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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems and neoliberal market based solutions

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.
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#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and all relevant territories should uniformly establish a permanent   Production Tax Credit for wind power production in the United States. The 50 states, Washington D.C., and all relevant territories should substantially increase financial incentives for wind power production.

#### States solve – grab bag of financial incentives and a long history of experience with financial incentives for renewable energy

Mark Gielecki, Fred Mayes, and Lawrence Prete, EIA, “Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy", EIA, February 2001.

State Incentives, Mandates, and Programs for Renewable Energy Electric industry restructuring is the major issue affecting renewable energy at the State levels. In a few States, electric industry restructuring legislation supports renewable energy with financial incentives through funds from surcharges on electricity sales or renewable portfolio standards. (19) Most States provide for net metering. (20) Even prior to electric restructuring legislation, many States had financial incentives for renewable energy. (A DOE-sponsored North Carolina State University website provides summary information, updated periodically, on State-level financial incentives, and regulatory programs and policies for renewable energy.) (21) State financial incentives include personal income tax credits and deductions for the purchase of various renewable-based technologies or alternative fuel vehicles; corporate income tax credits, exemptions, and deductions for investments in renewable technologies; sales tax exemptions on renewable equipment purchases; variable property tax exemptions on the value added by the renewable energy system; renewable technology and demonstration project grants; and special loan programs for renewable energy investments. Some State incentives for renewable energy technologies overlap the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT) Production Tax Credit (PTC). When State and Federal incentives overlap, the PTC may or may not be reduced, depending on Internal Revenue Service rulings. In California, for example, wind projects canget renewable resource funds without jeopardizing eligibility for the PTC. In other cases, the PTC is reduced by the amount of the State incentive. (22) While some ethanol-producing States do not subsidize ethanol, others offer tax incentives for gasoline blended with ethanol and for ethanol production, which vary from $0.10 to $0.40 per gallon.

# 3

#### Compromise now- pc key

Posner Jan. 8th

[Eric Posner, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, Jan. 8th, 2013, President can raise debt ceiling on his own, http://www.stltoday.com/news/opinion/columns/president-can-raise-debt-ceiling-on-his-own/article\_1e07459c-348d-5dd0-a12a-96e3ebd354f6.html, uwyo//amp]

With the “fiscal cliff” behind us, we now must look forward to yet another budgetary battle — over the debt ceiling, in a repeat of summer 2011. Is there a way out of the endless stalemate between President Barack Obama and Republicans in Congress? Yes, but it requires the president to assert himself more aggressively than he has so far. The debt standoff is more ominous than the fiscal cliff because it doesn’t reflect a legitimate dispute over public policy. While reasonable people can disagree about the right level of taxation and spending, no one believes that the United States should default on its debt, not even the most ardent Tea Partiers. So holding the debt ceiling hostage is pure brinkmanship — akin to threatening to set off a nuclear bomb in Manhattan if the president fails to agree to spending cuts.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

-Political capital high: economy on cusp of revival

-AT: Compromise Bill Disproves: Compromised and merely delayed the big battles

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Wind incentives drain PC – the issue is politicized, it can barely get enough congressional support and only as rider to other bills

Jacobs and Noble, 12

[Jennifer Jacobs and Jason Noble, Des Moines Register, 8/15, lexis]

All the huff and puff on the campaign trail in Iowa aside, it’s likely that the wind energy tax credit will pass this fall, Iowans who follow the issue say. It’s a topic that Iowa voters typically don’t bring up. But President Barack Obama loves to talk about it because it gives him an opening to bash GOP rival Mitt Romney for being opposed to an incentive that all of Iowa’s top politicians consider important. “If he really wants to learn something about wind,” Obama said Tuesday, “all he’s got to do is pay attention to what you’ve been doing here in Iowa.” Obama is keeping up a drumbeat on the issue at every campaign stop. At a wind farm in Haverhill on Tuesday, he said the tax credits help create jobs while the rest of the country benefits from “clean American energy.” Iowa’s congressional delegation is cautiously optimistic the wind production tax credit will pass after the Nov. 6 elections as part of a larger bill, staffers told The Des Moines Register on Tuesday. All seven in the delegation support the tax credit. But Republican political operatives in Iowa say Obama has politicized the issue. They say he’s trying to manufacture an issue where there isn’t one — and that he’s just trying to distract from his own record on jobs and the economy. The debate on the campaign trail highlights that presidential candidates sometimes play up differences that are real, but may not have real effect on any legislation. Action on the tax credit won’t happen before the election, aides for Iowa’s congressional delegation said. After Nov. 6, when there’s more clarity to the political landscape, language is likely to get tacked onto a bigger bill and squeak through amid debate about the farm bill and George W. Bush-era tax cuts, staffers said. But Jeff Giertz, an aide to Democratic U.S. Rep. Bruce Braley, said he thinks it’s appropriate for Obama to focus on wind right now. “If you get status quo in Congress after this election and a president who won’t sign it into law, then it’s gone,” he said. Despite the expected likelihood of eventual passage, the uncertainty has fed turmoil in the wind energy industry, similar to delays in renewing the biodiesel tax credit two years ago, staffers said.

