### 1NC—Topicality

#### Energy production means extraction and conversion of energy into power

DCEE of Australia ‘11 [“Energy Production and Consumption,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/publications/supplementary-guidelines/energy-production-consumption.aspx]

Production of energy: in relation to a facility, means the:

1. extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility
2. manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility, or for use other than in the operation of the facility (regulation 2.23(3) NGER Regulations).

#### “Incentives for energy production” is performance-based—excludes investment cost incentives

Rosner & Goldberg 11 (Robert, William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics, and the College at the U of Chicago, and Stephen, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, "Small Modular Reactors - Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.," November 2011, [https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf], jam)

Capital Cost Incentive: A capital cost incentive would reduce the effective overnight capital cost through either direct government cost sharing or through an investment tax credit. 41 There are policy precedents for both. DOE provides direct cost sharing for demonstration projects involving FOAK coal generation technology under the Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI). Congress provided a capital cost incentive for renewable energy projects in the form of an Investment Tax Credit (ITC), which currently can be converted to an upfront cash grant. 42 Capital cost incentives help “buy down” the initial capital cost of SMR deployments, thus reducing the capital recovery requirements that would otherwise be reflected in the LCOE. A direct buy-down of the capital cost protects project sponsors against construction risk for SMRs by shifting a portion of that risk to the government. It also shifts performance risk from the project sponsor to the federal government, i.e., the federal government pays the capital cost incentive regardless of whether the project performs as planned or not. In the case of SMRs, shifting a portion of performance risk from the SMR community to the government also may adversely impact the risk-reward structure guiding the learning process. For example, a capital cost incentive for SMRs would be fixed, regardless of whether the investment achieved the estimated learning performance. Consequently, capital cost incentives were not incorporated into the business case analysis for SMRs. x Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets. 43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following: 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit.

#### Restrictions are explicitly codified limitations

Gerald Hill 12, The People’s Law Dictionary, http://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1835

Restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations, such organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions" intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property which are recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### Restrictions are ON production

Dictionary.com no date on. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved September 26, 2012, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on

16. (used to indicate a source or a person or thing that serves as a source or agent): a duty on imported goods; She depends on her friends for encouragement.

#### Plan just changes licensing authority—It’s a voting issue

#### Limits—modifying tax structures explodes research base—deprives us of generic spending links and CPs and lets them claim unpredictable advantages—lowering Warren Buffet’s taxes would be a topical aff

#### Education—distracts from core comparative debates about mechanism effectiveness like incentives vs mandates

#### Vagueness—They aren’t saying what specific restrictions they’re removing; Independent voter makes the aff a moving target because they can always shift.

#### Competing interps is best—most fair and objective

### 1NC—Politics

#### Immigration reform passes—Obama’s pushing—key to draw high skilled tech workers back to the US

Reuters 1-29 “Immigration Reform To Provide Net Benefit To U.S. Economy: Experts,” 1/29/2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/29/immigration-reform-economic-boost\_n\_2571414.html?utm\_hp\_ref=business

NEW YORK, Jan 29 (Reuters) - The sluggish U.S. economy could get a lift if President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of senators succeed in what could be the biggest overhaul of the nation's immigration system since the 1980s. Relaxed immigration rules could encourage entrepreneurship, increase demand for housing, raise tax revenues and help reduce the budget deficit, economists said. By helping more immigrants enter the country legally and allowing many illegal immigrants to remain, the United States could help offset a slowing birth rate and put itself in a stronger demographic position than aging Europe, Japan and China. "Numerous industries in the United States can't find the workers they need, right now even in a bad economy, to fill their orders and expand their production as the market demands," said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration specialist at the libertarian Cato Institute. The emerging consensus among economists is that immigration provides a net benefit. It increases demand and productivity, helps drive innovation and lowers prices, although there is little agreement on the size of the impact on economic growth. President Barack Obama plans to launch his second-term push for a U.S. immigration overhaul during a visit to Nevada on Tuesday and will make it a high priority to win congressional approval of a reform package this year, the White House said. The chances of major reforms gained momentum on Monday when a bipartisan group of senators agreed on a framework that could eventually give 11 million illegal immigrants a chance to become American citizens. Their proposals would also include means to keep and attract workers with backgrounds in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This would be aimed both at foreign students attending American universities where they are earning advanced degrees and high-tech workers abroad. An estimated 40 percent of scientists in the United States are immigrants and studies show immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses, said Nowrasteh. Boosting legal migration and legalizing existing workers could add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years, estimates Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a specialist in immigration policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. That's an annual increase of 0.8 percentage points to the economic growth rate, currently stuck at about 2 percent.

#### Wind incites massive Congressional controversy

Carney ‘12 (Timothy P., senior political columnist at the Washington Examiner, "Wind lobby strives to adapt to Tea Party era," 2012, [washingtonexaminer.com/article/1273946], jam)

The Tea Party has weakened the clout of the wind lobby, and imperiled the industry's prized political possession -- a billion-dollar "Production Tax Credit." Leaked documents show how the lobby is trying to adapt to Republican power. The American Wind Energy Association's 2011 annual report and related documents were quietly posted on the Internet last week by a wind power opponent upset by windmills' negative impact on birds. The documents show the lobby's efforts to frame its opponents as tax hikers, and to use opposition research against subsidy critics, some of whom it classifies as "libertarian free-market fundamentalists." One of AWEA's strongest responses to the 2010 GOP takeover of the House was to hire Republican strategist Mike Murphy, whose past clients include John McCain, Mitt Romney and Jeb Bush. Murphy's Revolution Agency came on to help with AWEA's top legislative priority: extending the federal Production Tax Credit for renewable energy. The PTC reduces a windmill owner's corporate income tax by 2.2 cents for every kilowatt-hour generated. "AWEA's message and champions have largely resided on the left," the Revolution Agency stated in a strategy memo included in AWEA's 2011 annual report. So the 2010 elections required AWEA to "pivot" from "green energy and Obama to jobs, manufacturing, business investment, and Conservative Republicans," while still "taking care not to erode base support from the left." One core problem, the memo explained: The "debt-strapped, partisan, and Tea Party-infused Congress is reflexively skeptical of subsidies and many outside the windy red states have an inherently negative sentiment toward renewable energy." So how do you convince fiscally conservative Republicans to preserve a subsidy for green energy? "The campaign must define the failure to reauthorize the PTC as a tax hike with resulting negative implications for American jobs," Murphy's agency explained. For instance, Revolution agency suggested AWEA give out a "Taxpayer Protector Award" to congressmen backing the credit. Murphy's group also suggested "reaching out to a credible conservative tax advocate voice like Grover Norquist," president of Americans for Tax Reform. Norquist has recently opposed the abolition of some special energy tax credits. But he and ATR endorsed legislation last year that would end all energy tax credits, including the PTC, because it would also lower rates. Norquist told me Thursday that he hadn't heard from AWEA on the PTC. To persuade the grassroots, Murphy and his colleagues suggested advertising on sites such as RushLimbaugh.com, Hannity.com, GlennBeck.com, and FoxNews.com. Winning over Republican staff would not be easy, Revolution warned. "Among the GOP staffers, there is a strong ideological tilt and they're inclined to view renewable energy with skepticism." Specifically, Murphy's agency instructed AWEA not to pit wind energy against fossil fuels. One reason: "Fossil fuels and coal have spent so much time and money programming these Staffers."

#### Immigration reform key to US-Mexico relations – Mexican economy and human rights

Mares and Vega Cánovas 10 (David, political science professor at UCSD, and Gustavo, Visiting Chair in Mexican Studies at U. Texas and Director of the Center for International Studies at El Colegio de Mexico. “The US-Mexico Relationship: Towards a New Era?” US Mexico Working Papers, April 2010. <http://usmex.ucsd.edu/assets/024/11635.pdf>) will

