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## 1NC

### 1

#### The United States federal government should ban all subsidies and tax credits for energy production and institute a carbon tax per ton of emission. 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 the environment and economy and avoids picking winners.

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.

### 2

#### 1. CIR will pass now – recent developments.

Martin 3/22 (Gary, San Antonio Express News columnist, GOP developments on immigration reform give hope of eventual legislative action, http://www.mysanantonio.com/opinion/columnists/gary\_martin/article/GOP-developments-on-immigration-reform-give-hope-4377241.php#ixzz2OJ9VowEV)

Several developments on Capitol Hill this week led many to believe Congress will pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year.¶ Those developments involved traditional Republican opposition to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ First, the Republican National Committee issued a report that recommended the GOP embrace comprehensive reform — which commonly denotes citizenship.¶ Second was the support for eventual citizenship by GOP presidential hopeful Rand Paul, although tortured in his explanation. Paul's nuanced speech to the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce was careful to avoid the actual word “citizenship,” which conservatives often claim to be “amnesty.”¶ All this was watched intently by Democrats, who voiced disbelief at how fast the GOP position on immigration reform has shifted since the November election.

#### 2. Obama’s capital is key to holding the coalition together

Bloomberg 3/22 (Guest-Worker Visas Sticking Point on Immigration Rewrite, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-03-21/guest-worker-visas-sticking-point-on-immigration-rewrite.html)

With Senate Republicans and Democrats moving closer to an agreement to grant a chance at U.S. citizenship to 11 million undocumented immigrants, a long- simmering dispute between organized labor and the business lobby risks sapping momentum for the measure.¶ The two constituencies are at odds over a new program to provide U.S. work visas to low-skilled foreign workers, placing pressure on lawmakers poised for a compromise. Unions are pressing for a limited visa system that guarantees better wages for future immigrant workers, while businesses seek a broader program more responsive to their hiring needs.¶ It’s the tougher side of what is otherwise a broadening consensus in both parties around an immigration plan, whose centerpiece is a path to U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants. A bipartisan group of eight senators is nearing a deal to bolster border security and workplace verification while revamping the legal immigration system.¶ Republican Senator Marco Rubio of Florida, a member of the group, called the guest-worker issue “one of the more difficult parts” of the negotiations.¶ “I’m not going to be part of a bill that doesn’t create a process whereby people can come to this country temporarily in the future if we need them,” Rubio said yesterday. “There’s no secret that the broader labor movement, with some exceptions, would rather not even have an immigration bill.”¶ Political Consequences¶ The disagreement carries significant political consequences for Republicans and Democrats alike, essentially making them choose between their strongest constituencies -- organized labor for Democrats and big business for Republicans -- and achievement of an overriding policy goal that both parties increasingly see as an electoral imperative.¶ Hispanics accounted for 10 percent of voters in the 2012 presidential election. President Barack Obama won 71 percent of their votes, and just 27 percent backed Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who had proposed “self-deportation” for undocumented immigrants. Since then, a growing chorus of Republicans has publicly backed legal status for undocumented immigrants.¶ Meanwhile, a group of Republican officials who unveiled a top-to-bottom review this week called for the party to back “comprehensive immigration reform” or see its appeal shrink.¶ “It is in neither party’s interest for one group within a party to stop this, because it is bad for the economy if we don’t have immigration reform,” former Mississippi Governor and Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour said this week, referring to labor unions’ objections to a guest-worker program.¶ Worker Program¶ Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, a Democrat co- chairing an immigration task force with Barbour at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, said it is ultimately up to Obama to persuade Democrats not to abandon the bill if the immigrant-worker program doen’t match the unions’ agenda.¶ “If we don’t get guest-worker provisions that are exactly in line with what labor wants, we can’t hold up the bill because of that,” Rendell said. “We’ve got to do the best we can to preserve and protect the interests of organized labor, but in the end you can’t always get what you want.”¶ The president, he added, has “his work cut out for him.”¶ The bipartisan plan, expected to be unveiled early next month following a two-week congressional break, also faces a potentially rough road in the Senate and uncertain fate in the House, where Republican opposition to granting citizenship to undocumented immigrants is more prevalent.¶

#### 3. Pushing clean energy subsidies is unpopular and partisan.

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

#### 4. Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**2012** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### 5. US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war.

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 3

#### Wind energy is technologized – it is the storage of the wind that robs it of its’ objectivity

Beckman 2k Tad Beckman 2000 (<http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html> Harvey Mudd College Claremont California)

Heidegger clearly saw the development of "energy resources" as symbolic of this evolutionary path; while the transformation into modern technology undoubtedly began early, the first definitive signs of its new character began with the harnessing of energy resources, as we would say. [(7)](http://www2.hmc.edu/%7Etbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_7_) As a representative of the old technology, the windmill took energy from the wind but converted it immediately into other manifestations such as the grinding of grain; the windmill did not unlock energy from the wind in order to store it for later arbitrary distribution. Modern wind-generators, on the other hand, convert the energy of wind into electrical power which can be stored in batteries or otherwise. The significance of storage is that it places the energy at our disposal; and because of this storage the powers of nature can be turned back upon itself. The storing of energy is, in this sense, the symbol of our over-coming of nature as a potent object. "...a tract of land is challenged into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit." {[7], p. 14} This and other examples that Heidegger used throughout this essay illustrate the difference between a technology that diverts the natural course cooperatively and modern technology that achieves the unnatural by force. Not only is this achieved by force but it is achieved by placing nature in our subjective context, setting aside natural processes entirely, and conceiving of all revealing as being relevant only to human subjective needs.

