 and 2010. Stuxnet is believed to have caused some of the machines to spin erratically, thereby destroying them.¶ "**There is hard evidence** that there has been penetration of our power companies, and given Stuxnet, that is a staging step before destruction" of electricity-generating equipment, the expert told Killer Apps. Because uranium centrifuges and power turbines are both spinning machines, "**the attack is identical -- the one to take out the centrifuges and the one to take out our power systems is the same attack**."¶ "If a centrifuge running at the wrong speed can blow apart" so can a power generator, said the expert. "If you do, in fact, spin them at the wrong speeds, you can blow up any rotating device."¶ Cyber security expert Eugene Kaspersky said two weeks ago that one of his greatest fears is someone reverse-engineering a sophisticated cyber weapon like Stuxnet **-- a relatively easy task** -- and he noted that Stuxnet itself passed through power plants on its way to Iran. "Stuxnet infected thousands of computer systems all around the globe, I know there were power plants infected by Stuxnet very far away from Iran," Kaspersky said.

**Grid attacks take out C and C---causes retaliation and nuclear war**

**Tilford 12** Robert, Graduate US Army Airborne School, Ft. Benning, Georgia, “Cyber attackers could shut down the electric grid for the entire east coast” 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/cyber-attackers-could-easily-shut-down-the-electric-grid-for-the-entire-east-coa>

To make matters worse a cyber attack that can take out a civilian power grid, for example could also cripple the U.S. military.¶ The senator notes that is that the same power grids that supply cities and towns, stores and gas stations, cell towers and heart monitors also power “every military base in our country.”¶ “Although bases would be prepared to weather a short power outage with backup diesel generators, within hours, not days, fuel supplies would run out”, he said.¶ Which means military **command and control centers could go dark**.¶ Radar systems that detect air threats to our country **would shut Down completely**.¶ “Communication between commanders and their troops would also go silent. And many weapons systems would be left without either fuel or electric power”, said Senator Grassley.¶ “So in a few short hours or days, the mightiest military in the world would be left scrambling to maintain base functions”, he said.¶ We contacted the Pentagon and officials confirmed the threat of a cyber attack is something very real.¶ Top national security officials—including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Secretary of Defense, and the CIA Director— have said, “preventing a cyber attack and improving the nation’s electric grids is among the most urgent priorities of our country” (source: Congressional Record).¶ So how serious is the Pentagon taking all this?¶ Enough to start, or end a war over it, for sure (see video: Pentagon declares war on cyber attacks http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_kVQrp\_D0kY&feature=relmfu ).¶ A cyber attack today against the US could very well be seen as an “Act of War” and could be met with a “full scale” US military response.¶ That could include the use **of “nuclear weapons**”, if authorized by the President.

#### Scenario B --- Alaska

#### DOD facilities in Alaska are vulnerable to grid disruptions now

Warwick 10 Engineer & Researcher at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, “Renewable Resource Development on Department of Defense Bases in Alaska: Challenges and Opportunities”, September, http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\_reports/PNNL-19742.pdf)

Alaska Military Facilities There are seven major DOD facilities in Alaska, as follows (see Figure 1 for a map). Fort Richardson (FRA) is the major Army facility in the southern part of the state. It is in Anchorage adjacent to Elmendorf Air Force Base (AFB). There is another cluster of facilities in the north central part of the state near Fairbanks. This includes Fort Wainwright (FWA) on the eastern edge of Fairbanks and Eielson AFB (EAFB) approximately 26 miles southeast of Fairbanks. Roughly 100 miles further southeast of Fairbanks is Fort Greely (FGA) and the training ranges for Fort Wainwright. Facilities of the Ground Missile Defense (GMD) are located on the range as well. While support to Ground Missile Defense is provided by the Army, it is a facility of the Missile Defense Agency. Approximately mid-way between Fairbanks and Anchorage is the Clear Air Force Station (CAFS). The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process resulted in Fort Wainwright having greater control over the lands at Fort Greely and joint-basing of Fort Richardson and Elmendorf AFB under the control of the Air Force as Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). As a result of this consolidation the focus of Army operations is now primarily Fort Wainwright, while the Air Force operates three major facilities. The Air Force facilities are under the Air Force Pacific and Space Commands. Each of the services, including the Navy, operates smaller facilities in remote areas that are either not interconnected to the Alaska power grid or are too small to be of concern for this study. Alaska Utility Infrastructure The electrical system in Alaska is primitive in comparison to that in the lower 48 states and the rest of the developed world because of the harsh climate, large land mass and sparse population. There are two major population centers in the state, Anchorage and Fairbanks, and a cluster of smaller towns scattered across the Kenai Peninsula (see Figure 2). All three areas are linked by a single transmission circuit that is about 600 miles long. It follows the major railroad and highway linking these areas and is therefore called the Railbelt transmission system. Power exchanges along the system are limited primarily as a consequence of the nature of electricity requirements in the state and the associated history of each utility. The climate in Alaska is so harsh that a power outage of any duration can be devastating. As a result, each utility has planned to be able to operate independently of all others. They also plan to have sufficient reserve generating capacity to be able to provide power even if multiple generators are inoperable. The end result is sufficient generating capability to offset the need for integrated operations, and therefore, the need for an extensive transmission system (see Figure 3, from Doyon Utilities). The major interconnected utilities are Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA), which serves the north central part of the state centered on Fairbanks. The Anchorage area has two primary utilities, Anchorage Municipal Light and Power (ML&P) and Chugach Electric Association (CEA). Matanuska Electric Association (MEA) provides power to the northern suburbs of Anchorage. The GVEA system in the north is connected to the three Anchorage area utilities by a 170-mile transmission line, the Alaska Intertie, owned by the Alaska Energy Authority, which is a “public,” meaning state-owned, corporation of the Department of Commerce (Alaska Energy Authority 1991). Access to the intertie is through an “intertie agreement.” This is standard practice among utilities in regions where there is no independent system operator (ISO) to collectively manage transmission access on behalf of multiple utility owners. The California ISO (CAISO) is an example of an ISO. In this case, Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) contracts with ML&P and GVEA to manage the intertie. As noted previously, to complete the circuit between GVEA and the two Anchorage utilities, transmission has to pass through the MEA system. AEA recently constructed an extension to the intertie to bypass the MEA system and tie in to the CEA system directly. The intertie was initially envisioned as means to distribute power from a large hydropower development project on the Susitna River. This development is north of the Anchorage area and would require connections to both the south and the north to be feasible. The generating capability from the Susitna project could equal the combined generation of Alaska’s major utilities if fully developed. Like all large hydropower projects, this one is controversial and expensive, and consequently has had an on-again, off-again history. Interest in the project remains high, however, given the current dependence on fossil fuel for generation and shrinking supplies of oil from the North Slope and natural gas from the Cook Inlet near Anchorage (see Figure 4). GVEA serves Forts Wainwright and Greely and Eielson AFB. Elmendorf AFB and Fort Richardson (JBER) are served by ML&P. Power flowing between GVEA and ML&P passes through the systems of MEA and CEA because Anchorage is located on the southern edge of Cook Inlet and MEA and CEA are on the northern and eastern edges, respectively. Clear AFS is not connected to any utility power grid. It is in the GVEA territory and could be interconnected by constructing a transmission line approximately 3-miles long. Clear AFS, Eielson AFB, Fort Wainwright, and Fort Greely have their own central plants that provide both heat and power. Therefore, they are self-sufficient and typically operate without grid power. The plants at Clear, Eielson, and Wainwright are coal-fired using low Btu content coal mined near Clear, roughly 100 miles southeast of Fort Wainwright. Coal is delivered by rail. Fort Greely and GMD have diesel-fired generation in place, however because of the cost, Fort Greely uses excess power generated at Fort Wainwright whenever it is available. Power from Wainwright is wheeled by GVEA under a standard service tariff. The wheeling service is somewhat expensive but doesn’t require GVEA customers on either end of the transaction to provide reliability reserves or ancillary services, which are typically required in wholesale wheeling transactions.

#### That’s key to boost airpower and prevent Arctic conflict escalation

Schanz 8 Associate Editor of the Air Force Magazine, “Strategic Alaska”, http://www.airforce-magazine.com/MagazineArchive/Pages/2008/November%202008/1108alaska.aspx

Billy Mitchell saw its great potential in 1935, and now the rest of the world has finally caught on.

More than ever before, the Air Force is paying close attention to its force structure in Alaska. Indeed, a major rush of events in the High North has propelled the 49th state up to the top ranks of service thinking. A resurgent Russia has ramped up its long-range bomber flights nearby. A changing Arctic climate has uncorked a flurry of activity in the region as once inaccessible resources now seem ready for exploitation. Alaska’s strategic Arctic location is viewed as useful for missile defense, air defense, and force deployments to locations ranging from Europe to East Asia and beyond. And the military training space available to USAF there is huge and varied. For these and other reasons, the Air Force has started beefing up its forces in the state. A visitor there sees that the service has been sending its newest and most advanced equipment for Alaskan service, including brand-new F-22 fighters and C-17 transports. "From an airman’s perspective, [it’s] probably the most strategic location," said Lt. Gen. Dana T. Atkins, commander of Alaskan Command and Alaskan NORAD region. The state’s geographic location "makes it hugely of strategic import to the United States and really important in a global context." From Alaskan bases, the Air Force can gain quick access both to the Pacific and European Theaters. Transiting across the Arctic, forces could arrive in Europe faster than if flying from the East Coast of the US, Atkins pointed out. This responsive location has helped to push Alaska to the forefront of USAF’s investment queue. The reinvigoration of Russian bomber patrols over Arctic waters in August 2007 was an opening push of that country’s increasingly assertive power projection efforts. NORAD’s US and Canadian fighters have repeatedly intercepted Russian flights skirting Alaskan airspace. New F-22s at Elmendorf Air Force Base took center stage last fall when Raptors stepped in to fill the role of the temporarily grounded F-15 fleet to intercept Russian Tu-95 Bear bombers. The Air Sovereignty Mission Many of the Raptor pilots leveraged their F-15 backgrounds, and the scrambles led to the development of a new training plan for the air sovereignty mission, said Lt. Col. Orlando Sanchez, director of operations for the 525th Fighter Squadron at Elmendorf. While F-22s are no longer on alert, they may perform intercepts in the future. The commander of Russia’s Air Force, Col. Gen. Alexander Zelin, said in April the country will increase its strategic patrols to as many as 30 a month. "It’s been interesting in the last few years," said Gen. Carrol H. Chandler, chief of Pacific Air Forces, in September. "When I was ... Alaskan Command commander, we had one intercept in the time that I was there. The Russians have continued to put emphasis on long-range aviation; they’ve continued to put emphasis on presence in the Arctic. ... Those numbers have picked up considerably over the last three to four years." Chandler suspects that a "competition for resources" will continue, and perhaps intensify, in the Arctic. Last year, Russia publicized a submarine trip to the bottom of the seabed at the North Pole—where the crew deposited a titanium Russian flag, symbolically marking territory. The Canadians derided the expedition as a "stunt," with Prime Minister Stephen Harper making a trip to Canada’s Arctic region to unveil several major military investments, and following with a new defense strategy, outlining new capabilities in the North. Russia’s focus on Arctic operations is a part of the country’s push to assert its own interests over Siberia’s extended continental shelf—the largest and least explored so far of the world’s continental shelves, according to senior Russian military officials. Geologists believe major oil and gas deposits could potentially become available as the polar ice cap slowly recedes with warming temperatures—a fact that is the focus of increasing attention to the nations claiming Arctic waters. "I don’t see that abating anytime in the near future, and the Russians certainly have the resources at this point" to continue to push into the region, said Chandler. A Resurgent Russia While Russia’s Arctic bellicosity has been on the rise, commanders in the region say the moves have to be kept in perspective. "Is it Cold War games all over again? I don’t think so," said Brig. Gen. Thomas L. Tinsley, who led the 3rd Wing at Elmendorf until his death in July. The moves are not hollow, however, and represent Russia’s "desire to bring their Air Forces back up to the speed they were." Tinsley noted that Russia has doubled the fuel it allots to its strategic aviation forces in order to bring back lost training capability. "But you know we’re constantly testing each others’ intel ability, we’re constantly testing each others’ reaction ability, and that’s just part of it." A big issue in the mix is the filing of standard international flight plans by the Russians, Atkins said. If an aircraft approaches a nation’s sovereign boundary with a flight plan, things would be a lot less complicated, he said. The problem with the Russian long-range bomber missions is that "what we’ve witnessed ... is these flights occur without these flight plans." This is one of the goals of improved mil-to-mil relations with the Russian Far East Military District commanders, Atkins added. "It seems too simple to say that, but if they would just adhere to the protocols that we have all accepted, then I think a lot of the perceived tension will evaporate." The US Coast Guard cooperates closely with the Russians just across the Bering Strait on issues ranging from fishing to limiting piracy, Atkins said. This month a survival search and rescue exercise was to be conducted, and this past summer US forces participated in a homeland defense exercise where a simulated hijacking took place—with command and control elements in both Alaska and Russia simulating the tracking and handing off of the aircraft. Both Atkins and Gen. Victor E. Renuart Jr. at NORAD have been working to invite some of the Russian Far East Military District commanders to visit Alaska to continue building between the two militaries professional relationships—which haven’t always been as close as the Coast Guard’s. "I’m the new guy. I’m going to try to keep building that professional rapport," Atkins quipped. "It would be great to get a rapport like the [Coast Guard’s]. ... I’d like to achieve the same kind of professional tie." In addition to renewed tensions with Russia, increased air and maritime traffic is a growing concern at Alaskan Command. Climate conditions have revealed a host of new Arctic transnational issues.

#### Air power solves global nuclear war

Khalilzad and Lesser 1 \*PhD from the University of Chicago, counselor at CSIS, permanent representative to the UN, \*\*Senior Transatlantic Fellow at the US German Marshall Fund, former Vice President and Director of Studies at the Pacific Council on International Policy, RAND, “Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century”, p.164-5, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf

This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf.

#### Arctic conflict risk high now---prefer recent evidence

Clark 2/6 Pilita, Financial Times, "Environment: Frozen frontiers", 2013, www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/a51a35e2-704c-11e2-ab31-00144feab49a.html#axzz2KSkdFR00

Yet this is only the latest sign of a surge in diplomatic, commercial and scientific activity in one of the world’s last unspoilt wildernesses. Much of this Arctic awakening is being driven by the belief that rapidly melting Arctic ice will unleash access to more than a fifth of the world’s undiscovered oil and gas deposits, plus a lot of fish and tourist attractions.¶ So far, it has unfolded peacefully. But two distinct schools of thought are emerging about whether it will stay this way or eventually erupt into what Scott Borgerson, a US maritime policy specialist, has described as “an armed mad dash” for resource spoils in a region that never expected to need the rules to prevent such chaos.¶ “Either outcome is possible,” says Canadian academic, Michael Byers, author of Who Owns the Arctic? Right now, he says, “there is a concerted effort on the part of all the Arctic countries to steer future development towards co-operation and away from conflict”.¶ But doubts persist. “It sounds like Europe in 1935,” says Rob Huebert of the University of Calgary’s Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, the co-author of a study showing that some Arctic countries, including Russia, have already started rebuilding their Arctic military capabilities while others have plans to follow.¶ Such is the uncertain backdrop to a region producing more surprises each year, not least in the shipping trade.

#### Goes nuclear

Wallace and Staples 10 Michael Wallace is Professor Emeritus at the University of British Columbia; Steven Staples is President of the Rideau Institute in Ottawa, March 2010, “Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons A Task Long Overdue”, http://www.arcticsecurity.org/docs/arctic-nuclear-report-web.pdf

The fact is, the Arctic is becoming a zone of increased military competition. Russian President Medvedev has announced the creation of a special military force to defend Arctic claims. Last year Russian General Vladimir Shamanov declared that Russian troops would step up training for Arctic combat, and that Russia’s submarine fleet would increase its “operational radius.” Recently, two Russian attack submarines were spotted off the U.S. east coast for the first time in 15 years. In January 2009, on the eve of Obama’s inauguration, President Bush issued a National Security Presidential Directive on Arctic Regional Policy. It affirmed as a priority the preservation of U.S. military vessel and aircraft mobility and transit throughout the Arctic, including the Northwest Passage, and foresaw greater capabilities to protect U.S. borders in the Arctic. The Bush administration’s disastrous eight years in office, particularly its decision to withdraw from the ABM treaty and deploy missile defence interceptors and a radar station in Eastern Europe, have greatly contributed to the instability we are seeing today, even though the Obama administration has scaled back the planned deployments. The Arctic has figured in this renewed interest in Cold War weapons systems, particularly the upgrading of the Thule Ballistic Missile Early Warning System radar in Northern Greenland for ballistic missile defence. The Canadian government, as well, has put forward new military capabilities to protect Canadian sovereignty claims in the Arctic, including proposed ice-capable ships, a northern military training base and a deep-water port. Earlier this year Denmark released an all-party defence position paper that suggests the country should create a dedicated Arctic military contingent that draws on army, navy and air force assets with shipbased helicopters able to drop troops anywhere. Danish fighter planes would be tasked to patrol Greenlandic airspace. Last year Norway chose to buy 48 Lockheed Martin F-35 fighter jets, partly because of their suitability for Arctic patrols. In March, that country held a major Arctic military practice involving 7,000 soldiers from 13 countries in which a fictional country called Northland seized offshore oil rigs. The manoeuvres prompted a protest from Russia – which objected again in June after Sweden held its largest northern military exercise since the end of the Second World War. About 12,000 troops, 50 aircraft and several warships were involved. Jayantha Dhanapala, President of Pugwash and former UN under-secretary for disarmament affairs, summarized the situation bluntly: “From those in the international peace and security sector, deep concerns are being expressed over the fact that two nuclear weapon states – the United States and the Russian Federation, which together own 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world – converge on the Arctic and have competing claims. These claims, together with those of other allied NATO countries – Canada, Denmark, Iceland, and Norway – could, if unresolved, lead to conflict escalating into the threat or use of nuclear weapons.” Many will no doubt argue that this is excessively alarmist, but no circumstance in which nuclear powers find themselves in military confrontation can be taken lightly. The current geo-political threat level is nebulous and low – for now, according to Rob Huebert of the University of Calgary, “[the] issue is the uncertainty as Arctic states and non-Arctic states begin to recognize the geo-political/economic significance of the Arctic because of climate change.”