Liberalization of migration flows remains, without doubt the toughest issue within North ¶ America. Whenever North American integration is debated, migration questions attract the ¶ spotlight, especially as they pertain to Mexico and the United States. Before tackling the most ¶ difficult migration questions, however, we believe that progress can be achieved on several ¶ lesser questions¶ First, Mexico and the US can make quick progress on a subject where they share ¶ common interests, namely the creation of a more efficient system for the free flow of legitimate ¶ travelers among the two countries. The smart border concept negotiated between Canada and the ¶ United States and Mexico and the US contains two useful ideas: high-tech identity cards for ¶ permanent residents, using biometric identifiers; and pre-clearance programs for frequent ¶ travelers. Border crossings will be faster for these persons; meanwhile, the immigration ¶ authorities can focus their attention on unknown travelers. ¶ Second, the US and Mexico can make it easier for their citizens to retire anywhere in ¶ North America. NAFTA retirement visas should be readily available, as a companion to the TN ¶ visas used by firms to relocate their employees within North America. More important, P a g e | 26¶ Medicare and similar health benefits should be made portable within North America. An ¶ American retired in Guadalajara should be able to spend her Medicare benefits at an approved ¶ clinic in that city. The same principle should apply to a Canadian retired in West Palm Beach, ¶ or a Mexican retired in Vancouver.¶ Finally, and most difficult between Mexico and the United States, is the looming issue of ¶ undocumented Mexican workers. Within this category are two groups: those who already reside ¶ in the United States, a group whose number reached between 4.5 and 5 million in the last decade ¶ and those who will, in the future, come to the United States to work. While important ¶ distinctions can be made between the two groups (a point we discuss later) the whole issue of ¶ unauthorized immigration is highly charged. ¶ On the Mexican side, the government considers the legalization of immigrant workers a ¶ matter of human rights and social justice – and a necessary step in the economic integration of ¶ North America. In terms of economic benefits, legalization will help ensure that the Mexican ¶ economy receives a growing flow of worker remittances (now running about $20 billion a year). ¶ The legalization of millions of Mexicans working in the United States will moreover improve ¶ their economic prospects, and enable many to return to Mexico as successful entrepreneurs. ¶ On the United States side, feelings are equally strong. Some Americans flat out oppose ¶ any increase in immigration. More immediately, the attack on September 11 and the subsequent ¶ deterioration of the U.S. economy damped discussions of a “Grand Bargain” that started in the ¶ Administration and Congress in the fall of 2001. The recession and rising unemployment gave ¶ fresh impetus to groups that oppose the opening of the border to migrant workers. ¶ What does this imply for a new policy on immigration?P a g e | 27¶ Public debate and policy in the US are deadlocked over how to balance the objectives of ¶ ending unauthorized flows, resolving the status of undocumented residents, enhancing immigrant ¶ integration and providing for labor needs – in addition to setting desirable levels of legal ¶ immigration and the criteria for admission.¶ On the other hand, widespread agreement exists along the border that some type of ¶ formal worker registration program is necessary. The current state of affairs forces hard working ¶ persons to face the uncertainties of a north-of-the-border “informal underground labor market,” ¶ which is at best, an inefficient arrangement. Since the benefits of illegal migration are nationally ¶ distributed, federal financial support to county and municipal agencies facing excess ¶ expenditures due to non-resident social service provision would be appropriate.¶ One way to tackle the migration issue is to start with an expanded number of legal visas, ¶ say 300,000 persons from Mexico annually. Additional visas should be issued on a work skill ¶ basis (including unskilled workers), not on a family reunification basis (the dominant test for ¶ current visas). However – and this is where security is underlined – to obtain a temporary work ¶ permit, the Mexican applicant will have to undergo a background check designed to avert ¶ security threats. Once inside the United States, temporary permit holders would need ¶ periodically to inform the Immigration and Naturalization Service electronically of their address ¶ and place of employment. Permit holders could renew their permits as long as they were ¶ employed a certain number of months (say eight months) in each rolling twelve-month period, ¶ had no felony convictions, and reported regularly to the INS. They could apply for residency ¶ after a certain number of years (say a cumulative five years as temporary permit holders). In the ¶ meantime, they should accumulate public Social Security and Medicare rights, as well as any ¶ private health or pension benefits. P a g e | 28¶ Coupled with this substantial, but closely regulated, increase in temporary work permits, ¶ the United States and Mexico should embark on a joint border patrol program to reduce the flow ¶ of illegal crossings. The program should include features such as enhanced use of electronic ¶ surveillance, and ineligibility for a temporary work permit for three years after an illegal ¶ crossing, No border patrol program will eliminate illegal crossings, but a joint program, coupled ¶ with a substantial temporary work permit initiative, could reduce the flow.¶ That leaves the very difficult question of perhaps 5 million undocumented Mexicans living ¶ and working in the United States. We do not have a magic solution. The foundation for our ¶ tentative suggestions is the proposition that nearly all these people have made permanent homes ¶ in the United States and they are not going to pick up their lives and return to Mexico. Under a ¶ set of appropriate circumstances, therefore, they should be granted residence permits with ¶ eligibility for citizenship. The appropriate circumstances we envisage have two components – a ¶ threshold relating to illegal crossings, and standards for individual applicants.

#### US-Mexico relations key to prevent terrorism

Alden et al 9 (Edward Alden, Senior Fellow at CFR, and Director of CFR’s US Immigration Policy Report. Chairs: Jeb Bush, former FL governor, and Thomas McLarty, former Chief of Staff to President Clinton and senior international fellow at the Chamber of Commerce. Task force members included Allen Goodman, president of the Institute of International Education and former Foreign Service professor at Georgetown, Gordon Hanson, professor of economics at UCSD, Robert Putnam, professor of public policy at Harvard, Andrew Selee, director of the Wilson Center’s Mexico Institute and professor of government at Johns Hopkins, Margaret Stock, former professor of law at West Point, and Raul Yzaguirre, professor of practice in community development and civil rights at ASU. “US Immigration Policy” Independent Task Force Report No. 63, Council on Foreign Relations 2009 <http://www.cfr.org/immigration/us-immigration-policy/p20030>) will

Immigration is the most important issue in one of America’s most¶ important bilateral relationships, with its Mexican neighbor. For that¶ reason alone, the United States needs to take a renewed look at the¶ impact its immigration policies have beyond its borders.¶ For many in the United States, the immigration issue is almost¶ entirely about Mexico, and not without some reason. Mexico is by far¶ the largest source of immigrants to the United States, both those who¶ come legally and those who come illegally, and it is the transit country¶ for many immigrants from Central America, which is the second biggest¶ source of undocumented migrants. About eleven million Mexicans represent¶ more than 30 percent of the foreign-born population currently¶ living in the United States. And the numbers have grown steadily in¶ recent decades. As a share of Mexico’s national population, the number¶ of Mexican immigrants living in the United States was just 1.5 percent¶ in 1970 but more than 10 percent in 2005.80 In 2007, Mexicans living¶ abroad, mostly in the United States, sent home approximately $24 billion¶ in remittances.81 The size of the migration flows from Mexico is¶ enough to give it a central place in any discussion of broader U.S. immigration¶ policies.¶ Since the enactment of NAFTA in 1994, the U.S. and Mexican¶ economies have become ever more closely linked; some 85 percent of¶ Mexico’s exports come to the United States, and Mexico is the second¶ largest market for U.S. exports after Canada. American companies provide¶ more than 60 percent of all foreign direct investment in Mexico, and bilateral trade has tripled in the last two decades. As a result of this¶ unique combination of large trade and migratory flows to the United¶ States, Mexico has been most keenly and deeply affected by the choices¶ the United States has made about immigration. Conversely, the United¶ States has most keenly and deeply felt the impact of Mexican policies¶ that have contributed to the vast northward migration, in particular¶ that country’s failure to lift its economy fast enough to provide enough¶ jobs for its citizens at home.¶ Mexico, along with Canada, is also a vitally important part of U.S.¶ homeland security policies aimed at keeping terrorists from carrying¶ out another successful attack in the United States. The United States¶ and Mexico have cooperated closely in trying to make certain that terrorist¶ groups do not use Mexico as a transit route into this country. Some¶ of the efforts on this front have not received much public attention, yet¶ both Mexico and the United States have clearly recognized their strong¶ common interest in counterterrorism initiatives. The Mexican government¶ is acutely aware that, were there to be an attack in which terrorists¶ used Mexico as a transit country to the United States, the inevitable¶ U.S. reaction would be enormously damaging to Mexico’s economy.¶ The countries have also deepened their cooperation to deal with the¶ huge and persistent problem of illegal drugs, which has spawned deadly¶ violence on the Mexican side of the border as warring drug cartels have¶ found themselves under greater pressure from the Mexican government.¶ The administration of Mexican president Felipe Calderón has¶ been willing to work more closely with the United States, including¶ military-to-military cooperation, than any previous Mexican government.¶ The United States in turn has pledged $1.4 billion in weapons and¶ training under the Merida Initiative to help the Mexican government in¶ its war with the drug cartels, though most of the promised assistance¶ has yet to be disbursed. The Obama administration recently announced¶ significant new efforts to stem the flow of cash and weapons from the¶ United States to the cartels in Mexico, and has publicly acknowledged¶ that the United States needs to step up efforts to reduce the demand for¶ illegal drugs that is fueling the cartels.¶ The Task Force finds that Mexico represents a special case for U.S. immigration¶ policy. Because of the size of the cross-border labor flows, its close¶ economic integration with the United States, and the implications for U.S.¶ homeland security, the U.S-Mexico relationship on migration issues is particularly¶ important for American foreign policy interests.

### 1NC—Heidegger

#### The affirmative's obsession with storing energy casts nature into standing-reserve, naturalizing its annihilation and holding Being hostage in an architecture of technology.