#### The rapacious drive to secure energy is a symptom of “challenging-forth,” a mindset that renders everything as disposable. The alternative is to reject challenging forth and embracing bringing forth can we avoid this hollowing out of Being

Waddington 5 A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding 'The Question concerning Technology' more by David Waddington Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 37, No. 4, 2005 http://concordia.academia.edu/DavidWaddington/Papers/538046/A\_Field\_Guide\_to\_Heidegger\_Understanding\_The\_Question\_concerning\_Technology

Most essays on technology focus primarily on practical issues surrounding the use of particular technologies . Heidegger’s essay, however, does not—instead, it focuses on the ways of thinking that lie behind technology. Heidegger (1977, p. 3) thinks that by coming to understand these ways of thinking, humans can enter into a ‘free relationship’ with technology. After dismissing the conventional account of technology, which supposedly states that technology is simply a means to an end, Heidegger commences a discussion on ancient craftsmanship. He suggests that the ancient craftsmanship involves the four Aristotelian causes: material, formal, ﬁnal, and efﬁcient. Intuitively, one might think that the efﬁcient cause of a given craft-item (the craftsman) was the most signiﬁcant of the four. However, although the craftsman has an important role in that she unites the four causes by considering each of them carefully, each of the four causes is equally co-responsible for the particular craft-item that is produced. Heidegger comments, ‘The four ways of being responsible bring something into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing’ (1977, p. 9). Appropriately enough, Heidegger names this process bringing-forth . Notably, bringing-forth is not merely a descriptive genus under which the four causes are subsumed—rather, it is a uniﬁed process, ‘a single leading-forth to which [each of the causes] is indebted’ (Lovitt, 1972, p. 46).Heidegger writes that bringing-forth ‘comes to pass only insofar as something concealed comes into unconcealment’ (1977, p. 11). Thus, instead of the craft-item being created by the craftsman, as one would think, it was revealed or unconcealed .In ‘The Thing’, Heidegger comments on the making of a jug, The jug is not a vessel because it was made; rather, the jug had to be made because it is this holding vessel. The making … lets the jug come into its own. But that which in the jug’s nature is its own is never brought about by its making. (1971, p. 168)Clearly, revealing/unconcealing in the mode of bringing-forth contains strong hints of Platonism. Bringing-forth is the mode of revealing that corresponds to ancient craft. Modern technology, however, has its own particular mode of revealing, which Heidegger calls challenging-forth . Thinking in the mode of challenging-forth is very different from thinking in the mode of bringing-forth: when challenging-forth, one sets upon the elements of a situation both in the sense of ordering (i.e. setting a system upon) and in a more rapacious sense (i.e. the wolves set upon the traveler and devoured him). In bringing-forth, human beings were one important element among others in the productive process; in challenging-forth, humans control the productive process. Efﬁciency is an additional important element of thinking in the mode of challeng-ing forth; the earth, for example, is set upon to yield the maximum amount of ore with the minimum amount of effort. Essentially, challenging-forth changes the way we see the world—as Michael Zimmerman pointedly remarks, ‘To be capable of transforming a forest into packaging for cheeseburgers, man must see the forest not as a display of the miracle of life, but as raw material, pure and simple’ (1977, p. 79).Production in the mode of challenging-forth reveals objects that have the status of standing-reserve . Objects that have been made standing-reserve have been reduced to disposability in two different senses of the word: (1) They are disposable in the technical sense; they are easily ordered and arranged. Trees that once stood chaotically in the forest are now logs that can be easily counted, weighed, piled, and shipped. (2) They are also disposable in the conventional sense; like diapers and cheap razors, they are endlessly replaceable/interchangeable and have little value. For the most part, challenging things forth into standing-reserve is not a laudable activity, and thus it makes sense to wonder what drives human beings to think in this way. Heidegger’s answer to this motivational question is unconventional— instead of suggesting that the origins of this motivation are indigenous to human beings, he postulates the existence of a phenomenon that ‘sets upon man to order the real as standing-reserve’ (1977, p. 19). Heidegger calls this mysterious phenomenon enframing ( Ge-stell in German). The word ‘Ge-stell’ gathers together several meanings of the -stellen family of German verbs: in Ge-stell, humans are ordered ( bestellen ), commanded ( bestellen ), and entrapped ( nachstellen ) (Harries 1994,p. 229). Heidegger thinks that our default state is that of being trapped by Ge-stell; this is what he means when he writes, ‘As the one who is challenged forth in this way, man stands within the essential realm of [Ge-stell]. He can never take up a relationship to it only subsequently’ (1977, p. 24; Sallis, 1971, p. 162). According to Heidegger (1977, p. 25), there are different ‘ordainings of destining’ for human beings. Although the default destining is that of Ge-stell, it is possible to choose an alternate road. Heidegger thinks that human beings have been granted the special role of ‘Shepherds of Being’—we have been granted the power to reveal the world in certain ways (Ballard, 1971, p. 60). Trapped in Ge-stell, we tend to reveal things in the mode of challenging-forth, but we can also choose to reveal things in the mode of bringing-forth. Heidegger comments, ‘Placed between these possibilities, man is endangered from out of destining’ (1977, p. 26). However, by carefully considering the ways of thinking that lie behind technology, we can grasp the ‘saving power’. We can realize that we, the Shepherds of Being, have a choice : we can bring-forth rather than challenge-forth. Thus, once we understand the thinking behind technology, we become free to choose our fate—‘… we are already sojourning in the open space of destining’ (Heidegger, 1977, p. 26).