#### Sequestration devastates the economy, collapses heg, and culminates in Middle Eastern war

Hutchison 9/21

[Kay Bailey Hutchison,, U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis]

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Middle East goes nuclear

Russell 9

[James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers, #26, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf]

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.
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#### Wind power increases demand for natural gas in the electricity sector

Vos, gas analyst in the Gas Coal and Power Division of the International Energy Agency, 2012

(Irene, “The Impact of Wind Power on European Natural Gas Markets,” January 2012, http://www.iea.org/papers/2012/impact\_of\_wind\_power.pdf)

This working paper discusses how an increasing wind market share changes the characteristics of the electricity demand that needs to be filled by generation capacity other than wind, the so‐ called residual demand. It discusses whether, and how the demand for fuel in the power sector changes due to an increasing wind market share, and whether, as a result, wind affects energy markets other than the electricity market. This paper focuses on one fuel; **natural gas**, which is often identified as one of the generation fuels best suited to support an increasing wind market share, thanks to its relatively clean burning properties and its flexibility in generation. It also focuses on the effects of an increasing share of wind power in Europe (EU27), which currently is − and is expected to remain − the region with the highest wind market share in the world (IEA, 2010a). Wind power has distinctive characteristics. Firstly, its output can vary greatly and within short periods of time. Secondly, its output cannot be completely controlled or predicted. Consequently, **an increasing wind market share puts pressure on electricity systems and increases the need for system flexibility**. Tools that can deliver flexibility include energy storage, demand‐side response, increasing interconnection and supply‐side response (i.e. other forms of generation capacity which can be ramped up or down in response to changing demand). Much of the flexibility in electricity systems is currently delivered by supply‐side response; this instrument is likely to play an important role in supporting an increasing wind market share. A comparison of the three generation fuels with the largest shares in European power generation − coal, nuclear and natural gas − shows that generation units running on these fuels all have the technical capabilities to act as supply-side response instruments. They can all vary their output in response to changes in power demand. **Its short start-up times**, **high ramp rates and low start-up costs make natural gas the best-suited technology to support fast changes in power demand**. While both coal- and nuclear-fired technologies can vary their output, their long start-up times, lower ramp rates and high start‐up costs make them less attractive to employ as running reserve and less suitable to respond to fast demand changes. An analysis of the effect of an increasing wind market share on residual demand shows that wind significantly alters the load duration curve (LDC) of residual demand, changing not only its size but also its slope. Comparing the LDC of demand and residual demand shows how wind strongly decreases the average capacity factor of residual demand; the share of capacity running at high capacity factors (70% to 100%) decreases, while the amount of capacity running at low capacity factors (0% to 30%) increases strongly. A decreasing capacity factor can have a significant impact on the relative profitability of investments in different types of generation capacity. As the capacity factor decreases, the levelised costs of electricity (LCOE) of generation technologies with high investment costs, such as coal- and especially nuclear-fired capacity, increase faster than those of technologies with lower investment costs, such as gas-fired capacity. Natural gas technologies seem to be best suited to support wind power in the future, due to their relatively low investment costs and technical capabilities to deliver flexibility. This makes it likely that, **as the market share of wind increases**, **the role of natural gas** as a flexible fuel supporting wind output **increases**. As a result, **wind will** also **have a growing impact on natural gas demand in the power sector**.

#### Wind and solar aren’t competitive with low-cost natural gas and Chinese imports

Pagliery 8/21

[Jose, CNN Money, “Why green energy startups are now 'toxic'” 8.21.12. <<http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/21/smallbusiness/green-energy-startups/index.html>>//wyo-hdm]

Green energy startups are feeling the sting of rejection by investors concerned about falling energy prices and the future of government support. The boom in natural gas has hurt the competitiveness of alternative energy. And proposed budget cuts would force the government to dial back support of [wind farms](http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/06/news/economy/wind-power-Colorado/index.htm?iid=EL), solar panel manufacturers, ethanol producers and makers of [alternative fuel cars](http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/15/autos/honda-fit-ev.fortune/index.html?iid=EL). In response, investors say they won't lend money to green energy companies, especially startups, because they haven't proven they can be profitable on their own. Rosa McCormick, managing director of Wild Basin Investments in Austin, Texas, said that's particularly true for doomed solar panel makers, such as [Solyndra](http://money.cnn.com/2012/06/06/technology/solyndra/index.htm?iid=EL) and [Abound Solar](http://money.cnn.com/2012/06/28/news/economy/abound-solar-bankrupt/index.htm?iid=EL). U.S. companies can't lower prices enough to compete with [solar panels imported from China](http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/08/02/china-solar-energy/?iid=EL), which provides big subsidies. "The bottom fell out of that market," McCormick said. "No one wants to touch that. It's toxic from an investor point of view." Another headwind moving against that industry -- and the growth of green energy in general -- is the falling price of [natural gas](http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/24/investing/natural-gas-prices/index.htm?iid=EL), which is less than half what it was just a few years ago. Why invest in alternative energy when natural gas is abundant and cheap? Danotek Motion Technologies is already feeling the market pressure. The wind energy firm in Canton, Mich., is building magnet-powered generators that serve as the heart of wind turbines. It had 50 employees in 2010 and planned to hire hundreds more. Instead, it has scaled back to 30 workers. "The market's down. That puts a dilemma in place that affects our volume and growth," CEO Don Naab said. Companies involved in the creation of ethanol fuel, derived from corn, are also facing pressure. The ongoing [drought](http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/13/smallbusiness/drought/index.htm?iid=EL) has devastated crops and caused the [price of corn](http://buzz.money.cnn.com/2012/08/10/corn-prices-usda-forecast/?iid=EL) to skyrocket. Dozens of lawmakers have called for a review of the federal government's mandate requiring that [ethanol](http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/06/news/economy/ethanol-drought/index.htm?iid=EL) be blended into gasoline. Bob Calcaterra, managing director of St. Louis-based StartUp Midwest Management, is avoiding investments tied to the ethanol industry. There's too much reliance on government assistance, and there's no telling how long that will last. "Smart angel investors stay away from them," Calcaterra noted.