Sinnerbrink 2012 (Robert, Prof. Phil @ Macquarie Univ., "Ereignis, Technology, Art: Poetic Dwelling in the Later Heidegger," Scholar, Pp. 7) CJQ

An important aspect of this inappropriate challenging-forth in modern technology is that it is always geared towards expediting, that is, unlocking and exposing, the latent energies in nature in the service of maximizing efficiency: "i.e., toward driving on to maximum yield at the minimum expense".20 But this process is not only discernible in the technological approach to Nature; it is also present in the challenging-forth of energies in our social, cultural, and political environments. Here we could mention the production of energy resources and commodities for technical use and market consumption, the endless circulation of investment, stocks, and information within the networks of global capital, but also the manipulation of so-called "human resources" available on-call for use within social institutions and economic processes. Modem technology must therefore be understood as a way of revealing that has the character of a setting-upon both nature and culture, and that it functions in general by the excessive challenging-forth of energies to be extracted and stored. The technological mode of challenging-forth comprises a dynamic process of the unlocking, transforming, storing, and networking of energies in an endless cycle of production and consumption whose aim is self-perpetuation and immanent expansion (the new global economy is thus perhaps the most powerful instance of Heideggerian Gestell). This endless cycle of technological production and consumption involves constant regulating and securing, the "chief characteristics" of the technological mode of revealing the world.21 The kind of truth revealed in this way Heidegger calls Bestand or "standing-reserve"; modern technology reveals beings in the world exclusively in the mode of resources available for use. "Everywhere everything is ordered to stand by, to be immediately on hand, indeed to stand there just so that it may be on call for a further ordering. Bestand designates the technological mode of revealing the world through the violent challenging forth of its energies, transforming reality into a permanently ordered and available stock of resources.

#### This renders everything as tools of total mobilization: Metaphysics challenges-forth Dasein to consume and destroy Being in every possible way, culminating in the endless annihilation of Being.

Joronen 2011 (Mikko, Dept. of Geography, U. of Turku, Finland, “Dwelling in the Sites of Finitude: Resisting the Violence of the Metaphysical Globe,” Antipode, 0(0).)

Although it is rather evident that machination proposes a violent unfolding of things by its way of total ordering and manipulation, machination is also an epiphenomenon of a broader mechanism of ontological violence specific to all the metaphysical ways of moulding the world. As metaphysics machination possesses violence by forcing beings into its total mould of unfolding and thus does not let beings self emerge but violently encloses them in its own ground. Nonetheless, a discussion about violence, especially in the context of metaphysics, may sound unnecessary, even obscure, or at least it may evoke a derogatory sense. Intuitively violence seems as something concrete while metaphysics does not. Heidegger, however, as will be shown in more detail, does not merely move the issue of violence from the concrete tragedies to the metaphysical domain, as Hardt and Negri (2000:46), for instance, seem to worry, but better reads metaphysics, to use Slavoj ˇ Ziˇzek’s words, as corresponding to an ontological domain of “systemic violence”. As ˇ Ziˇzek further specifies (2007:68–70), it was “implicitly, but clearly” Heidegger’s achievement to show that the violence of metaphysical grounding needs to be understood as something that, by opening up a domain of disclosure for concrete things, grounds the outbursts of physical and ontic violence. Hence, we cannot categorise this realm of violence as merely ontological: by imposing a certain mould of the world metaphysical violence offers an ontological grounding of the social relations of domination.

#### The alternative is to interrupt the technological metaphysics of modernity by rejecting the affirmative.

#### Rejection exposes the abyssal ground of Being—we experience ontology without the technics of calculative power.

Joronen 2011 (Mikko, Dept. of Geography, U. of Turku, Finland, “Dwelling in the Sites of Finitude: Resisting the Violence of the Metaphysical Globe,” Antipode, 0(0).)

In its most basic sense, the word Gelassenheit, the letting-be, refers to human “release” from the manipulative moulding of things, and thus, to the recognition and rejection of the rule of the prevailing ground of being, the power of machination (eg K¨aufer 2005:488; Zimmerman 1993:241). Through its letting-be the calculative power of machination, its one-track course of manipulative and ever-more-exploiting handling of nature (the “earth” of things), and ourselves, becomes simply rejected. Nevertheless, as Sch¨urmann (1978:16) reminds us, in German the “lassen” of Gelassenheit means only secondarily “to abandon”, “to reject” or “to ignore”, and primarily “to let” or “to let be”. Hence, it is not just the rejection and abandonment of the power of machination, but also letting-of-the-transformation-of-being into such “other beginning” where being unfolds as power-free, as a modality other than violence and power, and thus, where the earth is not forced under our orderings and calculations but rather where earth’s leading strings are followed. Our power-free letting-be thereby indicates a double sense, a doubleway of resisting: by rejecting the willfull power and by permissive letting of fundamental transformation based on abyssal being and self-emergence of things on earth. According to the first sense of rejecting, letting-be indicates a radical negation of the domain of the power of machination, a negation that interrupts its total and perfectly functioning unfolding (cf. Davis 2007:303). In its first sense, then, Gelassenheit means a leap that breaks open in the midst of the planetary power of machination through negation, by rejecting. It happens as a breaking open into the primordial freedom of abyssal being, into the openness prior to the freedoms and acts of a subject. Thus, this comportment of rejecting eventually brings out the abyssal groundlessness of being, which according to Heidegger works as an abundant reservoir that “grants us the possibility of dwelling [. . .] in a totally different way” (1966a:55). In its second sense, then, Gelassenheit intimates a possibility of a mode of being radically other than willing, a release from the grasp of limitless power- and profitseeking, a futural force of transformation that eventually offers what Heidegger calls the “other beginning” based on abyssal “time-spaceplay” of the Event of being (see Heidegger 1958:188, 2000:4, 60–61, 181, 2006:84–86).

#### Ontology comes first and inevitable—Interpretations of Being undermine all thought, the plan is not politics but it’s philosophy

Dillon 1999 (Michael, “The Scandal of the Refugee: Some Reflections on the ‘Inter’ of International Relations and Continental Thought," Pp. 97-99)

As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other-regional-modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate through the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock-innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

### 1NC—Counterplan

#### The United States Department of the Treasury should clarify through a revenue ruling that that income from wind power production equipment is Real Estate Investment Trust-eligible.

#### REITs solve investment restructuring—generates large scale energy development—empirics

Mormann and Reicher ’12 Felix Mormann and Dan Reicher, Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance at Stanford Law and Business, “Smarter Finance for Cleaner Energy: Open Up Master Limited Partnerships (MLPs) and Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs) to Renewable Energy Investment,” Brookings Institute, November 2012, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20clean%20energy%20investment.pdf

REITs, meanwhile, have a total market capitalization of over $440 billion, with recent Internal Revenue Service “private letter rulings” blazing a trail for investment in gas pipelines, power transmission, and other energy-related projects. With average shareholder dividends of approximately 9 percent, REITs raised over $50 billion in 2011 alone, including some for traditional energy and infrastructure projects, and overall more capital than all U.S. clean energy investment for that year.

#### CP avoids congressional action—aff doesn’t

Mormann and Reicher ’12 Felix Mormann, and Dan Reicher, “Smarter Finance for Cleaner Energy: Open Up Master Limited Partnerships (MLPs) and Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs) to Renewable Energy Investment,” Brookings Institute, November 2012, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/11/13%20federalism/13%20clean%20energy%20investment.pdf

REITs could be opened for renewable energy investment through executive or legislative action. Executive action would require the Department of Treasury to clarify—through project-specific private letter rulings or, preferably, a broadly applicable “revenue ruling”—that renewable power generation equipment qualifies as real property under the tax code and that income from these assets, including from the sale of electricity, is considered REIT-eligible income. The same clarification could also be made through a legislative amendment to the federal tax code. Use of MLPs for renewable energy projects would require legislative action, such as the amendments proposed by the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act. Current law specifically prohibits MLP investment in “inexhaustible” natural resources, leaving little room for statutory interpretation that would make renewables MLP-eligible.