#### Extinction

Corcoran 9 PhD, Senior Fellow @ Global Security, Former Strategic Analyst at the US Army War College where he chaired studies for the Office of the Deputy Chief of Operations and member of the National Advisory Board for the Alsos Digital Library for Nuclear Issues, 4/21, http://sitrep.globalsecurity.org/articles/090421301-strategic-nuclear-targets.htm

That brings us to Russia, our former main adversary, now a competitive partner and still a potential future adversary, particularly as relations have gradually soured in recent years. Russia is the only other nation with a formidable arsenal of some three thousand strategic weapons. Our opposing arsenals were built up in the period when Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) was the underlying strategic concept -- each side deterred from striking the other by the prospect of assured retaliatory destruction. The situation became even madder as both sides worked to develop a capability to destroy the other's strike force with a crippling first strike. This resulted in further large increases in the sizes of the arsenals, as well as early warning systems and hair-trigger launch-on-warning alert procedures. The final result was an overall system in which each side could destroy the other in a matter of minutes. And it also raised another chilling specter, Nuclear Winter, in which the atmospheric dust raised from a major nuclear exchange would block sunlight for an extended period and essentially destroy human civilization globally. The collapse of the Soviet Union collapsed this threat, but did not eliminate it. US and Russian nuclear forces remained frozen in adversarial positions. The May 2002 Moscow Treaty began to address this legacy and is leading to a reduction in strategic nuclear forces down to levels of about two thousand on each side by 2012. These levels are still sufficient to destroy not only both nations but also human civilization. It is hard to even construct scenarios where the use of even a few strategic nuclear weapons does not risk a total escalation. Strikes on Russian warning facilities or strike forces would almost certainly bring a wave of retaliatory strikes. Strikes on hardened command centers would be of questionable effectiveness and also risk total escalation. In addition, successful elimination of Russian leaders could greatly complicate any efforts to stop escalation short of a total nuclear exchange.

#### Scenario C --- Forward Operating Bases

#### Commitment to low-carbon power is key to avoid forward base kick-outs globally

Parthmore 10 Christine, Fellow at the Center for a New American Security; and Dr. John Nagl, President of the Center for a New American Security, September 2010, “Fueling the Future Force Preparing the Department of Defense for a Post-Petroleum Era,” http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Fueling%20the%20Future%20Force\_NaglParthemore.pdf

Signs indicate that federal and state governments will continue to push for greater adoption of domestic and/or lower-carbon energy technologies. As a result, DOD will face a changing legal, regulatory and political environment in the coming decades. Congress has consistently passed legislation since 2005 to support investments and set federal requirements supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy production. The Obama administration strongly supports this approach as well. Obama issued an October 2009 Executive Order committing federal agencies to calculate and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, which spurred energy-focused DOD officials to begin complying with this requirement. Likewise, 27 states have instituted renewable energy portfolio standards, and nine others have renewable or alternative energy goals or requirements.18 Legal and regulatory changes can also constrain energy choices. For instance, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that greenhouse gas emissions constitute a pollutant and therefore can be regulated at the federal level, and the Obama administration has signaled its intent to move forward with such regulation unless the Congress mandates emissions reductions through legislation. ¶ While the U.S. government sets domestic regulations and laws, and can exempt combat-related activities, it does not exercise the same control internationally. Indeed, there is growing concern that foreign countries may not always exempt military activities within their territory from environmental standards. For example, the Canadian government recently decided to upgrade one of its vessels that was not equipped to meet the environmental standards of several European countries, for fear that the vessel could be denied port access.19 The Department of Defense must consider emerging international trends in regulating emissions and adopting less carbon-intensive energy sources as it considers how to guarantee its freedom of access to foreign ports and territories.

#### That results in conflicts everywhere that go nuclear---land power’s key

Steven Metz 12, Chairman of the Regional Strategy and Planning Department and Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute, January 30, 2012, “To Maintain U.S. Primacy, Standoff Power is not Enough,” World Politics Review, online: http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11312/to-maintain-u-s-primacy-standoff-power-is-not-enough

Though the objective itself is admirable, the strategy behind it can prove to be counterproductive and even dangerous if pushed to extremes. Standoff methods are extraordinarily effective in some situations and against some types of opponents. Unfortunately, a global power that seeks to shape the security environment, prevent the emergence of conflict and shape the outcome of conflicts that do occur confronts situations and opponents far from its home territory. In these cases, the capability to project force with little risk to one’s forces is essential. But preferring standoff methods is one thing; having only standoff capabilities is something entirely different. All U.S. presidents have found that the promotion of American national interests requires balanced military capabilities, with more-direct methods, particularly land power, in the mix. ¶ Following the 1991 Gulf War, some military and political leaders came to believe that modern technology had made standoff methods so effective that there was less need for direct military action. The value of land power, according to this group, was in decline. The Sept. 11 attacks and the ensuing struggle with extremists in Iraq, Afghanistan and other parts of the world showed otherwise. For a while, the inclination to place all bets on standoff methods faded. Now this debate has re-emerged. ¶ The idea that standoff military methods now outweigh a balanced capability in strategic importance grows from a misreading of recent history. It is based on the belief that Libya rather than Iraq or Afghanistan should be the model for future U.S. military operations. Americans certainly prefer a Libya-style use of force with few or no American casualties. But if that is the limit of the nation’s capabilities, it will have no ability to deter or defeat opponents more clever and capable than Moammar Gadhafi's security services; to shape regional security systems; to stabilize countries or regions; and to influence the outcome of conflicts that do not look like Libya. ¶ Global trends point toward an enduring need for land power. States will fragment, with accompanying conflict. There is a possibility of renewed proxy wars between regional and global powers. In the absence of effective American land power, aggressors would simply avoid large-scale conventional military operations and devolve to the use of proxies, whether insurgents, terrorists or militias. The United States would be ill-prepared to help its friends resist this form of aggression, thus making it more likely. Fragile states, including those emerging from a conflict or from democratic revolutions, would have trouble finding the assistance they needed to establish stability. The United States would be hard-pressed to lead international efforts to stop humanitarian disasters or genocide, particularly in the wake of a devastating conflict such as a nuclear exchange. ¶ Without a balanced military capability, America would lose its ability to shape the world in pursuit of its national interests. While budget and force cuts are necessary, they should be structured so that the U.S. military retains both its dominance at defeating enemy armed forces through standoff strikes and its ability to deter other types of opponents and shape strategic outcomes through the application of land power. ¶ There is no doubt that the United States will exercise global leadership more selectively in coming years. It may decide to avoid large-scale counterinsurgency operations along the lines of Iraq and Afghanistan or direct involvement in major wars. But while making such a decision based on expected benefits, costs and risks is wise, to be forced into it by a lack of effective land power would be very dangerous. ¶ If the United States only needs to defeat conventional enemy armed forces, standoff military methods are enough. But if the national interest requires facing other types of opponents, deterring conflict and shaping conflicts that cannot be deterred, America needs a balance of standoff and direct capabilities. If the United States intends to remain an effective global power, it must have potent land power.

#### NATO prevents global nuclear war

Brzezinski 9 (Zbigniew, former U.S. National Security Adviser, Sept/Oct 2009, “An Agenda for NATO,” Foreign Affairs, 88.5, Ebsco)

NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction -- not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers -- the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India -- at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons -- and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally.

#### NATO interoperability resolves global problems in Syria, North Korea, the Gulf of Guinea and Straits of Hormuz

Kempe 12 Frederick, President and CEO of the Atlantic Council, "How NATO can revitalize its role", May 16, blogs.reuters.com/thinking-global/2012/05/16/how-nato-can-revitalize-its-role/

However, beneath the third agenda item – partnerships – lies a potential revolution in how the world’s most important security alliance may operate globally in the future beside other regional organizations – and at the request of the United Nations. At a time of euro zone crisis, U.S. political polarization and global uncertainty, it provides a possible road map for “enlarging the West” and its community of common values and purpose. “NATO is now a hub for a global network of security partners which have served alongside NATO forces in Afghanistan, Libya and Kosovo,” Obama and Rasmussen agreed.¶ As America’s willingness and capability to act unilaterally declines, any U.S. president will find himself increasingly drawn to NATO as an even more vital tool for foreign and defense policy – against a host of global threats ranging from Syrian upheavals and North Korean nuclear weapons to cyber attacks and piracy. The problem, however, is that NATO members more often than not won’t be located where they are most needed. Or due to lack of political will or inadequate military muscle, many NATO members may not have the capability to intervene. That means regional partners will be increasingly necessary to provide both the credibility and resources for the most likely future operations.¶ Although many experts, including then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, opposed NATO’s 2011 intervention in Libya, the operation’s ultimate success provides something of a model for this sort of future. NATO operated alongside key regional and European non-alliance partners within NATO structures – with the blessing of the Arab League and the United Nations Security Council. The alliance – and by extension the United States – achieved its objectives with no allied casualties, minor collateral damage and limited U.S. engagement. The war lasted seven months and cost the alliance just $1.2 billion, the equivalent of one week of operations in Afghanistan.¶ Such situations never repeat themselves precisely. Should NATO ultimately be involved in Syria, for example, regional engagement would likely be far greater. In a North Korean scenario, it is hard to imagine any response that wouldn’t be coordinated with America’s Asia-Pacific allies and China. Regarding maritime security, the NATO countries involved and local partners would shift given the threat, whether off the Gulf of Guinea or the Straits of Hormuz. What’s clear is that for the model of NATO at the hub of a global security network, the alliance will need to become more flexible and adaptable – and to build a broader and deeper array of global partnerships.¶ The expected discussions of NATO leaders this weekend about how best to wind down their decade-long Afghan military operation and about how to maintain sufficient defense capabilities, despite growing budget cuts, risk leaving the impression of an alliance in retrenchment or decline. That’s hardly an inspiring or helpful message for a U.S. president heading home to Chicago at the beginning of his re-election campaign.¶ By contrast, NATO’s efforts to broaden and deepen cooperation with capable partner nations can be rolled out as a pro-active, forward-looking initiative that has NATO going on offense for a new era. So that no one misses his notion of NATO at the core of a global security network, President Obama and his allies will stage an unprecedented summit meeting with 13 partner nations – from South Korea, Japan, New Zealand and Australia in Asia-Pacific to Jordan, Morocco, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates in the Middle East and North Africa. Also present will be five European states that aren’t members of the alliance but routinely contribute to alliance activities – Austria, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland.¶ What they’ll be trying to do is give teeth to an agenda for NATO that I first saw discussed in detail by former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski in a major Foreign Affairs article in October 2009. He argued against those who wished to expand NATO into a global alliance of democracies. He said that would dilute the crucial importance of the U.S.-European connection, which still accounts for half of the world’s economy, and that none of the world’s rising powers would be likely to accept membership in a global NATO. An ideologically defined democratic alliance would needlessly draw institutional lines between the U.S. and, for example, China.¶ “NATO, however, has the experience, the institutions, and the means to eventually become the hub of a globe-spanning web of various regional cooperative-security undertakings among states with the growing power to act,” he wrote. “In pursuing that strategic mission, NATO would not only be preserving transatlantic political unity; it would also be responding to the twenty-first century’s novel and increasingly urgent security agenda.”

#### Korean war goes nuclear

STRATFOR 10 5/26, “North Korea, South Korea: The Military Balance on the Peninsula,” <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/20100526_north_korea_south_korea_military_balance_peninsula>

So the real issue is the potential for escalation — or an accident that could precipitate escalation — that would be beyond the control of Pyongyang or Seoul. With both sides on high alert, both adhering to their own national (and contradictory) definitions of where disputed boundaries lie and with rules of engagement loosened, the potential for sudden and rapid escalation is quite real**.** Indeed, North Korea’s navy, though sizable on paper, is largely a hollow shell of old, laid-up vessels. What remains are small fast attack craft and submarines — mostly Sang-O “Shark” class boats and midget submersibles. These vessels are best employed in the cluttered littoral environment to bring asymmetric tactics to bear — not unlike those Iran has prepared for use in the Strait of Hormuz. These kinds of vessels and tactics — including, especially, the deployment of naval mines — are poorly controlled when dispersed in a crisis and are often impossible to recall. For nearly 40 years, tensions on the Korean Peninsula were managed within the context of the wider Cold War. During that time it was feared that a second Korean War could all too easily escalate into and a thermonuclear World War III, so both Pyongyang and Seoul were being heavily managed from their respective corners. In fact, USFK was long designed to ensure that South Korea could not independently provoke that war and drag the Americans into it, which for much of the Cold War period was of far greater concern to Washington than North Korea attacking southward. Today, those constraints no longer exist. There are certainly still constraints — neither the United States nor China wants war on the peninsula. But current tensions are quickly escalating to a level unprecedented in the post-Cold War period, and the constraints that do exist have never been tested in the way they might be if the situation escalates much further.

#### Gulf of Guinea is the most dangerous maritime area in the world---new attacks wreck global trade

ICG 12 International Crisis Group, "The Gulf of Guinea: The New Danger Zone", December 12, www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/africa/central-africa/195-the-gulf-of-guinea-the-new-danger-zone.aspx

Within a decade, the Gulf of Guinea has become one of the most dangerous maritime areas in the world. Maritime insecurity is a major regional problem that is compromising the development of this strategic economic area and threatening maritime trade in the short term and the stability of coastal states in the long term. Initially taken by surprise, the region’s governments are now aware of the problem and the UN is organising a summit meeting on the issue. In order to avoid violent transnational crime destabilising the maritime economy and coastal states, as it has done on the East African coast, these states must fill the security vacuum in their territorial waters and provide a collective response to this danger. Gulf of Guinea countries must press for dynamic cooperation between the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), take the initiative in promoting security and adopt a new approach based on improving not only security but also economic governance.¶ The recent discovery of offshore hydrocarbon deposits has increased the geostrategic importance of the Gulf of Guinea. After long neglecting their maritime zones, Gulf of Guinea states are now aware of their weakness. On the international front, renewed Western interest in the region is accompanied by similar interest from emerging nations. In this context, the rise in maritime crime has increased collective concern in a region where, for decades, the problems of sovereignty and territorial control have only been posed on dry land.

#### Nuclear war

Michael J. Panzner 8, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth **protectionist legislation** like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a **prolonged** and **devastating global disaster**, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. ¶ Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending.¶ In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly.¶ The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and **dangerous confrontations** over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to **full-scale military encounters,** often with minimal provocation.¶ In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, **terrorist groups** will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level.¶ Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly **belligerent posture** toward **Taiwan**, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point.¶ More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. **Terrorists** employing **biological or nuclear weapons** will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a **new world war**.

### 1AC – Leadership Advantage

#### CONTENTION 2: LEADERSHIP

#### Perception of greenwashing destroys the credibility of DOD leadership on clean energy---credible strategy’s key to global spillover of sustainable tech

Laura Horton 11, J.D., Golden Gate University School of Law, Spring 2011, “COMMENT: FUTURE FORCE SUSTAINABILITY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN A CHANGING CLIMATE,” Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, 4 Golden Gate U. Envtl. L.J. 303, p. lexis

As the world’s largest consumer of energy, the military has a long way to go if it intends to achieve energy efficiency goals set by the government and the DOD itself. However, not everyone is convinced that the military will follow through, considering its past environmental record. 153 This skepticism is valid in light of the growing impact climate change has had on the planet and the extent to which the military has contributed to GHG emissions. 154 In addition, mistrust of the DOD’s environmental record is warranted, since environmental damage from military activities still exists all over the United States 155¶ The suspect attitude toward military greening is akin to an attitude held by many concerning corporate “environmentalism” in the form of “greenwashing.” 156 The military is claiming to go “green,” and is indeed making strides in energy efficiency, while simultaneously increasing oil use by 1.5% annually through 2017. 157 Also, efficiency programs are limited to base installations and are not applied to tactical fleets, where much of the DOD’s fuel consumption occurs. 158 Furthermore, little is said in any of the aforementioned reports about the many exemptions the DOD sought from numerous environmental laws over the past eight years. 159 The military is accustomed to approaching environmental protection on its own terms and is giving mixed signals about how important energy efficiency will be in the near future. Consequently, there is a question as to how self-imposed standards such as voluntary compliance with federal energy efficiency standards, from which the DOD is otherwise exempt, will play out. 160 One example of the uncertainty of these programs can be found in a recent article in ClimateWire. 161 According to the article, the aforementioned spray foam insulation program has now been halted in the absence of advocacy for such programs. 162 The difficulty of relocating the foam tents and high disposal costs have led to the demise of spray foam use, and supporters are calling for a mandate to move forward with the project. 163 It is unclear whether the DOD will resume the program at all. The need for advocacy is especially important for the public to understand, because of the potential for new energy technology to transform the civilian marketplace as military technology finds its way into the public domain. 164¶ The military has begun to take the lead in energy efficiency, drive the civilian sector toward sustainable energy use, and push for “policy change to help make the necessary cultural shifts in how its people think about energy use and the decisions they make in all settings.” 165 The more seriously the military takes energy efficiency, the faster sustainable technology will reach the public. For that reason, progress on these efforts should be monitored and documented for the public to review. A history of military brush-offs of the importance of environmental protection does not lend itself to a campaign of global stewardship. In order to win the confidence of the public, the military must demonstrate a willingness to follow through with the programs it has set in place to lead alternative-energy development in the United States and the world.