#### Wind power emits several CO2 emissions: manufacture, transportation, construction, and maintenance.

Dolan and Heath 12

(Stacey L. and Garvin A., Journal of Industrial Ecology, “Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions of

Utility-Scale Wind Power,” March 30, 2012, Wiley Online Library//wyo-mm)

Electricity generation accounted for approximately 40% of energy-related carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in the United States in 2008 (EIA 2009). Interest in technologies powered by renewable energy sources such as the wind and sun has grown partly because of the potential to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the power sector. However, due to GHG emissions produced during equipment manufacture, transportation, on-site construction, maintenance, and decommissioning, wind and solar technologies are not GHG emission-free. Life cycle assessment (LCA) is particularly well suited for comparing conventional power generation systems to renewables because it accounts for GHG emissions across the full life cycle of each technology, and therefore helps to inform decision makers of the attributable environmental impacts of energy technologies.
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#### Plan can’t kick-start wind-growth- no demand

Pueblo Chieftan 8.25

[Dennis Darrow, “Wind Woes Go Beyond Tax Credit”, accessed: http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-08-25/features/sns-mct-wind-woes-go-beyond-tax-credit-20120825\_1\_production-tax-credit-wind-energy-wind-turbine]

8:04 a.m. EST, August 25, 2012|Dennis Darrow, The Pueblo Chieftain, Colo.

Even if a federal tax credit is extended, the U.S. wind energy market appears headed for a lull. Far fewer U.S. wind turbine orders appear in the offing for 2013 and 2014, according to the agency's latest Wind Technologies Market report released Aug. 15. The forecast isn't good for Vestas and other U.S. wind turbine makers, who in recent days have announced some layoffs while leaving the door open for more job cuts as orders slip. "Even with a (Production Tax Credit) extension . . . most predictions are for more modest wind power additions in the near term," the report states. Several industry analysts expect orders to drop by more than half in 2013 and 2014 even if Congress votes to extend the tax credit, according to the report.

#### Green markets result in inflationary labor shortages because wind power will siphon talent away from other industries, not employ the unemployed

Michaels & Murphy 2009

[Robert Michaels and Robert Murphy, Institute for Energy Research, January 2009, GREEN JOBS: Fact or Fiction?, http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/IER%20Study%20-%20Green%20Jobs.pdf, uwyo//amp]

Double counting of jobs and overly simplistic treatment of the labor market. The green studies critiqued in this report implicitly assume that there is a limitless pool of idle labor which can fill the new “green” slots created by government spending. Yet to the extent that some of the new green jobs are filled by workers who were previously employed, estimates of job creation are overstated, perhaps significantly so. In addition, the studies do not account for the rise in worker productivity over time. Thus their long-range forecasts of total jobs created by green programs are inflated, even on their own terms. To its credit, CAP alludes to potential “inflationary labor shortages from job creation”6 due to its proposed program, but dismisses the concern as irrelevant for an economy in recession. The thinking is that the workers going into the new green jobs will simply reduce the unemployment rate, rather than siphoning talented people away from other industries. The CAP analysis ignores the fact that other industries, not favored by the green subsidies or mandates, would have been able to draw on the pool of unemployed workers as the economy recovers. With fewer workers seeking jobs, job creation in “non-green” sectors will be lower than it otherwise would have been. Moreover, some of the infrastructure plans will require a long time to implement and then reach completion. Their implementation over time could contribute to “inflationary labor shortages” once the current recession has passed.

#### No US-China war – regional stability

Ackerman 11

(Robert, quoting former admiral Timothy Keating, the official blog of the Armed Forces Communication and Electronics Association, 5/10/11, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” <http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/>)

The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other because neither country wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests. That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, noted that China actually wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism. And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that above all China fears instability, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own. As for Taiwan, Adm. Keating offered that with each day, the likelihood of a Chinese attack on Taiwan diminishes. Economic ties between the two governments are growing, as is social interaction. He predicts that a gradual solution to reunification is coming. The United States can hasten that process by remaining a powerful force in the region, he added.

#### WIND TURBINES UPSET MILITARY RADAR, ARE HAZARDS TO LOW-FLYING AIRCRAFT, AND PREVENT MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITIES

BUTLER ET AL IN ‘04

(James, Ph.D., Environmental Health Sciences; 21 years of experience in health risk assessment, and 21 other really qualified people that we would be happy to show you, “Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Wind Energy Development on BLM-Administered Lands in the Western United States,” U.S. Dept of Interior & Bureau of Land Management, September 2004, pg. online @ <http://windeis.anl.gov/documents/dpeis/> //wyo-ef)

The two main aviation safety considerations in the development of a wind energy project are (1) the physical obstruction of the tower itself and (2) the effects on communications, navigation, and surveillance systems, such as radar (DTI 2002). The potential vertical obstruction of the wind turbine, like any tall structure, could pose a hazard to aircraft arriving or departing at a nearby airfield as well as to military training and other low-flying aircraft (DTI 2002).