### 1NC—Solvency

#### The plan increases wind power investment by 5.6 billion max

**DiMugno 12** A 1AC card they used to read (Laura, editor, writer and journalist work has spanned areas including energy, the environment, travel, and technology, North American Wind Power, “UPDATED: New Legislation Could Unlock Billions Of Dollars In Wind Energy Investment,” June 7, 2012, <http://www.nawindpower.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.9961//wyo-mm>)

Opening up an investment vehicle long used in fossil-fuel markets to renewable energy resources could unlock billions of dollars in wind energy investment, according to a new report released by the Maguire Energy Institute at Southern Methodist University. According to the study, federal tax-code restrictions currently limit investment in renewable energy infrastructure by $5 billion to $6 billion while, at the same time, prohibiting thousands of jobs from being created. If the federal production tax credit for wind energy is not renewed beyond the end of this year, up to $15 billion in private investment could disappear. Absent support for renewables at the federal level, the market will have to find other ways to keep the industry afloat and the capital flowing. One way to secure that investment could be through master limited partnerships (MLPs), in which regular investors are allowed to purchase shares in publicly traded partnerships just like stock shares. MLPs have been a key investment tool in the oil and gas industries since the 1980s, but they are not currently available to renewables such as wind power. MLPs have been quite successful in the energy sector, and as a result, their use has increased dramatically over the past couple of decades. According to the report, in 1996, there were just 12 MLPs, with a market capitalization of about $8 billion. By 2011, those numbers had grown to 75 MLPs representing over $270 billion in market capitalization. Eighty percent of MLPs are in the energy sector, according to the report, but renewables are currently excluded. The study’s authors used financial modeling to expand the MLP structure to include renewable energy, and the results were astounding: Opening up MLPs to renewables could lead to an additional $3.2 billion to $5.6 billion in investment between now and 2021, they said, noting that the specific number would depend on economic and market conditions. According to the report, MLPs are a strong fit for renewable energy investments because power purchase agreements for wind and solar projects are generally long-term contracts that offer cashflow stability.

#### To put this in perspective, that’s a 4% increase in investment

DOE ’12 “Energy Report: U.S. Wind Energy Production and Manufacturing Surges, Supporting Jobs and Diversifying U.S. Energy Economy,” U.S. Department of Energy, 8/14/2012, http://energy.gov/articles/energy-report-us-wind-energy-production-and-manufacturing-surges-supporting-jobs-and

WASHINGTON – The Energy Department released a new report today highlighting strong growth in the U.S. wind energy market in 2011, increasing the U.S. share of clean energy and supporting tens of thousands of jobs, and underscoring the importance of continued policy support and clean energy tax credits to ensure that the manufacturing and jobs associated with this booming global industry remain in America According to the 2011 Wind Technologies Market Report, the United States remained one of the world’s largest and fastest growing wind markets in 2011, with wind power representing a remarkable 32 percent of all new electric capacity additions in the United States last year and accounting for $14 billion in new investment. According the report, the percentage of wind equipment made in America also increased dramatically. Nearly seventy percent of the equipment installed at U.S. wind farms last year – including wind turbines and components like towers, blades, gears, and generators - is now from domestic manufacturers, doubling from 35 percent in 2005. President Obama has made clear that clean, renewable wind energy is a critical part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy that aims to develop more secure, domestic energy sources, while strengthening American manufacturing.

#### Wind’s expensive and inefficient. Err neg—their numbers are industry-biased understatements

Helman 12-21 Christopher Helman, “Why It's The End Of The Line For Wind Power,” Forbes, 12/21/2012 aka the apocalypse, http://www.forbes.com/sites/christopherhelman/2012/12/21/why-its-the-end-of-the-line-for-wind-power/

First off — the windiest places are more often far away from where electricity is needed most, so the costs of building transmission lines is high. So far many wind projects have been able to patch into existing grid interconnections. But, says Taylor, those opportunities are shrinking, and material expansion of wind would require big power line investments. Second, the wind doesn’t blow all the time, so power utilities have found that in order to balance out the variable load from wind they have to invest in keeping fossil-fuel-burning plants on standby. When those plants are not running at full capacity they are not as efficient. Most calculations of the cost of wind power do not take into account the costs per kWh of keeping fossil plants on standby or running at reduced loads. But they should, because it is a real cost of adding clean, green, wind power to the grid. Taylor has crunched the numbers and determined that these elements mean the true cost of wind power is more like double the advertised numbers.

#### Neodynium shortage means no turbine construction

Chandler ‘12 David, MIT News Office, 4/9/12, “Clean energy could lead to scarce materials” <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2012/rare-earth-alternative-energy-0409.html>

As the world moves toward greater use of low-carbon and zero-carbon energy sources, a possible bottleneck looms, according to a new MIT study: the supply of certain metals needed for key clean-energy technologies. Wind turbines, one of the fastest-growing sources of emissions-free electricity, rely on magnets that use the rare earth element neodymium. And the element dysprosium is an essential ingredient in some electric vehicles’ motors. The supply of both elements — currently imported almost exclusively from China — could face significant shortages in coming years, the research found. The study, led by a team of researchers at MIT’s Materials Systems Laboratory — postdoc Elisa Alonso PhD ’10, research scientist Richard Roth PhD ’92, senior research scientist Frank R. Field PhD ’85 and principal research scientist Randolph Kirchain PhD ’99 — [has been published online](http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es203518d) in the journal Environmental Science & Technology, and will appear in print in a forthcoming issue. Three researchers from Ford Motor Company are co-authors. The study looked at 10 so-called “rare earth metals,” a group of 17 elements that have similar properties and which — despite their name — are not particularly rare at all. All 10 elements studied have some uses in high-tech equipment, in many cases in technology related to low-carbon energy. Of those 10, two are likely to face serious supply challenges in the coming years. The biggest challenge is likely to be for dysprosium: Demand could increase by 2,600 percent over the next 25 years, according to the study. Neodymium demand could increase by as much as 700 percent. Both materials have exceptional magnetic properties that make them especially well-suited to use in highly efficient, lightweight motors and batteries. A single large wind turbine (rated at about 3.5 megawatts) typically contains 600 kilograms, or about 1,300 pounds, of rare earth metals. A conventional car uses a little more than one pound of rare earth materials — mostly in small motors, such as those that run the windshield wipers — but an electric car might use nearly 10 times as much of the material in its lightweight batteries and motors. Currently, China produces 98 percent of the world’s rare earth metals, making those metals “the most geographically concentrated of any commercial-scale resource,” Kirchain says. Historically, production of these metals has increased by only a few percent each year, with the greatest spurts reaching about 12 percent annually. But much higher increases in production will be needed to meet the expected new demand, the study shows. China has about 50 percent of known reserves of rare earth metals; the United States also has significant deposits. Mining of these materials in the United States had ceased almost entirely — mostly because of environmental regulations that have increased the cost of production — but improved mining methods are making these sources usable again. Rare earth elements are never found in isolation; instead, they’re mixed together in certain natural ores, and must be separated out through chemical processing. “They’re bundled together in these deposits,” Kirchain says, “and the ratio in the deposits doesn’t necessarily align with what we would desire” for the current manufacturing needs. Neodymium and dysprosium are not the most widely used rare earth elements, but they are the ones expected to see the biggest “pinch” in supplies, Alonso explains, due to projected rapid growth in demand for high-performance permanent magnets. Kirchain says that when they talk about a pinch in the supply, that doesn’t necessarily mean the materials are not available. Rather, it’s a matter of whether the price goes up to a point where certain uses are no longer economically viable. The researchers stress that their study does not mean there will necessarily be a problem meeting demand, but say that it does mean that it will be important to investigate and develop new sources of these materials; to improve the efficiency of their use in devices; to identify substitute materials; or to develop the infrastructure to recycle the metals once devices reach the end of their useful life. The purpose of studies such as this one is to identify those resources for which these developments are most pressing. While the raw materials exist in the ground in amounts that could meet many decades of increased demand, Kirchain says the challenge comes in scaling up supply at a rate that matches expected increases in demand. Developing a new mine, including prospecting, siting, permitting and construction, can take a decade or more. “The bottom line is not that we’re going to ‘run out,’” Kirchain says, “but it’s an issue on which we need focus, to build the supply base and to improve those technologies which use and reuse these materials. It needs to be a focus of research and development.” Barbara Reck, a senior research scientist at Yale University who was not involved in this work, says “the results highlight the serious supply challenges that some of the rare earths may face in a low-carbon society.” The study is “a reminder to material scientists to continue their search for substitutes,” she says, and “also a vivid reminder that the current practice of not recycling any rare earths at end-of-life is unsustainable and needs to be reversed.”

#### Wind power kills unique predators

Ritter 5 [Ritter – staff writer – 1/4/2005 (John, “Wind turbines taking toll on birds of prey,” USA Today, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-01-04-windmills-usat_x.htm>)]

ALTAMONT PASS, Calif. — The big turbines that stretch for miles along these rolling, grassy hills have churned out clean, renewable electricity for two decades in one of the nation's first big wind-power projects. But for just as long, massive fiberglass blades on the more than 4,000 windmills have been chopping up tens of thousands of birds that fly into them, including golden eagles, red-tailed hawks, burrowing owls and other raptors. After years of study but little progress reducing bird kills, environmentalists have sued to force turbine owners to take tough corrective measures. The companies, at risk of federal prosecution, say they see the need to protect birds. "Once we finally realized that this issue was really serious, that we had to solve it to move forward, we got religion," says George Hardie, president of G3 Energy. The size of the annual body count — conservatively put at 4,700 birds — is unique to this sprawling, 50-square-mile site in the Diablo Mountains between San Francisco and the agricultural Central Valley because it spans an international migratory bird route regulated by the federal government. The low mountains are home to the world's highest density of nesting golden eagles. Scientists don't know whether the kills reduce overall bird populations but worry that turbines, added to other factors, could tip a species into decline. "They didn't realize it at the time, but it was just a really bad place to build a wind farm," says Grainger Hunt, an ecologist with the Peregrine Fund who has studied eagles at Altamont.