#### U.S. leadership on the broader green tech transition solves extinction

Klarevas 9 –Louis Klarevas, Professor for Center for Global Affairs @ New York University, 12/15, “Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html

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

#### Inflating REC demand causes fake emission reductions---locks in warming

Alice Kenny 10, prize-winning science writer and a regular contributor to the Ecosystem Marketplace, 2010, “Voluntary Carbon Offsets: Boon or Boondoggle?,” <http://greenopolis.com/media/headlines/voluntary-carbon-offsets-boon-or-boondoggle>

But with battling experts, evolving scientific knowledge and no Better Business Bureau to police this new green field, what guarantees that the carbon offsets being sold effectively protect the environment? ¶ The bad news, says Derek Broekhoff, a senior associate at the World Resources Institute, is that "the vast majority of providers have a long way to go before they are up to speed and maintaining consistent levels of quality." ¶ "I would definitely say it's a buyer beware market," he concludes. ¶ Now, with real money at stake, consumers, suppliers, scientists and investors have begun assessing the voluntary carbon market's ability to ensure consumer confidence, the key to the market's future. ¶ A Dog's Dinner¶ The voluntary carbon market surged 1000 percent over the past two years, according to recent reports. It racked in sales of over $100 million last year and is set to double again by next year. Yet no single standard exists to appraise the quality of marketed carbon offsets, forcing consumers to rely on advertisements for much of their education. In the short term, this could prove a bonanza for businesses marketing carbon offsets. But in the long term, it could compromise this consumer-driven market's credibility, threatening inroads made in the battle against global warming. ¶ Now, says Jeff Reamer, assistant vice president for renewable energy at GE Energy Financial Services, "just about anyone can hang out a shingle and say I'm selling a ton of carbon." ¶ Confronting this lapse, United Kingdom regulators announced last month that all future voluntary carbon credits undergo the same scrutiny as carbon credits sold on the mandatory European carbon market for factories and large institutions. The move has come under heavy criticism from many in the industry who argue that such regulation will strangle the innovative side of the market that keeps transaction costs low and contributes to sustainable development. Whether they are for or against the government approach, however, nearly everyone agrees with UK Environment Secretary David Miliband: "People need to be sure that the way they offset is actually making a difference." ¶ Since the United States has neither a federally mandated carbon market nor established standards, it could not follow Britain's lead even if it wanted to do so. Instead, a potpourri of unofficial groups proposed their own standards. The CDM Gold Standard recently released what it calls a voluntary market standard and the Climate Group, the International Emissions Trading Association and the World Economic Forum Global Greenhouse Register are in the midst of developing their Voluntary Carbon Standard. ¶ The Center for Resource Solutions offers it's Green-E logo for vetted renewable energy certificates and is creating similar criteria to certify carbon reductions (for more on these standards see Comparing Apples & Oranges: In Search of a Standard for the Voluntary Carbon Market and The Missing Link? Green-e Attempts to Join the Voluntary Markets for RECs and Carbon Offsets in U.S.). Meanwhile GE, in its new carbon-offset partnership with AES, plans to create its own standard to ensure that what is sold as a ton of sequestered CO2 actually represents a ton of CO2, says Reamer. ¶ Many applaud these various yardsticks, saying they provide effective ways to guarantee that carbon reductions are delivered and not double sold. But with so many standards out there and none universally accepted, "it's a bit of a dogs' dinner right now," says Sean Clark, offset portfolio manager for Climate Trust, a nonprofit carbon-offset provider based in Oregon. "It's a mess." ¶ Messier still is where this leaves consumers. With no universal standards, even bottom-line information on how many voluntary offsets have been sold remains unknown. In a recently published report commissioned by Clean Air, Cool Planet, Mark Trexler, president of the energy and environmental policy consulting firm Trexler Climate + Energy Services, determined that nearly 75 percent of the 30 retail voluntary carbon-offset providers existing at the time of his study provided insufficient information on how their offsets combat global warming, limiting consumers' ability to make educated purchasing decisions. ¶ "We were surprised by how little information consumers had on the web about what they were buying," Trexler said. "We were also surprised by how many providers provided no indication that they understood the tricky issues of offset quality." ¶ Shooting the Dog¶ Remember the National Lampoon magazine cover that threatens, "If you don't buy this magazine we'll shoot this dog"? The voluntary carbon market also suffers from this type of "counterfactual hypothetical," says Steve Calderia, a scientist at Carnegie Institution's department of global ecology. Just as the dog would not be shot whether or not the magazine was purchased, a rainforest sequestering carbon may or may not have been preserved regardless of funding received from the voluntary carbon market. Factories updated in exchange for permission to spew carbon from another site may have found it financially profitable to modernize regardless of newly available carbon finance. By trading against hypothetical situations, Calderia says, "a great deal of room is left for gaming the system." ¶ Folks in the carbon-trading business refer to this thorny issue as additionality. And when assessing the quality of the carbon market, additionality, most agree, presents the biggest hurdle. ¶ Experts from various perspectives bring up additionality even when discussing the most basic issue surrounding offsets: promoting renewable energy verses relying on direct emissions reduction activities. Jasmine Hyman, marketing director of the Gold Standard, says that promoting renewable energy projects through the voluntary offset market provides a key way to shift from a fossil-fuel-based economy. Meanwhile, Hyman adds, carbon offset projects that prevent carbon emissions rather than create energy offer less permanence and therefore provide less quality. ¶ Conversely, Trexler argues that intermingling renewable energy certificates in the carbon-offset market could add green energy to the grid without achieving cuts in CO2 emissions. Because of this perspective, he gave low marks in his study to voluntary-carbon-offset providers that included sizeable percentages of renewable energy certificates in their portfolios. ¶ Without clear standards, consumers must come up with their own criteria and may wind up paying for phantom reductions. Flabby oversight that forfeits consumer safeguards comes with high stakes. "We know that selling offsets as absolution would be a disaster for the environment. We need to raise awareness so that consumers know that pressing the buy button is only the first step," says Tom Arnold, chief environmental officer of the carbon-offset seller Terrapass.¶ Baby Steps¶ The voluntary carbon market is not only just a first step; it is also a baby step. Voluntary offsets can lead the market but cannot solve the problem of global warming. Most scientists agree that seven billion tons of carbon emissions must be prevented from entering the atmosphere over the next 50 years to make a dent in global warming. The voluntary market can only deliver about 1/10,000 of these emissions cuts, Trexler estimates. Its strength, then, lies in its potential to spur massive government efforts to limit carbon emissions from large-scale emitters. If consumers lose confidence in their ability to fight global warming, they may be less likely to agitate for these reductions. ¶ Critics claim that some fraudulent greenhouse gas reduction projects sell more carbon credits than they actually reduce, exploiting the lack of an international standard and leaving consumers mistakenly believing that they offset their carbon emissions. Others say that most carbon-reduction providers do their best to provide high-quality carbon offsets. But without accepted standards to vet these offsets and verify that they are sold only once, the voluntary market's reputation can rise or fall on anecdotes.

#### Extinction

Flournoy 12 – Citing Feng Hsu, PhdD NASA Scientist @ the Goddard Space Flight Center, Don Flournoy, PhD and MA from UT, former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, former Associate Dean at SUNY and Case Institute of Technology, Former Manager for Unviersity/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications, Ohio University, “Solar Power Satellites,” January 2012, Springer Briefs in Space Development, p. 10-11

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a  NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010 )

### 1AC – Plan

#### The Executive branch of the United States should increase acquisition of electricity from wind and/or solar powered microgrid systems for military installations in the United States by prioritizing such electricity for purchase under the Department of Defense Environmental Conservation Investment Program.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### CONTENTION 3: SOLVENCY

#### A --- The Grid:

#### The Environmental Conservation Investment Program features zero investment in microgrids now---leaves bases dependent on the civilian grid

Daniel Sater 11, Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office, MA in Public Policy from the Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia, August 2011, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions,” http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf

In the first six months of 2011, the US civilian power grid suffered 155 blackouts affecting an average of 83,000 people with 36 blackouts affecting over 100,000 people.1 Despite these staggering numbers, US military bases rely solely on the civilian grid to power 99% of their war fighting capabilities, homeland security missions, and rescue and relief operations.2 This paper analyzes the Department of Defense’s current efforts to increase energy efficiency and assurance and makes recommendations on the policy options available to the DOD to increase the incorporation of smart microgrids onto its military installations. ¶ A Microgrid is a small localized version of the Smart Grid. It increases energy efficiency by regulating demand and allows for better incorporation of renewable energy sources. During a power outage, a microgrid will disconnect itself from the civilian power grid and turn on an installation’s generators to ensure electricity availability to a base’s critical loads. By prioritizing loads during an emergency, a microgrid will drastically decrease the need for fuel resupplies during a civilian power grid failure. Microgrids also have the potential for deployment in war zones where power supplies are even less secure.¶ Despite the benefits of microgrids, the DOD, as well as legislation and executive orders, has focused on less efficient energy alternatives. The Environmental Conservation Investment Program, one of the principle funding mechanisms to fund conservation efforts in the DOD, rarely invests in microgrids and focuses too much on less cost efficient projects. Further, the DOD’s Net Zero Energy Installation Initiative does little to increase energy assurance at military installations. By focusing too much on renewable energy generation, legislation and executive orders have decreased the available funds for microgrids, which if installed before a renewable energy project, can increase its viability. ¶ The Defense Science Board (DSB) has published two reports urging the DOD to decrease its energy costs and better secure its energy supply to bases. However, the development of microgrids, despite their cost effectiveness and impact on energy assurance, remains slow and infrequent. To increase national security and decrease the department’s energy expenditures, the DOD should enact changes to its investment programs to give more consideration to microgrids and pursue special appropriations from Congress for the widespread deployment of microgrids. The benefit of this two-pronged approach is that it allows the DOD to follow a short-term zero cost solution while it waits for the necessary appropriation from Congress to solve the Defense Department’s energy problems.

#### Prioritizing microgrids within ECIP massively increases microgrid investment

Daniel Sater 11, Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office, MA in Public Policy from the Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia, August 2011, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions,” http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf

Option 2: Make changes to DOD regulations including project rules for the ECIP¶ A no-cost solution for the DOD to increase the number of microgrid projects would be to change the regulations of the Environmental Conservation Investment Program (ECIP). The DOD could add a stipulation to the program’s rules that microgrids should receive special consideration for funding, similar to the regulation that gives additional consideration to renewable energy projects. Another possible change would be to increase the expected lifespan of microgrids from 10 to 20 years. By increasing the expected lifespan, the savings-to-investment ratio would increase, thereby making these projects more appealing. Most project categories in the ECIP already have an expected lifespan of 15 or 20 years. EMCS projects are currently the lowest at 10 years. Finally, the DOD could allow base commanders to enter into special contracts with microgrid developers to build the grid at no upfront cost and pay the developer over time with the money saved from increased efficiency. The GAO labels these contracts as alternative financing agreements, and they already exist for the development of renewable energy projects.76 Avoiding upfront costs circumvents the appropriations process and could allow installations to deploy microgrids more rapidly. ¶ Option 3: Request appropriations from Congress ¶ A special appropriation for the development of microgrids in the next defense authorization and appropriations bills is the best option for the immediate widespread development of microgrids. The Secretary of Defense could urge Congress to authorize and appropriate these funds because of the importance of energy security at military installations. The current budget climate will make it difficult to secure additional funding. However, if the DOD presents the request with an emphasis on its cost-saving measures, Congress might realize the potential savings in long-term energy costs and accept the extra funding in the short-team.¶ There are approximately 381 military bases in the United States and abroad.77 Removing the 20 that already have microgrids leaves 361 bases. Assuming an average cost of $2.75 million to install a microgrid (this figure is the average of most recent microgrid projects developed for military bases by General Electric and Lockheed Martin) means the necessary appropriation from Congress would be approximately $993 million. It is reasonable to assume that the DOD will stagger the development of the grids, building the most critical ones first. After the installation of all the microgrids, the DOD will see cost savings of approximately $473 million per year in reduced electricity costs. This figure assumes that the ESTCP estimation of 20% reduction in energy costs holds true and uses the DOD’s expenditures of $2.4 billion on facility electricity in 2009.¶ Recommendation¶ The DOD should immediately enact Option 2 and follow Option 3 as a long-term strategy. Allowing present trends to continue (Option 1) ignores the warnings of the Defense Science Board and the Quadrennial Defense Review. Overreliance on the civilian grid threatens the capability of military installations to carry out their missions. The current pace of microgrid development is not fast enough to ensure energy supply to critical military installations.¶ Option 2 is an ideal short-term strategy because it entails zero cost. Changes to the ECIP and new alternative financing agreements will ensure an increased number of microgrids. The ECIP reports do not make public the submitted projects that were not chosen for funding, so it is impossible to know how many microgrid projects lost out to other proposals. With the changes in Option 2, microgrid proposals will have a better chance of receiving funding because of their increased SIR and the special consideration afforded to them. The changes will also increase the number of microgrid proposals submitted to the ECIP because base commanders are more likely to submit proposals they believe will have a good chance of receiving funding.

#### Renewable microgrids insulate military facilities through islanding

Will Rogers 12, the Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, 8/8/12, “DOD-Interior Renewable Energy Projects Could Help Mitigate Grid Vulnerability,” http://www.cnas.org/blogs/naturalsecurity/2012/08/dod-interior-renewable-energy-projects-could-help-mitigate-grid-vulner

On Monday, the Departments of Defense and Interior formalized a partnership to develop renewable energy at or near DOD facilities aimed in part at strengthening the military’s resiliency to disruptions in the electric grid. ¶ “Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta and Interior Secretary Ken Salazar have signed a memorandum of understanding [MOU] that encourages appropriate development of renewable energy projects on public lands set aside for defense-related purposes and other onshore and offshore areas near military installations,” American Forces Press Service reported on Monday. “Each of the military services has committed to deploy 1 gigawatt of renewable energy on or near its installations by 2025.” ¶ The DOD-Interior MOU comes on the heels of a warning by a top U.S. government official about the vulnerability of the U.S. electric grid. Last month at the Aspen Security Forum, Paul Stockton, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs, cautioned that the U.S. electric grid is vulnerable to disruption, particularly from a terrorists attack that could cause a “long term, large scale outage.”¶ Defense officials are acutely aware of this vulnerability and the implications for DOD’s readiness. The Department of Defense relies on many domestic installations to serve as command and control centers for critical operations abroad, such as drone missions in Afghanistan. “And to make those operations function, we depend on the electric grid,” said. ¶ Developing renewable energy projects on DOD facilities can help mitigate this vulnerability by helping the military rely less on the civilian electric grid. The effort – known as “islanding” – is intended to insulate DOD facilities from a disruption to the civilian electric grid by generating enough power on base to sustain critical functions for an indefinite period of time.

#### Plan solves energy security at Alaskan bases

WM Warwick 10, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, September 2010, “Renewable Resource Development on Department of Defense Bases in Alaska: Challenges and Opportunities,” <http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-19742.pdf>

The potential to increase utilization of renewable energy sources among military facilities in Alaska through coordinated development and operation of available resources, both renewable and conventional, is the premise of this task. This potential exists because Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) previously identified significant wind and other renewable resources at two Army installations, Fort Richardson and Fort Greely that are at opposite ends of the regional transmission system (the Railbelt transmission system). Full exploitation of these resources will require transmission access to wheel power to Department of Defense (DOD) facilities connected to it. The primary focus of the task initially was identification of legal and regulatory barriers that may prohibit realization of this potential, specifically with regard to the legal ability of installations to wheel power among the various locations to optimize the development and use of renewable resources. In addition to the legal hurdles, this potential may not be realized because of limitations that are technical, economic, and mission related. ¶ This task was premised on the understanding that coordinated operation of DOD resources across the Railbelt could only be accomplished through utilization of civilian infrastructure, including utilization of transmission capacity on the Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA) system at minimum, and access to the bulk of the Railbelt transmission system in the ideal. At the outset of the study, it became clear that the notion of integrated operation of the Railbelt transmission system to optimize resource utilization was of interest to the Army, Air Force, Alaska utilities and state government. And that each was considering plans to pursue their vision somewhat independently. The most fully developed plans available for this study were those of the Army and the state. Fortunately, a contemporaneous study of this issue by the state provided both a parallel framework for this task and critically important data and results that were used in it. At the same time, the recommendations from the state study create new uncertainties, specifically; the interests of the state in integrated Railbelt transmission operations may preempt those of the military. That could present challenges to the notion of a “military grid” operating within the existing civilian infrastructure. By the same token, state action to implement a state-wide grid could facilitate the “military grid” objective by increasing transmission capacity, albeit on a schedule and at a cost that could differ from that of DOD. Further examination of both the state study and the larger energy context in the state revealed other parallel activities that could affect implementation of a military grid. Evaluation of these other efforts, most of which are in their early stages, indicates the military has a number of opportunities to affect the future course of energy infrastructure development in the state in a way that benefits both itself and civilian society. However, doing so will require prompt action to engage in processes over which the military has little control, subjecting its plans and aspirations to unknown schedules and outcomes. Doing nothing with respect to these other plans and proceedings will leave the military at the mercy of those outcomes; outcomes that are likely to be less favorable, especially in terms of long term costs of electricity.