#### AIR POWER IS THE LYNCHPIN OF U.S. MILITARY STRENGTH – KEY TO FLEXIBILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS WHICH MUST BE PRESERVED

MEILINGER IN 2003

(Phillip S. Colonel, USAF – Deputy Dir of the Air and Space Center at Science Applications International Corporation “The Air and Space Nation Is in Peril” Air & Space Power Journal Spring 2003 http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj03/spr03/vorspr03.html [delo])

The reason for this emphasis on air and space power among our soldiers, sailors, and marines is their realization § Marked 09:23 § that military operations have little likelihood of success without it. It has become the American way of war. Indeed, the major disagreements that occur among the services today generally concern the control and purpose of air and space assets. All of them covet those assets, but their differing views on the nature of war shape how they should be employed. Thus, we have debates regarding the authority of the joint force air component commander, the role of the corps commander in the deep battle, the question of which service should command space, and the question of whether the air or ground commander should control attack helicopters. All the services trumpet the importance of joint operations, and air and space power increasingly has become our primary joint weapon. Air and space dominance also provides our civilian leadership with flexibility. Although intelligence is never perfect, our leaders now have unprecedented information regarding what military actions can or cannot accomplish and how much risk is involved in a given action. For example, our leaders understood far better than ever before how many aircraft and weapons would be needed over Serbia and Afghanistan to produce a specified military effect, weapon accuracy, collateral damage that might occur, and risk to our aircrews. This allowed our leaders to fine-tune the air campaign, providing more rapid and effective control than previously. Other factors affect the way we’ll fight. One hears much talk today of “transforming the military” to meet new threats. The Persian Gulf War, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan- and, for that matter, Somalia and Haiti- indicate that traditional methods, weapons, forces, and strategy will often be inadvisable. Warfare has changed. Stealth, precision weapons, and space-based communication and intelligence-gathering systems are examples of this new form of war. Certainly, the human element in war can never be ignored. People make war, and all their strengths and weaknesses must be considered. Yet, it would be foolish not to exploit new technologies that remove part of the risk and human burden in war. It is not always necessary for people to suffer. Air and space power permits new types of strategies that make war on things rather than on people and that employ things rather than people. It capitalizes on the explosion in computer, electronic, and materials technologies that so characterize the modern era. This is America’s strength- one that we must ensure.
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#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Economic Studies at Brookings & Founding Director of CBO, 6/12, “Rethinking Federalism for More Effective Governance” http://publius.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/06/12/publius.pjs028.full?keytype=ref&ijkey=j9keOPmOHj0c2xV)

A bolder approach would be for the federal government to cede some major functions to the states and concentrate on carrying out its remaining national responsibilities more effectively. The case for dividing the governmental job rests partly on efficiency—**lowering the administrative cost of federal state overlap and interaction**. It also rests on the perception that the United States is an extremely diverse country and that many governmental services should be tailored to local conditions. Whether the service is education or housing or transportation, residents of inner city Philadelphia have different needs than those of rural Kansas or coastal Alaska. Governments closer to the scene are better able to assess the needs of citizens and design programs to meet them. It is easier for citizens at the state and local level to be actively involved in what their government does and call officials to account for their performance.

#### States solve better – federal incentives create a boom and bust environment

Sasha Kemmet, 2006 WISE Intern, senior at Iowa State University studying electrical engineering, “Using Financial Incentives to Encourage Wind Power Project Development”, IEEE, August 3, 2006.

Current financial incentives at the federal level for wind energy include a production tax credit (PTC), accelerated depreciation, and project loan guarantees. PTCs are extremely effective in encouraging wind project development but delayed PTC renewal has caused a “boom-and-bust” environment in the wind industry which makes it more difficult for projects to receiving financing and good lending terms. At the state level, government subsidized loans have been extremely effective in encouraging wind system development. They reduce debt by offering lower interest rates and more favorable lending terms than commercial loans.

# tix

#### Gov will default on February 15th

Glueck 1.8

[Katie Glueck, Politico, 1/8/2012, Report: Debt ceiling ‘X Date’ Feb. 15, [http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/report-debt-ceiling-x-date-feb-15-85884.html#ixzz2HPqfMtB8](http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/report-debt-ceiling-x-date-feb-15-85884.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22ixzz2HPqfMtB8), uwyo//amp]

The next debt ceiling battle could come as soon as mid-February, when the federal government looks to hit its borrowing limit, a new report says. “Based on financial data from Treasury, we estimate that the government will be unable to pay all of its bills as early as February 15, also known as the X Date” said Steve Bell, senior director of the Economic Policy Project at the Bipartisan Policy Center, in a statement. Continue Reading The Bipartisan Policy Center announced the findings of the organization’s study on Monday. According to a release from the Center, their analysis indicates that “the federal government will be unable to meet all of its spending obligations as early as mid-February unless the debt ceiling is raised.” (PHOTOS: Who won, who lost fiscal cliff deal) “Our numbers show that we have less time to solve this problem than many realize,” Bell continued. “We estimate that Treasury will exhaust its borrowing authority and no longer have sufficient funds to meet its obligations in full and on time at some point between February 15 and March 1. It will be difficult for Treasury to get beyond the March 1 date in our judgment.”

#### Sequestration destroys US global military power—-collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war

Hunter 9/30

[Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. "SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE," 2012, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1~~%23article>]

The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, Iran is desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program, while threatening to close the Strait of Hormuz and targeting Israel with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. Africa is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for al-Qaeda. There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. There is also the threat of North Korea with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry, Russia with its focus on arms modernization, and China with its large-scale and rapid military buildup. China’s display of hostility toward Taiwan — a friend and ally of the United States — also shows no sign of diminishing. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capability. More likely, these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the global interests of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs. Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. The strength of the U.S. military has dissuaded conflict and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition. It was this deterrent, in fact, that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force. Sequestration would change all of this, for the worse. In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said sequestration is the equivalent of “shooting ourselves in the head.” Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right.Sequestration would produce the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.