#### Top level predators key to ecological health

Carey 6 [LiveScience staff writer – 7/19/2006 (Bjorn, “Top predators key to ecosystem survival,” MSNBC, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/13939039>)]

Top-level predators strike fear in the hearts of the animals they stalk. But when a deer is being mauled by a wolf, at least it can know that it's giving its life for the greater good. A new study reveals how ecosystems crumble without the presence of top predators be keeping populations of key species from growing too large. It also provides a cautionary lesson to humans, who often remove top predators from the food chain, setting off an eventual collapse. The study is detailed in the July 20 issue of the journal Nature. The researchers studied eight natural food webs, each with distinct energy channels, or food chains, leading from the bottom of the web to the top. For example, the Cantabrian Sea shelf off the coast of Spain has two distinct energy channels. One starts with the phytoplankton in the water, which are eaten by zooplankton and fish, and so on up to what are called top consumer fish. The second channel starts with detritus that sinks to the sea floor, where it's consumed by crabs and bottom-dwelling fish, which are consumed by higher-up animals until the food energy reaches top-level consumers. The top predators play their role by happily munching away at each channel's top consumers, explained study leader Neil Rooney of the University of Guelph in Canada. "Top predators are kind of like the regulators of the food web—they keep each energy channel in check," Rooney told LiveScience. "The top predator goes back and forth between the channels like a game of Whac-a-Mole," a popular arcade game in which constantly appearing moles are smacked down with a mallet. Constant predation of the top consumers prevents a population from growing larger than the system can support. Boom or bust Removing a top predator can often alter the gentle balance of an entire ecosystem. Here's an example of what can happen: When an area floods permanently and creates a series of islands, not all the islands have enough resources to support top predators. Top consumers are left to gobble up nutrients and experience a reproductive boom. The boom is felt throughout the system, though, as the booming species out-competes others, potentially driving the lesser species to extinction and reducing biodiversity. Rooney refers to this type of ecosystem change as a "boom-and-bust cycle," when one species' population boom ultimately means another will bust. Bigger booms increased chances of a bust. “With each bust, the population gets very close to zero, and its difficult getting back," he said. Human role in 'boom-and-bust' Humans often play a role in initiating boom-and-bust cycles by wiping out the top predator.s For example, after gray wolves were hunted to near extinction in the United States, deer, elk, and other wolf-fearing forest critters had free reign and reproduced willy-nilly, gobbling up the vegetation that other consumers also relied on for food. Or, more recently, researchers found that when fish stocks in the Atlantic Ocean are over fished, jellyfish populations boom. While jellyfish have few predators, removing the fish frees up an abundance of nutrients for the jellyfish to feast on. Ecosystems provide us with the food we eat and help produce breathable air and clean water. But they're generally fragile and operate best when at a stable equilibrium, scientists say. "These are our life support systems," Rooney said. "We're relying on them. This study points to the importance of top predators and that we need to be careful with how we deal with them."

#### Heg collapse inevitable—structural economic weakness

Layne ’12 Christopher Layne, Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, noted neorealist, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the *Pax Americana*,” International Studies Quarterly (2012) 56, 203-213

Contrary to the way their argument was portrayed by many of their critics, the 1980s declinists did not claim either that the United States already had declined steeply, or that it soon would undergo a rapid, catastrophic decline. Rather, they pointed to domestic and economic drivers that were in play and which, over time, would cause American economic power to decline relatively and produce a shift in global distribution of power. The declinists contended that the United States was afflicted by a slow—’’termite’’—decline caused by fundamental structural weaknesses in the American economy.7 Kennedy himself was explicitly looking ahead to the effects this termite decline would have on United States’ world role in the early twenty-first century. As he wrote, ‘‘The task facing American statesman over the next decades. .. is to recognize that broad trends are under way, and that there is a need to ‘manage’ affairs so that the relative erosion of the United States’ position takes place slowly and smoothly, and is not accelerated by policies which bring merely short-term advantage but longer-term disadvantage’’ (Kennedy 1987:534; my emphasis). When one goes back and re-reads what the 1980s declinists pinpointed as the drivers of American decline, their analyses look farsighted because the same drivers of economic decline are at the center of debate today: too much consumption and not enough savings; persistent trade and current account deficits; chronic federal budget deficits and a mounting national debt; and de-industrialization. Over time, 1980s declinists said, the United States’ goals of geopolitical dominance and economic prosperity would collide. Today, their warnings seem eerily prescient. Robert Gilpin’s 1987 description of America’s economic and grand strategic plight could just as easily describe the United States after the Great Recession: With a decreased rate of economic growth and a low rate of national savings, the United States was living and defending commitments far beyond its means. In order to bring its commitments and power back into balance once again, the United States would one day have to cut back further on its overseas commitments, reduce the American standard of living, or decrease domestic productive investment even more than it already had. In the meantime, American hegemony was threatened by a potentially devastating fiscal crisis. (Gilpin 1987:347–348) In the Great Recession’s wake—doubly so since it is far from clear that either the United States or global economies are out of the woods—the United States now is facing the dilemmas that Gilpin and the other declinists warned about.

#### Heg causes Russia and China backlash – leads to extinction

Roberts 10, Paul, former assistant secretary of Treasury, associate editor of WSJ, “The Road to Armageddon,” Foreign Policy Journal, 2/25/10, <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2010/02/26/the-road-to-armageddon>

The U.S. has already encircled Iran with military bases. The U.S. government intends to neutralize China by seizing control over the Middle East and cutting China off from oil. This plan assumes that Russia and China, nuclear armed states, will be intimidated by U.S. anti-missile defenses and acquiesce to U.S. hegemony and that China will lack oil for its industries and military. The U.S. government is delusional. Russian military and political leaders have responded to the obvious threat by declaring NATO a direct threat to the security of Russia and by announcing a change in Russian war doctrine to the pre-emptive launch of nuclear weapons. The Chinese are too confident to be bullied by a washed up American "superpower." The morons in Washington are pushing the envelope of nuclear war. The insane drive for American hegemony threatens life on earth. The American people, by accepting the lies and deceptions of "their" government, are facilitating this outcome.

### Solvency—Natty Gas

#### No wind adoption—natty gas is too cheap

Yergin ’12 Daniel Yergin is chairman and founder of IHS Cambridge Energy Research Associates, is on the U.S. Secretary of Energy advisory board, and chaired the U.S. Department of Energy's Task Force on Strategic Energy Research and Development, interviewed by Brian Dumaine, “Will gas crowd out wind and solar?” CNN, 4/17/2012, http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/17/yergin-gas-solar-wind/?iid=HP\_LN

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

### 1NC—Navy

#### No East Asia war—interdependence and liberalization

Vannarith ’10 Chheang Vannarith, Executive Director of the Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace. PhD in Asia Pacific Studies, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific U, “Asia Pacific Security Issues: Challenges and Adaptive Mechanism,” CICP Policy Brief No. 3, July 2010, http://www.cicp.org.kh/download/CICP%20Policy%20brief/CICP%20Policy%20brief%20No%203.pdf

Some people look to China for economic and strategic interests while others still stick to the US. Since, as a human nature, change is not widely acceptable due to the high level of uncertainty. It is therefore logical to say that most of the regional leaders prefer to see the status quo of security architecture in the Asia Pacific Region in which US is the hub of security provision. But it is impossible to preserve the status quo since China needs to strategically outreach to the wider region in order to get necessary resources especially energy and raw materials to maintain her economic growth in the home country. It is understandable that China needs to have stable high economic growth of about 8 percent GDP growth per year for her own economic and political survival. Widening development gap and employment are the two main issues facing China. Without China, the world will not enjoy peace, stability, and development. China is the locomotive of global and regional economic development and contributes to global and regional peace and stability. It is understandable that China is struggling to break the so-called containment strategy imposed by the US since the post Cold War. Whether this tendency can lead to the greater strategic division is still unknown. Nevertheless, many observers agree that whatever changes may take place, a multi-polar world and multilateralism prevail. The reasons or logics supporting multilateralism are mainly based on the fact that no one country can really address the security issues embedded with international dimension, no one country has the capacity to adapt and adopt to new changes alone, and it needs cooperation and coordination among the nation states and relevant stakeholders including the private sector and civil societies. Large scale interstate war or armed conflict is unthinkable in the region due to the high level of interdependency and democratization. It is believed that economic interdependency can reduce conflicts and prevent war. Democracy can lead to more transparency, accountability, and participation that can reduce collective fears and create more confidence and trust among the people in the region. In addition, globalism and regionalism are taking the center stage of national and foreign policy of many governments in the region except North Korea. The combination of those elements of peace is necessary for peace and stability in the region and those elements are present and being improved in this region.