#### Microgrids ensure reliability and low-carbon energy for forward bases

Amory B. Lovins 10, Chairman/Chief Scientist of the Rocky Mountain Institute, second quarter 2010, “DOD’s Energy Challenge as Strategic Opportunity,” Joint Force Quarterly, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/images/jfq-57/lovins.pdf

The U.S. electric grid was named by the National Academy of Engineering as the top The U.S. electric grid was named by the National Academy of Engineering as the top engineering achievement of the 20th century. It is very capital-intensive, complex, technologically unforgiving, usually reliable, but inherently brittle. It is responsible for ~98–99 percent of U.S. power failures, and occasionally blacking out large areas within seconds—because the grid requires exact synchrony across subcontinental areas and relies on components taking years to build in just a few factories or one (often abroad), and can be interrupted by a lightning bolt, rifle bullet, malicious computer program, untrimmed branch, or errant squirrel. Grid vulnerabilities are serious, inherent, and not amenable to quick fixes; current Federal investments in the “smart grid” do not even require simple mitigations. Indeed, the policy reflex to add more and bigger power plants and power lines after each regional blackout may make the next blackout more likely and severe, much as suppressing forest fires can accumulate fuel loadings that turn the next unsuppressed fire into an uncontrollable conflagration. ¶ Power-system vulnerabilities are even worse in-theater, where infrastructure and the capacity to repair it are often marginal: “attacks on the grid are one of the most common and effective tactics of insurgents in Iraq, and are increasingly seen in Afghanistan.” 39 Thus electric, not oil, vulnerabilities now hazard national and theater energy security. Simple exploitation of domestic electric vulnerabilities could take down DOD’s basic operating ability and the whole economy, while oil supply is only a gathering storm.¶ The DSB Task Force took electrical threats so seriously that it advised DOD— following prior but unimplemented DOD policy 40 —to replace grid reliance, for critical missions at U.S. bases, with onsite (preferably renewable) power supplies in netted, islandable 41 microgrids. The Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory found ~90 percent of those bases could actually meet those critical power needs from onsite or nearby and mainly renewable sources, and often more cheaply. This could achieve zero daily net energy need for facilities, operations, and ground vehicles; full independence in hunker-down mode (no grid); and increased ability to help serve surrounding communities and nucleate blackstart of the failed commercial grid. ¶ Implementing these sensible policies merits high priority: probably only DOD can move as decisively as the threat to national security warrants. And as with the Endurance capability, exploiting Resilience—building on DOD’s position as the world’s leading director-indirect buyer of renewable energy—would provide leadership, market expansion, delivery refinement, and training that would accelerate civilian adoption. Already, the 2008 NDAA requires DOD to establish a goal to make or buy at least 25 percent of its electricity from renewables by 2020, and study solar and windpower feasibility for expeditionary forces. Under 2007 Executive Order 13423’s Government-wide mandate, DOD must also reduce energy intensity by FY15 to 30 percent below FY03. The Resilience capability would focus all these efforts on robust architectures and implementation paths, ensuring that bases’ onsite renewables deliver reliable power to critical loads whether or not the commercial grid is working—a goal not achieved by today’s focus on compliance with renewables quotas.¶ Resilience is even more vital and valuable abroad, in fixed installations and especially in FOBs (whose expeditionary character emphasizes the Endurance logic of Fully Burdened Cost of Electricity). Foreign grids are often less reliable and secure than U.S. grids; protection and social stability may be worse; logistics are riskier and costlier in more remote and austere sites; and civilian populations may be more helped and influenced. Field commanders strongly correlate reliable electricity supplies with political stability. In Sadr City, Army Reserve Major General Jeffrey Talley’s Task Force Gold proved in 2008–2009 that making electricity reliable, and thus underpinning systematic infrastructure-building, is an effective cornerstone of counterinsurgency.¶ Reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan is starting to define and capture this opportunity to build civic cohesion and dampen insurgency, while reducing attacks’ disruption and attractiveness. A resilient, distributed electrical architecture can bring important economic and social side-benefits, as with Afghan microhydropower programs for rural development. Cuba lately showed, too, that aggressively integrating end-use efficiency with micropower can cut national blackouts—caused by decrepit infrastructure, not attacks—by one to two orders of magnitude in a year.¶ At home, DOD efficiency and micropower echo new domestic energy policy and startling developments in the marketplace. In 2006, micropower 42 delivered one-sixth of the world’s electricity, one-third of its new electricity, and 16 to 52 percent of all electricity in a dozen industrialized countries (the United States lagged with 7 percent). In 2008, for the first time in about a century, the world invested more in renewable than in fossilfueled power supplies; renewables (excluding big hydroelectric dams) added 40 billion watts of global capacity and got $100 billion of private investment. Their competitive and falling costs, short lead times, and low financial risks attract private capital. Shifting to these more resilient energy solutions goes with the market’s flow.

#### Microgrids enhance NATO interoperability and credibility

Hallett 12 Michael, works for NATO Allied Command Transformation, Journal of Energy Security, "Microgrids: A Smart Defense Based NATO Contribution to Energy Security", November 20, www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=390:microgrids-a-smart-defense-based-nato-contribution-to-energy-security&catid=130:issue-content&Itemid=405

Deterrent effect of increased resilience¶ Microgrids on military installations constitute a capability that will both enhance NATO’s ability to respond to crises in the security dimension and, through interconnection with local community load capacity, increasing the overall resilience of the nation. This increased resilience is not only useful in itself, but also contributes to NATO’s ability to deter adversaries. Extremely resilient power systems in NATO countries, consisting of combinations of large scale power generation, distributed generation and storage, and microgrids mutually supporting one another through a regional power transmission grid will affect the decision making calculus of potential enemies in two ways. One, the challenges associated with creating disruption will increase due to the need to not simply degrade the main power grid, but degrade multiple well protected energy network nodes. Two, the negative effects resulting from a successful attack on a single node in the power generation or supply network will decrease. As a result, the costs of developing such system degrading capabilities increase while the negative effects decrease, (the disruption cost curve moves up to the left while the resilience cost curve moves down) making such attacks less worth the investment of enemy resources. Military microgrids connected to civil emergency service provider facilities can thus directly help the nation meet its most fundamental obligation – preserving citizen’s security.

#### B --- Leadership:

#### DoD acquisition of electricity from renewables avoids REC purchases

Loni Silva 12, J.D., The George Washington University Law School, Summer 2012, “THE PROBLEMS WITH USING RENEWABLE ENERGY CERTIFICATES TO MEET FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS,” Public Contract Law Journal, Vol. 41, No. 4

The Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) within the Department of Energy (DOE) is tasked with providing guidance on federal laws and regulations. n16 Through its guidance on EPAct 2005 and EO 13423, FEMP has allowed agencies to meet the renewable energy consumption requirements by purchasing RECs. n17 While allowing agencies to purchase RECs furthers the development of renewable energy resources and promotes energy security overall, the FEMP REC interpretation is problematic from a government contract and policy perspective for several reasons. First, purchasing RECs contradicts the government contracting principle of best value because RECs do not respond to or fulfill an agency's tangible need for energy. n18 As a result, agencies that use RECs must still purchase the [\*988] energy they need in addition to the RECs. n19 Second, the FEMP REC interpretation implicates government contracting principles of transparency and accountability. This is because the policies themselves give no indication that their requirements for renewable energy use can be met by purchasing RECs. n20 Allowing agencies to purchase RECs to comply with the renewable energy requirement is obscure and so the Government is less accountable. n21 Third, the FEMP REC interpretation includes a REC retention requirement. This requirement frustrates the policies' goal of developing on-site renewable energy facilities because it discourages the use of one of the most common alternative financing arrangements used to build these facilities. n22 This Note will examine the problems inherent in FEMP's interpretation allowing use of RECs to meet EPAct 2005 and EO 13423 requirements. This Note will propose that the best way to avoid these problems is to minimize the use of RECs through actual consumption of renewable energy. RECs should be a short-term, stop-gap way to meet the policies' requirements while agencies build the facilities needed to actually consume renewable energy. In order to encourage agencies to actually consume renewable energy, as required by the policies, barriers to developing on-site renewable energy facilities should be removed and development near agency installations should be encouraged. Developing renewable energy facilities within the United States is an important and difficult task, and RECs can and should be used as an aid during the transition period while facilities are developed. However, because of the problems with their use, RECs should be phased out as a means of complying with EPAct 2005 and EO 13423. To understand the problems with the FEMP REC interpretation, Part II of this Note explains the requirements of EPAct 2005 and EO 13423. Part III then provides the reader with a working knowledge of what RECs are and how they work. Part IV addresses the reasons for buying RECs. Part V analyzes why the FEMP REC interpretation is problematic, focusing on government contracting principles of best value, transparency, and accountability, as well as the goals of the policies themselves. Part VI proposes that RECs should be phased out by making changes that will encourage agencies to consume renewable energy from facilities on and near federal property. Finally, Part VII discusses how these changes will allow agencies to achieve the underlying goals of energy independence, security, and sustainability without the problems inherent in RECs. [\*989] II. WHAT ARE EPACT 2005 AND EO 13423 REQUIREMENTS? EPAct 2005 requires that a growing percentage of the electric energy consumed by the Federal Government each year be from renewable energy sources. n23 For fiscal years 2010 through 2012, EPAct 2005 requires that 5% of the total amount of electric energy the Federal Government consumes come from renewable energy. n24 From 2007 to 2009, the requirement was 3%; from 2013 onward, the requirement will be 7.5%. n25 EO 13423, signed on January 24, 2007, strengthened the goals of EPAct 2005 by requiring that at least half of the statutorily required renewable energy consumed by a federal agency each year come from new renewable sources. n26 EO 13423 defines "new renewable sources" as "sources of renewable energy placed into service after January 1, 1999." n27 Both policies emphasize the goal of developing on-site renewable energy facilities. EO 13423 requires that "to the extent feasible, the agency implement[] renewable energy generation projects on agency property for agency use . . . ." n28 EPAct 2005 encourages on-site development by providing a double credit bonus toward an agency's renewable consumption requirements if its renewable electricity is produced on-site at a federal facility, on federal lands, or on Indian lands. n29 There are no specific penalties for noncompliance. However, agencies are required to submit a report to the DOE detailing their progress toward meeting the EPAct 2005 and EO 13423 requirements as part of their regular annual energy data reporting. n30 The secretary of energy must then provide a report to Congress every two years. n31 Agencies are thus motivated to meet the requirements to avoid being reported to Congress as noncompliant. FEMP provides guidance on federal laws and regulations. n32 Under the FEMP guidance, agencies can meet the EPAct 2005 and EO 13423 requirements in three ways. First, agencies can generate renewable energy on-site. n33 Second, agencies can purchase renewable energy. n34 Third, agencies can purchase RECs from an energy supplier or broker. n35 Energy managers, like Joe, have a choice. Joe can build a facility on-site to produce renewable energy for the base to use; he can buy renewable energy for the base to use; or, if he wants to power the base with energy from fossil fuel, he can meet the renewable energy requirements by purchasing RECs.

#### This is the best way to eliminate problems associated with RECs

Loni Silva 12, J.D., The George Washington University Law School, Summer 2012, “THE PROBLEMS WITH USING RENEWABLE ENERGY CERTIFICATES TO MEET FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS,” Public Contract Law Journal, Vol. 41, No. 4

The best way to address the problems with FEMP’s REC interpretation is to render the use of RECs to meet EPAct 2005 and EO 13423 obsolete. RECs should only be used as a short-term, stop-gap solution to meet the renewable energy requirements. 139 The long-term goal should be for agencies to consume bundled renewable energy produced on or near agency installations.¶ Consuming renewable energy would eliminate the current problems with FEMP’s REC interpretation. First, consuming renewable energy would eliminate the problem with best value because, unlike RECs, renewable energy responds to and fulﬁlls agencies’ actual energy needs. 140 For Joe, the energy manager, the ability to use renewable energy means that he would not need to spend part of his energy budget on a commodity that does not address his actual energy needs. 141¶ Second, consuming renewable energy would eliminate the problems with transparency and accountability. 142 Because the policies plainly require agencies to consume renewable energy, complying by consuming renewable energy, rather than purchasing RECs, would be transparent. 143 Moreover, because this method of compliance is transparent and allows a clear view of what the Government is doing in response to the requirements of the policies, it allows the Government to be held accountable. 144¶ Third, consuming renewable energy produced at on-site facilities would further the policies’ goal of developing on-site renewable energy facilities. 145 Having facilities on or near agency property would provide power to the installation in case the grid is attacked or fails. 146 It would also promote the energy independence, security, and sustainability of both the Federal Government and the nation as a whole by developing new renewable energy facilities. 147¶ Developing new renewable energy facilities on or near agency installations would allow agencies to consume renewable energy, rather than RECs. 148 Of course, not all locations are able to support a renewable energy facility. 149 However, because the policy requirements are agency-wide rather than installation speciﬁc, agencies can build facilities at installations with available land, increasing renewably energy production to compensate for installations where the lack of available land or other factors makes facility development impossible. 150

#### REC reliance sends a signal of greenwashing

Auden Schendler 7, Vice President of sustainability at Aspen Skiing Company, October 2007, “When Being Green Backfires,” Harvard Business Review, Vol. 85, Issue 10

The danger in buying RECs is that the mainstream press has begun to challenge claims about their environmental value. Articles have appeared in publications including BusinessWeek and the Financial Times pointing out that most RECs don't actually offset emissions, and the skepticism is spreading across the Internet. Indeed, most RECs don't result in the creation of clean electricity, which would have been generated anyway, whether or not an REC was printed. As consumers become increasingly savvy about evaluating companies' environmental claims, businesses that tout REC purchases may expose themselves to charges of greenwashing.¶ A report released in 2006 by an environmental organization called Clean Air--Cool Planet was among the first to rigorously examine the environmental impact of RECs. The report found that while most RECs don't lead to carbon-emissions reductions, a minority do, by directly helping to finance, say, the construction of a new wind farm. Companies that buy RECs and want to avoid charges of greenwashing should seek out these higher-quality and more costly certificates, whose purchase directly and demonstrably helps reduce carbon emissions.¶ RECs, supporters argue, create a market mechanism that spurs the development of new wind, solar, and other green-electricity plants. As demand for RECs grows, their prices will rise, encouraging developers to build more renewable power facilities that can generate income through increasingly profitable sales of the certificates. Unfortunately, because there has been such a surplus of cheap RECs--and no easy way to distinguish between high- and low-quality offerings--the market mechanism has remained stalled for the most part. If companies, mindful of their reputations, reject inferior RECs and begin demanding quality ones, that could jump-start the production of renewable electricity and actually reduce carbon emissions. Corporate scrutiny and activism might even foster the development of a badly needed tool that could clean up the entire REC industry in one masterstroke: a third-party gold standard for REC quality.

# 2AC

## Grid

### Yes Cyber Attack Coming

#### Massive cyber-attack coming this year---experts

Gallagher 13 Sean, Ars Technica's IT Editor, a former Navy officer, "Security pros predict "major" cyber terror attack this year", January 4, arstechnica.com/security/2013/01/security-pros-predict-major-cyberterror-attack-this-year/

A sampling of computer security professionals at the recent Information Systems Security Association conference found that a majority of them believe there will be a "major" cyber terrorism event within the next year. The survey, conducted by the network security and hardening vendor Ixia, found that of 105 attendees surveyed, 79 percent believe that there will be some sort of large-scale attack on the information technology powering some element of the US's infrastructure—and utilities and financial institutions were the most likely targets. Fifty-nine percent of the security professionals polled believed that the US government should be responsible for protecting citizens from cyber terrorism.¶ The survey didn't give a definition for a major cyber attack. "We left that to the security professionals to interpret for themselves," said Larry Hart, Ixia's vice president of marketing and strategy, in an interview with Ars. "The general idea of the question was 'is something big going to happen?'"¶ Hart said that concerns over attacks like Stuxnet have increased awareness among security professionals that the tools used for cyber warfare by nation-states could be used by other parties. "There are all these new battlegrounds in information technology for people to take action against various governmental or paragovernmental organizations."¶ As far as predicting the target of an attack, 35 percent of the security professionals polled pointed at the power grid, with 13 percent picking the oil and gas industry. Mike Hamilton, a director of systems engineering at Ixia, said that the highly interdependent nature of the three major power grids in the US makes for a "fertile field for cyber-terrorists."

### REC Reliance = Greenwashing

#### REC reliance sends a signal of greenwashing

Auden Schendler 7, Vice President of sustainability at Aspen Skiing Company, October 2007, “When Being Green Backfires,” Harvard Business Review, Vol. 85, Issue 10

The danger in buying RECs is that the mainstream press has begun to challenge claims about their environmental value. Articles have appeared in publications including BusinessWeek and the Financial Times pointing out that most RECs don't actually offset emissions, and the skepticism is spreading across the Internet. Indeed, most RECs don't result in the creation of clean electricity, which would have been generated anyway, whether or not an REC was printed. As consumers become increasingly savvy about evaluating companies' environmental claims, businesses that tout REC purchases may expose themselves to charges of greenwashing.¶ A report released in 2006 by an environmental organization called Clean Air--Cool Planet was among the first to rigorously examine the environmental impact of RECs. The report found that while most RECs don't lead to carbon-emissions reductions, a minority do, by directly helping to finance, say, the construction of a new wind farm. Companies that buy RECs and want to avoid charges of greenwashing should seek out these higher-quality and more costly certificates, whose purchase directly and demonstrably helps reduce carbon emissions.¶ RECs, supporters argue, create a market mechanism that spurs the development of new wind, solar, and other green-electricity plants. As demand for RECs grows, their prices will rise, encouraging developers to build more renewable power facilities that can generate income through increasingly profitable sales of the certificates. Unfortunately, because there has been such a surplus of cheap RECs--and no easy way to distinguish between high- and low-quality offerings--the market mechanism has remained stalled for the most part. If companies, mindful of their reputations, reject inferior RECs and begin demanding quality ones, that could jump-start the production of renewable electricity and actually reduce carbon emissions. Corporate scrutiny and activism might even foster the development of a badly needed tool that could clean up the entire REC industry in one masterstroke: a third-party gold standard for REC quality.