#### Cuts are inevitable but a low-drama outcome is likely now - Obama’s credibility is and key to prevent slashing defense spending and setting future spending trajectories.

Michael Santoli, The Exchange, “How Much Should We Really Fear the Next Budget Fight?”, Yahoo Finance, 1/2/2013. http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/the-exchange/just-much-investors-fear-next-budget-fight-214038003.html

A Low-Drama Outcome?¶ Yet what if the chances for a low-drama outcome are higher than commonly believed, just as we’ve all become resigned to a new apparent reality of maximum Washington budget dysfunction?¶ This notion begins with the fact that President Obama achieved his one explicit, hard-line campaign promise by taking back the Bush tax cuts from upper-income taxpayers. The stakes that remain are certainly huge – long-term entitlement obligations, historically high defense spending, the president’s stated desire to set aside funds for infrastructure rebuilding. But they are less immediate, specific or politically toxic, and involve fewer “nonstarter” policy positions at the outset. The long-term nature of a possible “grand bargain” on entitlement and tax reform means the argument can occur mostly in the imaginary legislative universe of 10-year budget projections and accounting maneuvers.¶ It is at least conceivable that the president, having seen House Speaker John Boehner and the Senate GOP edge toward some middle ground, will use his inaugural speech and/or State of the Union address to strike a statesmanlike, post-partisan, legacy-etching posture. He has already reportedly entertained such ideas as raising the eligibility age for Medicare and altering the inflation calculation for Social Security that would make benefits less generous – once anathema to Democrats.¶ From the Republican perspective, there is no doubt that the deficit-slashing rhetoric and promises will be loudly asserted, right up to the point of any agreement. With tax rates set permanently, though, the entire conversation will now occur between two sides who both say they are determined to deal with “structural” deficits over the extended horizon. That means the debate will be over how much and by what means spending trajectories are altered – not whether they ought to be.¶ Perhaps this is wishful thinking on a day when all the alarmist headlines and panicky market action about the hazards of the Dec. 31 fiscal-cliff deadline in recent months seem suddenly to have been misplaced. But when expectations for compromise are at such depressed levels, they are that much easier to exceed under the right circumstances.

### UQ

#### Yes compromise-fiscal cliff gives bipartisan incentive to compromise

North Dallas Gazette Jan. 8th

[North Dallas Gazzette, Staff writer, Jan. 8th, 2013, Beyond the fiscal cliff, <http://northdallasgazette.com/2013/01/08/beyond-the-fiscal-cliff/>, uwo//amp]

All of the participants in our budget process now have an incentive to agree to a bipartisan compromise on deficit reduction, while protecting those who benefit from Social Security and Medicare. There were acrimonious debates while the measure was being considered. Some very difficult decisions will have to be made by legislators in the coming weeks. § Marked 09:18 § We must have significant discussions about additional revenue sources. We need to consider shared sacrifices. The future of our nation, our children and their children are at stake. I have reservations about any attempts to cut Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid benefits as some are suggesting. These programs are vitally important to millions of people in Texas. The proposed spending cuts, referred to as sequester, will do great damage to our national and state economies if we do not come up with additional sources of revenue. I strongly oppose cuts in services to those who suffer from diabetes, end stage renal disease and other illnesses that disproportionately impact many of those who elected me to represent them in Congress. I am fully aware of the devastation these cuts would have on medical care in economically distressed communities. I will work with the President, members of my party and members of the Republican Party to reach a solution that is fair and just for all Americans. Together we can achieve such a result. It is something that we must do to ensure our personal futures and the future of our nation.

### PC k

#### Deal will pass now but Obama’s pc k

Stanage & Parnes 1/6

[http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/275759-obama-will-draw-on-public-support-in-negotiating-with-gop#ixzz2HDKz5DXH]

President Obama intends to take a confrontational approach with Republicans in future economic battles by using the same campaign-style events the White House saw as effective in the “fiscal-cliff” fight. Many in Obama’s party believe that he got the upper hand in the recent deal to avoid the mixture of across-the-board tax hikes and spending cuts, and that the aggressive approach helped build his public case. Sources close to Obama say he can fend off Republicans for several reasons: his successful reelection; polling suggesting public support for many of his positions; and division among Republicans on Capitol Hill. Jen Psaki, who served as a press secretary during both of Obama’s presidential campaigns, said that the biggest lesson the president learned from his first term was “the power of the American people” and “the importance of having the will of the American people behind you.” In practical terms, “that means taking the argument on the road, taking the time, as he did before the fiscal-cliff deal, to explain the stakes... and to use real-world examples of how certain fights impact the middle class,” she added. Yet there are risks to the approach as well. A Jan. 31 rally Obama held at the White House during which supporters cheered the president on as he scolded Republicans angered the GOP just as sensitive talks with senators were taking place. Republican senators warned it could cost the president votes, though in the end it appeared it did not. Obama’s supporters want him to press his case forcefully. The left criticized the president during his first term, saying the prodigious organization that had been built up during his 2008 campaign was harnessed only sporadically, if at all, when it came to governing.