#### No SCS war

Gupta ’11 Rukmani Gupta, Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses in New Delhi, “South China Sea Conflict? No Way,” The Diplomat, 23 October 2011, <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/10/23/south-china-sea-conflict-no-way/2/>

These suggestions to recalibrate Indian policy towards the South China Sea and its relationship with Vietnam are premature at best. Despite the rhetoric, conflict in the South China Sea may well not be inevitable. If the history of dialogue between the parties is any indication, then current tensions are likely to result in forward movement. In the aftermath of statements by the United States, and skirmishes over fishing vessels, ASEAN and China agreed upon the Guidelines on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea at the Bali Summit in July 2010. And recent tensions may well prod the parties towards a more binding code of conduct. This isn’t to suggest that territorial claims and sovereignty issues will be resolved, but certainly they can become more manageable to prevent military conflict. There’s a common interest in making the disputes more manageable, essentially because, nationalistic rhetoric notwithstanding, the parties to the dispute recognize that there are real material benefits at stake. A disruption of maritime trade through the South China Sea would entail economic losses – and not only for the littoral states. No party to the dispute, including China, has thus far challenged the principle of freedom of navigation for global trade through the South China Sea. The states of the region are signatories to the UNCLOS, which provides that ‘Coastal States have sovereign rights in a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) with respect to natural resources and certain economic activities, and exercise jurisdiction over marine science research and environmental protection’ but that ‘All other States have freedom of navigation and over flight in the EEZ, as well as freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines.’ The prospect of threats to SLOCS thus seems somewhat exaggerated.

#### Heg collapse inevitable—structural economic weakness

Layne ’12 Christopher Layne, Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, noted neorealist, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the *Pax Americana*,” International Studies Quarterly (2012) 56, 203-213

Contrary to the way their argument was portrayed by many of their critics, the 1980s declinists did not claim either that the United States already had declined steeply, or that it soon would undergo a rapid, catastrophic decline. Rather, they pointed to domestic and economic drivers that were in play and which, over time, would cause American economic power to decline relatively and produce a shift in global distribution of power. The declinists contended that the United States was afflicted by a slow—’’termite’’—decline caused by fundamental structural weaknesses in the American economy.7 Kennedy himself was explicitly looking ahead to the effects this termite decline would have on United States’ world role in the early twenty-first century. As he wrote, ‘‘The task facing American statesman over the next decades. .. is to recognize that broad trends are under way, and that there is a need to ‘manage’ affairs so that the relative erosion of the United States’ position takes place slowly and smoothly, and is not accelerated by policies which bring merely short-term advantage but longer-term disadvantage’’ (Kennedy 1987:534; my emphasis). When one goes back and re-reads what the 1980s declinists pinpointed as the drivers of American decline, their analyses look farsighted because the same drivers of economic decline are at the center of debate today: too much consumption and not enough savings; persistent trade and current account deficits; chronic federal budget deficits and a mounting national debt; and de-industrialization. Over time, 1980s declinists said, the United States’ goals of geopolitical dominance and economic prosperity would collide. Today, their warnings seem eerily prescient. Robert Gilpin’s 1987 description of America’s economic and grand strategic plight could just as easily describe the United States after the Great Recession: With a decreased rate of economic growth and a low rate of national savings, the United States was living and defending commitments far beyond its means. In order to bring its commitments and power back into balance once again, the United States would one day have to cut back further on its overseas commitments, reduce the American standard of living, or decrease domestic productive investment even more than it already had. In the meantime, American hegemony was threatened by a potentially devastating fiscal crisis. (Gilpin 1987:347–348) In the Great Recession’s wake—doubly so since it is far from clear that either the United States or global economies are out of the woods—the United States now is facing the dilemmas that Gilpin and the other declinists warned about.

#### No risk or impact to economic decline

Drezner ‘11 Daniel W. Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “Please come down off the ledge, dear readers,” Foreign Policy, 8/12/11, http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/08/12/please\_come\_down\_off\_the\_ledge\_dear\_readers

So, when we last left off this debate, things were looking grim. My concern in the last post was that the persistence of hard times would cause governments to take actions that would lead to a collapse of the open global economy, a spike in general riots and disturbances, and eerie echoes of the Great Depression. Let's assume that the global economy persists in sputtering for a while, because that's what happens after major financial shocks. Why won't these other bad things happen? Why isn't it 1931? Let's start with the obvious -- it's not gonna be 1931 because there's some passing familiarity with how 1931 played out. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has devoted much of his academic career to studying the Great Depression. I'm gonna go out on a limb therefore and assert that if the world plunges into a another severe downturn, it's not gonna be because central bank heads replay the same set of mistakes. The legacy of the Great Depression has also affected public attitudes and institutions that provide much stronger cement for the current system. In terms of [public] attitudes, compare the results of this mid-2007 poll with this mid-2010 poll about which economic system is best. I'll just reproduce the key charts below: The headline of the 2010 results is that there's eroding U.S. support for the global economy, but a few other things stand out. U.S. support has declined, but it's declined from a very high level. In contrast, support for free markets has increased in other major powers, such as Germany and China. On the whole, despite the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression, public attitudes have not changed all that much. While there might be populist demands to "do something," that something is not a return to autarky or anything so [drastic]. Another big difference is that multilateral economic institutions are much more robust now than they were in 1931. On trade matters, even if the Doha round is dead, the rest of the World Trade Organization's corpus of trade-liberalizing measures are still working quite well. Even beyond the WTO, the complaint about trade is not the deficit of free-trade agreements but the surfeit of them. The IMF's resources have been strengthened as a result of the 2008 financial crisis. The Basle Committee on Banking Supervision has already promulgated a plan to strengthen capital requirements for banks. True, it's a slow, weak-assed plan, but it would be an improvement over the status quo. As for the G-20, I've been pretty skeptical about that group's abilities to collectively address serious macroeconomic problems. That is setting the bar rather high, however. One could argue that the G-20's most useful function is reassurance. Even if there are disagreements, communication can prevent them from growing into anything worse. Finally, a note about the possibility of riots and other general social unrest. The working paper cited in my previous post noted the links between austerity measures and increases in disturbances. However, that paper contains the following important paragraph on page 19: [I]n countries with better institutions, the responsiveness of unrest to budget cuts is generally lower. Where constraints on the executive are minimal, the coefficient on expenditure changes is strongly negative -- more spending buys a lot of social peace. In countries with Polity-2 scores above zero, the coefficient is about half in size, and less significant. As we limit the sample to ever more democratic countries, the size of the coefficient declines. For full democracies with a complete range of civil rights, the coefficient is still negative, but no longer significant. This is good news!! The world has a hell of a lot more democratic governments now than it did in 1931. What happened in London, in other words, might prove to be the exception more than the rule. So yes, the recent economic news might seem grim. Unless political institutions and public attitudes buckle, however, we're unlikely to repeat the mistakes of the 1930's. And, based on the data we've got, that's not going to happen.

#### Increasing demand caused by wind causes supply disruptions, global instability and war—turns the advantage

Hinten-Nooijen 10Project manager Centre for Science and Values @ Tilburg University [Dr. Annemarie Hinten-Nooijen, “Rare minerals - The treasures of a sustainable economy,” Asset Magazine, 3/25/2010, [http://www.tilburguniversity.edu/nl/over-tilburg-university/cultuur-en-sport/cwl/publicaties/beschouwingen/minerals](http://www.tilburguniversity.edu/nl/over-tilburg-university/cultuur-en-sport/cwl/publicaties/beschouwingen/minerals///edlee)]