### Solvency

#### DOD leadership makes the tech viable

Schuyler Null 10, Research Assistant at Global Green USA's Security and Sustainability Program, February 2010, “Defense Sustainability: Energy Efficiency and the Battlefield,” http://www.globalgreen.org/docs/publication-112-1.pdf

Many of the initiatives, technologies, and systems that have the potential to greatly improve Department of Defense energy security are either entirely new practices for the military or involve technologies that are tied up in ongoing systems development and demonstration (SDD) contracts. As with many military projects, these efforts need Congressional support and the backing of senior Pentagon leadership if they are to ever break out of the often perpetual development and demonstration phase and into regular DOD practice. If the Department is to curb its consumption habits senior Pentagon leadership must place focus on these four critical areas. ¶ The advantages to the Department encouraging on-site renewable energy projects on domestic bases are all gains that accrue over time— freedom from the volatility of oil prices, much lower maintenance costs, a cleaner environment, and reduced impact on global warming. Much like how the fully burdened cost of fuel program aims to one day show that petroleum-based tactical vehicles carry with them costs that are not simply reflected by the price of gasoline, renewable energy solutions have advantages over conventional power generation that a basic price per kilowatt-hour comparison will not show. The Department’s current REC purchasing policy uses a simple short-term cost/benefit analysis and therefore ignores these long-term advantages. As a result, the Pentagon’s current domestic energy practices greatly undervalue the worth of renewable energy. DOD has the land (see Appendix for Army renewable energy maps), the funding, and the mandate to put into place renewable energy construction projects on domestic bases that could provide reliable clean energy and even improved security for decades to come. All that is needed is leadership. ¶ One of the most important advantages to developing DOD-run renewable projects is their potential to decrease the Department’s dependence on the civilian energy grid. The Defense Science Board and the DOD Energy Security Task Force have both recognized that a key vulnerability in current practices is that Defense Department facilities are simply far too dependent on a power grid, which, as illustrated by events like the Northeast blackout during the summer of 2003, is remarkably fragile. 57 During the Northeast blackout, 50 million people lost power and over 250 power plants shut down including 22 nuclear power plants. The massive blackout turned out to be the result of a cascade of failures that was eventually traced to a utility in Ohio failing to trim trees properly. 58 Currently, Department of Defense facilities across the nation are no more immune to the effects of such blunders than anyone else.¶ By encouraging the on-site development of renewable energy, the Pentagon could greatly increase its bases’ protection against possible disruptions to the civilian power infrastructure. “Islanding” DOD sites in this way ensures that the nation’s most critical security facilities would have reliable power generation available on-site in case of any catastrophic disruption. There has been some recognition of this problem but efforts to fix the substantial vulnerability of most sites have so far been far too limited and scattered. An emphasis on encouraging the development of DOD-run renewable power projects across the county could provide a reliable counter to the Department’s current reliance on the civilian grid while also insulating the domestic energy budget from fluctuations in world energy markets and making a considerable dent in Department carbon emissions.

## T

### 2AC T – Financial Incentive

#### We meet – acquisition through ECIP is a financial incentive

Pierce 11 Brandon J., Pennsylvania Bar Association - Energy & Environmental Law Section Newsletter, "A New Shade of Camouflage: The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Helps the Department of Defense Go Green", December 1, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1967138

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM¶ ECIP is a relatively small, but important piece of DoD’s strategy, which the Recovery Act funded with $120 million.21 The Act states,¶ For an additional amount for ‘‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’’, $1,450,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated and expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects in the United States not otherwise authorized by law: Provided further, That of the amount provided under this heading, $1,330,000,000 shall be for the construction of hospitals and $120,000,000 shall be for the Energy Conservation Investment Program.22¶ ECIP is specifically designed to address energy reduction and water usage through “construction of new, high-efficiency energy systems and the improvement of existing systems.”23 Further, DoD, aware of the interconnected nature of its three-prong energy strategy, included important language in its directive that attempts to maximize the program’s value by stating, “ECIP also provides a critical funding source for investments in small-scale renewable energy technologies that fall within the savings-to-investment ratio and payback goals of the program.”24

#### C/I – Financial incentives induce behaviors

Webb 93 – lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Precision---our definition’s from the DoE

Waxman 98 **–** Solicitor General of the US (Seth, Brief for the United States in Opposition for the US Supreme Court case HARBERT/LUMMUS AGRIFUELS PROJECTS, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, http://www.justice.gov/osg/briefs/1998/0responses/98-0697.resp.opp.pdf)

2 On November 15, 1986, Keefe was delegated “the authority, with respect to actions valued at $50 million or less, to approve, execute, enter into, modify, administer, closeout, terminate and take any other necessary and appropriate action (collectively, ‘Actions’) with respect to Financial Incentive awards.” Pet. App. 68, 111-112. Citing DOE Order No. 5700.5 (Jan. 12, 1981), the delegation defines “Financial Incentives” as the authorized financial incentive programs of DOE, “including direct loans, loan guarantees, purchase agreements, price supports, guaranteed market agreements and any others which may evolve.” The delegation proceeds to state, “[h]owever, a separate prior written approval of any such action must be given by or concurred in by Keefe to accompany the action.” The delegation also states that its exercise “shall be governed by the rules and regulations of [DOE] and policies and procedures prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate(s).” Pet. App. 111-113.

### 2AC T – Energy Production

#### We meet – plan only incentivizes the wind and solar part of microgrid development and microgrids are energy production

Marnay et al 12 Chris, Nan Zhou, Min Qu and John Romankiewicz, China Energy Group, Environmental Energy Technologies Divison at Lawrench Berkeley National Lab, "International Microgrid Assessment: Governance, INcentives, and Experience (IMAGINE)", June, eaei.lbl.gov/sites/all/files/LBL\_5914E\_IMAGINE\_microgrids.June\_.2012\_1.pdf

Since microgrids offer an avenue for increased renewable energy production, policymakers should set support policies that are amenable to microgrid penetration and allow microgrids to capture any incentives that are potentially available. For instance, if a renewable portfolio standard is set up with a trading system for renewable energy credits, policymakers could make sure that microgrids would be allowed to get tradable credits for any renewable energy they produce and sell to the utility. Equipment will be needed to ensure that any renewable energy generation can be properly metered for these purposes.

#### Energy production is only electricity creation, not extraction

Vaekstfonden 6 Vaekstfonden is a Danish government backed investment fund that facilitates the supply of venture capital in terms of start-up equity and high-risk loans "THE ENERGY INDUSTRY IN DENMARK- perspectives on entrepreneurship andventure capital" No Specific Cited, Latest Data From 2006 s3.amazonaws.com/zanran\_storage/www.siliconvalley.um.dk/ContentPages/43667201.pdf

In all, 20 industry experts were interviewed about the composition and dynamics of the Danish energy sector. Insights from a minimum of 3 industry experts have been assigned to each of the stages in the value chain. Following is a brief description of what the different stages encompass.¶ Raw material extraction¶ This stage encompass the process before the actual production of the energy. As an example it is increasingly expensive to locate and extract oil from the North Sea. Likewise coal, gas and waste suitable for energy production can be costly to provide.¶ Energy production¶ Energy production encompasses the process, where energy sources are transformed into heat and power. Transmission and distribution¶ Energy transmission and distribution is in this report defined as the infrastructure that enables the producers of energy to sell energy to consumers.¶ Consumption¶ The last stage in the value chain is consumption. This stage encompasses products and services that geographically are placed near the consumers. As an example, decentralized energy production via solar power systems is part of the consumption stage.

## CP

### Naval Power Add-On

#### Microgrids key to Marine flexibility and naval power projection

Roberts 12 David, Staff Writer for Grist, "Reduced Dependence on Energy Supply Key", May 21, energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php#2211474

This is a small example, of no great economic or geostrategic significance, yet it carries a profound lesson. It is a lesson that, in the unfolding age of energy insecurity, can be expressed as something like a universal law: reduced dependence on energy supply lines means greater autonomy, flexibility, and effectiveness.¶ The U.S. Marine Corps prides itself on being the U.S. military's ship-to-shore expeditionary force -- light, fast, and lethal, able to deploy quickly and operate autonomously in hostile or austere circumstances. So they have been the most sensitive to the chafing restrictions of what Gen. James Mattis, a Marine commander in the first Iraq war, famously called the "tether of fuel."¶ That tether, the convoys crisscrossing Iraq and Afghanistan, not only slows the Marines and restricts their range of motion, it also gets them killed -- one killed or wounded for each 50 convoys or so. And it is wildly expensive. By the time fuel is convoyed up through Pakistan or down through Russia, over the Hindu Kush mountains or across the Amu Darya river, and out from the big bases to the forward bases, sometimes on helicopter, fuel that costs the Marines $3 a gallon at the pump can reach a "fully burdened cost" of as high as $400 a gallon. It's fair to say that Marines running diesel generators at forward operating bases in Afghanistan are using some of the most expensive fuel in the world.¶ With that in mind, Marines are field testing insulated tents, portable solar panels, LED lights, and systems to purify and cool local water. I reported on their efforts for a story in Outside last year, and every source I spoke to had the same thing to say: there may be some grumbling about the energy effort in the middle ranks, from officers set in their ways, but among young Marines on the front lines, and among the brass in the top ranks, there is nothing but enthusiasm.¶ It isn't about "greening" anything or cooling the climate. "Other people are busy saving the planet; this is about saving Marine lives," Col. Bob Charette, director of Marine Corps Expeditionary Energy Office, said recently. "I’d kiss a polar bear if it meant getting one Marine off an IED-filled highway."¶ Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus has said that both the Navy and Marines will reduce fossil fuel consumption by half by 2020. The Army and Air Force have also adopted aggressive goals. The military gets it: reduced dependence on energy supply lines means greater autonomy, flexibility, and effectiveness. It's not only true in the theater of war. It's true for the great military fleets at sea and in the sky. It's true for military bases in the U.S. or across the world, dependent on civilian power grids subject to attacks or blackouts.¶ And it's not just true for the military. In a time of rising fossil fuel prices and increasingly apparent climate dangers, the tether of fuel binds all of us -- homes, businesses, communities, and whole economies -- to a future of vulnerability and instability. Using less energy and generating more of our own is about more than dollars spent or saved. It's about self-determination. That makes for a more effective military and a more secure, productive society.

#### Global great power war

Conway et al 7 James T., General, U.S. Marine Corps, Gary Roughead, Admiral, U.S. Navy, Thad W. Allen, Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, “A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower,” October, http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

This strategy reaffirms the use of seapower to influence actions and activities at sea and ashore. The expeditionary character and versatility of maritime forces provide the U.S. the **asymmetric advantage** of enlarging or contracting its military footprint in areas where access is denied or limited. Permanent or prolonged basing of our military forces overseas often has unintended economic, social or political repercussions. The sea is a vast maneuver space, where the presence of maritime forces can be adjusted as conditions dictate to enable **flexible approaches** to escalation, **de-escalation** **and deterrence of conflicts**. The speed, flexibility, agility and scalability of maritime forces provide joint or combined force commanders a range of options for responding to crises. Additionally, integrated maritime operations, either within formal alliance structures (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or more informal arrangements (such as the Global Maritime Partnership initiative), send powerful messages to would-be aggressors that we will act with others to ensure collective security and prosperity. United States seapower will be globally postured to secure our homeland and citizens from direct attack and to advance our interests around the world. As our security and prosperity are inextricably linked with those of others, U.S. maritime forces will be deployed to protect and sustain the peaceful global system comprised of interdependent networks of trade, finance, information, law, people and governance. We will employ the global reach, persistent presence, and operational flexibility inherent in U.S. seapower to accomplish six key tasks, or strategic imperatives. Where tensions are high or where we wish to demonstrate to our friends and allies our commitment to security and stability, U.S. maritime forces will be characterized by regionally concentrated, forward-deployed task forces with the combat power to limit regional conflict, deter major power war, and should deterrence fail, win our Nation’s wars as part of a joint or combined campaign. In addition, persistent, mission-tailored maritime forces will be globally distributed in order to contribute to homeland defense-in-depth, foster and sustain cooperative relationships with an expanding set of international partners, and prevent or mitigate disruptions and crises. Credible combat power will be continuously postured in the Western Pacific and the Arabian Gulf/Indian Ocean to protect our vital interests, assure our friends and allies of our continuing commitment to regional security, and deter and dissuade potential adversaries and peer competitors. This combat power can be selectively and **rapidly repositioned to meet contingencies** that may arise elsewhere. These forces will be sized and postured to fulfill the following strategic imperatives: Limit regional conflict with forward deployed, decisive maritime power. Today regional conflict has ramifications far beyond the area of conflict. Humanitarian crises, violence spreading across borders, pandemics, and the interruption of vital resources are all possible when regional crises erupt. While this strategy advocates a wide dispersal of networked maritime forces, we cannot be everywhere, and we cannot act to mitigate all regional conflict. Where conflict threatens the global system and our national interests, maritime forces will be ready to respond alongside other elements of national and multi-national power, to give political leaders a range of options for deterrence, escalation and de-escalation. Maritime forces that are persistently present and combat-ready provide the Nation’s primary forcible entry option in an era of declining access, even as they provide the means for this Nation to respond quickly to other crises. Whether over the horizon or powerfully arrayed in plain sight, maritime forces can deter the ambitions of regional aggressors, assure friends and allies, gain and maintain access, and protect our citizens while working to sustain the global order. **Critical to this** notion **is the maintenance of a powerful fleet**—ships, aircraft, Marine forces, and shore-based fleet activities—capable of selectively controlling the seas, projecting power ashore, and protecting friendly forces and civilian populations from attack. Deter major power war. No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to **global stability** as **war among major powers**. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a **key component** of deterring major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces. Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to impose local sea control, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an indispensable element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection enable extended campaigns ashore.

### AT: Courts/States CP

#### Only the plan solves leadership

CFR 13 Council on Foreign Relations, Issue Brief, "The Global Climate Change Regime", February 15 2013 is last date updated, [www.cfr.org/climate-change/global-climate-change-regime/p21831](http://www.cfr.org/climate-change/global-climate-change-regime/p21831)

No: Opponents argue that the rest of the world is looking to the United States to act on climate change, and that pursuing national level reform—even if during the global financial crisis—could give the U.S. credibility and leverage in this area.¶ Since the failure of cap-and-trade, no significant climate change legislation has passed the House or Senate, calling U.S. global leadership in this area into question. Many climate change analysts also point to criticism regarding the inaction of the United States during the COP-17 as evidence that the climate change issue may be negatively affecting perceptions of U.S. global leadership. Furthermore, some would also suggest that the December 2011 decision by Canada to withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol has placed the entire global climate change regime in jeopardy.¶ Opponents of a state-by-state strategy also point to New Jersey's decision in 2011 to unilaterally pull out of the RGGI and Arizona's move in 2010 to leave the Western Climate Initiative as evidence that a state-by-state approach to reducing emissions in the United States is too risky of a strategy to rely on. In short, a top-down approach is likely to be more effective, and more enforceable rather than a bottom-up.

#### Perm shields

Wells 7Christina, Professor of Law Univ. of Missouri-Columbia “Katrina and the Rhetoric of Federalism” Lexis Mississippi Law Review

Cooperative federalism (along with its constituent programs) is not, however, without its critics. Some note that such programs, especially those that attach conditions to the receipt of funds, effectively coerce the states into accepting unattractive conditions because the states are rarely in a position to refuse such funding. [n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n22) Others argue that cooperative federalism programs "reduce political transparency[,] obscure political responsibility[,] and facilitate political blame-shifting" because the public can never be sure which level of government is responsible for failures in government programs. [n23](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n23) Still others argue that because these programs require states to implement national policy, they entail a "concentration of political powers in the national government." [n24](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n24) The debate among proponents and critics of cooperative federalism is unlikely to be resolved in the near future. Indeed, for every criticism, there seems to be a response, counter-response, and so forth in a seemingly endless loop of argument regarding the costs and benefits of cooperative federalism. [n25](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.227539.11646191782&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1247089448945&returnToKey=20_T6927138996&parent=docview#n25) Perhaps the answer is somewhere in between the two extremes. There are benefits to shared authority - especially in a nation so large that a single government authority cannot possibly undertake certain tasks. On  [\*132]  the other hand, without vigilance, such programs may indeed be abused - either by a government official attempting to escape accountability for bad decision making or by the federal government ostensibly abiding by federalism principles while actually imposing rigid substantive policies on the states and, thus, consolidating power. As with many things, the devil is in the details rather than in the concept, which proved to be the case with the federal government's response to Hurricane Katrina - a response that occurred largely in the context of a cooperative federalism program.

#### Congress will roll back

Calabresi 95Steven G. Calabresi, Associate Professor, Northwestern University School of Law. “A Government of Limited and Enumerated Powers,” Michigan Law Review December, 1995

Moreover, even when the Court is determined to resist the policy objectives of a lawmaking majority, Dahl demonstrates that "Congress and the president do **generally succeed** in overcoming a hostile Court on major policy issues." 193 Dahl shows that when the Court strikes down a major national policy initiative, Congress and the President typically repass the law in defiance of the Court. These arguments, confirmed in recent scholarship, 194 constitute an important rebuttal to those who profess fear that national judicial activism someday might lead to a dangerous weakening of the constitutional powers of the national government.