####

### Link

#### The Wind PTC fight means the plan’s supporters are exhausted and won’t invest in fighting for the plan—only a risk of the link – this card is amazing

Amy Harder, 1/3/13, Battle Over Wind Subsidy Leaves Industry Bruised, www.nationaljournal.com/congress/influence/battle-over-wind-subsidy-leaves-industry-bruised-20130103

The battle to get Congress to renew the wind-energy production tax credit before year’s end strained relationships among utilities, splintered support within the industry’s biggest trade group and is setting up the industry—and its supporters in Congress—for a 2013 even more contentious than 2012.

Many utilities, environmental groups and lawmakers from both parties are cheering the news that the PTC was extended by one year as part of the fiscal cliff deal. But the bruising fight over the last year doesn’t bode well for the sector as it must now agree on how to ramp down the tax subsidy that was first created 21 years ago.

Xcel Energy, which is among the top 10 biggest utilities in the country and had the largest wind capacity of any utility in 2011, is reviewing its membership in AWEA largely because of how the trade group handled the PTC debate. A final decision from the company is expected soon about what, if anything, it plans to do.

"We are in the process of reviewing our relationship with AWEA,” Xcel lobbyist John O’Donnell told NJ. “It's our concern that they continue to represent the interests of developers to the exclusion of customers."

O’Donnell is referring to both individual households and businesses whose electricity bills from utilities are affected by the production tax credit either directly or indirectly. O’Donnell doesn’t think extending the PTC, which is a tax credit that goes to wind-energy developers, benefits customers paying electricity bills or the utilities buying wind from renewable-energy generators. He went so far to say that because Congress extended the PTC without any additional policies to benefit customers, the Minnesota-based Xcel may not buy more wind.

"As the largest provider of wind to customers by far, we feel this action doesn’t nearly enough for customers, and throws into immediate question any further plans we have to buy more wind on their behalf,” O’Donnell said.

Another bruise from last year’s fight that will wear on into 2013 is lobbying by Exelon, the country’s biggest nuclear generator, to eliminate the PTC altogether. The Chicago-based Exelon, which is also the 11th-ranked utility in terms of wind generation, has aggressively lobbied lawmakers to end right away the tax credit because the policy distorts electricity market prices and hurts the company’s bottom line.

Exelon spent $6.4 million on lobbying through October (fourth-quarter lobbying numbers are due out later this month). In response to Exelon’s lobbying push, which was first reported by National Journal in August, AWEA kicked the company out of its group in September. Exelon is going to keep up its push against the policy now that Congress renewed it.

“In the coming months Exelon will work with legislators to inform them of the unintended negative consequences to power markets and investments in other sources of generation from the continuation of the PTC,” Exelon lobbyist David Brown told National Journal in an e-mail.

The lobbying power of Exelon, whose position against the PTC aligns the company with deep-pocketed conservative tea-party groups like Americans for Prosperity and the American Energy Alliance, could be even more concerning to the wind industry moving forward.

“Most people supportive of renewable energy are concerned about all the money they’re putting into this,” said one wind-energy lobbyist who would speak on the condition of anonymity only. “The renewable energy and wind energy specifically need to come up with a much better defense and push back…You’re going to see industry hit back harder now.”

But for now, AWEA is regrouping. Amid internal claims that the group’s leadership on the PTC was lacking, its CEO and president of the past four years, Denise Bode, announced last month she was resigning to return to the private sector as a tax attorney. AWEA’s top lobbyist, Rob Gramlich, will serve as interim CEO as the group finds a new one.

AWEA spent $1.81 million on lobbying through October, which is much less than Exelon and a $1 million less than NextEra Energy, the biggest renewable-energy generator that was the most outspoken company supporting the PTC. NextEra, whose lobbyists have clashed with Exelon executives over the PTC, did not immediately have a comment in response to this article.

AWEA has publicly announced it supports phasing out the tax credit, but consensus within the industry doesn’t exist (yet) about how and for how long that should happen.

Sen. Mark Udall, D-Colo., who is the most outspoken supporter of the policy in Congress and gave almost 30 floor speeches on the issue over the last several months, said he remains committed on a way forward.

“I plan on pushing my colleagues this year to pursue a multiyear extension in conjunction with a well-crafted phase-out,” Udall said to National Journal. “Such a phase-out would need to provide market certainty, and I believe that is the direction we need to head.”

Toward the end of last year, Xcel lobbied lawmakers on a proposal that would have replaced the production tax credit with a combination of an investment tax credit and a customer renewable credit.

The investment tax credit would be given to renewable-energy developers to help finance projects, and the customer renewable credit would be awarded to utilities that integrate more wind and solar onto the grid in order to incentivize such renewable-energy integration. The two credits combined would cost the government between $6 billion and $7 billion over 10 years. The one-year extension will cost taxpayers about $12 billion over 10 years.

“There is some merit to that,” said the wind-energy lobbyist about Xcel’s proposal. “Maybe that is a way to compromise and get utilities more supportive of tax credits for renewable energy.”

Udall expressed initial support for the proposal last month, but at that point he—and all other congressional wind backers—was focused chiefly on extending the PTC.

Another big problem lurking in the background for the wind industry is what, if any, legislative vehicle they can use to advance their proposal, if and when the industry can agree on a way forward. But that’s a fight for another day.