Driving a hybrid car, using energy from wind turbines or solar panels. That are choices to contribute to the transition to a sustainable economy. Sustainability is the spearhead of many western policy plans. It is regarded as the solution to get out of the crisis. But ironically, the raw materials that are needed for hybrid cars and wind turbines, for our technological industry as a whole, are not that sustainable. Necessarily required minerals like neodymium and indium are rare. And they are not available in the west, China has almost all of them. And having this position of power, China wants to use it. That is about strategy. The high-tech raw materials play a central part in the highly industrialised high-wage countries to survive the global competition by technological excellence. Will future wars be about minerals instead of oil, territories or water? THE BONE MARROW OF MODERN ECONOMY Minerals are an indispensable material pillar of our current economies and societies. They are the natural product of geological processes and occur in the crust of the planet. Only a fraction of the known minerals exists in greater quantities. Some of these are mined, refined and processed; are broken up into their elemental components, which are recombined into different types of materials. These materials are used to manufacture products that form the backbone of our modern economies: from LCD displays to fighter jets, from smart phones to electric cars. Without minerals, industrial society and modern technology would be inconceivable. That seems unbelievable, because we hardly hear or read about them in the media - whereas several research reports have been published recently. But imagine that by reading this article on printed paper or at your computer screen, minerals like nickel, chromium, molybdenum, gallium, selenium, aluminium, silicon and manganese were needed! And all these elements have to be first extracted from minerals, which in turn need to be mined from the earth's crust. CHINA'S GREEN DEAL In recent years, the world economy has grown enormously, and many new high-tech applications have been made. Moreover, the demand for minerals has exploded. Mining tried to meet the demand. A global competition between countries and companies over rare mineral resources started. Prices have shot up, countries have created strategic stockpiles or imposed export restrictions in order to secure supplies of these valuable resources. Mineral scarcity concerning the industry seems to be more of an economic issue than an issue set by limited resources. Minerals are getting evermore difficult to find and costly to extract - while they are the key to advanced sustainable technologies. Talking about sustainability seems not talking about China, because China is still building many polluting coal-fired power plants, and the social circumstances there are poor. However, recent developments also show progress concerning sustainability. And in a country like China these developments go faster than in many western democracies. Where we in the west talk and dawdle, they think and act strategically. In the United States, president Obama has to explain the Americans that forms of the New Green Deal are inevitable - like the situation in the thirties of the last century, when President Roosevelt made the so-called New Deal to reform the economy. Many Americans do not want the government to influence the market. They radically believe in the free market. In China, by contrast, the ideological separation between market and government does not exist. There is no Wall Street with greedy bankers, no neoconservative Grand Old Party that dreams of the cowboy economy. Decisions are taken quickly. And besides, they have to feed one billion people and develop a country that lived in Mao-ist poverty before. The Chinese are successful, after all, also in creating a sustainable economy: China does not only build old polluting power stations but uses the latest technology, with CO2- catch and -storage. And they are working on alternatives: windmills. In the next five years, they will build 100,000 windmills in the Gobi desert. Did they hate the wind in that area before, now they consider it the new gold. In the north-west area of China, the province of Gansu, the Qilian-mountains pass into the Gobi desert. There China is building the biggest windmill and solar panel park in the world. Six windmill parks with a capacity of ten gigawatts each are built, making China the biggest market of technology of wind energy, defeating the United States. "Red China becomes green China", party officials are saying. China has to grow, and so has the contribution of wind, water and sun at the energy market. This market would be interesting for foreign investments. According to Chinese officials they are welcome and can get subsidies. But, Beijing has decided that 70 percent of the windmills have to be made and designed in China. So it can be questioned if European and American companies have a fair chance in tendering for a contract. China considers itself a developing country and thinks that the western countries should contribute money to China to reduce the CO2 discharge. While America thought that energy saving is not worthwhile, China has taken an enormous energy-technological lead. The authoritarian and undemocratic but intelligent China exposes a variant of the New Deal. THE OPEC OF THE RARE MINERALS The example of China shows us that sustainable economy has everything to do with strategy and power. In a few decades China has been flooding the market of rare metals. The legend goes that president Deng Xiaoping had already predicted this in 1992, during a tour in the south of China: "They [the Mid East] have oil, but we in China have rare minerals". Nowadays, China indeed has 95 percent of the global supply of rare minerals. How did it do that? It was a result of good strategy: in the nineties, China flooded the world market with the rare minerals, although there was not that much demand. The west thought it okay because getting the minerals was a very expensive production process and the environmental legislation was very strict. The western competitors went bankrupt and they closed their mines. China became powerful. One of the centres of the rare mineral supply is around the city Baotou, an industrial city of two million people in Inner Mongolia. Here the states concern exploits almost half of the world storage of neodymium. DISRUPTION OF THE MARKET The lack of raw materials is not particularly a result of the geological availability but of disruptions in the market, because the developments of the world wide demand for rare minerals are not recognised in time - as part of the stormy development of the Chinese economy and the expansion of technical developments - and because the minerals occur in only a few countries. Experts have predicted that in the next few decades the demand of neodymium will increase by a factor 3.8. China uses 60 percent of its exploitation for its own economy. What's more, the Chinese export quota become stricter every year. What happens? Sudden peaks in the demand can lead to speculative price movements and a disruption of the market. "2010 will be the year of the raw materials", according to Trevor Greetham, Asset Allocation Director of Fidelity. Indium, a silver-white metal, which is not found directly in nature, but is a residual product of thin and zinc, is used in LCD displays for TVs, computers, mobile phones, and for led lights and the ultrathin and flexible solar panel. The price of this mineral multiplied tenfold between 2003 and 2006 from 100 to 980 Dollars per kilogram. The price of neodymium decreased from 11.7 dollar per kilogram in 1992 to 7.4 dollar in 1996. The market volume rose. In 2006 almost all of the world production of 137,000 tons came from China. By scaling back the export, prices rose, up to 60 dollar per kilogram in 2007. Imagine that for a hybrid car, like the Toyota Prius or the Mercedes S 400, you need at least 500 grams of neodymium for the magnetic power of the engine; and for the newest generation of wind turbines, the ones that are 16 meters high, you need about 1000 kilogram. That makes 60,000 dollars - for just a little bit of metal! Big business for China. At the same time, China makes further strategic investments: it took an interest in oil and gas fields. In August 2009, PetroChina paid 41 billion dollar to gain access to an enormous field of natural gas in front of the coast of Australia. And in September that year, it obtained a stake of 60 percent in the exploitation of fields of tar sand in Alberta, which might hold one of the biggest oil reserves in the world. And because China considers titanium a growing market, it took an interest of 70 percent in a titanium mine in Kenia - not only to build the Chinese 'Jumbojet', but also to provide Boeing with 2000 tons of titanium each year. By doing so, China might beat the competition in the battle for the market in green technologies. The 'free' market can be questioned. The mineral policies of China and the US both mention the usage of administrative barriers. These nontariff barriers involve regulations that seek to protect the national mineral extraction industry. As a result, it is much harder for foreign companies, if not impossible, to invest and gain a foothold in the national mineral extraction industry in these countries. The search for rare metals has become a global race: a mine in California has also been reopened, the mine of Mountain Pass. In 2008, it was bought by a group of investors, the partnership 'Molycorp Minerals'. The process of bringing the old mines into use costs much time and money. What does this mean for us? Do we get more dependent of China? The 'Innovation platform' in Rotterdam planned to build a unique windmill park in the sea, further from the coast and in the strongest sea wind than anywhere in the world. To build these windmills, we need rare minerals, the export of which is dominated by China. Part of the project is Darwind, which designed enormous windmills for at sea. But the umbrella company, of which Darwind is part, Econcern, was about to go bankrupt. Then, in mid-August 2009 it was saved by the, surprisingly, Chinese XEMC. THE THREAT OF GEOPOLITICAL INSTABILITY The transition to a sustainable economy involves underexposed elements like deficiency in minerals and shifting balances of power. They are the ideal receipt for geopolitical instability. The new world order will be a balance between countries that do have particular raw materials and ones that do not. The lack of indispensable minerals sharpens the relations in the world. The access to critical minerals is more and more an issue of national security, concluded the 'The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies' (HCSS) in its report about the scarcity of minerals (January 2010). The US, Japan and China are making a policy that tries to secure the supply of these raw materials. That will disturb the free market activity. HCSS thinks that large concerns will, with support of the government, compete more intensively with each other for access to these raw materials, e.g. by direct investments in areas rich in raw materials. Mineral scarcity will be an issue in the next decades, though it is uncertain when and to what extent. And we have to do something because a change in supply of rare minerals directly affects our current modern lives.

### 1NC—Birds DA

#### Birds DA—plan kills unique predators

Ritter 5 [Ritter – staff writer – 1/4/2005 (John, “Wind turbines taking toll on birds of prey,” USA Today, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-01-04-windmills-usat_x.htm>)]

ALTAMONT PASS, Calif. — The big turbines that stretch for miles along these rolling, grassy hills have churned out clean, renewable electricity for two decades in one of the nation's first big wind-power projects. But for just as long, massive fiberglass blades on the more than 4,000 windmills have been chopping up tens of thousands of birds that fly into them, including golden eagles, red-tailed hawks, burrowing owls and other raptors. After years of study but little progress reducing bird kills, environmentalists have sued to force turbine owners to take tough corrective measures. The companies, at risk of federal prosecution, say they see the need to protect birds. "Once we finally realized that this issue was really serious, that we had to solve it to move forward, we got religion," says George Hardie, president of G3 Energy. The size of the annual body count — conservatively put at 4,700 birds — is unique to this sprawling, 50-square-mile site in the Diablo Mountains between San Francisco and the agricultural Central Valley because it spans an international migratory bird route regulated by the federal government. The low mountains are home to the world's highest density of nesting golden eagles. Scientists don't know whether the kills reduce overall bird populations but worry that turbines, added to other factors, could tip a species into decline. "They didn't realize it at the time, but it was just a really bad place to build a wind farm," says Grainger Hunt, an ecologist with the Peregrine Fund who has studied eagles at Altamont.