## K

### 2AC Centralization K

#### Neolib is sustainable and inevitable---no alt

Jones 11—Owen, Masters at Oxford, named one of the Daily Telegraph's 'Top 100 Most Influential People on the Left' for 2011, author of "Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class", The Independent, UK, "Owen Jones: Protest without politics will change nothing", 2011, www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-protest-without-politics-will-change-nothing-2373612.html

My first experience of police kettling was aged 16. It was May Day 2001, and the anti-globalisation movement was at its peak. The turn-of-the-century anti-capitalist movement feels largely forgotten today, but it was a big deal at the time. To a left-wing teenager growing up in an age of unchallenged neo-liberal triumphalism, just to have "anti-capitalism" flash up in the headlines was thrilling. Thousands of apparently unstoppable protesters chased the world's rulers from IMF to World Bank summits – from Seattle to Prague to Genoa – and the authorities were rattled.¶ Today, as protesters in nearly a thousand cities across the world follow the example set by the Occupy Wall Street protests, it's worth pondering what happened to the anti-globalisation movement. Its activists did not lack passion or determination. But they did **lack a coherent alternative to the neo-liberal project**. With no clear political direction, **the movement was easily swept away** by the jingoism and turmoil that followed 9/11, just two months after Genoa.¶ Don't get me wrong: the Occupy movement is a glimmer of sanity amid today's economic madness. By descending on the West's financial epicentres, it reminds us of how a crisis caused by the banks (a sentence that needs to be repeated until it becomes a cliché) has been cynically transformed into a crisis of public spending. The founding statement of Occupy London puts it succinctly: "We refuse to pay for the banks' crisis." The Occupiers direct their fire at the top 1 per cent, and rightly so – as US billionaire Warren Buffett confessed: "There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning."¶ The Occupy movement has provoked fury from senior US Republicans such as Presidential contender Herman Cain who – predictably – labelled it "anti-American". They're right to be worried: those camping outside banks threaten to refocus attention on the real villains, and to act as a catalyst for wider dissent. But a **coherent alternative to the tottering global economic order remains,** it seems, **as distant as ever. Neo-liberalism crashes around, half-dead, with no-one to administer the killer blow.¶** There's always a presumption that a crisis of capitalism is good news for the left. Yet in the Great Depression, fascism consumed much of Europe. The economic crisis of the 1970s did lead to a resurgence of radicalism on both left and right. But, spearheaded by Thatcherism and Reaganism, the New Right definitively crushed its opposition in the 1980s.This time round, there doesn't even seem to be an alternative for the right to defeat. That's not the fault of the protesters. In truth, the left has never recovered from being virtually **smothered out of existence**. It was the victim of a perfect storm: the rise of the New Right; neo-liberal globalisation; and the repeated defeats suffered by the trade union movement.¶ But, above all, it was the aftermath of the collapse of Communism that did for the left. As US neo-conservative Midge Decter triumphantly put it: "It's time to say: We've won. Goodbye." From the British Labour Party to the African National Congress, left-wing movements across the world hurtled to the right in an almost synchronised fashion. It was as though the left wing of the global political spectrum had been sliced off. That's why, **although we live in an age of revolt, there remains no left to give it direction and purpose.**

#### No impact

Larrivee 10— PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>]

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism **Logical errors abound** in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that **certain people thought** various **social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems** to solve the problems they had identified. That **they failed to solve the problems, and** in fact **exacerbated them** while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

#### Neolib’s key to heg---makes the global order stable and cooperative

Eric S. Edelman 10, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, was Principal Deputy Assistant to the Vice President for National Security Affairs, 2010, “Understanding America’s Contested Primacy,” Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments

Huntington has pointed out that US primacy at the end of the Cold War was important for two other reasons. The first was that no other power in the international system could “make comparable contributions to international order and stability.” The second was that the perceived failure of the Soviet model left the United States “as the only major power whose national identity is defined by a set of universal political and economic values.” Because these values were not central to the national identity of other powers they did not have the same drive as the United States to promote them in international affairs. This willingness to provide certain global public goods that increased the chances of international cooperation was also acknowledged by Robert Jervis, who was otherwise skeptical about the effort to maintain US primacy. It also facilitated acceptance of US primacy and the unipolar system by other countries. Those observations remain valid today.24¶ Although the point remains controversial it seems apparent that America, while clearly creating some resentments with its policies, continues to be seen (particularly by governments) as relatively benign in its interactions with other powers. America shares a fundamental view of the world rooted in the neoliberal orthodoxy of free markets§ Marked 08:53 § , open societies, and democratic institutions that emerged as a consensus prescription for peace and prosperity after the collapse of communism. This “transnational liberalism” inclines national elites to see a broad confluence of interest with the United States and reduces their tendency to try and counterbalance American power. As the guarantor of the international world economy and a provider of security and stability because of its alliance system, the United States provides global public goods which others cannot provide. In that sense the question that Stanley Hoffman posed some years ago of whether the United States should pursue primacy or world order seems to be a false dichotomy. As Michael Mandelbaum has persuasively argued, to the degree that there is world order, it exists because American primacy, combined with the triumph of neoliberal ideas, has allowed the United States to provide governmental functions to the rest of the world, chief among them being the maintenance of the global commons — air, sea, and space.25

## DA

### AT: China Politics DA

#### US is cooperating---not zero sum

The Economist 3-6, “Cleaning up,” 3-6-13, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/analects/2013/03/renewable-energy>

A CASUAL glance at the business headlines might suggest that China’s renewable-energy industry is an unstoppable juggernaut. Over the past decade, Chinese firms have used supportive government policies and lavish subsidies to leapfrog to the top of the world’s wind and solar industries. This has prompted political backlashes overseas—especially in America, where Chinese exporters have faced anti-dumping duties and worse.¶ So China must hold a massively large trade surplus in clean energy with America, right? Quite the opposite, finds a striking report titled “Advantage America” released on March 6th. The two countries traded about $6.5 billion in solar, wind and smart-grid technology and services in 2011—and America sold $1.63 billion more of such kit to China than it imported from there. The analysis was done by Bloomberg New Energy Finance (BNEF), an industry publisher, and funded the Pew Charitable Trusts, a charity.¶ More surprising is the fact that America’s lead was maintained in all three categories studied by the boffins: solar, wind and smart energy technologies (see chart). One important explanation for this is that while China has strengths in large-scale assembly and mass manufacturing, it lacks the innovation to come up with high-value inputs. So American ingenuity is required to supply Chinese factories with such things as polysilicon and wafers for photovoltaic cells, and the fibreglass and control systems used in wind turbines.¶ The resulting picture is one that is reflective of the broader US-China relationship beyond trade. The two countries, though often appearing at loggerheads, are actually best seen in symbiosis. As Michael Liebreich of BNEF puts it in the report’s foreword, “the United States and China…are not so much competing as they are interdependent**.”**

#### No commercialization

Reitenbach 12 Dr. Gail, POWER's Managing Editor, "The U.S. Military Gets Smart Grid", January 1, www.powermag.com/smart\_grid/The-U-S-Military-Gets-Smart-Grid\_4228\_p3.html

There should be no question about the importance of more self-reliant, sophisticated, and flexible power grids for the military. However, the trickle-down benefits of DOD smart grid technology pilots for non-military electricity customers—in terms of new technologies and lower prices—may be limited.¶ To take a small example, the EVs currently being developed for the military are custom builds (as so much is for the military) by a new entrant, which suggests that the likely tech transfer between REV and the dozens of mainstream "legacy" automakers with better consumer brand awareness could be minimal. What could transfer to the civilian grid from V2G pilots is a better understanding of how to handle the distribution-level technical issues involved in using EV-stored energy to provide grid-balancing ancillary services. The regulatory and economic aspects of that transaction would be another matter. ¶ Other energy storage technologies developed for military applications may not translate quickly into civilian life because of cost constraints, whereas the military's primary reason for deploying energy storage is security rather than least cost. Over time, however, we can hope that experience gained in military applications leads to cheaper technologies.¶ Another limiting factor is that even for technologies that work technically, working practically can mean different things in military and civilian contexts. Microgrids, for example, are likely to remain relegated to energy users who put a premium on reliable power supply—including various types of industrial, corporate, and educational campuses. ¶ Though the size of military renewable generation installations is smaller than most utility-scale projects beyond base gates, military microgrid projects may provide valuable lessons about balancing renewable and fossil-fueled generation sources. They could also accelerate greater deployment of distributed renewable generation, something that at least one leading utility CEO, NRG Energy Inc.'s David Crane, already has his eye on. According to an interview with Yale Environment 360, "The electricity future, says Crane, will be transformed by the widespread adoption of three innovations: solar panels on residential and commercial roofs, electric cars in garages, and truly 'smart meters' that will seamlessly transfer power to and from homes, electric vehicles, and the grid."

#### Wind PTC and other incentives pound the DA

Bao 3/12 Cindy, PR Web, "Former California Controller Steve Westly to Address Renewable Energy Tax Credit Professionals", 2013, www.prweb.com/releases/2013/3/prweb10520715.htm

The extension of the production tax credit (PTC) through 2013, coupled with the availability of more than $150 million in advanced energy manufacturing tax credits announced by the U.S. Departments of Energy and Treasury, are expected to help drive additional renewable energy investment this year. However, uncertainty remains as the industry awaits guidance from the Internal Revenue Service regarding the "begun construction" language included in the extension legislation.

### AT: China Econ

#### No impact to Chinese economy

Blackwill 9 – former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning (Robert, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Next, China. Again, five years from today. Did the recession undermine the grip of the Chinese Communist Party on the People’s Republic of China (PRC)? No. Again, as Lee Kuan Yew stressed in the same recent speech, “China has proven itself to be pragmatic, resilient and adaptive. The Chinese have survived severe crises—the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution—few societies have been so stricken. These are reasons not to be pessimistic.” Did the crisis make Washington more willing to succumb to the rise of Chinese power because of PRC holdings of U.S. Treasury Bonds? No. Did it alter China’s basic external direction and especially its efforts, stemming from its own strategic analysis, to undermine the U.S. alliance system in Asia? No. Did it cause the essence of Asian security to transform? No.

### AT: Oil DA

#### Civilian renewables now

James Bradbury 12, Senior Associate in WRI’s Climate and Energy Program, U.S. ELECTRICITY MARKETS INCREASINGLY FAVOR ALTERNATIVES TO COAL, 2012, http://pdf.wri.org/factsheets/factsheet\_us\_electricity\_markets\_favor\_alternatives\_to\_coal.pdf

RENEWABLES ARE BECOMING MORE AFFORDABLE. In some regions, renewables are already becoming cost-competitive. For example, the Public Service Commission of Michigan, which is responsible for approving new electric power contracts, recently found23 that new contracts for electricity from new wind farms were up to 40 percent cheaper than the cost of building new coal-fired power in that state. The trend of increasingly affordable renewable electricity is also forecast to continue. The National Renewable Energy Lab24 recently estimated that by 2015 solar photovoltaics would be competitive in utilities representing 67 percent of residential electricity sales. The EIA projects25 new wind power to be more affordable than new coal-fired power in many regions of the U.S. by 2016.

#### DOD is investing in renewables now

Stephen Vagus 3-29-2013, “New solar energy projects to be launched by US Army,” Hydrogen Fuel News, http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/new-solar-energy-projects-to-be-launched-by-us-army/859745/

The U.S. Army has been tasked with the testing of solar energy by the Department of Defense. The federal agency has a strong desire to see renewable energy become a staple for the country’s power infrastructure. While the Department of Defense is the world’s largest consumer of oil, the agency has identified energy as a matter of national security, citing climate change as a potential calamity as well. Solar energy has, therefore, become a focus of the Army, which has been testing various solar-centric technologies abroad. New generation of tents focuses on energy efficiency and renewable power The Army is preparing to launch two new solar energy projects at Fort Benning, Georgia, and Fort Bliss, Texas. These projects are designed to highlight energy efficiency through the use of renewable power. The projects call for the use of a new generation of efficient tents that are built with rigid walls rather than the flexible material that is used with conventional military tents. While these structures are technically designated as tents, they are more similar to mobile trailers, with some being draped with tarps that are equipped with solar panels.

#### Price collapse inevitable---shale revolution

Paikin 12 Zach Paikin is a columnist for Canada's iPolitics and contributes research on international affairs to several Washington-based think tanks and institutes, April 11, 2012, “Coping in an increasingly competitive global economy”, http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/04/11/zach-paikin-coping-with-less-revenues-in-an-increasingly-competitive-global-economy/

It gets worse. **The price of oil is about to collapse due to the increasing extraction of unconventional oil**. Roughly 250 billion barrels of oil shale — and possibly as much as twice that figure — have been discovered in Israel and will begin to flow into the global market in about a decade **at an estimated $30-40 per barrel**, merely one third of the current price of oil. This gives Israel the third largest oil shale reserves in the world after the United States and China. The U.S. has already become a net exporter of gasoline and could surpass both Russia and Saudi Arabia as the world’s largest supplier of oil in the near future thanks to its unconventional oil reserves.¶ **The upcoming decline in the price of oil will result in the near-total collapse of non-diversified economies**, such as the Middle East’s oil-exporting countries. For instance, roughly 75 per cent of Saudi Arabia’s governmental revenue and 90 per cent of its export earnings come from the oil industry. Natural gas doesn’t provide these Mid-East states with much solace: Canadian exports of natural gas to the United States last year alone accounted for half the rate of all natural gas exports from the Middle East and North Africa.

#### Military doesn’t link

Kreutzer 12 David, Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change, Heritage Foundation, “Military Biofoolishness”, May 21, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php>

The entire U.S. military currently consumes about 360,000 barrels per day of petroleum-based fuel, with 175,000 barrels per day (or less) going to the Air Force’s jets. A single platform in the Gulf of Mexico (Thunderhorse) produces as much petroleum as these jets consume and at a much lower cost than the biofuel replacements. The Keystone XL Pipeline would bring enough petroleum from a very secure Canada to meet our total military consumption two or three times over. The same story holds for other potential sources of conventional petroleum, such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Air Force’s target is to replace about 26,000 barrels per day with biofuels. Whatever energy security that may provide could be doubled by a single well in the Gulf of Mexico. As a strategic policy, switching the military to biofuels can only make our enemies think we are not serious. If the entire military consumption were switched away from petroleum, that would cut worldwide demand by 0.4 percent. This cut would reduce revenues to oil producers by about 1.5 percent. Let’s hope biofuels are not anti-terrorism Plan A. Though some energy technologies that are too expensive for general civilian use may make sense for the military, biofuels are not among them. The military needs to rethink its biofuels program.

#### Electricity is 1% of oil demand

IER 12 (Institute for Energy Research, “Petroleum (Oil),” March, http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/energy-overview/petroleum-oil/)

Today, oil meets 36 percent of US energy demand [i], with 70 percent directed to fuels used in transportation – gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. Another 24 percent is used in industry and manufacturing, 5 percent is used in the commercial and residential sectors, and 1 percent is used to generate electricity. [ii] Petroleum is the main mover of our nation’s commerce and its use for transportation has made our world more intimate. It is the transportation fuel, as almost all of our nation’s transportation is dependent upon its concentrated liquid form.

### AT: CCP

#### No lashout – CCP knows it would be suicide and PLA wouldn’t support it

Gilley 4 [Bruce, former contributing editor at the Far Eastern Economic Review, M.A. Oxford, 2004, China’s Democratic Future, p. 114]

Yet the risks, even to a dying regime, may be too high. An unprovoked attack on Taiwan would almost certainly bring the U.S. and its allies to the island's rescue. Those forces would not stop at Taiwan but might march on Beijing and oust the CCP, or attempt to do so through stiff sanctions, calling it a threat to regional and world peace. Such an attack might also face the opposition of the peoples of Fujian, who would be expected to provide logis¬tical support and possibly bear the worst burdens of war. They, like much of coastal China, look to Taiwan for investment and culture and have a close affinity with the island. As a result, there are doubts about whether such a plan could be put into action. A failed war would prompt a Taiwan declaration of independence and a further backlash against the CCP at home, just as the May Fourth students of 1919 berated the Republican government for weakness in the face of foreign powers. Failed wars brought down authoritarian regimes in Greece and Portugal in 1974 and in Argentina in 1983. Even if CCP leaders wanted war, it is unlikely that the PLA would oblige. Top officers would see the disastrous implications of attacking Taiwan. Military caution would also guard against the even wilder scenario of the use of nuclear weapons against Japan or the U.S.47 At the height of the Tiananmen protests it appears there was consideration given to the use of nuclear weapons in case the battle to suppress the protestors drew in outside countries.48 But even then, the threats did not appear to gain even minimal support. In an atmosphere in which the military is thinking about its future, the resort to nuclear confrontation would not make sense.

### 2AC Immigration DA

#### Won’t pass---Rubio

Daily Mail 4-1, “Senators close to historic deal that would allow 11 million illegal immigrants to become U.S. citizens,” http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2302216/Senators-close-historic-deal-allow-11-million-illegal-immigrants-U-S-citizens.html#ixzz2PBrFxKPy

Even with one of the **largest hurdles** to an immigration overhaul **overcome**, **optimistic lawmakers** cautioned on Sunday they had not finished work on a bill that would provide a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants.¶ The AFL-CIO and the pro-business U.S. Chamber of Commerce reached a deal late Friday that would allow tens of thousands of low-skill workers into the country to fill jobs in construction, restaurants and hotels. ¶ Yet despite the unusual agreement between the two powerful lobbying groups, lawmakers from both parties conceded that the **negotiations were not finished.**¶'With the agreement between business and labor, every major policy issue has been resolved,' said Sen. Chuck Schumer, the New York Democrat who brokered the labor-business deal.¶ But it hasn't taken the form of a bill and the eight senators searching for a compromise haven't met about the potential breakthrough.¶ 'We haven't signed off,' said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C.¶ 'There are a few details yet. But conceptually, we have an agreement between business and labor, between ourselves that has to be drafted,' he added.¶ Yet just before lawmakers began appearing on Sunday shows, Sen. Marco Rubio warned he was not ready to lend his name - and political clout - to such a deal without hashing out the details.¶ 'Reports that the bipartisan group of eight senators have agreed on a legislative proposal are premature,' said Rubio, a Florida Republican who is among the lawmakers working on legislation.¶ Rubio, a Cuban-American who is weighing a presidential bid in 2016**, is a** leading figure **inside his party.** **Lawmakers will be** closely watching any deal **for his approval** and his skepticism about the process did little to encourage optimism.