### Hag

#### Hagel will inevitably be confirmed and will win Republicans over- but it doesn’t matter, Senate will get to vote on the nomination and it is controlled by the democrats

Freedburg Jan. 7th

[Sydney J. Freedberg Jr., Jan 7th, 2013, Hagel Nomination Complicates Sequester Deal: Fierce Fights Ahead, <http://defense.aol.com/2013/01/07/hagel-nomination-only-complicates-sequester-deal-fierce-fights/?icid=apb2#page2>, uwyo//amp]

Other Republicans have been less vituperative, so far, and Hagel may well win them over. "Once Republicans reacquaint themselves with Hagel's credentials, they will realize his nomination to the Pentagon's top job is a gift from the White House," said Loren Thompson, a member of the AOL Defense Board of Contributors. "Chuck may sound like an ecumenical internationalist when he's talking about foreign policy, but his views on domestic policy were decidedly conservative during his two terms as Senator." Ultimately, it's almost certain Hagel will be confirmed. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell promised him a "fair hearing," which presumably means the Senate will get to vote on the nomination rather than have it subject to a hold, and the Democrats have the votes. And after being forced to give up on Susan Rice's nomination to be Secretary of State, Obama is unlikely to back down from a fight on Hagel.

### w/w

#### Obama’s Velcro---only blame sticks to him---means winners lose---healthcare proves

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

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro**.¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But Obama remains **the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape.¶ **What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting.¶** Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."
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#### Wind power increases demand for natural gas in the electricity sector – intermittency means wind needs to fill in when it’s not windy – that’s Vos

#### Causes increased plant prices

Vos, gas analyst in the Gas Coal and Power Division of the International Energy Agency, 2012

(Irene, “The Impact of Wind Power on European Natural Gas Markets,” January 2012, http://www.iea.org/papers/2012/impact\_of\_wind\_power.pdf)

Even though the effects of an increasing wind market share on gas markets are relatively limited and there are several tools available within natural gas systems that can support an increased demand spread and unpredictability, **natural gas should not be seen as a inexpensive** or easy **way to support a higher wind market share**. An **increasing wind** market share **strongly decreases the capacity factor of gas-fired generation capacity**, thereby **increasing the** levelised **costs** of electricity (LCOE) **of electricity production by gas**-fired generation technologies. The diminished capacity factor also leads to a decreased utilisation rate of transport capacity bringing gas to gas-fired generation plants, leading to higher transport costs.

#### Wind power increases investments in natural gas electricity

Vos, gas analyst in the Gas Coal and Power Division of the International Energy Agency, 2012

(Irene, “The Impact of Wind Power on European Natural Gas Markets,” January 2012, http://www.iea.org/papers/2012/impact\_of\_wind\_power.pdf)

As the market share of wind increases, natural gas-fired capacity becomes relatively more attractive to invest in compared to both coal-fired capacity and nuclear-fired capacity. Adding wind output to the system significantly decreases the average capacity factor of residual demand, especially the share of capacity running at very low capacity factors (0% to 10%) increases significantly. At lower capacity factors, generation capacity with relatively low investment costs becomes more attractive. As natural gas-fired capacity has relatively low investment costs compared to both coal- and nuclear-fired capacity, **adding wind to the system makes gas fired capacity more attractive**; both CCGT systems and, for demand with a very low capacity factor, OCGT systems.

#### Flexibility

Vos, gas analyst in the Gas Coal and Power Division of the International Energy Agency, 2012

(Irene, “The Impact of Wind Power on European Natural Gas Markets,” January 2012, http://www.iea.org/papers/2012/impact\_of\_wind\_power.pdf)

The paper focuses on natural gas. Natural gas-fired generation capacity is often mentioned as one of the generation technologies that **will play an important role in supporting a growing wind market share**, due to its relatively clean burning properties and production flexibility. Little has been written about how a growing wind market share might affect the usage of natural gas in the power market and consequently its possible effect on natural gas markets.

#### Increases demand

Vos, gas analyst in the Gas Coal and Power Division of the International Energy Agency, 2012

(Irene, “The Impact of Wind Power on European Natural Gas Markets,” January 2012, http://www.iea.org/papers/2012/impact\_of\_wind\_power.pdf)

Due to its relatively low production costs at low capacity factors and good technical capabilities to deliver flexibility, **natural gas is the most attractive technology for future investments** in generation capacity **aimed at supporting** a higher **wind** market share. This makes it likely that the role of natural gas in supporting wind will increase in the future. As a result, wind will also have a growing impact on **natural gas demand in the power sector**.

# China

#### Extension of the PTC is not going to boost the industry, wind power is facing a massive drop off

Brown 2012, Phillip (specialist in Energy Policy). “US Renewable Electricity: how does the production tax credit impact wind markets?” Congressional Research Service. June 20, 2012. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42576.pdf>, accessed 9/16/12,WYO/JF

Neither BNEF nor EIA estimate a scenario where wind installations meet or exceed existing U.S. wind turbine manufacturing capacity (see Figure 2). As a result, a PTC extension is unlikely to result in stimulating additional wind manufacturing facilities in the United States. Estimated wind installations in 2013 and 2014 are expected to drop to levels much lower than existing U.S. manufacturing capacity, including PTC extension scenarios. Whether the PTC expires or is extended, U.S. wind manufacturing utilization levels will likely be less than levels needed to support the wind market in 2012. Therefore, some U.S. wind manufacturing facilities could reduce operations or even completely shut down in 2013 and beyond. Much like the U.S. wind market, there is excess capacity in the global wind turbine manufacturing sector.14

#### US-China war won’t happen – economic interdependence

Weede, Former Professor of Sociology at the University of Bonn, 2010

(Erich, retired in 2004, current member of the Mont Pelerin Society, “The Capitalist Peace and the Rise of China: Establishing Global Harmony by Economic Interdependence”, International Interactions 36:2, 206-213, 5/18/10, accessed 6/20/11) JDB

