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## 1NC

### 1

#### A. Interpretation - Financial incentives are committed funds directly tied to production

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

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.

By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive ***effects*** which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### B. Violation - they violate Incentives – the plan is a nonfinancial incentive and an *increase* in restrictions

Shapiro, associate – Energy, Environment & Public Utilities Practice Group @ Cozen O'Connor, publisher – Green Building Law Blog, 2011

(Shari, “Code Green: Is 'Greening' the Building Code the Best Approach to Create a Sustainable Built Environment?” Planning & Environmental Law 63:6, p. 3-12)

The explosion of state and local green building regulations has been extraordinary and has led to interesting regulatory experimentation. Many state and local governments begin by mandating green building practices for public buildings. Some local governments have expanded that mandate to require green building practices for both public and private development, often for new construction over a certain square footage. Others have sought to encourage green building practices through financial incentives. Still others have used non-financial incentives like expedited permitting or increased density to encourage the development of green buildings. Mandatory green building requirements work very much like traditional "command and control" environmental regulations, the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act being preeminent examples. Direct regulation may mandate specific green building practices or the achievement of a green building standard such as the USGBCs Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standard.3 Green building codes such as CALGreen, discussed in detail below, fall into this regulatory category. Financial incentives have taken the form of direct grants from government entities,4 tax incentives, and rebates.5 Other forms of financial incentives for green buildings are rebates of the typical government-related costs of building, such as application fees.6 Local governments are also experimenting with nonfinancial incentives for green building practices. These incentives are often attractive to municipalities because they do not deplete public finances directly and are therefore easier to get passed in difficult financial times or with teluctant constituencies.7 Examples of nonfinancial incentives include increased floor-to-area ratios for green buildings8 and expedited permitting processes.

#### **C. Reasons to prefer**

#### 1. Limits – Justifies any indirect financial incentives like giving money to oil companies to clean up oil spills and reading an environment advantage, or buying oil for the SPR and reading an oil shocks advantage.

#### 2. Ground – not spending money guts crucial link arguments to spending DA, budget tradeoff DAs, and politics DA. Also, specifying only one country kills the substantive nature of the link to foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

#### 3. Precision – they blur the line between the definition of a financial incentive and non-financial incentive. That kills predictability in engaging the topic because the resolution is the starting point for all research.

#### Voter for fairness and education.

### 2

#### The 50 states and all relevant U.S. territories should mandate that rates be set above the avoided cost for the production of solar energy.

#### State action gets modeled due to local innovation

Lash 7 (Jonathan, “Climate Policy in the State Laboratory: How States Influence Federal Regulation and the Implications for U.S. Policy,” World Resources Institute, September, <http://www.wri.org/publication/climate-policy-in-the-state-laboratory>, TGA)

America has a long and inspiring tradition of policy innovation and activism that is incubated at the state level. The states often take to the front lines of cutting-edge policy development, creating fresh and inventive programs to address the concerns and needs of their constituents. From standards for organic agriculture, to removing asbestos from schools, to creating enterprise zones, and reducing acid rain pollution, the states have shown a path forward and provided both the problem-solving acumen as well as the pressure to induce the Federal government to act. Of all the environmental problems now confronting this nation and the rest of the world, none holds greater potential for irrevocable and destructive disruption to our lives than climate change. Yet, up to now, our national government has failed to respond with initiatives appropriate to what looms ahead. The most significant first steps designed to measure and control the emission of greenhouse gases have come from an impressive number of states in this country. Ten states in the Northeast, seven in the West, and several in the Midwest are in the process of implementing mandatory programs to measure and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. And not surprisingly, as well, is the fact that over 100 cities have gotten on board, to one degree or another, taking concrete steps to reduce their contribution to climate change or to add their political clout to efforts to spur the national commitment needed to help catalyze essential international compacts. This timely report documents state efforts now underway to address the problem of climate change and our contribution to it. It puts them into the historical context of previous initiatives by states to lead our country in making difficult but necessary national decisions. Just as there is no “silver-bullet” technology that will solve climate change, there is no “silver-bullet” policy either. The commitment to policy innovation by U.S. states may prove to be the wellspring from which we build the low-carbon economy of the future.

### 3

#### The United States federal government should ban all subsidies and tax credits for energy production and institute a carbon tax per ton of emissions. The tax should be revenue neutral and the revenue should be used for offsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit.

#### A carbon tax solves better for warming and competitiveness

Griffin 9 (James, Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University; Director of the Robert A. Mosbacher Institute for Trade, Economics and Public Policy; he holds the Bob Bullock Chair in Public Policy and Finance and is a director in the Berkeley Research Group, a boutique economic consulting house; Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania; he is a Humboldt Fellow and serves on the editorial board of three economics journals; his research has resulted in six books and over 50 refereed journal articles; he has maintained a long-standing interest in energy policy, having co-authored the leading textbook in the field; “A smart energy policy: an economist's Rx for balancing cheap, clean, and secure energy” p.4-5

In this book I argue that the best energy policy for balancing the often-compet-¶ ing goals of cheap, clean, and secure energy would use the price system to fundamentally alter consumer behavior, business behavior, and the incentives to develop alternative-energy technologies. Currently, the price system fails to incorporate the true social cost of fossil fuels—the costs associated with climate¶ diange and oil security. Because these fossil fuels are artiﬁcially cheap, alternative clean and secure energy technologies are forced to compete on a very un-even playing ﬁeld. By taxing fossil fuels to reﬂect their true environmental and security costs, we can level the playing ﬁeld for these new technologies. Given a level playing ﬁeld, new technologies will ﬂourish, and energy conservation will regin in the overall growth of energy consumption. There will be no need for special subsidies, tax credits, and so forth for alternative technologies deemed winners of the congressional beauty pageant for alternative fuels. Instead, the marketplace will identify the winners and winnow out failed technologies.¶ There is currently no way for policymakers to identify the ultimate winners and¶ losers. We have no idea what technologies will dominate in thirty or ﬁfty years.¶ Instead of policymakers attempting to socially engineer the outcome, as in the¶ case ofcom-based ethanol, it is far better to create the market conditions under¶ which unknown and unknowable technologies will ﬂourish. Using the price system to modify human behavior is not a novel idea. “Sin¶ taxes” on alcohol and cigarettes, for example, have be shown to substantially¶ reduce consumption of both. in the Scandinavian counuies, high¶ taxes on alcohol have proved to be an eﬁecﬁve means of curtailing consurnp-¶ tion, after experimts with a variety of command-and-conu'ol policies, such as¶ prohibidon, generated much public discontent. But in the case of fossil fuels,¶ taxes would not only discourage the consumpﬁon of fossil fuels, but they¶ would also provide a level playing ﬁeld on which new energy technologies¶ could compete and ﬂourish. Speciﬁcally,¶ Congress should enact security a security tax per barrel of oil and a carbon tax per ton of carbon, thus raising the of all carbon-mntainingﬁnlr to ngﬂect tbeir true social cost.¶ Such a strategy has several advantages over the policy of awarding subsidies¶ and protective tariﬁ to industries represented by strong, entrenched lobbies¶ such as the Renewable Fuels Association (com-based ethanol producers) and¶ subjecting consumers to various command-and-conuols:¶ ° All new technologies would enjoy a more level playing ﬁeld.¶ ° The market, not the government, would determine which of the new tech-¶ nologies are the winners.¶ ° This approach is more uansparent. It is exuernely diﬂicult to assess the costs¶ (in terms of lost tax revenues) and the eﬁectiveness of the current patchwork¶ of subsidies and tax credits. In contrast, imposing carbon and security taxes would force us to ask how much we are willing to pay for clearner air and added oil security.¶ ° A focus on the prices right for fossil fuels would limit the opportunity¶ for Congress to pass legislation designed to enrich pardcular private-interest¶ groups.

### 4

#### 1. CIR will pass now

LA Times 2/21 (http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-labor-and-business-immigration-agreement-20130221,0,5405955.story)

Key business and labor leaders said Thursday that they have hammered out the broad outline of a compromise on one of the hardest issues in reforming the nation's immigration system -- how to handle future needs for foreign workers in the U.S.¶ Although both sides say key details remain to be negotiated, the deal could clear away a significant roadblock to further action in Congress.¶ "For the first time, labor and business have agreed publicly to commit to immigration reform," said Eliseo Medina, secretary-treasurer of the Service Employees International Union, one of the labor groups involved along with the AFL-CIO in the negotiations with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.¶ A bipartisan group of eight senators who have been crafting an immigration bill plan to meet next week to discuss the issue and have been waiting to see the results of the talks between the business and labor groups.¶ U.S. immigration law: Decades of debate¶ Failure to agree on how to handle future flows of foreign workers into the U.S. was a key factor in scuttling the last effort to reform the nation’s immigration laws, under President George W. Bush in 2007. Critics of the previous big immigration law, the amnesty passed under President Reagan in 1986, say that one of that measure's greatest failings was that it did not deal adequately with future needs, leading to a huge inflow of illegal immigrants in the 1990s and early 2000s.¶ To prevent that from happening again, the agreement worked out by the union and business representatives would create a legal system to allow a certain number of foreign workers to enter the country legally each year. Companies that could not find U.S. workers would be allowed to hire those workers if they first advertised jobs to Americans.

#### 2. Obama’s political capital is key.

Hesson 1/2 (Ted, Immigration Editor at ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTq55JIAho)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.¶ 2. Clear Space on the Agenda¶ Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

#### 3. Solar is not popular – Solyndra means it’s viewed as wasteful spending

NYT 12 (Cardwell, Diane, 2012, Jan. 26, “Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/27/business/energy-environment/clean-energy-projects-face-waning-subsidies.html?pagewanted=all)

But the lobbying by the wind and solar industries comes at a time when there is little enthusiasm for alternative-energy subsidies in Washington. Overall concerns about the deficit are making lawmakers more skeptical about any new tax breaks for business in general. And taxpayer losses of more than half a billion dollars on [Solyndra](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/companies/solyndra/index.html?inline=nyt-org), a bankrupt maker of solar modules that defaulted on a federal loan, has tarnished the image of renewable power in particular.

#### 4. Immigration reform is key to food security

Fitz 12 (Marshall Fitz is the Director of Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, Time to Legalize Our 11 Million Undocumented Immigrants, November 14th, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/11/14/44885/time-to-legalize-our-11-million-undocumented-immigrants/)

Nowhere is the tension between immigrant labor and the economy more obvious than in agriculture. By most estimates, undocumented immigrants make up more than half of the workers in the agriculture industry. Likewise the U.S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that each farm job creates three “upstream” jobs in professions such as packaging, transporting, and selling the produce, meaning that what happens in the agricultural sector affects the economy as a whole.¶ Agriculture is particularly susceptible to the whims of the labor market, since crops become ripe at a fixed time and must be picked quickly before they rot. Migrant laborers often travel a set route, following the growing season as it begins in places such as Florida and works its way north. Disrupting this flow of pickers can be devastating to local economies and the nation’s food security.¶ After the passage of Georgia’s anti-immigrant law, H.B. 87, for example, the Georgia Agribusiness Council estimated that the state could lose up to $1 billion in produce from a lack of immigrant labor. A survey of farmers conducted by the Georgia Department of Agriculture found 56 percent of those surveyed were experiencing difficulty finding workers—a devastating blow to the state. Even a program by Gov. Nathan Deal (D-GA) to use prison parolees to fill the worker shortage quickly fell apart, with most walking off the job after just a few hours.¶ Creating a process for legalizing these undocumented workers would help stabilize the agricultural workforce and enhance our nation’s food security. It would also diminish the incentive of states to go down the economically self-destructive path that Georgia, Alabama, Arizona, and others have pursued.