#### Perez nomination pounds the link

NPR 3-27-13, Carrie Johnson, “Obama's Labor Nominee Faces GOP Opposition Over His Role In A Supreme Court Case”, http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/03/27/175513560/obamas-labor-nominee-faces-gop-opposition-over-his-role-in-a-supreme-court-case

Thomas Perez, the president's nominee to lead the Department of Labor and a high-profile Latino advocate for civil rights, is scheduled for a Senate confirmation hearing April 18. **But behind-the-scenes wrangling over his nomination, and his controversial role in a Supreme Court case, is already well under way.**¶ House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa, R-Calif., and the ranking GOP member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Charles Grassley, are investigating what they call a quid pro quo deal that may have cost the federal Treasury as much as $180 million.¶ The GOP lawmakers are upset by the appearance that the Justice Department used inappropriate reasons to stay out of a whistle-blower lawsuit that claimed the city of St. Paul, Minn., had misused funds it got from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the False Claims Act, the Justice Department can intervene in such cases and support whistle-blowers, which often leads to victories or settlements that return millions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury.¶ Under the GOP theory, the Justice Department declined to throw its weight into that whistle-blower case as part of an improper deal with St. Paul, Minn. What's the other end of the alleged quid pro quo? That would be St. Paul agreeing to withdraw its bid for Supreme Court review in a separate case that put at risk a major legal tool the federal government uses in civil rights and housing discrimination cases.¶ In the case, Magner v. Gallagher, St. Paul asked the Supreme Court to consider the government's use of the so-called disparate impact theory, which allows lawsuits to proceed under the Fair Housing Act if people can prove a practice has a statistically significant negative impact on minorities, rather than specific bad acts involving individual landlords. That theory has been a frequent target of political conservatives and some members of Congress, and its supporters fear if the issue gets to the Supreme Court, it could be invalidated there.¶ Republican lawmakers have demanded more answers from Perez, the assistant attorney general for civil rights, and others in the Justice Department who may have played a role in that decision, which they consider a "dubious bargain."¶ Grassley told reporters earlier this month, "It's hard to believe that the president would nominate somebody at the heart of a congressional investigation and so deeply involved in a controversial decision to make a shady deal with the city of St. Paul, Minn."¶ New documents indicate Perez and other top DOJ officials have spent hours talking to members of Congress behind closed doors this month about that arrangement.¶ Perez told investigators in an eight-hour session on March 22 that the St. Paul case heading to the Supreme Court last year "caught my attention and was a source of concern."¶ In the first explanation of his role in the case, Perez said the dispute headed toward the Supreme Court presented some bad facts, and "because bad facts make bad law, this could have resulted in a decision that undermined our ability...to protect victims of housing and lending discrimination." He told lawmakers he reached out to people in Minnesota and found out they were interested in getting the Justice Department to stay out of a separate whistle-blower case that could cost the state money.¶ Perez said he reached out inside the Justice Department for ethics advice and told lawmakers he learned "there would be no concerns so long as I had permission" from counterparts in the civil unit handling the whistle-blower case and that "there was no prohibition on linking matters."¶ He added that he learned former Vice President Walter Mondale, who played a role in sponsoring the Fair Housing Act in Congress, and who had close ties to the mayor of St. Paul, was going to reach out regarding the Supreme Court case and its effects on civil rights enforcement as well.¶ "I believe then, and I believe now, that the result achieved here was in the best interests of the United States," he said.¶ Justice Department officials have turned over 1,500 pages of documents about the controversy, **but that's unlikely to satisfy Republicans on Capitol Hill.**

#### Gun control pounds

WaPo 3-28, “Obama, pushing gun-control agenda, says ‘shame on us if we’ve forgotten’ Newtown,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-pushing-gun-control-agenda-says-shame-on-us-if-weve-forgotten-newtown/2013/03/28/e2060b54-97be-11e2-b68f-dc5c4b47e519\_story.html

President Obama delivered a **forceful** and emotional **plea** to lawmakers Thursday to pass his **gun-control agenda**, saying “shame on us if we’ve forgotten” the elementary school massacre in Newtown, Conn.¶ Frustrated by the slow pace of progress on Capitol Hill, Obama urged passage of universal background checks and other gun-control measures while flanked by mothers of shooting victims in the East Room of the White House. He also repeatedly invoked the Dec. 14 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School as a cause for action.¶ “Less than 100 days ago that happened,” Obama said. “And the entire country was shocked. And the entire country pledged we would do something about it and this time would be different. Shame on us if we’ve forgotten. I haven’t forgotten those kids. Shame on us if we’ve forgotten.”¶ Obama — who spoke alongside Vice President Biden, the administration’s point person on guns — **is attempting to pressure wavering lawmakers** in advance of an expected **Senate vote next month** on his guns agenda. He urged Americans to “raise your voices and make yourselves unmistakably heard” so that lawmakers “don’t get squishy.”¶ “We need everybody to remember how we felt 100 days ago and make sure that what we said at that time wasn’t just a bunch of platitudes, that we meant it,” Obama said.¶ But **the fate of gun legislation** on Capitol Hill **is murky amid GOP opposition and wavering among conservative Democrats.** Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), widely viewed as a 2016 presidential contender, announced Thursday that he was joining three other Senate GOP conservatives — Ted Cruz (Texas), Mike Lee (Utah) and Rand Paul (Ky.) — in **threatening to filibuster** Democratic gun-control legislation.

#### Executive military action shields

Davenport 12 Coral, energy and environment correspondent for National Journal, Prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly. In 2010, she was a fellow with the Metcalf Institute for Marine and Environmental Reporting. From 2001 to 2004, Davenport worked in Athens, Greece, as a correspondent for numerous publications, including the Christian Science Monitor and USA Today, covering politics, economics, international relations and terrorism in southeastern Europe. She also covered the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, and was a contributing writer to the Fodor’s, Time Out, Eyewitness and Funseekers’ guidebook series. Davenport started her journalism career at the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton, Massachusetts, after graduating from Smith College with a degree in English literature. National Journal, 2/10, White House Budget to Expand Clean-Energy Programs Through Pentagon, ProQuest

The White House believes it has figured out how to get more money for clean-energy programs touted by President Obama without having it become political roadkill in the wake of the Solyndra controversy: **Put it in the Pentagon**. While details are thin on the ground, lawmakers who work on both energy- and defense-spending policy believe the fiscal 2013 budget request to be delivered to Congress on Monday probably won't include big increases for wind and solar power through the Energy Department, a major target for Republicans since solar-panel maker Solyndra defaulted last year on a $535 million loan guarantee. But they do expect to see increases in spending on alternative energy in the Defense Department, such as programs to replace traditional jet fuel with biofuels, supply troops on the front lines with solar-powered electronic equipment, build hybrid-engine tanks and aircraft carriers, and increase renewable-energy use on military bases. While Republicans will instantly shoot down requests for fresh spending on Energy Department programs that could be likened to the one that funded Solyndra, many support alternative-energy programs for the military. "I do expect to see the spending," said Rep. Jack Kingston, R-Ga., a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, when asked about increased investment in alternative-energy programs at the Pentagon. "I think in the past three to five years this has been going on, but that it has grown as a culture and a practice - and it's a good thing." "If Israel attacks Iran, and we have to go to war - and the Straits of Hormuz are closed for a week or a month and the price of fuel is going to be high," Kingston said, "the question is, in the military, what do you replace it with? It's not something you just do for the ozone. It's strategic." Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who sits on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said, "I don't see what they're doing in DOD as being Solyndra." "We're not talking about putting $500 million into a goofy idea," Graham told National Journal . "We're talking about taking applications of technologies that work and expanding them. I wouldn't be for DOD having a bunch of money to play around with renewable technologies that have no hope. But from what I understand, there are renewables out there that already work." A senior House Democrat noted that this wouldn't be the first time that the **Pentagon has been utilized to advance policies that wouldn't otherwise be supported**. "They did it in the '90s with medical research," said Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif., ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In 1993, when funding was frozen for breast-cancer research programs in the National Institutes of Health, Congress boosted the Pentagon's budget for breast-cancer research - to more than double that of the health agency's funding in that area. **Politically, the strategy makes sense**. Republicans are ready to fire at the first sign of any pet Obama program, and renewable programs at the Energy Department are an exceptionally ripe target. That's because of Solyndra, but also because, in the last two years, the Energy Department received a massive $40 billion infusion in funding for clean-energy programs from the stimulus law, a signature Obama policy. When that money runs out this year, a request for more on top of it would be met with flat-out derision from most congressional Republicans. Increasing renewable-energy initiatives at the Pentagon can also help Obama advance his broader, national goals for transitioning the U.S. economy from fossil fuels to alternative sources. As the largest industrial consumer of energy in the world, the U.S. military can have a significant impact on energy markets - if it demands significant amounts of energy from alternative sources, it could help scale up production and ramp down prices for clean energy on the commercial market. Obama acknowledged those impacts in a speech last month at the Buckley Air Force Base in Colorado. "The Navy is going to purchase enough clean-energy capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year. And it won't cost taxpayers a dime," Obama said. "What does it mean? It means that the world's largest consumer of energy - the Department of Defense - is making one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history," the president added. "That will grow this market, it will strengthen our energy security." Experts also hope that Pentagon engagement in clean-energy technology could help yield breakthroughs with commercial applications. Kingston acknowledged that the upfront costs for alternative fuels are higher than for conventional oil and gasoline. For example, the Air Force has pursued contracts to purchase biofuels made from algae and camelina, a grass-like plant, but those fuels can cost up to $150 a barrel, compared to oil, which is lately going for around $100 a barrel. Fuel-efficient hybrid tanks can cost $1 million more than conventional tanks - although in the long run they can help lessen the military's oil dependence, Kingston said Republicans recognize that the up-front cost can yield a payoff later. "It wouldn't be dead on arrival. But we'd need to see a two- to three-year payoff on the investment," Kingston said. Military officials - particularly Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who has made alternative energy a cornerstone of his tenure - have been telling Congress for years that the military's dependence on fossil fuels puts the troops - and the nation's security - at risk. Mabus has focused on meeting an ambitious mandate from a 2007 law to supply 25 percent of the military's electricity from renewable power sources by 2025. (Obama has tried and failed to pass a similar national mandate.) Last June, the DOD rolled out its first department-wide energy policy to coalesce alternative and energy-efficient initiatives across the military services. In January, the department announced that a study of military installations in the western United States found four California desert bases suitable to produce enough solar energy - 7,000 megawatts - to match seven nuclear power plants. And so far, those **moves have met with approval from congressional Republicans**. Even so, any request for new Pentagon spending will be met with greater scrutiny this year. The Pentagon's budget is already under a microscope, due to $500 billion in automatic cuts to defense spending slated to take effect in 2013. But even with those challenges, clean-energy spending probably won't stand out as much in the military budget as it would in the Energy Department budget. Despite its name, the Energy Department has traditionally had little to do with energy policy - its chief portfolio is maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons arsenal. Without the stimulus money, last year only $1.9 billion of Energy's $32 billion budget went to clean-energy programs. A spending increase of just $1 billion would make a big difference in the agency's bottom line. But it would probably be easier to tuck another $1 billion or $2 billion on clean-energy spending into the Pentagon's $518 billion budget. Last year, the Pentagon spent about $1 billion on renewable energy and energy-efficiency programs across its departments.

#### Plan’s bipartisan

Haugen 13 Dan, Midwest Energy News, "Analysis: Can Congress compromise on clean energy?", February 12, www.midwestenergynews.com/2013/02/12/analysis-can-congress-compromise-on-clean-energy/

The prospect for bipartisan energy policy was on the agenda last week in Washington.¶ Former members of Congress spoke last Wednesday about restoring the “legacy of bipartisan support for renewable energy” at a policy forum organized by the American Council on Renewable Energy (ACORE).¶ The next day, the Bipartisan Policy Center think tank separately released a set of recommendations (pdf) endorsed by a task force of Republicans and Democrats for improving the nation’s electricity grid.¶ The conversations around both events offer a few rays of hope that the heightened level of partisanship that’s bogged down the discussion of clean energy in recent years may be starting to fade.¶ “I think there are some positive signs,” said Joe Kruger, energy and environment director for the Bipartisan Policy Center.¶ Solyndra narrative fading¶ The election is over, the economy is improving, and mainstream support for clean energy continues to grow.¶ That said, any legislation faces a major hurdle in the House, where some conservative Republicans will still try to invoke Solyndra to slander any efforts to support renewables.¶ Some conservative Republicans, but not all. That nuance was on display at the ACORE forum.¶ Iowa Rep. Steve King, for example, receives consistently high marks from conservative groups, yet he broke with his party last year in the debate over extending the wind energy production tax credits.¶ He explained his support for renewables at the ACORE event, as reported by Stephen Lacey for Greentech Media:¶ “We’ve got to be a more reliable partner,” King said. “We do all of this [wind, solar, biofuels] and our country becomes more energy secure. … It’s the right thing to do.”¶ Modest expectations¶ In December, a Colorado Republican, Rep. Cory Gardner, and a Vermont Democrat, Rep. Peter Welch, announced a bipartisan energy efficiency caucus in the House.¶ Another promising partnership has emerged in the Senate between Ron Wyden, an Oregon Democrat, and Lisa Murkowski, an Alaska Republican. Wyden chairs the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and Murkowski is the ranking Republican member.¶ The senators in November announced their intentions to “set the tone” for collaboration and seek to address “pent-up demand” for energy legislation. Congress hasn’t passed a major energy bill since 2007.¶ “Sen. Wyden and Sen. Murkowski are clearly looking for ways to work together,” said Richard Caperton, director of the clean energy investment program at the Center for American Progress.¶ Caperton doesn’t expect “revolutionary concepts” to emerge from this Congress, but there could be progress on more familiar topics such as nuclear waste storage, hydropower siting, and natural gas exports.¶ Phyllis Cuttino, director of the clean energy program at Pew Environment Group, has a similar forecast. Don’t expect an all-encompassing national energy bill, but there’s hope for some “smaller, common-sense bills,” she said.

#### PC’s not key to immigration

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, has appeared many times as a commentator on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, and National Public Radio, has written for the Associated Press, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Foreign Affairs, Harper’s, and Washington Monthly, and authored two books, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

#### RECs non-unique the link

Bill Sweet 12, Editor of IEEE Spectrum, a publication of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, 3/2/12, “Are Renewable Energy Credits Excessively Expensive?,” http://spectrum.ieee.org/energywise/energy/renewables/are-renewable-energy-credits-excessively-expensive

The Manhattan Institute, a public policy research outfit with a free-market and somewhat libertarian orientation, has issued a report arguing that renewable energy credits (RECs) represent an excessively expensive way of addressing environmental concerns and promoting green technology. The REC is a device employed by the 29 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico that have adopted renewable portfolio standards, sometimes with special "carve-outs" for solar energy. Grid participants unable to meet mandated targets for renewable generation purchase tradeable credits from those that can, where a single REC represents one MWh of green energy delivered. Thus, the REC is a means of delivering subsidies to producers of green energy that are paid for by producers of dirty energy.¶ The REC, and even perhaps some of the purposes the REC is meant to serve, is not popular among the kinds of people who write for the Manhattan Institute. As they see it—and arguably they are right—the REC is a poorly concealed substitute for a carbon emissions credit, which in turn is a poorly concealed substitute for a carbon tax. Nevertheless, the Manhattan Institute has a record of producing serious work that is respected by people who do not necessarily share the institute's general point of view. This latest report, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," by Robert Bryce, deserves attention as a first stab at assessing the overall costs to consumers of RECs.¶ Basically Bryce compares the costs of electricity in states that have renewable energy mandates with costs in states that do not and finds that rates have gone up much more in states that do have such mandates. "The gap is particularly striking in coal-dependent states—seven such states with RPS mandates saw their rates soar by an average of 54.2 percent between 2001 and 2010, more than twice the average increase experienced by seven other coal-dependent states without mandates," reports Bryce. Though he devotes detailed attention to certain states such as California, Oregon and Washington, he does not try to disentangle the precise mix of reasons that have produced higher rates in states with portfolio standards, and nor does he claim to.¶ Bryce notes that tightening regulation of coal generating plants and higher expenditures on power transmission also have been major factors in driving up electricity costs. Citing figures from the Edison Electric Institute, Bryce says that "member companies spent over $55 billion on transmission projects between 2001 and 2009. Another $61 billion will likely be spent on transmission projects from 2010 through 2021."¶ However superficial, the Manhattan Institute report suggests worryingly that the costs of promoting wind and especially solar energy may start catching up with policy-makers and produce a political backlash, as we have been witnessing in Europe.

#### Winner’s win

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Loss of PC still results in high-skill reform

Yglesias 13 Matthew, Slate, 1/15, How the GOP Can Roll Obama on Immigration, www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration\_reform\_will\_obama\_get\_rolled.html

Of the major policy issues under discussion in Washington, "immigration reform" stands out for having unusually undefined content. For the major immigration-advocacy groups, the goal is clear, a comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship for the overwhelming majority of unauthorized migrants already living in the United States. But many other aspects of immigration law are in the mix as part of a proposed deal, and it seems to me that there's a fair chance that a nimble Republican Party could essentially roll the Democratic coalition and pass an "immigration reform" bill that doesn't offer the path Latino advocacy groups are looking for.¶ Elise Foley has the key line from her briefing on the administration's thinking about immigration, namely that a piecemeal approach "could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants."¶ And indeed it could. But how can they stop it? The last House GOP effort to split the high-tech visas question from the path to citizenship question was an absurd partisan ploy. If Republicans want to get serious about it they should be able to make it work. The centerpiece would be something on increased immigration of skilled workers. That's something the tech industry wants very much, it's a great idea on the merits, and few influential people have any real beef with it. High tech visas will easily generate revenue to pay for some stepped-up enforcement. Then instead of adding on a poison pill so Democrats will block the bill, you need to add a sweetener. Not the broad path to citizenship, but something small like the DREAM Act. Now you've got a package that falls massively short of what Latino groups are looking for, but that I think Democrats will have a hard time actually blocking. After all, why would they block it? It packages three things—more skilled immigration, more enforcement, and help for DREAMers—they say they want. Blocking it because it doesn't also do the broad amnesty that liberals want and conservatives hate would require the kind of fanaticism that is the exact opposite of Obama's approach to politics.