### Solvency

#### Plan picks winners —distorts the market, causes trade-offs and deters private capital

De Rugy 12 (Veronique, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center, "Assessing the Department of Energy Loan Guarantee Program", 6/19 mercatus.org/publication/assessing-department-energy-loan-guarantee-program)

This government involvement can distort the market signals further. For instance, the data shows that private investors tend to congregate toward government guarantee projects, independently of the merits of the projects, taking capital away from unsubsidized projects that have a better probability of success without subsidy and a more viable business plan. As the Government Accountability Office noted, “Guarantees would make projects [the federal government] assists financially more attractive to private capital than conservation projects not backed by federal guarantees. Thus both its loans and its guarantees will siphon private capital away.”[25] This reallocation of resources by private investors away from viable projects may even take place within the same industry—that is, one green energy project might trade off with another,more viable green energy project. More importantly, once the government subsidizes a portion of the market, the object of the subsidy becomes a safe asset. Safety in the market, however, often means low return on investments, which is likely to turn venture capitalists away. As a result, capital investments will likely dry out and innovation rates will go down.[26] In fact, the data show that in cases in which the federal government introduced few distortions, private investors were more than happy to take risks and invest their money even in projects that required high initial capital requirements. The Alaska pipeline project, for instance, was privately financed at the cost of $35 billion, making it one of the most expensive energy projects undertaken by private enterprise.[27] The project was ultimately abandoned in 2011 because of weak customer demand and the development of shale gas resources outside Alaska.28 However, this proves that the private sector invests money even when there is a chance that it could lose it. Private investment in U.S. clean energy totaled $34 billion in 2010, up 51 percent from the previous year.[29] Finally, when the government picks winners and losers in the form of a technology or a company, it oftenfails. First, the government does not have perfect or even better information or technology advantage over private agents. In addition, decision-makers are insulated from market signals and won’t learn important and necessary lessons about the technology or what customers want. Second, the resources that the government offers are so addictive that companies may reorient themselves away from producing what customers want, toward pleasing the government officials.

#### 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.

#### Can’t displace fossil fuels - intermittency

Post 12 (Willem Post, BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer, July 1, 2012, “Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated,” Energy Collective, http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Dispatch Value, Variability and Intermittency of Wind Energy¶ ¶ Dispatch Value: Wind energy is significantly different from conventional gas, coal, nuclear and hydro energy; just ask any grid operator with significant wind energy on his grid. The latter are controllable and dispatchable on short notice, whereas wind energy is a product of weather-dependent, variable wind speeds, i.e., its supply is unpredictable and uncontrollable. Therefore, it has zero-dispatch value to a grid operator. ¶ ¶ A grid operator needs to have available an adequate mix of generating capacity to serve peak demands for long-term planning purposes. The mix varies from grid to grid. Wind turbine systems have a capacity value in this mix. ¶ ¶ Example: For summer peak capacity planning, ERCOT counts 8.7 percent of wind turbine rated capacity as dependable capacity at peak demand, in accordance with ERCOT’s stakeholder-adopted methodology. According to ERCOT, the capacity value is a statistical concept created for generator planning purposes. It is based on multi-year averages of wind energy generation at key peak demand periods. ¶ http://www.ercot.com/news/press\_releases/show/381¶ ¶ ERCOT's capacity planning value of 8.7% does not mean the ENERGY of 8.7% of wind turbine rated capacity would be available at any specified “time-ahead” period. Because of the randomness of wind speeds, no one can accurately predict available wind energy at any future time. Hence, it's not available “on-demand”, i.e., not dispatchable.

#### Backlog means plan won’t even begin implementation for years

Richard 8 (Michael, Science & Technology, 4/7, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/04/wind-power-turbine-shortage-supple-problems.php)

We recently wrote about the massive **growth in the wind power industry** and how **forecasts estimate a 155% growth between now and 2012** (bringing total installed capacity to 240 gigawatts). Well, **there's a dark cloud on the horizon. The problem is not with demand, but with supply.**¶ **If you want wind turbines to build a wind farm, take a number and grab a magazine, because the wait could be long. If you order now, you might not get the turbines before late 2009 or later, depending on your connections with suppliers.** This is similar to what solar panel makers have been going through with the silicon shortage for the past few years.