#### 5. Food shortages lead to extinction.

Brown, founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, ‘9

[Lester, “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

### Solvency

#### FITS not utilized - Palo Alto proves

Wesoff 12 (Eric Wesoff, writing for Green Tech Media “Palo Alto, Calif. Had a Solar Feed-In Tariff and Nobody Came” August 2, 2012 http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Palo-Alto-Calif.-Had-a-Solar-Feed-in-Tariff-and-Nobody-Came)

One of the problems with solar feed-in tariffs is that if the price is set too high, there's a frantic gold rush to claim the richly subsidized projects. If the price is too low, there's not too much enthusiasm by developers to build marginal projects.That's what appears to have occurred in Palo Alto in the heart of Silicon Valley, California.Jon Abendschein, Resource Planner at the City of Palo Alto Utilities, just sent out a letter which said: *Tuesday*, July 31 was the deadline for submitting an application to receive a Palo Alto CLEAN contract in August. No applications were received, *so there is still 4 megawatts of capacity remaining in the program. The City is now accepting applications for September contract issuance. We encourage interested property owners and developers to submit an application by Friday, August 31 to receive a contract at the beginning of September.*[Craig Lewis, Director of the CLEAN Coalition](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/has-vermont-solved-the-solar-permitting-problem1/), a distributed generation advocacy group, said, "Although disappointing, this is not entirely unexpected, given that Palo Alto's objective was to set the price based on avoided cost and to test whether the market could deliver wholesale solar at a ratepayer-neutral price."The city is looking to pay $0.14 per kilowatt-hour for 20-year contracts. Jon Abendschein, Palo Alto's Resource Planner, had commented earlier that $0.14 per kilowatt-hour is a price that will attract developers to the program.  [Palo Alto initiated this program in March of this year](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Its-Official-Palo-Alto-Calif.-Has-a-Feed-In-Tariff-for-PV-/) with a unanimous vote by the Palo Alto City Council. Palo Alto looked to join Germany, Italy, Gainesville, Florida, and Sacramento, California as regions with solar [feed-in tariffs](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/can-the-u.s.-or-california-institute-a-feed-in-tariff/) (FIT).Palo Alto called its program a CLEAN program (Clean Local Energy Accessible Now) rather than what they considered the awkward term 'feed-in tariff,' or FIT

#### No solvency - Silicon shortages

[Wenzel](http://www.cnet.com/profile/elsa.wenzel/) 8 (Elsa, CNET News Staff Writer, May 9, “Barriers to solar energy's blockbuster promise,” <http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-9939715-54.html>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

As 26 U.S. states including California are requiring some renewable energy in utilities' portfolios, more utilities are jumping on the solar bandwagon.¶ The limited availability of silicon has partly stalled the growth of the solar sector.¶ "We're struggling to provide one-third of what people want from us, and we're No. 1," according to Kristina Peterson, director of structured finance at solar module maker Suntech.¶ However, [supplies could increase](http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-9919442-54.html) by 33 percent this year and 23 percent in 2009, according to research firm Gartner. From the world's modest 8 suppliers of silicon, 100 new providers could emerge by 2009, Peterson said.¶ No matter how renewables improve in efficiency and price, Kuga of PG&E said he foresees a continued reliance on the grid, especially for peak demand.¶ Renewables make up less than 3 percent of U.S. energy, according to the Department of Energy. They can be less reliable than tried-and-true yet carbon-intensive sources like coal. Both solar and wind depend upon the whims of weather.¶

#### Solar power fails - low energy capacity

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, April 19, “Zycher testimony to joint House subcommittee hearing on subsidies for renewable energy,” <http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/zycher-testimony-to-joint-house-subcommittee-hearing-on-subsidies-for-renewable-energy/>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

The same general problem afflicts solar power. The energy content of sunlight,¶ crudely, is about 150-400 watts per square meter, depending on location, of which about¶ 20-30 percent is convertible to electricity, depending on the particular technology.¶ Accordingly, even in theory a square meter of solar energy receiving capacity is enough¶ to power roughly one 100-watt light bulb, putting aside such issues of sunlight intensity¶ and the like. This problem of land requirements for solar thermal facilities is of sufficient¶ importance that most analyses assume a maximum plant capacity of 50-100 MW, which,¶ conservatively, would require approximately 1250 acres, or 2 square miles.¶ In short: Transformation of the unconcentrated energy content of wind and¶ sunlight into a form useable for modern applications requires massive capital investment¶ in the form of both land and wind turbines and solar receiving equipment. This means¶ that the energy that can be extracted from renewable

### Warming

#### U.S. coal exports to China are low, but downward pressure on domestic demand expands them massively

Bryan Walsh 12, Senior Editor at TIME, May 31, 2012, “Drawing Battle Lines Over American Coal Exports to Asia,” online: http://science.time.com/2012/05/31/drawing-battle-lines-over-american-coal-exports-to-asia/

But across the Pacific Ocean, the demand for coal has never been hotter, with China burning 4.1 billion tons in 2010 alone, far more than any other country in the world. That insatiable demand forced China in 2009 to become a net coal importer for the first time, in part because congested rail infrastructure raised the cost of transporting coal from the mines of the country’s northwest to its booming southern cities. In April, Chinese coal imports nearly doubled from a year earlier. Right now Australia and Indonesia supply much of China’s foreign coal. U.S. coal from the Powder River Basin could be a perfect addition to the Chinese market. Montana and Wyoming are just short train trips to ports on the Pacific Northwest coast, and from there it’s a container ship away from Asian megacities where coal doesn’t have to compete with cheap natural gas and air-pollution regulations are far weaker than in the U.S. To a wounded Big Coal, China is a potential savior.¶ As I write in the new edition of TIME, there’s just one problem: right now, ports on the West Coast lack the infrastructure needed to transfer coal from railcars into container ships. (Just 7 million of the 107 million tons of U.S.-exported coal left the country via Pacific Ocean ports last year.) That’s why coal companies like Peabody and Ambre Energy are ready to spend millions to build coal-export facilities at a handful of ports in Washington and Oregon. If all those plans go forward, as much as 150 million tons of coal could be exported from the Northwest annually—-nearly all of it coming from the Powder -River -Basin and headed to Asia. Even if the U.S. kept burning less and less coal at home, it would have a reason to keep mining it.

#### Solar trades off with U.S. coal consumption

Quilty 2012 (David, writer for Georgia Solar Utilities Online, “New Georgia Utility Building Solar Plant to Replace Retired Coal Plants.”, <http://www.gasolarutilities.com/index.php/news/90-new-georgia-utility-building-solar-plant-to-replace-retired-coal-plants>) PY

A new solar utility company in Georgia has big plans to replace several coal-fired power plants being retired in the state. When Georgia Power Company announced it was set to take two coal-burning units offline at its Plant Branch facility in order to reduce the area’s dependence on coal energy, Georgia Solar Utilities Inc. offered to build a solar plant on-site and sell them the plant and power through a power-purchasing agreement. Georgia Power declined the offer so Georgia Solar is now going it alone.¶ ¶ Located near Milledgeville, Georgia right next door to Georgia Power’s coal plant, the new solar plant will cover 2,200 acres and cost approximately $320 million. It will be capable of generating 90 megawatts of power, double that of the solar system that Georgia Power already has in place. That is, the laws governing utility companies in Georgia changes and it can get built.

#### U.S. exports lock in expanded Chinese coal capacity---causes warming over the tipping point---it’s unique because absent U.S. exports the rising cost of coal will cause a shift to renewables – turns the advantage

Thomas M. Power 12, Research Professor and Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics, University of Montana; Principal, Power Consulting; February 2012, “The Greenhouse Gas Impact of Exporting Coal from the West Coast: An Economic Analysis,” <http://www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Power-White-Paper.pdf>

The cumulative impact of these coal port proposals on coal consumption in Asia could be much larger than even that implied by the two pending proposals. If Arch, Peabody, and other western U.S. coal producers’ projections of the competitiveness of western coal in Asia are correct, facilitating the opening of the development of West Coast coal ports could have a very large impact on the supply of coal to China and the rest of Asia. ¶ 6.4 The Long-term Implications of Fueling Additional Coal-Fired Electric Generation ¶ Although the economic life of coal-fired generators is often given as 30 or 35 years, a permitted, operating, electric generator is kept on line a lot longer than that, as long as 50 or more years through ongoing renovations and upgrades. Because of that long operating life, the impact of the lower Asian coal prices and costs triggered by PRB coal competing with other coal sources cannot be measured by the number of tons of coal exported each year. Those lower coal costs will lead to commitments to more coal being burned for a half-century going forward. ¶ That time-frame is very important. During exactly this time frame, the next half-century, the nations of the world will have to get their greenhouse gas emission stabilized and then reduced or the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may pass a point that will make it very difficult to avoid massive, ongoing, negative climate impacts. Taking actions now that encourage fifty-years of more coal consumption around the world is not a minor matter. Put more positively, allowing coal prices to rise (and more closely approximate their full cost, including “external” costs) will encourage extensive investments in improving the efficiency with which coal is used and the shift to cleaner sources of energy. This will lead to long-term reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that will also last well into the next half-century. 57

#### Can’t solve warming

#### A.) Deforestation

Howden 7(Daniel Howden, The Independent “Deforestation: The Hidden Cause of Global Warming” 14 May 2007. DOA August 15, 12 sphinx.tsf.hu/new/iny/files/1645.doc)

**Most people think of forests** only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of **as the lungs of the planet.** But **the destruction of those forests will in the next four years** alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, **pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025.¶** Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China.¶ What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo.¶ According to the latest audited figures from 2003, **two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere** every year **from deforestation.** That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled **annually.¶** The remaining standing forest is calculated to contain 1,000 billion tons of carbon, or double what is already in the atmosphere.¶ As the GCP's report concludes: **"If we lose forests, we lose the fight against climate change."**

#### B.) Live stock

FAO 6 ("Spotlight: Livestock Impacts on the Environment." FAO: FAO Home. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Nov. 2006. Web. 15 August 12. <<http://www.fao.org/ag/magazine/0612sp1.htm>>.)

The livestock sector is by far the single largest anthropogenic user of land. Grazing occupies 26 percent of the Earth's terrestrial surface, while feed crop production requires about a third of all arable land. Expansion of grazing land for livestock is a key factor in deforestation, especially in Latin America: some 70 percent of previously forested land in the Amazon is used as pasture, and feed crops cover a large part of the reminder. About 70 percent of all grazing land in dry areas is considered degraded, mostly because of overgrazing, compaction and erosion attributable to livestock activity.¶ At the same time, the livestock sector has assumed an often unrecognized role in global warming. Using a methodology that considered the entire commodity chain *(see box below)*, FAO estimated that livestock are responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, a bigger share than that of transport. It accounts for nine percent of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions, most of it due to expansion of pastures and arable land for feed crops. It generates even bigger shares of emissions of other gases with greater potential to warm the atmosphere: as much as 37 percent of anthropogenic methane, mostly from enteric fermentation by ruminants, and 65 percent of anthropogenic nitrous oxide, mostly from manure.

#### No impact – newest data says warming is slowing

Rose 1/29 (David, Daily Mail Online, “Forget global warming - it's Cycle 25 we need to worry about (and if NASA scientists are right the Thames will be freezing over again)”, 2012, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2093264/Forget-global-warming--Cycle-25-need-worry-NASA-scientists-right-Thames-freezing-again.html?ito=feeds-newsxml) Nisarg

The supposed ‘consensus’ on man-made global warming is facing an inconvenient challenge after the release of new temperature data showing the planet has not warmed for the past 15 years. The figures suggest that we could even be heading for a mini ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists yesterday told The Mail on Sunday that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830. In this period, named after the meteorologist John Dalton, average temperatures in parts of Europe fell by 2C. However, it is also possible that the new solar energy slump could be as deep as the ‘Maunder minimum’ (after astronomer Edward Maunder), between 1645 and 1715 in the coldest part of the ‘Little Ice Age’ when, as well as the Thames frost fairs, the canals of Holland froze solid.

### Competitiveness

#### **Competitiveness high now – new tech.**

Shah ‘12 (Agam, “IBM, lab join hands to boost US competitiveness”, Computer World, 6-27-12,

<http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9228566/IBM_lab_join_hands_to_boost_US_competitiveness>, RSR)

IDG News Service - IBM is joining hands with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to develop new technology, products and processes critical to the U.S. infrastructure in an effort to boost the global competitiveness of the country.¶ LLNL, in Livermore, Calif., and IBM's research unit will work together and provide researchers and high-performance computing resources to solve complex technical problems facing businesses in the U.S. The goal is to make "wholesale" changes to business processes and execution, and also to make U.S. companies competitive on a global stage, said Frederick Streitz, the director of the Livermore HPC innovation center, in a video posted on YouTube regarding the project.¶ National security is the mission of LLNL, he said. "National security takes many different guises. One of them is economic security, the ability for the American industry to compete in the global marketplace," Streitz said.¶ The partnership expands an ongoing 20 year relationship in which IBM provides supercomputing resources to LLNL. IBM will make material contributions by assigning additional staff from its research unit with domain expertise and will also provide a dedicated supercomputer called Vulcan for the researchers to carry out complex calculations.