### AT: India Relations

#### Relations resilient---immigration fights don’t spill over

Shari B. Hochberg 12, Pace University School of Law, Winter 2012, “United States-India Relations: Reconciling the H-1B Visa Hike and Framework for Cooperationon Trade and Investment,” Pace International Law Review, Vol. 24, No. 1, http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1324&context=pilr

The United States and India share common interests, from international security to the free flow of commerce. India has joined the United States in becoming a major world power, and over the last decade, the two countries have worked together to strategize capitalizing on each other’s growth. Ties have strengthened between the nations. However, much of that relationship rests on a flawed system of immigration and inconsistent international employment standards.

The United States and India signed the Framework, and only five months later, the United States passed legislation to increase fees on the H-1B visa, most frequently utilized by Indian businesses. Additionally, the state of Ohio made a statement in banning outsourcing within a week after the visa fee hike. The United States is sending mixed messages to India as well as to the rest of the world.

So long as the United States Administration keeps dialogue open and assuages the fears of the Indian business sector, the fierce debate will remain calm in the short-term. In the long run, however, the United States must overhaul its current immigration law, starting with the H-1B visa program. Eventually, a multilateral trade treaty should be reached, exponentially expanding the global marketplace, while allowing member countries to protect their own domestic interests.

# 1AR

## Topicality

### 1AR XT – ECIP Meets

#### ECIP is a mechanism that provides temporary procurement contracts for renewables

DOD 10 Department of Defense, "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Energy Conservation Investment Program Plan", June 2010, www.defense.gov/recovery/plans\_reports/2010/pdfs/DoD%20ECIP%20Program%20Plan%20Update\_FINAL\_062110.pdf

The ECIP includes projects that meet the long-term Department of Defense goal to reduce energy consumption. The program complies with facility requirements that ensure high operational performance and productivity, while emphasizing sustainability, energy efficiency, and safety at the lowest overall life-cycle cost. Project activities funded by the Recovery Act achieve long-term public benefits by investing in technologies that increase economic efficiency and health benefits, build new sources of renewable energy, enhance job creation/retention, improve military facilities, and improve the quality of life for our troops and their families. ¶ This program supports the goals of fostering energy independence and security while improving infrastructure that will provide long-term economic benefits. The Military Services and Components (including Defense Commissary Agency, Defense Logistics Agency, and National Security Agency) are working to maintain mission readiness while incorporating energy conservation projects into existing Department facilities. Savings-to Investment Ratios (SIR), estimated through life-cycle cost analyses, and specific payback periods (the length of time needed to pay back the initial capital investment), are key components in the selection of ECIP projects. Historically ECIP obtains more than two dollars in life-cycle savings for every dollar invested. Department ECIP guidance targets projects with SIR greater than 1.25 and Simple Payback of less than ten years. This program delivers costs savings, freeing funds for other war fighter needs. For example, by implementing ECIP projects, annual savings for the Army are estimated to be $5.0 million in operating costs. ¶ The Department’s use of ECIP combines the desire to leverage innovative technologies in concert with our historic leadership role in environmental stewardship across the enterprise. This includes using renewable energy, highly efficient heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and controls, and water conservation measures. Reducing energy usage at installations frees up resources for operational and mission requirements. ¶ Recovery Act funding for ECIP was provided to the Military Services based on the combined requirements of the Recovery Act and goals of ECIP. ECIP is generally designated for projects that reduce energy and water consumption, but, ECIP also provides a critical funding source for investments in small-scale renewable energy technologies that fall within the savings-to-investment ratio and payback goals of the program. These projects also focus on improving energy efficiency in existing Department of Defense facilities and creating new energy generation sources on military installations in a cost effective manner. ¶ The economic conditions in the construction market have had a profound impact on the bidding environment for DoD projects. Many ECIP projects had contract awards less than the government estimate. These bid savings will be reinvested into additional ECIP requirements. The savings also allowed DoD to reconsider its project selection process. In support of Recovery Act goals, the Department revised its policy in order to allocate bid savings to the maximum extent possible, to states and localities where the unemployment rate is above the national average. This change ensures that those areas most affected by economic hardship are assisted directly using Recovery Act resources. ¶ C. Activities: ¶ In May 2009, the ECIP Recovery Act program identified 45 construction and three associated planning and design funding lines that would be executed in 17 different States. Project titles, locations, and estimated costs were provided in the Reports to Congress submitted on March 20, 2009, and April 28, 2009. Subsequent changes were made in a March 4, 2010, Report to Congress; two ECIP projects were cancelled due to execution delays and were replaced with two new projects. Project activities are focused on facility energy improvements, including: ¶ • Installing renewable energy sources, including wind turbines and solar photovoltaic and solar thermal systems¶ • Completing energy conservation upgrades ¶ • Installing direct digital controls ¶ • Upgrading and installing high efficiency lighting and associated controls ¶ • Drilling geothermal test wells ¶ • Installing solar “air / ventilation” pre-heating systems ¶ • Replacing heat pumps to improve energy efficiency and cost-effectiveness ¶ From February 2009 to March 31, 2010 the military services have awarded 32 of the 45 ECIP projects or over $61 million of the $120 million appropriated by Congress. Of the 32 awarded projects, 15 have started construction, and two projects have completed construction. The Department is on schedule to award all projects before the end of the fiscal year. ¶ D. Characteristics: ¶ The following characteristics demonstrate how ECIP projects will be contractually implemented. ¶ Type of Award ¶ Fixed Price is the preferred contract type for Federal procurements. The planned obligations align with the goals of the Recovery Act, the guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to maximize use of Fixed Price, and President Obama’s March 4, 2009 Government Contracting memorandum regarding the use of Fixed Price contract type. ¶ Based upon a fixed price emphasis, the Department forecasts 90 - 95%, or $108M - $114M, of Recovery Act Energy Conservation Investment Program funds will be obligated as Fixed Price. DoD expects to award the remaining 5 - 10%, or $6M - $12M, as Cost contracts. This projection is based on acquisition strategies developed by the Military Departments.

### 1AR XT – W/M

#### Acquiring is T

US Code 3 Legal Information Institute, “41 USC § 131 – Acquisition”, November 24, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/41/131?quicktabs_8=1#quicktabs-8>

In division B, the term “acquisition”—¶ (1) means the process of acquiring, with appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of an executive agency, from the point at which the requirements of the executive agency are established in consultation with the chief acquisition officer of the executive agency; and¶ (2) includes—¶ (A) the process of acquiring property or services that are already in existence, or that must be created, developed, demonstrated, and evaluated;¶ (B) the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs;¶ (C) solicitation and selection of sources;¶ (D) award of contracts;¶ (E) contract performance;¶ (F) contract financing;¶ (G) management and measurement of contract performance through final delivery and payment; and¶ (H) technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency requirements by contract.

## China Px DA

### Thumpers

#### Massive, rapid renewable expansion now

GTM 3-15 GreenTechMedia, America's Share of the Global Solar Market Grew Strongly in 2012, 3-15-13, <http://energy.aol.com/2013/03/15/america-s-share-of-the-global-solar-market-grew-strongly-in-2012/?icid=related1>

It may not compare to the German solar market. But the U.S. is definitely becoming a major force globally when it comes to new installations.¶ According to the 2012 Solar Market Insight report from GTM Research and the Solar Energy Industries Association, America installed 3,313 megawatts of solar capacity last year -- accounting for 11 percent of total global installations. That's up from 7 percent in 2011.¶ "From 2004 until 2010, America's global share had been stuck in a tight band. The U.S. significantly broke that in 2012," said Shayle Kann, vice president at GTM Research. "Our forecasts put us at 13 percent in 2013."¶ Every market is growing in the U.S., but the strongest growth occurred in the utility and residential sectors.¶ Boosted by the Department of Energy's loan guarantee program, the utility-scale solar sector saw 134 percent growth -- bringing in 1,782 megawatts of installations. According to the GTM/SEIA analysis, eight of the ten biggest solar PV projects installed in the U.S. were completed in 2012. And **there are 4,000 megawatts of additional utility-scale projects currently under construction.** Although new contracts have slowed for these massive projects, the **pipeline** will still represent roughly 45 percent of installed capacity in 2016.¶ On the other end of the spectrum, the residential market grew by 62 percent. The impact of solar services was stark: half of all new 2012 residential installations in California, Arizona, Colorado and Massachusetts were completed through the third-party ownership model last year. In Arizona, 90 percent of residential projects were done through leasing or power purchase agreements. GTM Research projects that these models will be valued at $5.7 billion in the next two years. After 2013, distributed projects will start to erode the utility sector's market share.¶ While installations across every sector rose, the **price of those systems consistently fell**. In 2012, the weighted average sales prices for PV systems dropped by more than a quarter to $5.04 per watt in the residential market, $4.27 per watt in the non-residential market, and $2.27 per watt in the utility market.¶ **GTM projects 30 percent growth in the U.S. this year**, with roughly the same breakdown across sectors.¶ Last year also marked a major milestone for solar PV globally. With **more than 30 gigawatts** of capacity installed world-wide, the solar industry reached the cumulative 100-gigawatt mark -- a mark that the wind industry hit in 2008.

#### US renewable energy production’s expanding

E2, 13, Environmental Entrepreneurs (E2), “2012 Clean Energy Jobs Year-in-Review and Fourth Quarter Report,” March 2013, http://www.e2.org/ext/doc/E2CleanEnergy2012YearEndandQ4.pdf

The solar industry continues to mature globally, and it is one of the fastest-growing sectors of the U.S. economy. Solar is projected to show a gain of more than 40 percent in new total capacity in 2012 in the United States. Because of this overall growth, solar had strong fourth quarter job announcements relative to other industries. In the fourth quarter, solar led the way with a combined 15 announced projects in power generation and manufacturing. This is more than all the other technologies (wind, biomass, biogas, geothermal) E2 tracked in the power generation and manufacturing categories combined. These solar projects could add up to more than 3,300 jobs, the majority coming from power generation.¶ Throughout 2012, one of the main solar industry themes was rapid solar PV price decline due to oversupply.3 Upstream oversupply is helping to lower installed cost of solar across the country. Also helping drive down costs is the U.S. Solar Investment Tax Credit, as well as state and locally mandated renewable portfolio standards.

## K

### FW

#### Engagement with technocracy is more effective than passive rejection

Jiménez-Aleixandre 2, professor of education – University of Santiago de Compostela, and Pereiro-Muñoz High School Castelao, Vigo (Spain) (Maria-Pilar and Cristina, “Knowledge producers or knowledge consumers? Argumentation and decision making about environmental management,” International Journal of Science Education Vol. 24, No. 11, p. 1171–1190)

If science education and environmental education have as a goal to develop **critical thinking and** to promote **decision making**, it seems that the acknowledgement of a variety of experts and expertise is of relevance to both. **Otherwise citizens could be unable to challenge a common view** that places economical issues and technical features over other types of values or concerns. As McGinn and Roth (1999) argue, citizens should be prepared to participate in scientific practice, to be involved in situations where science is, if not created, at least used. The assessment of environmental management is, in our opinion, one of these, and citizens do not need to possess all the technical knowledge to be able to examine the positive and negative impacts and to weigh them up. The identification of instances of scientific practice in classroom discourse is difficult especially if this practice is viewed as a complex process, not as fixed ‘steps’. Several instances were identified when it could be said that students acted as a knowledge-producing community in spite of the fact that the students, particularly at the beginning of the sequence, expressed doubts about their capacities to assess a project written by experts and endorsed by a government office. Perhaps these doubts relate to the nature of the project, a ‘real life’ object that made its way into the classroom, into the ‘school life’. As Brown et al. (1989) point out, there is usually a difference between practitioners’ tasks and stereotyped school tasks and, it could be added, students are not used to being confronted with the complexity of ‘life-size’ problems. However, as the sequence proceeded, **the students assumed the role of experts**, exposing inconsistencies in the project, offering alternatives and discussing it with one of its authors. The issue of expertise is worthy of attention and it needs to be explored in different contexts where the relationships among technical expertise, values hierarchies and possible biases caused by the subject matter could be unravelled. One of the objectives of environmental education is to **empower people with the capacity of decision making**; for this purpose the acknowledging of multiple expertise is crucial.

### AT: SVio

#### The status quo is structurally improving

Dash 2/4 Co-Founder and Managing Director at Activate, a new kind of strategy consultancy that advises companies about the opportunities at the intersection of technology and media co-founder and CEO of ThinkUp, which shows you how to be better at using your social networks, publisher, editor and owner of Dashes.com, my personal blog where I've been publishing continuously since 1999, entrepreneur, writer and geek living in New York City (Anil Dash, 4 February 2013, “THE WORLD IS GETTING BETTER. QUICKLY.,” http://dashes.com/anil/2013/02/the-world-is-getting-better-quickly.html)

The world is getting better, faster, than we could ever have imagined. For those of us who are fortunate enough to live in wealthy communities or countries, we have a common set of reference points we use to describe the world's most intractable, upsetting, unimaginable injustices. Often, we only mention these horrible realities in minimizing our own woes: "Well, that's annoying, but it's hardly as bad as children starving in Africa." Or "Yeah, this is important, but it's not like it's the cure for AIDS." Or the omnipresent description of any issue as a "First World Problem". But let's, for once, look at **the** actual **data** around developing world problems. Not our condescending, world-away displays of **emotion**, or our slacktivist tendencies to see a retweet as meaningful action, but the actual numbers and metrics about how progress is happening for the world's poorest people. Though metrics and measurements are always fraught and flawed, Gates' single biggest emphasis was the idea that measurable progress and metrics are necessary for any meaningful improvements to happen in the lives of the world's poor. So how are we doing? THE WORLD HAS CHANGED The results are astounding. Even if we caveat that every measurement is imprecise, that billionaire philanthropists are going to favor data that strengthens their points, and that some of the most significant problems are difficult to attach metrics to, it's inarguable that the past two decades have seen the greatest leap forward in the lives of the global poor in the history of humanity. Some highlights: Children are 1/3 less likely to die before age five than they were in 1990. The global childhood mortality rate for kids under 5 has dropped from 88 in 1000 in 1990 to 57 in 1000 in 2010. The global infant mortality rate for kids dying before age one has plunged from 61 in 1000 to 40 in 1000. Now, any child dying is of course one child too many, but this is astounding progress to have made in just twenty years. In the past 30 years, the percentage of children who receive key immunizations such as the DTP vaccine has quadrupled. The percentage of people in the world living on less than $1.25 per day has been cut in half since 1990, ahead of the schedule of the Millennium Development Goals which hoped to reach this target by 2015. The number of deaths to tuberculosis has been cut 40% in the past twenty years. The consumption of ozone-depleting substances has been cut 85% globally in the last thirty years. The percentage of urban dwellers living in slums globally has been cut from 46.2% to 32.7% in the last twenty years. And there's more progress in hunger and contraception, in sustainability and education, against AIDS and illiteracy. After reading the Gates annual letter and following up by reviewing the UN's ugly-but-data-rich Millennium Development Goals statistics site, I was surprised by how much progress has been made in the years since I've been an adult, and just how little I've heard about the big picture despite the fact that I'd like to keep informed about such things. I'm not a pollyanna — there's a lot of work to be done. But I can personally attest to the profound effect that basic improvements like clean drinking water can have in people's lives. Today, we often use the world's biggest problems as metaphors for impossibility. But the evidence shows that, actually, we're really good at solving even the most intimidating challenges in the world. What we're lacking is the ability to communicate effectively about how we make progress, so that we can galvanize even more investment of resources, time and effort to tackling the problems we have left.

### Alt Fails

#### The alt’s all-or-nothing choice fails --- small reforms like the plan are key to institutional change and getting others to sign on to the alt

Erik Olin Wright 7, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

5. Waystations¶ The final guideline for discussions of envisioning real utopias concerns the importance of waystations. The central problem of envisioning real utopias concerns the **viability of institutional alternatives** that embody emancipatory values, but the practical achievability of such institutional designs often **depends upon the existence of smaller steps**, intermediate institutional innovations **that move us in the right direction but only partially embody these values.** Institutional proposals which have an **all-or-nothing quality** to them are both **less likely to be adopted in the first place, and may pose more difficult transition-cost problems** if implemented. The catastrophic experience of Russia in the “shock therapy” approach to market reform is historical testimony to this problem.¶ Waystations are a difficult theoretical and practical problem because there are many instances in which partial reforms may have very different consequences than full- bodied changes. Consider the example of unconditional basic income. Suppose that a very limited, below-subsistence basic income was instituted: not enough to survive on, but a grant of income unconditionally given to everyone. One possibility is that this kind of basic income would act mainly as a subsidy to employers who pay very low wages, since now they could attract more workers even if they offered below poverty level¶ earnings. There may be good reasons to institute such wage subsidies, but they would not generate the positive effects of a UBI, and therefore might not function as a stepping stone.¶ What we ideally want, therefore, are **intermediate reforms** that have two main properties: first, they concretely **demonstrate the virtues of the fuller program of transformation, so they contribute to the ideological battle of convincing people that the alternative is credible and desirable;** and second, they **enhance the capacity for action of people**, increasing their ability to push further in the future. Waystations that increase popular participation and **bring people together in problem-solving deliberations** for collective purposes are particularly salient in this regard. This is what in the 1970s was called “nonreformist reforms”: reforms that are **possible within existing institutions** and that **pragmatically solve real problems** while at the same time **empowering people in ways which** **enlarge their scope of action in the future.**