#### Wind fails – electrical grid infrastructure can’t support it

Morriss et al 9 (ANDREW P. MORRISS, H. Ross and Helen Workman Professor of Law & Professor of Business, University of Illinois; WILLIAM T. BOGART, Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Economics, York College of Pennsylvania; ANDREW DORCHAK, Head of Reference and Foreign/International Law Specialist, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; ROGER E. MEINERS, John and Judy Goolsby Distinguished Professor of Economics and Law, University of Texas-Arlington; UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH PAPER SERIES NO. LE09-001, “GREEN JOBS MYTHS”, March 12th, www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/morriss-green-jobs-myths.pdf)

Yet another problem associated with wind energy is that the most favorable locations for wind power are often not accessible by the existing electrical grid,468 a problem recognized by President Obama:¶ One of, I think, the most important infrastructure projects that we need is a whole new electricity grid. Because if we're going to be serious about renewable energy, I want to be able to get wind power from North Dakota to population centers, like Chicago. And we're going to have to have a smart grid if we want to use plug-in hybrids then we want to be able to have ordinary consumers sell back the electricity that's generated from those car batteries, back into the grid. That can create 5 million new jobs, just in new energy.469¶ Additional electrical transmission lines are also key to entrepreneur T. Boone Pickens’ dream of turning Texas into “the Saudi Arabia of wind.”470 According to the Department of Energy, it would require an additional 12,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines costing $60 billion (undiscounted) to increase the contribution of wind to national electricity production to 20 percent by 2030.471¶ Wind power thus faces two key problems in increasing its share of electricity generation. First, it is unavailable at some times of peak power demand and so requires costly backup capacity. Second, current infrastructure is inadequate to support a rapid expansion of wind energy generation. Further, as we noted earlier, existing efforts to increase wind generation capacity have run into major hurdles with regulatory laws and NIMBY efforts.472 Despite these widely known problems, which are never discussed in depth in the green jobs literature, green jobs policy proposals propose enormous increases in wind capacity without detailing a strategy for how

#### Wind power fails – unreliable in providing electricity to the grid in peak hours, which means coal, natural gas and nuclear plants can’t be replaced

Institute for Energy Research 12 (August 13th, a not-for-profit organization that conducts intensive research and analysis on the functions, operations, and government regulation of global energy markets, California’s Flex Alert: A Case Study in Intermittent Energy, http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/48788)

California has long been a leader in promoting wind and other renewables to power the electricity grid. Recently, California has gone even further and in 2011, Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law to force an increase in the amount of renewables utilities must use to 33 percent of the state’s electricity by 2020.¶ Currently, the state is experiencing a stressed electricity grid because of high demand and because some nuclear and natural gas plants are offline. Mandated renewable energy is proving itself incapable of filling the void. This situation show how little actual value wind, solar and other politically correct renewables have in the real world work of supplying people with electricity when they need and want it.¶ California is currently experiencing a “flex alert” which strongly urges Californians to use less electricity. According to the California ISO, the operator of the region’s power grid, it is “critical” to conserve electricity today to make sure there aren’t blackouts. Here’s the graphic representing the alert:¶ Because California is rushing headlong toward more and more renewables in the electricity grid it is important to look at how renewables are contributing to keeping the electricity grid stable. For example, California has 4.297 gigawatts of installed wind capacity which could really help California balance the grid if the wind blew at the right times (spoiler alert—the wind doesn’t blow at the right times).¶ The first chart below shows the supply and demand for August 9, 2012 in the California ISO electrical grid. The actual demand is in blue and the available generation is in orange. The second chart shows the renewable generation in California at that time.¶ There are some very important things to note with respect to the renewable generation. Wind’s production peaked just before 1 am, when electricity demand was dropping as people went to bed and nighttime temperatures reduced the need for air conditioning. At the time, wind was producing 6 percent of California’s electricity, but after 1 am, wind began to falter and wind production fell by 90 percent by 11 am. At that time, wind was producing less than 100 megawatts of electricity—a mere 0.2 percent of the electricity in California.¶ This shows how wind fails to produce electricity when needed most. At 11 am, as electricity demand was rapidly increasing and electricity producing was needed most, wind was at a low ebb. Fortuitously, wind production increased in the afternoon, but by 5:30 pm, wind was only producing a little more than 1 percent of California’s total electricity.¶ Solar helped meet demand more than wind, because solar has the advantage of producing electricity when the sun is shining and households are using more power. But even solar failed to produce much electricity during the period of highest demand, producing just 2 percent of the state’s electricity at its peak. Solar production peaked at nearly 1 gigawatt at 11 am and continued to produce about 1 gigawatt until 3 pm. The problem is that the state’s highest period of demand occurred at about 5 pm, when solar’s production had fallen by over 50 percent from its peak.¶ This data shows how little value wind and solar have in producing electricity when people really need it, and should be a wake-up call to California—one of the many states with mandates—as well as the Obama administration and other promoters of wind and solar. Even though wind and solar production might be growing in California, it isn’t helping to balance the grid and keep the lights on. Electricity production has to balance electricity demand and wind and solar aren’t doing a good job contributing. Moreover, it does not matter how many wind and solar installations are built because natural gas and other reliable power plants will be required to be built to meet peak electricity demand.