#### Tariffs make the industry uncompetitive AND no jobs from production

Bensinger 12 (Ken, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer, April 23, “U.S. tariffs on Chinese solar cells fuel debate about green jobs,” <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/23/business/la-fi-solar-jobs-20120423>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

A simmering trade dispute is highlighting a debate about the kinds of jobs America can sustain in a greening economy.¶ The Obama administration's recent decision to slap import tariffs on Chinese solar cells was hailed by some domestic solar manufacturers as a victory for job creation, leveling the field while also sending a powerful message to Beijing about monopolistic behavior in crucial industries.¶ But a close look at the U.S. solar industry suggests that the tariffs may actually be a job killer because the vast majority of positions in the sector aren't on the assembly line. Instead, upward of 70% of U.S. solar employment is in installation, sales and distribution — and companies that hire those workers argue solar cells must get significantly cheaper to remain competitive with other energy sources.¶ "What China is doing to boost its manufacturers is unfair, but tariffs could actually reduce jobs," said Gordon Johnson, a green tech analyst at Axiom Capital Management. "The price of solar panels goes up and looks unaffordable compared to alternatives."¶ Although the U.S. pioneered photovoltaic solar cells decades ago, it has fallen increasingly behind lower-cost manufacturers of the technology, including China, South Korea and Malaysia. But the U.S. is among the world's fastest-growing solar consumers, opening vast opportunities for service-sector jobs in the sunlight-extraction business.¶ The matter comes to a head next month, when the Commerce Department will announce a determination on a possible second round of tariffs on Chinese-made silicon-based photovoltaic cells, which convert sunlight into electricity and are by far the most popular solar technology.¶ While tariff advocates say that protecting a solar manufacturing base is crucial to the nation's energy security, others argue the U.S. has already lost that footrace. Instead of swooping in to rescue remaining plants, they say, the focus should be on reducing the cost of solar to speed liberation from fossil fuels, which dovetails with the goal of reducing unemployment.¶ "Installation is where all the jobs are," said John Smirnow, vice president of trade and competitiveness at the Solar Energy Industry Assn. "There are 5,600 companies in the healthy, vibrant and growing solar-services sector."¶ The Commerce Department's May 17 ruling, in response to allegations of dumping by the U.S. unit of a German solar panel maker, could fundamentally alter the solar landscape in the U.S. Dumping is when a company or industry sells its products below cost to capture the market. If additional tariffs are applied, they will probably be much higher than the relatively light first round announced in March, which ran from 2.6% to 4.7%.¶ The smaller tariffs — designed to balance out Chinese subsidies of its solar factories — could squeeze margins for installers, but most experts agree they aren't enough to radically reduce consumption. Anti-dumping duties, however, could run above 20%, dramatically increasing the cost of switching to solar.¶ Cost is a key factor in getting businesses and homeowners to convert to solar power. A typical residential roof setup costs about $25,000, which federal, state and local rebates and tax incentives can cut to about $13,000 in the city of Los Angeles. At that price, it still could take about a dozen years for the systems to pay back the upfront costs through lower electricity bills.

#### Economy strong now – Best indicators prove risk of recession is 0.20%

Perry 13 [Mark, Chart of the day: US recession probability is down to 0.20%, AEIdeas, The public policy blog of the American Enterprise Institute, http://www.aei-ideas.org/2013/02/chart-of-the-day-us-recession-probability-is-down-to-0-20/]

The chart above shows University of Oregon economics professor Jeremy Piger’s “Recession Probability Index” from January 1990 to November 2012, based on the 4 monthly variables used by the NBER to determine U.S. recessions: 1) non-farm payroll employment, 2) the index of industrial production, 3) real personal income excluding transfer payments, and 4) real manufacturing and trade sales.¶ According to Professor Piger, “Historically, three consecutive months of recession probabilities exceeding 0.8 (see graph) has been a good indicator that an expansion phase has ended and a new recession phase has begun, while three consecutive months of recession probabilities below 0.2 has been a good indicator that a recession phase has ended and a new expansion phase has begun.”¶ Based on an update yesterday, the Recession Probability Index has been trending downward for the last three months and fell to 0.20% in November, the lowest level since June and July when the probability was also 0.20%. Based on this historically accurate measure of the probability of a US recession, the US economy is not even close to being in the early stages of an economic contraction.

#### Financing renewables hurt the economy – they crowd out jobs and capital investment in other industries and lower overall economic potential through their higher worker to output ratio

Frondel et al 9 (Dr. Manuel Frondel, Ph.D. in economics, professor for Energy Economics and Applied Econometrics at Ruhr-Universität Bochum, chief of the Environment and Resources Research Division at Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Nolan Ritter, Economics PhD candidate and researcher with Rhine-Westphalia Institute for Economic Research; Prof. Colin Vance, Ph.D in Economics, Adjunct Professor of Quantitative Methods with Jacobs University Bremen; “Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energies: The German experience”, Final report – October 2009, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/germany/Germany\_Study\_-\_FINAL.pdf)

While employment projections in the renewable sector convey seemingly impres- sive prospects for gross job growth, they typically obscure the broader implications for economic welfare by omitting any accounting of off-setting impacts. These impacts include, but are not limited to, job losses from crowding out of cheaper forms of conventional energy generation, indirect impacts on upstream industries, additional job losses from the drain on economic activity precipitated by higher electricity prices, private consumers’ overall loss of purchasing power due to higher electricity prices, and diverting funds from other, possibly more beneficial investment.¶ Proponents of renewable energies often regard the requirement for more workers to produce a given amount of energy as a benefit, failing to recognize that this ¶ lowers the output potential of the economy and is hence counterproductive to net job creation. Significant research shows that initial employment benefits from re- newable policies soon turn negative as additional costs are incurred. Trade- and other assumptions in those studies claiming positive employment turn out to be unsupportable.¶ In the end, Germany’s PV promotion has become a subsidization regime that, on a per-worker basis, has reached a level that far exceeds average wages, with per- worker subsidies as high as 175,000 € (US $ 240,000).¶ It is most likely that whatever jobs are created by renewable energy promotion would vanish as soon as government support is terminated, leaving only Germany’s export sector to benefit from the possible continuation of renewables support in other countries such as the US.¶

#### Hegemony will not collapse because China made it a little harder for polysilicon companies to sell their tech – the military will buy semiconductors if we need them.

#### No green jobs – small labor increases from massive incentives

**Glantz 11** (Aaron, New York Times Staff Writer, August 18, “Number of Green Jobs Fails to Live Up to Promises,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/19/us/19bcgreen.html?pagewanted=all>, d/a 7-31-12, ads)

In the Bay Area as in much of the country, the green economy is not proving to be the job-creation engine that many politicians envisioned. President Obama once pledged to create five million green jobs over 10 years. Gov. Jerry Brown promised 500,000 clean-technology jobs statewide by the end of the decade. But the results so far suggest such numbers are a pipe dream.¶ “I won’t say I’m not frustrated,” said Van Jones, an Oakland activist who served briefly as Mr. Obama’s green-jobs czar before resigning under fire after conservative critics said he had signed a petition accusing the Bush administration of deliberately allowing the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, a claim Mr. Jones denies.¶ A [study released in July by the non-partisan Brookings Institution](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2011/0713_clean_economy.aspx) found clean-technology jobs accounted for just 2 percent of employment nationwide and only slightly more — 2.2 percent — in Silicon Valley. Rather than adding jobs, the study found, the sector actually lost 492 positions from 2003 to 2010 in the South Bay, where the unemployment rate in June was 10.5 percent.¶ Federal and state efforts to stimulate creation of green jobs have largely failed, government records show. Two years after it was awarded $186 million in federal stimulus money to weatherize drafty homes, California has spent only a little over half that sum and has so far created the equivalent of just 538 full-time jobs in the last quarter, according to the State Department of Community Services and Development.¶ The weatherization program was initially delayed for seven months while the federal Department of Labor determined prevailing wage standards for the industry. Even after that issue was resolved, the program never really caught on.¶ “Companies and public policy officials really overestimated how much consumers care about energy efficiency,” said Sheeraz Haji, chief executive of the Cleantech Group, a market research firm. “People care about their wallet and the comfort of their home, but it’s not a sexy thing.”¶ Job training programs intended for the clean economy have also failed to generate big numbers. The Economic Development Department in California reports that $59 million in state, federal and private money dedicated to green jobs training and apprenticeship has led to only 719 job placements — the equivalent of an $82,000 subsidy for each one.¶ “The demand’s just not there to take this to scale,” said Fred Lucero, project manager at [Richmond BUILD](http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=1243), which teaches students the basics of carpentry and electrical work in addition to specifically “green” trades like solar installation.¶ Richmond BUILD has found jobs for 159 of the 221 students who have entered its clean-energy program — but only 35 graduates are employed with solar and energy efficiency companies, with the balance doing more traditional building trades work. Mr. Lucero said he considered each placement a success because his primary mission was to steer residents of the city’s most violent neighborhoods away from a life of crime.

#### Manufacturing not key Porter 12

(Eduardo, NY Times "The Promise Of Today's Factory Jobs," New York Times, April 3, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/04/business/economy/the-promise-of-todays-factory-jobs.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, d/a 10-11-12, ZML)

More important, perhaps, manufacturing is not the nation’s only cutting-edge industry. Many of the most innovative firms are not manufacturers but service companies. Apple is very competitive. But so are the companies that design applications running on its iPhones and iPads. Hollywood studios and marketing companies are big exporters. These firms need highly trained workers and pay high wages.¶Mr. Moretti says each job in an “innovation” industry, broadly understood, creates five other local jobs, about three times the number for an average job in manufacturing. Two of them are highly paid professional positions and three are low-paid jobs as waiters or clerks.¶ Innovation — not manufacturing —has always propelled this country’s progress. A strategy to reward manufacturers who increase their payroll in the United States may not be as effective as one to support the firms whose creations — whether physical stuff or immaterial services — can conquer world markets and pay for the jobs of the rest of us.