Economic cooperation and interdependence provide much more hope for the immediate future than democratization. The more countries trade with each other, the less likely military disputes between them become. Given the size of both economies and the distance between America and China, they already trade a lot with each other. As China is the first Asian giant to become capable of challenging the U.S., these pacifying ties happen to be in place where they are most needed. From a capitalist peace perspective there is another piece of good news. Although trade between India and China had been negligible for a long time, since 1999 it has grown. By 2009, China had become India’s biggest trading partner. Economic interdependence or trade may exert some pacifying impact on the relationship between Asia’s neighboring giants. Comparing the war-proneness of the Middle East with the avoidance of major military conflicts in the Far East over the past three decades, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the East Asian focus on economic openness and interdependence, on commerce, exports and growth did contribute to the pacification of East Asia**.**
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#### Hagel builds bipartisanship

Scott Wilson, Washington Post, “Obama to nominate Chuck Hagel for defense secretary”, 1/6/2013

Hagel would add a well-known Republican to the president’s second-term Cabinet at a time when Obama, after a bitter presidential campaign, is looking to better bridge the partisan divide.

#### No one will block

Joan Walsh 1-7, editor at Salon, “The phony Chuck Hagel fight”, http://www.salon.com/2013/01/07/the\_phony\_chuck\_hagel\_fight/

As if reporters don’t have enough to cover, with the House GOP imploding and another game of fiscal hostage-taking coming in two months, everybody’s gone all in on the “controversy” over former GOP Sen. Chuck Hagel’s nomination as Secretary of Defense. Yes, Sen. Lindsay Graham is shrieking that his foreign policy views are “out of the mainstream,” John McCain has “serious concerns” and Mitch McConnell won’t promise to confirm him, but this will blow over. The biggest non-story is the threat that pro-Israel Democrats might ally to block Hagel’s nomination. Although New York Sen. Chuck Schumer conspicuously failed to promise to support Hagel’s confirmation on “Meet the Press” last month, allegedly because of his insufficient fealty to protecting Israel, Schumer is unlikely to buck President Obama. The National Journal’s Josh Kraashauer had a slightly odd column about Democratic Hagel skeptics, hyping Schumer’s doubts and pointing to the Democratic Jewish “minyan” of senators, including Dianne Feinstein and Carl Levin, as key to the confirmation. But Levin and Feinstein quickly came for Hagel’s confirmation after his nomination Monday. Schumer and New York’s other senator, Kirsten Gillibrand, both released non-committal statements praising Hagel’s background and vowing a fair hearing, but stopping short of endorsing him. Still, it’s almost impossible to imagine the two of them going it alone, without § Marked 09:07 § Feinstein or Levin, on Hagel. There are a few progressives who lament that Obama is picking a Republican, squandering the political capital he’d amassed for Democrats with his hawkish foreign policy and killing Osama bin Laden. (Daily Kos ran a campaign to get Obama to pick a Democrat.) While taking those arguments seriously, Obama critic (and my former colleague) Glenn Greenwald nonetheless called Hagel’s appointment “one of Obama’s best appointments and boldest steps of his presidency.” Others have been irked that the president is ready to fight for Hagel in a way he didn’t fight for Susan Rice as Secretary of State. I wish he’d fought for Rice, if indeed he wanted to appoint her, but I’m glad he’s bucking the neocons to fight for Hagel. It might bother me that Democrats are so willing to pick Republicans to head defense, from Robert Gates back to Bill Cohen under President Clinton, except that Hagel is better on defense policy than a lot of Democrats. His skepticism about the war in Iraq as well as a possible war with Iran, along with his unorthodox (for Washington) views about our relationship with Israel is reassuring. So is his apparent willingness to cut defense; David Sirota notes his public statements calling the defense budget “bloated” and suggesting that it “needs to be pared down,” sentiments you rarely hear from Republicans and not frequently enough from Democrats. Hagel made dumb comments about Ambassador Jim Hormel being “aggressively gay,” for which he has apologized. Rep. Barney Frank, who first sounded alarms about the Hagel nomination, now supports him. Foreign policy wonk Steve Clemons, who happens to be gay, knows Hagel well and backs him strongly, recently writing that “Chuck Hagel is pro-gay, pro-LGBT, pro-ending ‘don’t ask, don’t tell.’” Likewise, Hagel’s maligned comments about “the Jewish lobby,” which is more correctly called the Israel lobby, didn’t disqualify him with the Jewish foreign policy expert who recorded the remarks, Aaron David Miller. Miller recently called the Hagel attacks “scurrilous,” writing in Foreign Policy. In the end, Senate Republicans may decide to hang together to deny the president a strong defense appointment. Even though McCain hailed Hagel as a good Secretary of State choice in 2006, he’s unlikely to back him now, especially given the help Hagel gave Obama in 2008. Having backed Democrat Bob Kerrey in his failed Nebraska Senate campaign, Hagel is barely a RINO anymore, and his former GOP colleagues may relish the chance to rebuke their former colleague as well as the president they loathe. But I can’t see Schumer or other pro-Israel Democrats allying with them. Honestly, if Hagel were to go down, it would do more to focus attention on the unseemly influence of pro-Israel hawks on American foreign policy than anything in recent memory. That may be why so far, AIPAC is officially neutral on his nomination. Neutral isn’t an endorsement, and certainly suggests their reservations, but if AIPAC isn’t ready to make this a fight, it’s hard to imagine a major Democrat bucking the president to do so.