### Econ

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Wind subsidies doesn’t boost employment – lowered Danish GDP by 270 million

Sharman and Meyer 9 (Hugh Sharman, degreee in civil engineering, founder and principal of Incoteco, an energy consulting firm based in Hals, Denmark, and Henrik Meyer, Master of Economics, Deputy Director at Copenhagen Consensus Center, WIND ENERGY THE CASE OF DENMARK, September 2009, www.cepos.dk/fileadmin/user\_upload/Arkiv/PDF/Wind\_energy\_-\_the\_case\_of\_Denmark.pdf)

Denmark has been a first-mover in the wind power industry for over ten years, and its leading wind turbine manufacturers have been able to maintain a very strong global position. This has been a consequence of a concerted policy to increase the share of wind power in Danish electricity generation. The policy has only been made possible through substantial subsidies supporting the wind turbine owners. This indirect subsidy has in turn generated the demand for wind turbines from the manufactures. Exactly how the subsidies have been shared between land, wind turbine owners, labor, capital and shareholders is opaque, but it is fair to assess that no Danish wind industry to speak of would exist if it had to compete on market terms.¶ This paper documents the experiences gained in Denmark with regard to the employment effect of subsidizing the wind industry.¶ Substantial subsidies have been directed to the Danish wind mill industry over years. From 2001-2005 the yearly subsidy has been 1.7-2.6 billion DKK. The Danish Wind industry counts 28,400 employees. This does not, however, constitute the net employment effect of the wind mill subsidy. In the long run, creating additional employment in one sector through subsidies will detract labor from other sectors, resulting in no increase in net employment but only in a shift from the non-subsidized sectors to the subsidized sector. Allowing for the theoretical possibility of wind employment alleviating possible regional pockets of high unemployment, a very optimistic ballpark estimate of net real job creation is 10% of total employment in the sector. In this case the subsidy per job created is 600,000- 900,000 DKK per year ($90,000-140,000). This subsidy constitutes around 175-250% of the average pay per worker in the Danish manufacturing industry.¶ In terms of value added per employee, the energy technology sector over the period 1999-2006 underperformed by as much as 13% compared with the industrial average.¶ This implies that the effect of the government subsidy has been to shift employment from more productive employment in other sectors to less productive employment in the wind industry.¶ As a consequence, Danish GDP is approximately 1.8 billion DKK ($270 million) lower than it would have been if the wind sector work force was employed elsewhere.

#### Wind turbines conclusively devastates the housing and property market

Kielisch 9 (Kurt, President, Appraisal Group One, company specializing in forensic appraisal, eminent domain, stigmatized properties and valuation research, “WIND TURBINE IMPACT STUDY”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/AGO-WIND-TURBINE-IMPACT-STUDY.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

The impact of a wind turbine close to a property “takes a property of substantial value ¶ and takes away all of the characteristics that are the strengths of that property,” Bounds said. ¶ “The visual impact takes away value. The noise takes away value. The property owners ¶ complain that the wind turbines take away value and there is no way for them to escape.”¶ 124¶ In Maryland, a wind farm developer demonstrated the diminution of value when it ¶ bought two abutting properties to their wind farm and were unable to sell them for close to ¶ their purchase price. They bought one property for $104,447.50 and sold it for $65,000. They ¶ bought another property for $101,049.00 and shortly thereafter sold it for only $20,000.¶ 125¶ Studies have shown that fear of wind farms can negatively affect purchase prices. In his ¶ February 2009 study, “Impact of Wind Turbines on Market Value of Texas Rural Land,” ¶ Appraiser Derry Gardner studied 350 acres of premium ranch land that were put on the market ¶ for $2.1 million. A prospective buyer agreed to the sale price but backed out when the seller ¶ disclosed a 27-turbine wind farm within a 1½ mile radius from the property. The seller ¶ discounted the land by 25%, but the buyer still declined to purchase. As of the study’s ¶ publication, after two years on the market there has been little interest in the property despite ¶ its other positive characteristics.¶ 126¶ Independent studies have shown an average diminution of value up to -37% when the ¶ turbine is on the property; up to -26% average diminution for properties within 1,056 – 2,112 ¶ feet of a turbine; and up to -25% average diminution for properties within 1.8 miles of turbines. ¶ Properties can also suffer an additional 15-25% diminution in value due to infrastructure ¶ construction (clearing, blasting, digging, etc.), high voltage transmission power lines (HVTL) to ¶ transport generated electricity, substations, additional traffic for servicing turbines and HVTLs, ¶ and additional roads.¶ 127¶ ¶ Wind farms have the potential to impact local property values.¶ 128¶ As the number of ¶ houses near to, or with a view of the installation increases, the likelihood of aesthetic or ¶ economic objections seems to increase.¶ 129

#### Housing key to the economy

Reuters 10 (“What's left to fix housing market?”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/03/21/businesspro-us-economy-weekahead-outlook-idUSTRE62K1G420100321>, Acc: 8/3/12, og)