#### Competitiveness theory is wrong

Amar Bhide 8, Professor of Business at Columbia, “The Venturesome Economy: How Innovation Sustains Prosperity in a More Connected World”, <http://bhide.net/venturesome_press/JACF_Venturesome_Economy_1_bhide.pdf>

Techno-nationalist arguments based on sound bytes or parsimonious economic models cannot deal with the complexity of the multiplayer game. They rarely distinguish between different levels and kinds of know-how. Instead, they equate innovation with scientific publications or patents on cutting-edge technology produced in universities or in commercial research labs. They ignore the contributions of the other players in the innovation game that don’t result in publications or patents. Techno-nationalists also tend to oversimplify the phenomenon of globalization, often assuming that high-level know-how never crosses national borders—only the final products made using the know-how are traded.19 This assumption is pivotal in theoretical models of “North-South” trade that Richard Freeman invokes to predict the woeful consequences of the erosion of U.S. technological leadership. The reality, however, is that high-level ideas cross national borders rather easily, whereas a large proportion of “final” output, especially in the service sector, does not. The Propositions My analysis of the multiplayer game and cross-border interactions suggests outcomes that differ sharply from the dire predictions of the techno-nationalists. According to my assessment, the United States is not locked into a “winner-take-all” race for scientific and technological leadership, and the growth of research capabilities in China and India—and thus their share of cutting-edge research—does not reduce U.S. prosperity. Indeed my analysis suggests that advances abroad will improve living standards in the U.S. Moreover, the benefits I identify are different from the conventional economist’s account whereby prosperity abroad increases opportunities for U.S. exporters. Instead, I show that cutting-edge research developed abroad benefits domestic production and consumption in the service sector. And contrary to the policy prescriptions of techno-nationalists, I suggest that the U.S. embrace the expansion of research capabilities abroad instead of devoting more resources to maintaining its lead in science and cutting-edge technology.20 My assessment and prescriptions differ so sharply from those of the techno-nationalists for reasons that I summarize below: The world is a long way from being “flat”—China and India aren’t anywhere close to catching up with the U.S. in their capacity to develop and use technological innovations. Starting afresh may allow China and India to leapfrog ahead in some fields, in building advanced mobile phone networks, for example. But excelling in the overall innovation game requires a great and diverse team, which, history suggests, takes a very long time to build. Consider Japan, which began to “enter the world” after the Boshin War of 1868. In the subsequent Meiji Restoration, the country abolished its feudal system and instituted a Western legal system and a quasi-parliamentary constitutional government. In a few decades, Japan had modernized its industry, its military, and its educational system. Today Japan is a highly developed economy and makes important contributions to advancing the technological frontier. But nearly a century and a half after Japan started modernizing, its overall capacity to develop and use innovations, as evidenced by the country’s average productivity, remains behind that of the U.S. Similarly, Korea and Taiwan started industrializing (as it happens, under Japanese rule) about a century ago and enjoyed miraculous rates of growth after the 1960s. In several sectors of the electronics industry, Korean and Taiwanese companies are technological leaders. Yet their overall productivity suggests they have less capacity than Japan to develop and use innovations. Is it likely, then, that within any reader’s lifetime China and India will attain the parity with the U.S. that has eluded Japan, Korea, and Taiwan? The fear of offshoring of innovation is similarly exaggerated—don’t expect to hear a giant sucking sound anytime soon. The massive relocation of innovation appears highly unlikely. The fact that U.S. companies have started R&D centers abroad that do high-level research doesn’t mean that all lower-level know-how development will quickly follow. Of the many activities included in the innovation game, only some are performed well in remote, low-cost locations. Many mid-level activities, for instance, are best conducted close to potential customers. Any catch-up, even if it takes place gradually and in the normal course of development, will to some degree reduce the U.S. “lead.” Furthermore, the global influence of techno-nationalism could accelerate this process. As alarmists in the U.S. continue to remind us, governments in “emerging” countries such as China and India—also in the thrall of techno-nationalist thinking—are making a determined effort to leap ahead in cutting-edge science and technology. But I am skeptical that these efforts are going to do any more good for China’s and India’s economy than similar efforts in Europe and Japan in the 1970s and 1980s.21 But putting aside the issue of whether investing in cutting-edge research represents a good use of Chinese and Indian resources, does whatever erosion of U.S. primacy in developing high-level know-how this might cause really threaten U.S. prosperity? Should the U.S. government respond in kind by putting even more money into research? Nobel laureate Paul Krugman has long decried what he refers to as the “dangerous obsession” with “national competitiveness.” As Krugman wrote in a 1994 article in Foreign Affairs, the widespread tendency to think that “the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi” is “flatly, completely and demonstrably wrong.” Although “competitive problems could arise in principle, as a practical, empirical matter,” Krugman goes on to say, “the major nations of the world are not to any significant degree in economic competition with each other.”22 The techno-nationalist claim that U.S. prosperity requires that the country “maintain its scientific and technological lead” is particularly dubious: the argument fails to recognize that the development of scientific knowledge or cutting-edge technology is not a zero-sum competition. The results of scientific research are available at no charge to anyone anywhere in the world. Most arguments for the public funding of scientific research are in fact based on the unwillingness of private investors to undertake research that cannot yield a profit. Cutting-edge technology (as opposed to scientific research) has commercial value because it can be patented; but patent owners generally don’t charge higher fees to foreign licensors. The then tiny Japanese company Sony was one of the first licensors of Bell Labs’ transistor patent. Sony paid all of $50,000—and only after first obtaining special permission from the Japanese Ministry of Finance—for the license that started it on the road to becoming a household name in consumer electronics. Moreover, if patent holders choose not to grant licenses but to exploit their inventions on their own, this does not mean that the country of origin secures most of the benefit at the expense of other countries. Suppose IBM chooses to exploit internally, instead of licensing, a breakthrough from its China Research Laboratory (employing 150 research staff in Beijing). This does not help China and hurt everyone else. Rather, as I discuss at length later, the benefits go to IBM’s stockholders, to employees who make or market the product that embodies the invention, and—above all—to customers, who secure the lion’s share of the benefit from most innovations. These stockholders, employees, and customers, who number in the tens of millions, are located all over the world. In a world where breakthrough ideas easily cross national borders, the origin of ideas is inconsequential. Contrary to Thomas Friedman’s assertion, it does not matter that Google’s search algorithm was invented in California. After all, a Briton invented the protocols of the World Wide Web—in a lab in Switzerland. A Swede and a Dane in Tallinn, Estonia, started Skype, the leading provider of peer-to-peer Internet telephony. How did the foreign origins of these innovations harm the U.S. economy? The techno-nationalist preoccupation with high-level research also obscures the importance of what happens at lower levels of the innovation game. High-level breakthroughs that originate in China or India can in principle be used to develop mid- and ground-level products of value to workers and consumers everywhere. But the benefits are not automatic: realizing the value of high-level innovation requires “venturesome” lower-level players who have the resourcefulness and gumption to solve challenging technical and business problems. Without venturesome radio manufacturers such as Sony, transistors might have remained lab curiosities. Moreover, the benefits of lower-level venturesome consumption often remain in the country where it occurs, and all countries don’t have the same capacity for such consumption. Therefore, I argue, because high-level ideas cross borders easily, a nation’s “venturesome consumption”—the willingness and ability of intermediate producers and individual consumers to take a chance on and effectively use new know-how and products—is at least as important as its capacity to undertake high-level research. Maryland has a higher per capita income than Mississippi, Norway has a higher per capita income than Nigeria, and Bosnia has a higher per capita income than Bangladesh; the richer places are not ahead because they are (or once were) significant developers of breakthrough technologies. Rather, they are wealthier because of their capacity to benefit from innovations that originated elsewhere. Conversely, the city of Rochester, New York (home to Xerox, Kodak, and the University of Rochester) is reputed to have one of the highest number of patents per capita of any city in the U.S. It is far from the most economically vibrant. The United States, according to my analysis, has more than just great scientists and research labs: it also hosts an innovation game with many players who can exploit high-level breakthroughs regardless of where they originate. Therefore, the erosion of the U.S. lead in cutting-edge research, far from hurting the U.S. economy, may well be a blessing for the following reason: an increase in the world’s supply of high-level know-how provides more raw material for mid- and ground-level innovations that increase living standards in the United States. The U.S. technological lead narrowed after World War II as Western Europe and Japan rebuilt their economies and research capabilities. This led not to a decrease, but to an increase in U.S. prosperity.23 And the U.S. likely enjoys a higher standard of living because Taiwan and Korea have started contributing to the world’s supply of scientific and technological knowledge.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

## 2NC

### CP

#### Carbon tax is comparatively better than FITs at reducing emissions

McIIveen et al 10 (Robert McIlveen is a Research Fellow in the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He completed his PhD in Political Science at the University of Sheffield in 2008., Dieter Helm is an economist specialising in utilities, infrastructure, regulation and the environment, and concentrates on the energy, water and transport sectors primarily in Britain and Europe. He is a Professor at the University of Oxford, Simon Less is head of the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He was previously a Director at Ofwat, July 10th, http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases/category/item/greener-cheaper)

The recommendations in this report propose a better way towards cutting the UK’s carbon emissions. “We have set out measures that will help the UK go greener more cheaply than the current set of¶ policies – at a smaller cost to businesses and ordinary families facing rising energy bills.¶ “Current policies are complicated, overlap each other and wasteful. This report shows how we can cut the cost of tackling climate change through measures like a streamlined carbon tax that will be more effective, more efficient and better for Britain.”¶ Some policies are simply wasting money and should be abolished – the feed-in tariff scheme for micro- renewables is a very expensive way to subsidise a marginal contribution to decarbonisation. While there is nothing wrong with small-scale renewables, the report finds no justification of the generous subsidy it enjoys under this scheme, which costs on average £460 for every tonne of carbon dioxide saved – compared to around £12 under the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EUETS). The report recommends abolishing the feed-in tariff scheme due to its excessive cost and poor value for money - £8 billion over twenty years could be spent much more effectively on other approaches to tackling climate change.¶ The report also calls for the Carbon Reduction Commitment to be simplified. The basic idea behind the policy – requiring large but non-energy intensive businesses and public sector bodies to monitor and report their emissions – is sound, but has been turned into something much more complicated than it needs to be. The cap-and-trade element is unnecessary and just makes it more complex and burdensome, so the report recommends removing this element from what is otherwise a worthwhile policy.¶ The second part of the report lays out how a carbon tax would be another way of cutting costs and achieving more carbon reduction. Professor Dieter Helm CBE, Professor of Energy Policy at Oxford University and author of the second section of the report writes: “Carbon taxes are efficient – and hence their main rationale is that they will achieve the same results as other policies at lower costs. There is therefore a direct implication for the politics of climate change mitigation: carbon taxes are a cheaper option.”

#### Carbon tax is better than FITs – UK Proves

McIIveen et al 10 (Robert McIlveen is a Research Fellow in the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He completed his PhD in Political Science at the University of Sheffield in 2008., Dieter Helm is an economist specialising in utilities, infrastructure, regulation and the environment, and concentrates on the energy, water and transport sectors primarily in Britain and Europe. He is a Professor at the University of Oxford, Simon Less is head of the Environment and Energy Unit at Policy Exchange. He was previously a Director at Ofwat, July 10th, http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases/category/item/greener-cheaper)

UK carbon reduction policy has become complex, costly and excessively burdensome. If this is not addressed, it will frustrate efforts to decarbonise, as public resistance and economic costs mount over policies which, simply put, are wasting significant amounts of money. Of the policies examined in this report, Feed-in Tariffs for microgeneration should simply be abolished, while the RHI proposals should scaled back and CRC simplified.¶ The introduction of a carbon tax represents a major opportunity. Implemented well, with the right strategy to ensure political credibility as well as a predictable price, it could enable a far-reaching tidy-up of policy, promoting more effective, and more cost-effective, decarbonisation.¶ Carbon reduction policy can be much more cost-effective than it is now. By prioritising simplicity and value for money, carbon reduction policy can achieve more for less.¶ This report has proceeded on the basis of improving cost-effectiveness in reducing carbon emissions, not on how to meet all targets the UK has, including on renewables.The recommendations made would reduce the cost of meeting our carbon targets by removing expensive distortions. However, they would make meeting the renewables target – the objective of a number of the more expensive policies – less likely, since expensive renewables (such as those under FiTs and the RHI) could be replaced by cheaper, non-renewable emissions cuts (such as fuel switching and energy efficiency measures).

#### Carbon tax leads to solar installation – makes it cost competitive

Electrical Connection 12 (Carbon Tax making solar look even cheaper, July 2nd, http://electricalconnection.com.au/article/10016654/carbon-tax-making-solar-look-even-cheaper)

With the carbon tax now operating and energy price rises kicking in, the economics around solar power are making it look even cheaper.¶ People in New South Wales already know that electricity prices are allowed to go up 18% over the next year from 1 July.¶ The two main reasons for this are the carbon tax and the cost of distributing electricity, the poles and wires. Households in NSW currently pay between 20 and 30 cents a kilowatt hour, reaching 43 cents at peak.¶ According to Jeff Bye, from ASX listed CBD Energy, the effect of the carbon tax is just making the gap even bigger between low cost solar power and more expensive traditional generation.¶ “If you have your own solar power station on your roof you not only avoid these costs but your source of power, the sun, is free and your low cost is locked in for 25 years,” Jeff says.¶ Solar energy is now costing between 5 and 7 cents a kilowatt hour to produce, with this level applicable over the lifetime of a solar system of around 25 years.¶ Unlike the increasing cost of building new coal fired power stations, the cost of solar panels has been falling, helped principally by the lower cost of their main ingredient of silicon which has fallen in price from $450/kg in 2008 to around $25/kg today.