#### Top level predators are key to ecosystem survival

Carey 6 [LiveScience staff writer – 7/19/2006 (Bjorn, “Top predators key to ecosystem survival,” MSNBC, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/13939039>)]

Top-level predators strike fear in the hearts of the animals they stalk. But when a deer is being mauled by a wolf, at least it can know that it's giving its life for the greater good. A new study reveals how ecosystems crumble without the presence of top predators be keeping populations of key species from growing too large. It also provides a cautionary lesson to humans, who often remove top predators from the food chain, setting off an eventual collapse. The study is detailed in the July 20 issue of the journal Nature. The researchers studied eight natural food webs, each with distinct energy channels, or food chains, leading from the bottom of the web to the top. For example, the Cantabrian Sea shelf off the coast of Spain has two distinct energy channels. One starts with the phytoplankton in the water, which are eaten by zooplankton and fish, and so on up to what are called top consumer fish. The second channel starts with detritus that sinks to the sea floor, where it's consumed by crabs and bottom-dwelling fish, which are consumed by higher-up animals until the food energy reaches top-level consumers. The top predators play their role by happily munching away at each channel's top consumers, explained study leader Neil Rooney of the University of Guelph in Canada. "Top predators are kind of like the regulators of the food web—they keep each energy channel in check," Rooney told LiveScience. "The top predator goes back and forth between the channels like a game of Whac-a-Mole," a popular arcade game in which constantly appearing moles are smacked down with a mallet. Constant predation of the top consumers prevents a population from growing larger than the system can support. Boom or bust Removing a top predator can often alter the gentle balance of an entire ecosystem. Here's an example of what can happen: When an area floods permanently and creates a series of islands, not all the islands have enough resources to support top predators. Top consumers are left to gobble up nutrients and experience a reproductive boom. The boom is felt throughout the system, though, as the booming species out-competes others, potentially driving the lesser species to extinction and reducing biodiversity. Rooney refers to this type of ecosystem change as a "boom-and-bust cycle," when one species' population boom ultimately means another will bust. Bigger booms increased chances of a bust. “With each bust, the population gets very close to zero, and its difficult getting back," he said. Human role in 'boom-and-bust' Humans often play a role in initiating boom-and-bust cycles by wiping out the top predator.s For example, after gray wolves were hunted to near extinction in the United States, deer, elk, and other wolf-fearing forest critters had free reign and reproduced willy-nilly, gobbling up the vegetation that other consumers also relied on for food. Or, more recently, researchers found that when fish stocks in the Atlantic Ocean are over fished, jellyfish populations boom. While jellyfish have few predators, removing the fish frees up an abundance of nutrients for the jellyfish to feast on. Ecosystems provide us with the food we eat and help produce breathable air and clean water. But they're generally fragile and operate best when at a stable equilibrium, scientists say. "These are our life support systems," Rooney said. "We're relying on them. This study points to the importance of top predators and that we need to be careful with how we deal with them."

#### Variability of wind energy production kills the grid—even if it doesn’t crash it destroys energy distribution

Newman et all ‘11

(Newman is part of the Physics Department at the University of Alaska, Carreras is a professer at University of Carloss in Madrid, Kirchner is part of the Physics Department at the University of Alaska, and Dobson is a member of the ECE department at the University of Wisconsin; the paper was presented at the Hawaii International Conference on System Science)

[Newman, D. E., B. A. Carreras, M. Kirchner, and I. Dobson. "The Impact of Distributed Generation on Power Transmission Grid Dynamics." (2011): n. pag. Print.] AMB

If one were able to build a power transmission system with highly reliable distributed generation, these results suggest that system would be very robust and reliable. This makes sense from the point of view of the dynamic reorganization that can occur. When an element of the system fails, there are many other routes and generators that can take up the slack. The problem of course is that distributed generation, particularly from renewables like wind and solar, are much less reliable then central generation facilities. As mentioned in the last section, distributed generation is not in general as reliable as the central generation. Wind, and therefore wind energy, in a given location can vary greatly as to a lesser degree can solar power. When added to the generation mix, this less reliable generation source can impact the transmission grid. To investigate this, we use the same distributed generation model as before, but now allow the distributed generators to have a daily random fluctuation in their capacity. For this study, we have set a fraction (Pg) of the distributed generation nodes to probabilistically be reduced to a fixed fraction (fg) of their nominal generation limits. In the cases shown here we have used Pg = 0.5 and fg = 0.3. This means that half of the distributed generators can have their capacity reduced to 0.3 of their nominal capacity. While these added fluctuations in the system increase the probability of failure, the most pronounced effect comes when the total amplitude of these distributed generation variations start to become close to the total system generation margin. At that point a huge change in the dynamics occurs and increasing the distributed generation seriously degrades the system behaviour. Figure 11 shows the blackout frequency as a function of the degree of distribution for 2 uniform distribution cases, one without any variability of the distributed generators and one with variability. At 0.1 degree of distribution the frequencies are the same but after 0.3 they diverge sharply with the improvement seen in the reliable distribution cases reversed in the variable distribution case and becoming much worse.

#### Turn- Increase demand for traditional fuels—fuels k2 regulation and contingency for the energy grid.

EnerNex Corporation ‘6 (Leading energy company for the middle of America, additionally co-authored by the Midwest Independent System Operator for the Purpose of Minnesota’s economy. Probably objective and/or want Minnesota to have wind. Just sayin.)

EnerNex Corporation & The Midwest Independent System Operator. "Final Report - 2006 Minnesota Wind Integration Study." (2006): n. pag. Print. ] AMB

Wind generation cannot be controlled or precisely predicted. While these attributes are not unique to wind generation, variability of the fuel supply and its associated uncertainty over short time frames are more pronounced than with conventional generation technologies. Energy from wind generating facilities must be taken “as delivered”, which necessitates the use of other controllable resources to keep the demand and supply of electric energy in balance. Integrating wind energy involves the use of supply side resources to serve load not served by wind generation and to maintain the security of the bulk power supply system. Conventional resources must then be used to follow the net of wind energy delivery and electric demand and to provide essential services such as regulation and contingency reserves that ensure power system reliability. To the extent that wind generation increases the required quantity of these generating services, additional costs are incurred.

#### No solvency—unpredictable, means can’t meet public demand

EnerNex Corporation ‘6 (Leading energy company for the middle of America, additionally co-authored by the Midwest Independent System Operator for the Purpose of Minnesota’s economy. Probably objective and/or want Minnesota to have wind. Just sayin.)

[EnerNex Corporation & The Midwest Independent System Operator. "Final Report - 2006 Minnesota Wind Integration Study." (2006): n. pag. Print.] AMB

The high reliability of the electric power system is premised on having adequate supply resources to meet demand at any moment. In longer term planning, system reliability is often gauged in terms of the probability that the planned generation capacity will be sufficient to meet the projected system demand. It is recognized that conventional electric generating plants and units are not completely reliable – there is some probability that in a given future hour capacity from the unit would be unavailable or limited in capability due to a forced outage – i.e. mechanical failure. Even if the installed capacity in the control area exceeds the peak projected load, there is some non-zero probability that the available capacity might be insufficient to meet load in a given hour The capacity value of wind plants for long term planning analyses is currently a topic of significant discussion in the wind and electric power industries. Characterizing the wind generation to appropriately reflect the historical statistical nature of the plant output on hourly, daily, and seasonal bases is one of the major challenges. Several techniques that capture this variability in a format appropriate for formal reliability modeling have been proposed and tested. The lack of adequate historical data for the wind plants under consideration is an obstacle for these methods.

#### No solvency—fail between 15 and 20%

Lew and Milligan ‘11

(Both work for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the United States Department of Energy)

[Milligan, Michael R., Alan H. Miller, and Francis Chapman. *The Value of Wind Power Forecasting*. N.p.: n.p., 2011. Print.] AMB

With increasing penetration of wind generation on interconnected power systems, system operators are faced with increased levels of variability and uncertainty. Given that the power output of wind plants is a function of wind speed, the level of wind generation on a power system varies from hour-to-hour and from day-to-day. And given that wind speed is a function of the weather, the amount of wind that a power system operator can expect for the next day is subject to the level of uncertainty in weather-related forecasts for the next day. Power system operators presently use day-ahead load forecasts to predict how much energy must be delivered for each hour of the next day. This forecast enables day-ahead commitment of generation resources, some of which may need many hours advance notice to be ready to generate power during the next day. Power systems with high penetrations of wind generation use day-ahead wind forecasts to predict how much of the wind power will be available for each hour of the next day. Combining the wind forecast with the load forecast enables operators to commit the balance of the generation fleet to economically and securely serve load on the next day. Forecasts are not perfect. Load forecasting is a very mature science since power system operators have been using day-ahead load forecasts in their security-constrained unit commitment (SCUC) processes for several decades. Day-ahead hourly load forecast errors are typically in the range of 1% to 3% (GE Energy, 2009). Today’s wind forecasts typically have errors in the range of 15% to 20% mean absolute error (MAE) for a single wind plant.