Housing was at the heart of the global recession, and plays a crucial role in the U.S. economy. During the boom years, rising home values left Americans feeling flush, and they were able to tap home equity to boost spending. The bust has taken a $10 trillion bite out of household wealth, and spending has suffered.¶ As poorly as the housing market has performed so far this year, some economists think it may soon get worse. The tax credit, which was expanded and extended late last year, expires in April, the Fed is wrapping up its mortgage asset purchases by the end of this month, and millions of homeowners are behind on payments, leaving them vulnerable to foreclosure, which tends to drive down prices of neighboring homes.¶ Sal Guatieri, an economist with BMO Capital Markets in Toronto, said the economic recovery was grinding along instead of gaining momentum, and a "precarious" housing market was a big reason why.¶ "Witness February's 6 percent pullback in (housing) starts and a surprising setback in homebuilder confidence in March," he said. "This wasn't supposed to happen until after the homebuyer tax credit expired in April."¶ WHAT MORE?¶ The tax credit has been a pit of a puzzle. It spurred huge demand late last year, when buyers rushed to close deals before the originally scheduled expiration. Congress then extended and expanded the credit, but the second installment has not generated the same demand.¶ As for the Fed's efforts, between cutting interest rates to near zero and buying up mortgage-related assets, the central bank has successfully pushed mortgage rates down. The average rate on a 30-year mortgage has hovered near 5 percent in recent weeks, but that has not been enough to spark much activity.¶ What happens to rates when the Fed wraps up its asset-buying program at the end of this month is a big question mark. Fed officials expect minimal market reaction, but the central bank has never embarked on such an ambitious buying spree and cannot be certain what will happen when it ends.¶ Some economists think this uncertainty may be one reason why the Fed signaled last week that it would keep its benchmark interest rate near zero for the foreseeable future. Perhaps officials want to see how the housing market behaves before dropping a hint that borrowing costs may soon rise.¶ Economists at IHS Global Insight offered other reasons for concern about the housing market's path.¶ "Economic conditions remain dire, with unemployment likely to remain stubbornly near 10 percent for some time," the firm wrote in a quarterly housing market report on Friday. "In addition, the federal tax credit for first-time buyers played a significant and temporary role in bolstering the market."¶ The report found that the national housing market was 8.9 percent undervalued at the end of 2009, and not a single metropolitan area was considered "extremely overvalued." Contrast that with 2005, the height of the housing bubble, when 52 metro areas were judged to be extremely overvalued.¶ Since that peak, 10 metro areas have seen home prices fall by more than half, and 31 have recorded drops of more than 40 percent. That is a big reason why household wealth has dropped by $10 trillion since 2007.¶

#### Wind plants produce only a few temporary jobs

Boone 5 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JON BOONE BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND”, http://www.windaction.org/?module=uploads&func=download&fileId=162, Acc: 8/2/12, og)

Very few permanent jobs will likely be created— perhaps a couple of low wage¶ maintenance employees. According to a report by the National Renewable Energy Lab on¶ windplant jobs, the national average is one maintenance employee for every 12-15¶ turbines. A 20 turbine windplant in Meyersdale, Pennsylvania now employs only two¶ maintenance employees. The claim here that four permanent jobs will be created appears¶ generous. But even if it were true, this is a very small return relative to a $40 -50 million¶ capital project.¶ 13¶ During construction, a few local security guards and some local earth moving crews may¶ be hired for a few months, while the bulk of construction will probably be completed by¶ non-local labor, since many huge turbines are actually manufactured in Europe(often as¶ subcontracts to US firms like GE) with warranties likely serviced by the manufacturer¶ and its employees. A recent study by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources on the¶ "Top of Iowa" windplant showed that, of the 200 total construction jobs, only 20 were¶ local—and all disappeared within six months.

### Environment

#### Wind power increases emissions – volatility reduces efficiency of conventional plants

Hawkins 10 (Kent, holds electrical engineering degrees from Royal Military College of Canada and Queen’s University, “Subsidizing CO2 Emissions via Windpower: The Ultimate Irony”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/06/subsidizing-co2-emissions/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

The two studies and calculator results demonstrate that claimed CO2 emissions are not reduced, but are increased, with the introduction of wind plants, and a straight substitution of gas for coal production is a far superior strategy. This is by no means the last word, as all three analysis approaches call for comprehensive and objective studies, based on complete information, to confirm these findings.¶ Point of Zero Fossil Fuel and Emissions Savings¶ The Netherlands study shows that the point where CO2 emissions overall become negative occurs at about 2% efficiency reduction across the fossil fuel fleet and corresponds to about 3% wind penetration. This is shown in Figure 2 which is reproduced from the Netherlands study. ΔF is the change in fossil fuel consumption and ΔR is the percent reduction in efficiency of the total fossil fuel fleet.¶ If the wind proponents are right and ΔR is zero, then ΔF is approximately 1.00 GWy. Therefore the fossil fuel consumption of 18.45 GWy as shown in Table 2 of the Netherlands study would be 18.45-1.00 = 17.45 GWy. That is to say, in theory the introduction of wind saves 1.00 GWy, but at ΔR of 2% gives this back due to the inefficient operation of the fossil fuel plants. Therefore the typical wind proponent claim is that the 1.00 GWy would be saved and the percentage saving is about 1.00/17.45, or 5.7%. Compare this to the calculated wind proponent claim of 6.3% for the Netherlands in Figure 1.¶ However theoretically possible, this has been demonstrated by Colorado and Texas experience not to be the case. Further, increases in the efficiency loss for the fossil fuel fleet above 2% will result in increased fossil fuel consumption (negative ΔF), and hence CO2 emissions, again as shown by the Colorado and Texas experience. Such increases in efficiency loss could be caused by:¶ Increased wind penetration¶ Increased wind volatility which may occur between jurisdictions and from year to year.¶ This report, sponsored by the Independent Producers Association of Mountain States, ¶ concludes that the emissions benefits of renewable energy are not being realized as planned ¶ based on examination of four years of Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCO) ¶ operational history. Integrating erratic and unpredictable wind resources with established coal ¶ and natural gas generation resources requires PSCO to cycle its coal and natural gas-fired ¶ plants.¶ 3¶ Cycling coal plants to accommodate wind generation makes the plants operate ¶ inefficiently, which drives up emissions. Moreover, when they are not operated consistently at ¶ their designed temperatures, the variability causes problems with the way they interact with ¶ their associated emission control technologies, frequently causing erratic emission behavior ¶ that can last for several hours before control is regained. Ironically, using wind to a degree ¶ that forces utilities to temporarily reduce their coal generation results in greater SO2, NOX and ¶ CO2 than would have occurred if less wind energy were generated and coal generation were ¶ not impacted.