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Carbon cap key get China on board

Morgan 11 (Dan Morgan, fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, U.S. Shelves "Cap and Trade" -- Policy Shift (And Congressional Opposition) Sink EU-Style Climate Exchange-Market In U.S. By Dan Morgan, http://www.europeaninstitute.org/EA-February-2011/us-shelves-qcap-and-tradeq-policy-shift-and-congressional-opposition-sink-eu-style-climate-exchange-market-in-us.html)

No accident, the omission merely confirmed a development that has become obvious: the big idea of a U.S. “cap and trade system” to limit greenhouse-gas emissions is dead for this administration and even more clearly, anathema to the new Republican-leaning Congress. For the remaining two years of the President’s mandate, the Obama administration has clearly concluded that the pursuit of a national carbon ceiling – in effect, a price tag on pollution – has to be abandoned as a policy approach that is currently unworkable. In the U.S, the opposing view is too strong: that pollution limits will constrain economic growth. The Result? Without any prospect of a government-mandated “cap,” there can be no U.S. national system of emissions-trading as a way to ratchet down carbon-caused greenhouse gases.¶ Its demise does not bury hopes that the U.S. will still work for “clean energy” to curb carbon pollution, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat climate change. But, it does deliver a severe blow to longstanding hopes for transatlantic convergence on “cap-and-trade” as a potentially global model for “decarbonizing” economies.¶ For a decade, this approach has been a point of common transatlantic purpose among U.S. and European climate-change negotiators, who saw it as the most flexible and pragmatic approach to global cooperation in curbing greenhouse gases. The EU has pioneered this approach: its Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) started in 2005 and is the world’s largest market of this kind. Even though the ETS has suffered severe teething problems, its operations have been steadily improving, making it a paradigm for other nations to join.¶ Now the concept has been orphaned. While the EU will continue operating the ETS, there is no realistic prospect of seeing the U.S. join this initiative, certainly not before new elections in 2012, and perhaps never. As the EU persists alone, European industrialists can be expected to complain that the system makes them less competitive internationally. And, of course, the absence of a common transatlantic stance will ease diplomatic pressure on China and other nations that are growing global sources of carbon pollution. In practice, the impact of the EU’s ETS as a world exemplar always depended on being joined by a similar U.S. system with real teeth. The ETS excludes agriculture and many other non-industrial sources of carbon pollution, many of which would have been captured by the proposed U.S. system. A big exception would still have been American agriculture, whose emissions were ignored in the U.S. draft bill. Even so, the U.S. version of the cap-and-trade bill was still strongly opposed by the American farm lobby: this block of largely Democratic legislators worked tirelessly in the Democratic-conrolled Senate to keep the bill from coming up. Indeed, the measure died there. The U.S. farm sector lobbied so strongly because the sector is highly sensitive to any rise in electricity and gas prices and feared that cabon caps, especially on refineries in the Middle West, would drive up these costs. In contrast, EU farm groups had little to fear, at least at this stage, from the weaker ETS system when it was adopted.

#### Carbon caps key to climate talks

Washington Post 8 (Transition's Timing Hits Climate Talks, By Juliet Eilperin¶ Washington Post Staff Writer¶ Monday, December 8, 2008 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/07/AR2008120702426.html)

The delicate state of the global climate talks -- weighted down by the worldwide financial crisis -- highlights the challenges the negotiators face. The Bush administration and its allies successfully resisted setting specific climate goals during the past few negotiating rounds, and there are doubts that Obama can get Congress to approve a sufficiently ambitious national carbon cap by the time delegates meet again next December in Copenhagen. And without a U.S. commitment in place, other nations will be reluctant to sign a deal.¶ "A full, final, ratifiable agreement just isn't in the cards" next year, said Elliot Diringer, director of international strategies for the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "It's really important to have realistic expectations going into Copenhagen, and then there's a chance of success."

#### Doesn’t link to politics – revenue neutral and conservative support

Davenport 12 (Coral, energy and environment correspondent for the National Journal, prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly.December 6th, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/how-obama-and-congress-could-find-common-ground-on-energy-20121206)

Still, a combination of events—including more droughts, floods, and extreme weather like superstorm Sandy—has increased the sense of urgency. The recent explosion in domestic oil and natural-gas production has helped to create jobs and prop up the recovery while bringing together oil companies and the Obama White House in alliances that could pave the way for new agreements on energy policy. And as Washington grapples with the deficit, many in the capital are more open to the carbon tax as a way to raise revenue.¶ CLIMATE CHANGE¶ Over the past two years, Republican candidates increasingly denied the science of climate change, spurred by fossil-fuel-funded super PACs that attacked members of Congress for expressing belief in climate change and a desire to stop it. But the assault doesn’t seem to have worked. Despite all the money spent by the fossil-fuel industry in this cycle, the president won the election handily and Democrats gained two seats in the Senate. Meanwhile, a “Flat Earth Five” campaign run by the League of Conservation Voters to unseat climate deniers helped to defeat all but one of its targets.¶ That may be in part because voters are less likely to support candidates who deny global warming. In a September poll, the Yale Project on Climate Change Communication found that Americans’ belief in global warming increased from 57 percent in January 2010 to 70 percent in September 2012. The number of Americans who doubt climate change declined from 20 percent in January 2010 to only 12 percent today. The group also found that 77 percent of Americans say that global warming should be a “very high,” “high,” or “medium” priority, and 88 percent believe the United States should accept the economic costs to reduce global warming.¶ In the poll, 61 percent said they would vote for a candidate who supports a revenue-neutral carbon tax if it created more U.S. jobs in the renewable-energy and energy-efficiency industries. “Denial doesn’t work for us on climate change, immigration, people loving who they want to love, not on the fiscal cliff,” says Bob Inglis, a former Republican House member from South Carolina who has launched a campaign to build support among conservative voters and lawmakers for a revenue-neutral tax swap. “And that change is soaking into some conservatives.”

#### Doesn’t link to politics – conservatives like it

Trabish 12 (Herman K., Contributor to Wired and Greentechmedia Trabish: December 7, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Why-is-DC-Talking-about-a-Carbon-Tax-Again)

Washington insiders at both ends of the political spectrum have begun talking about a carbon tax.¶ The document "A Progressive Carbon Tax Will Fight Climate Change and Stimulate the Economy" by Richard Caperton of the Democrat-aligned Center for American Progress (CAP) is a little surprising because the assumption since 2009 has been that some version of a market-based cap-and-trade program was the only politically viable way to put a price on carbon emissions.¶ Advocacy for a carbon tax by academics at the Republican-aligned American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is astonishing because the word "tax," thanks to Grover Norquist, seemed to have been synonymous with the word "unpatriotic" on that side of the aisle.¶ But with both parties struggling with how the federal government can put its fiscal house in order, things may have changed.¶ At an AEI-hosted conference in July, AEI researchers Kevin Hassett and Aparna Mathur and Brookings Institution researcher Adele Morris jointly proposed the idea as part of a broad fiscal reform program because it could be a “significant source of revenue.” ¶ A tax “starting at about $20 per ton of CO2 in 2015 and rising at 4 percent over inflation would raise over $100 billion in the first year, rising to over $400 billion per year by 2040,” they estimated. And, they added, a tax “that funds deficit reduction or offsets other distortionary taxes would be a lot less costly to the economy than one that doesn’t.”¶ They recommended a progressive structure so that a rebate program would not be needed to protect vulnerable businesses and those with low incomes.¶ “A greenhouse gas tax can reduce the need for both more burdensome regulation and other federal outlays and tax expenditures,” they said, putting them in agreement with other AEI presenters who noted that a carbon tax has advantages over the traditional regulation conservatives disdain at least as much, adding that it provides an incentive to reduce consumption, drives emissions reductions via the lowest-cost options, and is more transparent.

#### Doesn’t link - corporate support for a carbon tax

Ebell 12 (Say It Isn’t So! Exxon Supports a Carbon Tax , December 3rd, http://www.globalwarming.org/2012/12/03/say-it-isnt-so-exxon-supports-a-carbon-tax/)

Big Oil is coming out of the closet. Exxon Mobil confirmed earlier this month in a Bloomberg Businessweek article that they support a carbon tax. Shell and BP have signed a Climate Price Communiqué that was distributed on 29th November at the eighteenth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is meeting in Doha, Qatar, this week and next.¶ The most obvious reason why big oil and gas companies would support a huge new tax on their own products is that it would kill coal first. Burning coal emits roughly twice as much carbon dioxide as producing the same amount of energy by burning natural gas. A $20 a ton of CO2 tax would roughly double the current price of coal used for producing electricity. That would provide a huge incentive for utilities to switch to natural gas. Exxon Mobil owns the world’s largest privately-owned reserves of natural gas. Shell and BP also own huge gas reserves.¶ The Climate Price Communiqué states that, “Putting a clear, transparent and unambiguous price on carbon emissions must be a core policy objective.” They mean a global price, but a U. S. domestic carbon tax could fit comfortably into their plans.¶ The communiqué was organized by the Prince of Wales’s Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change and is managed by the University of Cambridge’s Programme for Sustainability Leadership. One-hundred forty companies have signed on, but Shell and BP are among just a handful of major corporations.¶ Amusingly, an article posted on the Center for American Progress’s ThinkProgress web site claimed that the signers were “leading global companies.” Here’s the list of North American companies: Actio, Aimia, Bullfrog Power, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Wedge, Delphi Group, Eco-kraft, EOS Climate, Horizon Capitol Holdings, Events Outside the Box, Mountain Equipment Co-Op, Offsetters, Pacific GPS, Westport, and Wildlife Works.

### Solvency

#### Outweighs the aff – Low manufacturing costs are key to growth

Benedetti 12 (Georgina, Frost and Sullivan senior industry analyst, June 4, “U.S. tariffs on Chinese solar panels could slow industry,” <http://www.eetimes.com/electronics-news/4374479/U-S--tariffs-solar>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

As a result, on May 24, the Commerce Department slapped stiff tariffs on imports of Chinese solar panels, imposing tariffs of 31 percent to 250 percent on Chinese solar-product imports. However, import duties on Chinese solar panels can have negative effects on the solar industry in the United States. Since the enactment of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the U.S. government has invested in providing tax incentives and loan guarantees with the aim to promote solar energy system installations and reduce its installation and generation cost. Government incentives and renewable energy standards have been important drivers for solar energy deployment and cost reduction. However, lower solar module prices from Chinese manufacturers have also helped reduce the price of solar energy, making solar more affordable for U.S. customers and more competitive with other forms of electricity generation. Average selling module prices have decreased 28.1 percent in 2011 (with respect to 2010) in the United States. The Commerce Department's decision, coupled with the recent expiration of the Section 1603 cash grant (in lieu of the Investment Tax Credit, is projected to increase solar electricity prices in the United States, affect demand for solar panels (which may exacerbate the current oversupply of polysilicon in the industry), hurt U.S. jobs, diminish the competitiveness of solar energy relative to conventional and non-solar renewable sources of energy, and may also lead China to take retaliatory measures against U.S. solar panels manufacturers. These projections are supported by the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy led by Sun Edison, which predicts that a 50 percent tariff would eliminate 14,000 jobs in the United States. The solar market has grown more than 100 percent during 2011. It is difficult at this point to forecast the precise effects the new tariffs will have on solar panel demand and prices, but Frost & Sullivan expects a deceleration in the industry’s growth in 2012.

### Warm

#### Chinese emissions are sufficient to cause extinction

John Copeland Nagle 11, the John N. Matthews Professor, Notre Dame Law School, Spring 2011, “How Much Should China Pollute?,” Vermont Journal of Environmental Law, 12 Vt. J. Envtl. L. 591

Third, the rest of the world suffers because of the inability of China and the United States to agree on a method for reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. Even if the rest of the world were to reach such an agreement, the failure to include China and the United States would doom the project from the start. Together, China and the United States account for forty-one percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. [FN19] Left unchecked, China's emissions alone could result in many of the harms associated with climate change. [FN20] That is why many observers believe that “[t]he decisions taken in Beijing, more than anywhere else, [will] determine whether humanity thrive[s] or perishe[s].”

#### A. Too late

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, 2010, “Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change,” pg 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.