#### Back up plants are worse – wind investment trades off with building cleaner fossil fuel plants

Page 8 (Lewis, National Wind Watch, July 3, http://www.wind-watch.org/news/2008/07/03/research-wind-power-pricier-emits-more-co2-than-thought/)

Oswald is an expert on gas turbines, having worked for many years at Rolls Royce\*. He says that most people, in allowing for gas backup to wind farms, assume that the current situation of gas-turbine usage applies. Not so, he says. Gas turbines used to compensate for wind will need to be cheap (as they won’t be on and earning money as often as today’s) and resilient (to cope with being throttled up and down so much). Even though the hardware will be cheap and tough, it will break often under such treatment; meaning increased maintenance costs and a need for even more backup plants to cover busted backup plants. Thus, the scheme overall will be more expensive than the current gas sector. And since people won’t want to thrash expensive, efficient combined-cycle kit like this, less fuel-efficient gear will be used — emitting more carbon than people now assume. High-efficiency base load plant is not designed or developed for load cycling … Load cycling CCGT plant will induce thermal stress cracking in hot components … The other impact on the individual plant is a reduction in the plant’s utilisation. This has an economic consequence, which will encourage operators of generation plants to buy cheaper, lower-efficiency and therefore higher carbon emission plants … Reduced reliability will require more thermal plant to be installed … And it gets worse. All this will hammer the gas grid’s pipeline networks and storage hardware too, costing the end consumer even more money — again, something that isn’t currently accounted for in wind power schemes. Power swings from wind will need to be compensated for by power swings from gas-powered plants, which in turn will induce comparable power swings on the gas network as plant ramps up and down. This will have a cost implication for the gas network, an implication that does not seem to have been included in cost of wind calculations …In essence, wind plans aren’t actually wind plans, according to Oswald. They’re gas plans with windfarms used to reduce the amount of gas actually burned in the plants. But he thinks the assumptions now made on costs and emissions reductions to be anticipated are unduly optimistic. From one perspective, one might argue that this is the exact purpose of renewable plants, namely to reduce fossil fuel burning. However, it does this not by obviating the need for that plant, but instead by reducing the utilisation of power plants which continue to be indispensable. Electricity operators will respond to the reduced utilisation … high capital [cleaner gas] plant is not justified under low utilisation regimes … it is critically important that the carbon saving achieved by the whole system is known, understood, and achieved in practice. The effect of this higher carbon calculation does not appear to be mentioned

#### Wind energy increases warming – turbine motions

Gray 12 (Louise Gray, April 29, 2012, “Wind farms can cause climate change, finds new study,” The Guardian, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/9234715/Wind-farms-can-cause-climate-change-finds-new-study.html)

Usually at night the air closer to the ground becomes colder when the sun goes down and the earth cools.¶ But on huge wind farms the motion of the turbines mixes the air higher in the atmosphere that is warmer, pushing up the overall temperature.¶ Satellite data over a large area in Texas, that is now covered by four of the world's largest wind farms, found that over a decade the local temperature went up by almost 1C as more turbines are built.¶ This could have long term effects on wildlife living in the immediate areas of larger wind farms.¶ It could also affect regional weather patterns as warmer areas affect the formation of cloud and even wind speeds.¶ It is reported China is now erecting 36 wind turbines every day and Texas is the largest producer of wind power in the US.¶ Liming Zhou, Research Associate Professor at the Department of Atmospheric and Environmental Sciences at the University of New York, who led the study, said further research is needed into the affect of the new technology on the wider environment.¶ "Wind energy is among the world’s fastest growing sources of energy. The US wind industry has experienced a remarkably rapid expansion of capacity in recent years,” he said. “While converting wind’s kinetic energy into electricity, wind turbines modify surface-atmosphere exchanges and transfer of energy, momentum, mass and moisture within the atmosphere. These changes, if spatially large enough, might have noticeable impacts on local to regional weather and climate.”¶ The study, published in Nature, found a “significant warming trend” of up to 0.72C (1.37F) per decade, particularly at night-time, over wind farms relative to near-by non-wind-farm regions.¶ The team studied satellite data showing land surface temperature in west-central Texas.¶ “The spatial pattern of the warming resembles the geographic distribution of wind turbines and the year-to-year land surface temperature over wind farms shows a persistent upward trend from 2003 to 2011, consistent with the increasing number of operational wind turbines with time,” said Prof Zhou.