58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

#### Doesn’t solve fossil fuel use – subsidies spur increased energy demand

Zehner 12 (Ozzie, University of California Berkeley Visiting Scholar, June 04, “Green Illusions: The Dirty Secrets Of Clean Energy,” <http://thegwpf.org/the-climate-record/5880-green-illusions-the-dirty-secrets-of-clean-energy-.html>, d/a 8-2-12, ads)

Hexafluoroethane has a global warming potential that is 12,000 times higher than CO2, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It is 100 percent manufactured by humans, and survives 10,000 years once released into the atmosphere. Nitrogen trifluoride is 17,000 times more virulent than CO2, and SF6, the most treacherous greenhouse gas, is over 23,000 times more threatening.¶ The solar photovoltaic industry is one of the fastest-growing emitters of these gases, which are now measurably accumulating within the earth's atmosphere according to the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). A NOAA study shows that atmospheric concentrations of SF6 have been rising exponentially. A paper published in the peer-reviewed journal Geophysical Research Letters documents that atmospheric NF3 levels have been rising 11 percent per year.¶ "If photovoltaic production grows, so will the associated side effects," claims Zehner. "Even worse, there's no evidence that solar cells offset fossil fuel use in the American context." Zehner explains that alternative energy subsidies keep retail electricity costs incrementally lower, which then spurs demand. "It's a boomerang effect," remarks Zehner. "The harder we throw alternative energy into the electrical grid, the harder demand comes back to hit us on the head. Historically, we've filled that demand by building more fossil fuel plants, not fewer."¶ Instead, Zehner advocates shifting to energy taxes and other conservation measures. He claims that even some of the most expensive options for dealing with CO2 would become cost competitive long before today's solar cell technologies.¶ "If limiting CO2 is our goal, we might be better off directing our time and resources to those options first; solar cells seem a wasteful and pricey strategy," says Zehner. "It is hard to conceive of a justification for extracting taxes from the working class to fund installations of Stone Age photovoltaic technologies high in the gold-rimmed suburbs of Arizona and California."¶

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

Marques et al. 12 (António Cardoso Marques and José Alberto Fuinhas, University of Beira Economics Department, University of Beira Interior, Management and Economics Department and NECE, "Is renewable energy effective in promoting growth?," Energy Policy, Vol. 46, July 2012, p. 434-442, Science Direct)

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

### Compete

#### US economy growing now, multiple indicators prove

Sherter 2012 [Alain, U.S. economy growing faster than forecast, CBS MoneyWatch, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123\_162-57556104/u.s-economy-growing-faster-than-forecast/]

(MoneyWatch) The U.S. economy got an early holiday gift Thursday when the U.S. Commerce Department announced that growth in the third quarter was 2.7 percent, topping a previous forecast. ¶ While the latest economic snapshot is good news for Americans, it raises the heat on Congress and President Barack Obama to reach a deal to avoid taking the nation off the so-called "fiscal cliff," a package of mandated government spending cuts and expiring tax breaks scheduled to take effect in January. That could throw the economy in reverse just as it appears to be gaining speed.¶ The new GDP figures are an update of the agency's estimate last month of 2 percent growth in the July-to-September period. The revised numbers, which are adjusted seasonally, offer a more accurate picture of growth than the government's initial forecast. The economy grew 1.9 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively, in the first and second quarters.¶ Propelling the growth in GDP was stronger consumer spending, federal outlays, expanding business inventories and a renewed housing sector, the Commerce Department said. ¶ Yet the latest report also suggests the economy may be slowing slightly in the fourth quarter. Drags on growth include exports, which slid 1.6 percent for the quarter, compared with a 5.3 percent rise in the previous quarter, and shrinking investment in non-residential real estate. Gains in household income also fell, which could reduce consumer spending in future months. ¶ Much of the growth for the quarter, at 0.8 percent, came from businesses building up inventories. Because they may not need to re-stock in the current quarter, that could effectively steal growth from the last three months of the year. "The bigger the build-up in the third quarter, the more likely we are to see a run down in the fourth," said Paul Ashworth, chief U.S. economist with Capital Economics, in a research note. ¶ Another 0.7 percent of GDP growth stemmed from increased federal spending, mostly for defense. The government is likely to curb such spending in the current quarter, which also could reduce growth. ¶ Perhaps most critically for the recovery, housing around the U.S. continues to show steady, if unexceptional, gains. For the third quarter, home prices around the nation were up 3.6 percent from the year ago-period, according to the Case-Shiller index, and sales of existing houses have grown roughly 10 percent from a year ago. Driving that rebound: Low mortgage rates, which are luring home buyers back into the market and a declining stock of new and existing homes.¶ Rising real estate prices allow homeowners who owe more on their mortgages than their properties are worth to recoup equity. In shedding debt and recovering some of the wealth that vaporized during the housing crash, people are freer to spend, which fuels broader economic expansion.¶ On the supply side, rising housing values and sales give homebuilders an incentive to put up new homes. As a result, construction expanded across most of the Federal Reserve's 12 districts, the central bank said Wednesday, with new starts roughly 40 percent above year-ago levels.¶ For now, that momentum looks likely to continue.9888 A growing number of Americans plan to buy a home within the next six months, according to the Conference Board, a trade association representing businesses. Patrick Newport, U.S. economist with IHS Global Insight, also said in a report this week that the research firm expects home prices to continue rising over the next five years, although not much faster than inflation.¶ The other major engine for the economy this year has been consumer spending. That fell slightly in the quarter, to 1.4 percent, down from 2 percent in the previous estimate, Commerce reported. Yet many economists expect that to rebound next year. One good sign is that the key holiday shopping season is off to a good start, fueled by strong Black Friday sales, and expectations for the final month of the year are generally upbeat. ¶ Consumer spending accounts for roughly 70 percent of economic activity. As Americans have continued to spend, even amid mounting public attention on the fiscal cliff, more businesses have started hiring.¶ The number of Americans applying for jobless benefits fell 23,000 last week to 393,000, the U.S. Labor Department said today. The labor market has strengthened in recent months, with the government revising upward previous job-creation estimates. Unemployment fell last month in more than half of the 372 biggest U.S. cities, according to the government.

#### Incentives kill jobs – opportunity cost for the capital used to create subsidies

Alvarez et al 9 (Gabriel Calzada Álvarez PhD, Associate Professor of Applied Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, in Madrid; Raquel Merino Jara, Associate Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; Juan Ramón Rallo Julián, Professor of Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; José Ignacio García Bielsa, Mining Engineer, former Director of RWE Trading/Solutions, responsible for the development of their energy business in Spain and Portugal; “Study of the effects on employment of public aid to renewable energy sources,” March 2009, www.juandemariana.org/pdf/090327-employment-public-aid-renewable.pdf)

Public investment in renewable energy has job creation as one of its explicit goals, which, given the current economic crisis, suggests an intention of seeding a future recovery with “green job” subsidies. The problem with this plan is that the resources used to create “green jobs” must be obtained from elsewhere in the economy. Therefore, this type of policy tends to create not just a crowding-out effect but also a net destruction of capital insofar as the investment necessary must be subsidized to a great extent and this is carried out by absorbing or destroying capital from the rest of the economy.¶ The money spent by the government cannot, once committed to “green jobs”, be consumed or invested by private parties and therefore the jobs that would depend on such consumption and investment will disappear or not be created.¶ Investment in green jobs will only prove convenient if the expense by the public sector is more efficient at generating wealth than the private sector. This would only be possible if public investment were able to be self-financing without having to resort to subsidies, i.e., without needing to absorb wealth generated by the rest of the economy in order to support a production that cannot be justified through the incurred incomes and costs. We have calculated that the total public subsidy in Spain, both spent and committed, totals 28,671 million Euros (€28.7 billion or appx. $37 billion USD), and sustains 50,200 jobs.¶ In order to know how many net jobs are destroyed by a green job program for each one that it is intended to create, we use two different methods: with the first, we compare the average amount of capital destruction (the subsidized part of the investment) necessary to create a green job against the average amount of capital that a job requires in the private sector; with the second, we compare the average annual productivity that the subsidy to each green job would have contributed to the economy had it not been consumed in such a way, with the average productivity of labor in the private sector that allows workers to remain employed.The total amount of invested and promised money to guarantee the viability of renewable energy in Spain is as high as 28,671 million Euros, and, if we include the non- subsidized investment, up to 50,200 employees have been put to work.¶ This forcible loss of resources incurred by renewable energy programs must be compared with the average resources per worker allocated in the private sector. The parameter that most closely approximates it is the average stock of capital per worker, whose mean between 1995 and 2005 in Spain was 259,143 Euros.¶ Therefore, for every green job that is attempted to be created, there is a 2.2 destruction of the resources that on average the private sector employs per worker¶ Subdidy \_ to \_ renewables \_ per \_ wor ker = 571,138 = 2.2 Average \_ capital \_ per \_ wor ker 259,143¶ This is to say that for every renewable energy job that the State manages to finance, we can be confident that on average 2.2 jobs will be destroyed, to which we have to add those jobs that the non-subsidized investment would have created.¶ In this section, we shall compare the average annual productivity that the green job subsidy would have contributed to the economy had it not been consumed in public financing, with the average productivity in the private sector that allows them to keep their job, the latter being ultimately the measure which justifies the creation or preservation of that job.¶ In order to obtain the annual public consumption of resources devoted to renewable energy we calculate the average annuity value during the next 25 years of subsidies. Now, what should be the rate at which we discount the annuities? In a private enterprise, the adequate rate would be the ROA (return on assets) because this is the rate of additional return that we would have obtained over a year if we had allocated, in the private sector, the annual cost of renewables.¶ For an entire economy, the closest thing we have to an ROA is the relationship between the annual income of capital and the stock of capital in the economy, that is, a ratio of the annual return on that stock of capital.¶ In Spain, annual capital profitability has slowed in recent years and thus we will take the lowest rate available: 8.53% in 2005.56 With this discount, the average annuity for the end of 2008 is €55,946 per worker.This figure must be compared with the annual average productivity per worker in the rest of the economy. We can obtain this data by dividing the total income of labor in the economy by the number of workers. Thus, the average productivity per worker, between 2003 and 2007, was 25,332 Euros57.¶ Thus, on average, the subsidized green job destroys the resources required to have created 2.2 jobs in the economy.¶ Annual \_ subsidy \_ to \_ renewables \_ per \_ wor ker = 55,946 = 2.2 Average \_ productivity \_ per \_ wor ker 25,332¶ Consequently, through the use of both methods we have reached a similar conclusion: for every green job, we can be highly confident that 2.2 jobs are destroyed elsewhere in the economy, to which we have to add those jobs that the non-subsidized investment would have created.¶ With that said, not all forms of energy sources are equally destructive, given that, to remain competitive, not all of them require the same amount of subsidy per megawatt. Our calculations, charted, reveal the following:W e see that solar energy is significantly less competitive given that it requires more than twice the amount production of subsidy per megawatt compared to wind energy. By putting the per megawatt subsidy data in relation to the mean amount of capital resources, we obtain the number of jobs lost as a result of each kind of subsidized renewable energy source.We achieve an identical result by relating the present value of an annuity of the sum of the committed amount with the annual productivity of labor: As we can see in figure 10, each renewable megawatt installed, on average (given Spain’s breakdown of individual source contributions), destroys 5.28 jobs, compared with the 4.27 jobs destroyed per megawatt of wind energy, the 5.05 jobs destroyed per megawatt of mini-hydro and the 8.99 destroyed per megawatt of photovoltaic installed capacity as a result of “green jobs” mandates, subsidies and related regimes.¶ This result is important, since although solar energy may on paper appear to employ many workers (essentially in the plant’s construction), the reality is that for the plant to work, it requires consumption of great amounts of capital that would have instead created many more jobs in other parts of the economy. Inversely, wind power, while still noxious in its economic impact when coercively introduced through state intervention, wastes far fewer resources per megawatt of installed capacity and thus does not destroy as many jobs in the rest of the economy.¶ This case is similar to the one that French economist Frédéric Bastiat denounced in his famous “Petition by the candle-makers,” in which he ridicules the intentions of protectionist entrepreneurs by comparing them to candle-makers clamoring for the state to crowd-out the sun, which was competing with them unfairly when providing light. In their opinion, if the sun was barred from providing light, numerous jobs would be created in the candle manufacturing industry. Obviously, this is not so: precisely by not being able to profit from the sun’s light we would be wasting scarce resources in the production of candles instead of producing other goods and services that would increase our wealth.

#### Renewable energy incentives kills jobs – opportunity cost to incentives

Alvarez 9 (GABRIEL CALZADA ÁLVAREZ, PHD, Associate Professor of Applied Economics at Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, in Madrid, TESTIMONY BEFORE THE¶ HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING¶ September 24, 2009¶ Washington, DC¶))

President Obama has made clear his intention to follow Europe’s lead in employing state intervention in the economy to “create” what are called “green jobs”, specifically as a path out of the current economic troubles. Europe’s experience actually suggests that this is precisely the wrong approach, and I appreciate the opportunity to comment for your hearing record on our research which put these claims to the test using official data.¶ Our study sought to answer the seminal question—what was the price of Spain’s attempt to lead the world in a clean energy transformation. Our research shows that that price was very high. Here are some highlights from our study:¶ • For every 1 green job financed by Spanish taxpayers, 2.2 jobs were lost as an opportunity cost.¶ • Only 1 out of 10 green job contracts were in maintenance and operation of already installed plants, and most of the rest of the working positions are only sustainable in an expansive environment related to high subsidies.¶ • Since 2000, Spain has committed €571,138 ($753,778) per each “green job,”¶ • Those programs resulted in the destruction of nearly 110,500 jobs.¶ • Each “green” megawatt installed on average destroyed 5.39 jobs elsewhere in the economy,¶ and in the case of solar photovoltaics, the number reaches 8.99 jobs per megawatt hour installed.¶ Spain has already attempted to lead the world in a clean energy transformation. But our research shows that Spain’s policies were economically destructive.¶ When the president of a country with a relatively low unemployment rate like the US decides to learn how to create jobs from a country like Spain with the highest unemployment rate among developed countries, it should be in a field where that country has a a demonstrable track record of job creation. Unfortunately, this is not the case of job creation in Spain through public support for the renewable energy.¶ ￼￼¶ Spain might have some original and efficient policies to show the rest of the world but unfortunately renewables aid is not one of them.¶ Bubbles Burst¶ In Spain, we are witnessing the logical conclusión of an unsustainable policy of government subsidies and mandates of uneconomic forms of Energy. The bubble is bursting. In this case, it is a bubble created by government policies requiring more and more revenue best described so well by former British Prime Minister Lady Margaret Thatcher: “the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people’s money.” That is what is happening in Spain’s renewable energy business today.¶ And while small and localized bubbles have occurred throughout history because of many individuals making the same bad decisión, the magnitude of potential problems is tremendously amplified when those decisions are sanctioned and encouraged by government largesse and misguided interventions in the market. Governments have a bad track record of picking winners and losers in markets, and in fact, generally pick economic losers because it lacks the necessary incentives to avoid mal-investment and loss of capital. This eventually results in the withdrawal of political and economic support for the government’s created market. The bubble bursts.

#### Manufacturing decline inevitable and it’s not key

MGI 12, Mckinsey Global Institute – research branch of the Mckinsey management consulting company, “Trading myths: Addressing misconceptions about trade, jobs, and competitiveness”, May, http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/mgi/research/productivity\_competitiveness\_and\_growth/six\_myths\_about\_trade

Myth: Mature economies are losing out to emerging markets in trade and thus face increasing trade deficits. Reality: The trade balance of mature economies has remained largely stable in the aggregate and even begun to improve. There are wide variations between individual countries, but no evidence supports claims of a wholesale deterioration of the trade balance between the mature and emerging economies over the past decade. Myth: Manufactured goods drive deteriorating trade deficits. Reality: Imports of primary resources, whose prices have been rising sharply, are the largest negative contributor to the trade balance of mature economies. In 2008, mature economies ran a 3.3 percent of GDP trade deficit in primary resources but a 0.5 percent of GDP surplus in manufactured goods and specifically a 1.6 percent surplus in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Some individual mature countries run trade deficits in knowledge-intensive manufacturing. Myth: Trade is at the heart of the loss of manufacturing jobs. Reality: Changes in the composition of demand and ongoing productivity increases are the main reasons for the decline in the number of such jobs in mature economies. The share of manufacturing in these countries’ total employment is bound to decline further, from 12 percent today to less than 10 percent in 2030, according to our analysis. MGI finds that trade or offshoring are responsible for the loss of around 20 percent of the 5.8 million US manufacturing jobs eliminated between 2000 and 2010.

#### Economic growth is key to a stable environment – collapse ensures destruction

Panayotou 2K (Theodore Panayotou 2K. Lecturer in Environmental Policy, is a Faculty Associate at the Center for International Development, a member of Core Faculty of Sustainable Development, and a Faculty Fellow of the Environmental Economics Program at Harvard University, “ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT,” <http://www.unece.org/ead/pub/032/032_c2.pdf> )

At the other extreme, are **those** who **argue that the fastest road to environmental improvement is along the path of economic growth: with higher incomes comes increased demand for goods and services that are less material intensive, as well as demand for improved environmental quality that leads to the adoption of environmental protection** measures. **As Beckerman puts it, “The strong correlation between incomes, and the extent to which environmental protection measures are adopted, demonstrates that in the longer run, the surest way to improve your environment is to become rich”**.58 **Some went as far as claiming that environmental regulation, by reducing economic growth, may actually reduce environmental quality**.59
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### Politics

#### Turns competitiveness – CIR is key to heg.

Jeb Bush, former governor of Florida, Edward Alden, Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, specializing in U.S. competitiveness, and Thomas F. McLarty III, former White House Chief of Staff for US President Bill Clinton, 2009, “U.S. Immigration Policy,” Council on Foreign Relations, www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Immigration\_TFR63.pdf

4 U.S. Immigration Policy America’s attractiveness to immigrants is essential to its prosperity, and will be especially important in helping the United States recover and emerge stronger from the current global economic downturn. In a world in which many of the barriers to free trade have been eliminated, and high-wage countries are in direct competition with lower-wage countries, innovation is the essence of maintaining economic advantage. Innovation requires, more than anything else, an abundance of smart people with diverse knowledge and experience. No single country, however impressive its educational system, contains within its borders a preponderance of the world’s most talented individuals. The Task Force believes that one of the central reasons the United States achieved and has been able to retain its position of global leadership is that it is constantly replenishing its pool of talent, not just with the ablest and hardest working from inside its borders, but with the best from around the world. Maintaining American economic and political leadership depends on maintaining that flow of talent. The United States, a country shaped by generations of immigrants and their descendants, is badly mishandling its immigration policy, with serious consequences for its standing in the world. The urgency of this issue has led the Council on Foreign Relations to convene an Independent Task Force to deal with what is ordinarily regarded as a domestic policy matter. America’s openness to and respect for immigrants has long been a foundation of its economic and military strength, and a vital tool in its diplomatic arsenal. With trade, technology, and travel continuing to shrink the world, the manner in which the United States handles immigration will be increasingly important to American foreign policy in the future. The Task Force believes that the continued failure to devise and implement a sound and sustainable immigration policy threatens to weaken America’s economy, to jeopardize its diplomacy, and to imperil its national security. Why is the country facing this crisis? Immigration should be seen as one of America’s great success stories. The United States has for generations welcomed large numbers of immigrants, found productive employment for them, and successfully integrated them into its population. Unlike many other advanced countries, high levels of immigration have largely maintained what would otherwise be a shrinking population of working-age adults, a huge economic advantage for the United States. This country has been especially good at attracting ambitious, skilled people. For talented immigrants across the world, the United States has long been the destination of first choice. Many innovative and successful new American companies—Google, Intel, eBay, and countless others—have been built by recent immigrants. At the same time, the abundant opportunities for immigrants to advance and succeed here have largely spared the United States from the kinds of internal security threats that have faced European countries, where some immigrants are more marginalized.

#### Turns solvency - Reforms key to energy development -- skilled labor shortage crushes aff otherwise

**COC, ‘9**

[COMPETE – Council on Competitiveness, “Mobilizing a World-Class Energy Workforce,” Dec., http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/CoC\_-\_Pillar\_6\_Handout\_-\_Mobilizing\_a\_World-Class\_Energy\_Workforce,\_Dec09.pdf]

**America currently lacks an energy workforce of sufficient size and capabilities to meet the needs of a sustainable, secure energy system**.1 **With increasing demand come abundant job opportunities in both traditional and emerging energy industries. Unfortunately, U.S. workers are neither aware nor sufficiently prepared to take them**. Moreover, **with an aging population and the retirement of the baby boomers well under way, there is an inadequate pipeline of replacement workers, technicians and managers to succeed them.** Bridge the Skills Gap and Build the Talent **The Council Recommends that:** • The U.S. Government offer full scholarships to U.S. graduates who commit to a minimum period of service in an energy-related career in the governmental, academic or non-profit sectors. • Congress establish a CompetePass program that will allow eligible participants to redeem the passes at U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) one-stop training centers. • **The U.S. Government grant green cards to foreign students receiving undergraduate and advanced degrees in scientific and engineering disciplines from U.S. institutions. The United States stands to lose half of its electric power industry workforce within the next five to ten years due to retirement**. America’s oil and gas workforce averages 50 years in age; half are likely to retire soon. Workers in these conventional energy sector jobs, from power plant operators to transmission line and pipeline workers, are retiring at a much faster rate than they are being replaced. The introduction of any new energy technologies will not compensate for this workforce shortage. For example, **in the nuclear industry, the fact that there has been no new construction of a nuclear facility in the United States in over 30 years has led to the atrophy of skills, the loss of technicians, the dearth of American students in nuclear engineering and a national security risk for the primarily nuclear-powered U.S. Navy**. 2 **The development, installation and maintenance of new technologies require skills at all levels of educational training. Many of these jobs, such as building new power plants, cannot be exported and will remain in the United States.** So-called “green collar” jobs could fill this gap over time and provide for significant domestic employment growth, but **capitalizing on this opportunity will require government being proactive in developing programs to provide the necessary skills**. Government should provide a 21st century education to match the 21st century job opportunities, requirements and needs. **There is growing global competition for scientific and engineering talent today, and the U.S. pipeline of students is slowing**.3 The private sector, where the overwhelming majority of careers will be, knows best the current opportunities that are not being met. **Executives cite the lack of scientific, engineering and skilled talent as among the most serious challenges facing their businesses today**.4 **They know what skills will be required and can assist in developing the workforce of the future by working closely with educational institutions as well as within their own organizations**.

**Open immigration key to US aging transition – solves global aging.**

**Haas, '7** (Political Science Professor -- Duquesne, International Security, Summer)

**The more the U**nited **S**tates **maintains its enviable demographic position** (compared with the other great powers) **and relatively superior ability to pay for the costs of its elderly** population, **the more it will** be able both to **preserve its own position of international power dominance and** to **help other states address their aging** (and other) **problems** when it is in U.S. interests to do so. A critical implication of these facts is that such domestic policies as means-testing Social Security and Medicare payments, raising the retirement age to reflect increases in life expectancies, **maintaining largely open immigration policies to help keep the United States’ median age relatively low,** encouraging individual behaviors that result in better personal health, **and** perhaps above all **restraining the rising costs of its health-care system are critical international security concerns.**

 A defining political question of the twenty-first century for U.S. international interests is whether U.S. leaders have sufficient political will and wisdom to implement these and related policies. **The more proactive U.S. leaders are in minimizing** the scope of its **aging** population **and** the **costs associated** with it, **the more protected U.S. international interests will be. To ignore these costs, or even to delay** implementing various **reforms designed to limit their size, will jeopardize the level of global influence and security that the U**nited **S**tates enjoys today.

**Multiple nuclear wars.**

**Jackson & Howe, 11** (Senior Fellow – CSIS & Senior Associate – CSIS, http://csis.org/files/publication/110104\_gai\_jackson.pdf)

**A number of demographic storms are now brewing in different parts of the developing world**. The moment of maximum risk still lies ahead—just a decade away, in the 2020s. Ominously, this is the same decade when the developed world will itself be experiencing its moment of greatest demographic stress. Consider China, which may be the first country to grow old before it grows rich. For the past quarter-century, **China has been “peacefully rising,” thanks** in part **to a one-child**-per-couple **policy** that has lowered dependency burdens and allowed both parents to work and contribute to China’s boom. **By** the **2020**s, however, **the huge Red Guard generation**, which was born before the country’s fertility decline, **will move into retirement**, **heavily taxing the** resources of their children and **the state.** **China’s coming age wave**—by 2030 it will be an older country than the United States—**may weaken the t**wo pillars of the current **regime’s legitimacy**: rapidly rising GDP and social stability. Imagine workforce growth slowing to zero while tens of millions of elders sink into indigence without pensions, without health care, and without large extended families to support them. **China could careen toward social collapse**—**or**, in reaction, toward an **authoritarian clampdown**. The arrival of China’s age wave, and the turmoil it may bring, will coincide with its expected displacement of the United States as the world’s largest economy in the 2020s. According to “power transition” theories of global conflict, this moment could be quite perilous. By the 2020s, **Russia**, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, **will be in the midst of an extended population decline** as steep or steeper than any in the developed world. The Russian fertility rate has plunged far beneath the replacement level even as life expectancy has collapsed amid a widening health crisis. Russian men today can expect to live to 60—16 years less than American men and marginally less than their Red Army grandfathers at the end of World War II. By 2050, Russia is due to fall to 16th place in world population rankings, down from 4th place in 1950 (or third place, if we include all the territories of the former Soviet Union). Prime Minister Vladimir Putin flatly calls Russia’s demographic implosion “the most acute problem facing our country today.” **If the problem is not solved, Russia will weaken progressively, raising the nightmarish specter of a** failing or **failed state with nuclear weapons**. Or **this cornered bear may lash out** in revanchist fury rather than meekly accept its demographic fate. Of course, **some regions** of the developing world **will remain extremely young** in the 2020s. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is burdened by the world’s highest fertility rates and is also ravaged by AIDS, will still be racked by large youth bulges. So will a scattering of impoverished and chronically unstable Muslim-majority countries, including Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. **If the correlation between extreme youth and violence endures, chronic unrest and state failure could persist** in much of sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the Muslim world through the 2020s, or even longer if fertility rates fail to drop. Meanwhile, many fast-modernizing countries where fertility has fallen very recently and very steeply will experience a sudden resurgence of youth in the 2020s. It is a law of demography that, when a population boom is followed by a bust, it causes a ripple effect, with a gradually fading cycle of echo booms and busts. In the 2010s, a bust generation will be coming of age in much of Latin America, South Asia, and the Muslim world. But by the 2020s**, an echo boom will follow**—dashing economic expectations and perhaps **fueling political violence, religious extremism, and ethnic strife**. These echo booms will be especially large in Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan, the decade-overdecade percentage growth in the number of people in the volatile 15- to 24-year-old age bracket is projected to drop from 32 percent in the 2000s to just 10 percent in the 2010s, but then leap upward again to 19 percent in the 2020s. In Iran, the swing in the size of the youth bulge population is projected to be even larger: minus 33 percent in the 2010s and plus 23 percent in the 2020s. **These echo booms will be occurring in countries whose social fabric is already strained by rapid development**. **One country teeters on the brink of chaos, while the other aspires to regional hegemony. One already has nuclear weapons, while the other seems likely to obtain them**.

#### Obama’s PC will lead to sides overcoming disagreement and bipartisanship

Sink, 2/19 (Justin, 2/19/2013, The Hill, “Obama seeks to repair rift with Republicans on immigration reform,” <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/283877-obama-seeks-to-repair-rift-with-with-gop-on-immigration>))

President Obama reached out to key Senate Republicans on Tuesday in an effort to smooth the waters over immigration reform. Obama placed calls to Sens. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) Tuesday afternoon after the Republican senators accused the White House of undermining bipartisan negotiations in the Senate with the weekend release of the administration’s own immigration bill. According to White House press secretary Jay Carney, Obama told the senators “that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles” of immigration reform. “He thanked the Senators for their leadership, and made clear that he and his staff look forward to continuing to work together with their teams to achieve needed reform,” Carney added in a statement. The president’s outreach came after last weekend’s leak of draft White House legislation depicting the administration’s preferred immigration reform package. That bill did not tie a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants to new border security measures and did not create a new visa exit system — two provisions Republicans have insisted on in negotiations. Republican leaders said the release undercut Senate negotiations and threatened to politicize the reform effort. “If actually proposed, the president’s bill would be dead on arrival in Congress, leaving us with unsecured borders and a broken legal immigration system for years to come,” Rubio said in a statement. Republicans also accused the White House of barreling forward on immigration without seeking input from across the aisle. In a statement released earlier Tuesday, Rubio spokesman Alex Conant said that no one in the Florida lawmaker’s office had ever been contacted by the White House to discuss immigration policy. “President Obama and the White House staff are not working with Republicans on immigration reform. Senator Rubio’s office has never discussed immigration policy with anyone in the White House,” Conant said. The White House immediately pushed back on that assertion, with a senior administration official citing at least five instances in which White House officials had met with representatives from a bipartisan group of Senate negotiators. Conant returned fire, saying that while Rubio’s staff had been briefed on administration efforts on behalf of a reform package, their suggestions had never been solicited. Republican support for the immigration package is thought largely to hinge on Rubio, and the phone calls Tuesday appeared to be an effort by the White House to repair relations. The gesture seemed to have paid off, with spokesmen for the Republican senators issuing optimistic statements following the phone calls. “Senator Rubio appreciated receiving President Obama’s phone call to discuss immigration reform late tonight in Jerusalem,” Conant said. Rubio was traveling Tuesday in Israel. “The Senator told the President that he feels good about the ongoing negotiations in the Senate, and is hopeful the final product is something that can pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support.”A spokesman for Graham called the call “short” and “cordial,” but said the South Carolina lawmaker and Obama agreed “it is important we fix our broken immigration system.” A senior Democratic congressional aide close to the bipartisan immigration talks downplayed the criticism from Rubio and other Republicans about the leaked White House bill.The aide suggested it was all part of the complicated political dance that must take place to keep both liberals and conservatives at the table on immigration reform. “I don’t think it hurts the process at all,” the aide said. “It shows the president is serious, and he’s not going to wait forever for Congress to act.”The White House in recent weeks has made a public show of demonstrating that it has learned the lessons of its fight for healthcare reform in 2009. Then, Obama faced criticism for allowing bipartisan Senate talks to drag on for too long, wasting political momentum and allowing opposition to escalate into a firestorm.Now, the White House has offered repeated public reminders that it is prepared to submit its own bill if Congress dawdles, and the leak of parts of it over the weekend could serve as a spur for that process. “I wouldn’t say we were surprised” by the leak, the Democratic aide said. The aide did voice regret that the published proposal did not encompass the entirety of the principles Obama has laid out on immigration reform, which include enhancements to border security and reforms to the legal immigration system. “It’s unfortunate that only a piece of it was leaked out,” the aide said. Janet Murguía, head of the National Council of La Raza, an Hispanic civil-rights group, said there’s “some legitimacy” to Rubio’s criticisms of Obama. But she was quick to add that it’s also “legitimate and appropriate” for the president to remind lawmakers that he’ll push his own reforms if Congress fails to reach a deal on its own. She characterized the partisan barbs as “healthy tensions” that put pressure on both sides to secure comprehensive reforms this year.“Both appear committed,” she said.

#### Only our ev is predictive – there is progress now.

Samay Live, 2/21 (“Obama is hoping to sign immigration reform bill,” 2/21/2013, Factiva))

US President Barack Obama is encouraged by the progress made in the US Congress on comprehensive immigration reform and hoped that a bill in this regard would soon land up on his table for signature. "As the (US) President has made clear, he is encouraged by and hopeful about the process underway in the Senate, the bipartisan process led by the so-called Gang of Eight (a group of eight Senators), towards achieving a comprehensive immigration reform bill that could pass the Senate -- and hopefully pass the House, and land on his desk for his signature," the White House Press Secretary Jay Carney told reporters here yesterday. "He (Obama) prefers that option to any other, and he is very encouraged by the progress that's been made so far. He thought his conversations with Senate Democrats involved in this process last week were very productive, and he felt the same about his conversations with Senate Republicans yesterday," Carney said referring to the telephonic conversations the US President had with top three Republican lawmakers, a day earlier. Responding to questions, Carney said there is not much disagreement among various parties when it comes to the need to pursue enhanced border security as part of comprehensive immigration reform. "That's part of why it's called comprehensive. So we look forward, to continuing to work with Congress, work with the Senate as they pursue bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform legislation," he said. Carney said that the prospects of success in this regard can be easily reflected from the comments of Republican Senator Mario Rubio."But we encourage the Senate to keep working because this is a significant priority. It's a priority that has in the past enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and that we believe is, once again, enjoying that kind of support," the White House Press Secretary said. He said the legislation that then-Senator Obama supported back in 2006 was co-authored by Senator (John) McCain, which also got the support of President George W. Bush "And that I think represents and reflects what should be the bipartisan consensus behind this very important policy goal," he said. Carney said that comprehensive immigration reform provides a clear path to citizenship that includes getting in the back of the line and paying taxes and the like, a view supported by both the Democratic and Republican parties.

#### Top priority

Slater 2/20 (Wayne, senior political writer for Dallas news, http://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/headlines/20130220-conservative-evangelical-christians-sign-on-for-immigration-overhaul-pitch.ece)

In his recent State of the Union speech, President Barack Obama made immigration reform a top priority for his second term. Both members of Congress and the White House have advanced ideas for providing a pathway to legal status, creating a guest-worker program and further securing the border.

#### Energy spending is falling – short-term incentives are phasing out

Cardwell 12 (Diane, Renewable Sources of Power Survive, but in a Patchwork, New York Times, 10 April 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/11/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-advances-in-the-us-despite-obstacles.html, da 8-16-12)

And the problems of Solyndra, a would-be solar panel maker that collapsed despite receiving a $535 million federal loan guarantee, have given subsidies for green energy a bad name, which in turn has weakened interest from the private sector in financing it. A tax grant program important to the solar industry has already expired, while a tax credit favored by the wind industry is scheduled to end this year.

#### Plan would be spun as Obamacare 2.0 – state would backlash to unfunded mandates and GOP would seize the opportunity

Newsmax 2010 (March 22nd, “States Move to Block Obamacare's Unfunded Mandate”, http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/healthcare-lawsuits-states-florida/2010/03/22/id/353475)

Less than 24 hours after the House gave final approval to a sweeping overhaul of healthcare, attorneys general from several states on Monday said they will sue to block the plan on constitutional grounds.¶ Republican attorneys general in 11 states warned that lawsuits will be filed to stop the federal government overstepping its constitutional powers and usurping states' sovereignty.¶ States are concerned the burden of providing healthcare will fall on them without enough federal support.

#### Budgetary concerns of the plan with the public means backlash *at the constituent level*

Von Schirach 12 (Paolo, International Economic Development Consultant

May 11, “[Renewable Energy In The US – Subsidies Politically Unpopular – Natural Gas A Much Cheaper Alternative – USG Should Focus On R&D](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/),”

<http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/>, d/a 7-20-12)

American enthusiasm for renewable energy, not too deep [to begin](http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/)with, has gone away. In part this has to do with loss of interest in “climate change” and its dire consequences. Unfortunately, climate change has been and is mostly an issue of political belief, rather than upholding science. And as the intensity of the political fervor somehow waned, in large part replaced by more immediate economic fears, so did political support for all the renewable energy technologies that were supposed to create, relatively quickly it was thought, workable alternatives to carbon based energy. An additional reason for waning support is that keeping renewable energy alive means also subsidizing it for a few more years. And this is less and less politically palatable at a time of budgetary constraints at every level. Paying more for electricity simply because this kind is clean looks like an unaffordable luxury, whatever the consequences of burning more (cheaper) fossil fuels may be.

#### Winners win not true for Obama on energy policy.

Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, ‘12

[Matthew, “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

#### Focus and prioritization matter even if political capital doesn’t exist --- plan can still tradeoff with other priorities

Hirsh, 2/7 --- Chief correspondent (2/7/2013, Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital; The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong,” [http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207%29))

THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.

Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.