#### Too late to solve - CO2 stays in the atmosphere for hundreds of years.

Hillman, Senior Fellow at the Policy Studies Institute, ‘7

[Mayer, The Suicidal Planet: How To Prevent Global Climate Catastrophe, p. 25-6]

The effects of climate change cannot quickly be reversed by reducing or even eliminating future emissions of greenhouse gases. There are two reasons for this. First, greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere linger for decades (in the case of relatively short-lived gases like methane), or hundreds of years (for carbon dioxide), or even thousands of years (for the long-lived gases like perfluorocarbons). Carbon dioxide and methane concentrations in the atmosphere are respectively one-third and more than twice as high as those at any time over the last 650,000 years. Even if no additional carbon dioxide were emitted from now on, atmospheric concentrations would take centuries to decline to pre-Industrial Revolution levels. While elevated levels of greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, additional warming will occur.

#### 3 periods of rapid warming show no extinctions- models are flawed guesswork

NIPCC 11(Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “2011 Interim Report from the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change,” http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/2011report.html)

The first period they examined was the Eocene Climatic Optimum (53–51 million years ago), when the atmosphere‘s CO2 concentration exceeded 1,200 ppm and tropical temperatures were 5–10°C warmer than modern values. Yet far from causing extinctions of the tropical flora (where the data are best), the four researchers report ―all the evidence from low-latitude records indicates that, at least in the plant fossil record, this was one of the most biodiverse intervals of time in the Neotropics.‖ They also note ―ancestors of many of our modern tropical and temperate plants evolved ...when global temperatures and CO2 were much higher than present ... indicating that they have much wider ecological tolerances than are predicted based on present-day climates alone.‖ The second period they examined included two rapid-change climatic events in the Holocene—one at 14,700 years ago and one at 11,600 years ago—when temperatures increased in the mid- to high-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere by up to 10°C over periods of less than 60 years. There is evidence from many sites for rapid plant responses to rapid warming during these events. The researchers note ―at no site yet studied, anywhere in the world, is there evidence in the fossil record for large-scale climate-driven extinction during these intervals of rapid warming.‖ On the other hand, they report extinctions did occur due to the cold temperatures of the glacial epoch, when subtropical species in southern Europe were driven out of their comfort zone. The Willis et al. study also makes use of recent historical data, as in the case of the 3°C rise in temperature at Yosemite Park over the past 100 years. In comparing surveys of mammal fauna conducted near the beginning and end of this period, they detected some changes but no local extinctions. Thus they determined that for all of the periods they studied, with either very warm temperatures or very rapid warming, there were no detectable species extinctions. In a study that may help explain how some researchers could have gotten things so wrong in predicting massive extinctions of both plants and animals in response to projected future warming, Nogues-Bravo (2009) explains the climate envelope models (CEMs)—often employed to predict species responses to global warming (and whether or not a species will be able to survive projected temperature increases)—―are sensitive to theoretical assumptions, to model classes and to projections in non-analogous climates, among other issues.‖ To determine how appropriate these models are for determining whether a particular species will be driven to extinction by hypothesized planetary warming, Nogues-Bravo reviewed the scientific literature pertaining to the subject and found several flaws. Nogues-Bravo writes, ―the studies reviewed: (1) rarely test the theoretical assumptions § Marked 07:26 § behind niche modeling such as the stability of species climatic niches through time and the equilibrium of species with climate; (2) they only use one model class (72% of the studies) and one palaeoclimatic reconstruction (62.5%) to calibrate their models; (3) they do not check for the occurrence of non-analogous climates (97%); and (4) they do not use independent data to validate the models (72%).‖ Nogues-Bravo writes, ―ignoring the theoretical assumptions behind niche modeling and using inadequate methods for hindcasting can produce ―a cascade of errors and naïve ecological and evolutionary inferences. Hence, he concludes, ―there are a wide variety of challenges that CEMs must overcome in order to improve the reliability of their predictions through time. Until these challenges are met, contentions of impending species extinctions must be considered little more than guesswork (see also Chapman, 2010).

## 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.”

#### Market uncertainty destroys solvency

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

While libertarians are often caricatured as those who have near religious certainty about the correctness of their ideologically-charged view of the world, the reality is quite the opposite. In short, we libertarians argue that, in energy markets, much is uncertain. We don’t know whether renewable energy is the “best” way to reduce greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. We don’t know for certain when (or even if) oil will meaningfully grow more scarce. We don’t know what the transportation market will look like tomorrow. And we don’t know better than greedy, profit-hungry investors whether money spent in this sector or that – or on this technology or that – is a better deal than money spent in some other way. Hence, we propose to leave it to producers and consumers to sort such things out. Nor are we libertarians the only ones who see wisdom in this policy path. Even “soft energy” guru Amory Lovins has no complaint with leaving energy decisions to the market and letting the chips fall where they may.

#### This ensures error replication and market failure

Taylor 8 Jerry, CATO, Powering the Future, 8/22, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=9609>

Before you confidently hold forth about the future of energy markets, you really ought to pick up a copy of Vaclav Smil's 2005 book, "Energy at the Crossroads," and direct your attention to Chapter 4. There you will find a thorough review of the most prominent energy forecasts that have been offered over the last several decades by various blue-ribbon commissions, government forecasting agencies, top-flight academics, energy trade associations, think tanks, policy advocates and energy corporations. **One can't help but conclude that drunk monkeys would be just as reliable** as "the best and the brightest" when it comes to soothsaying about the future of technology, market share or price. The point here is that we don't know what the energy future may hold and we should accordingly treat the periodic energy crazes that sweep the political landscape more skeptically than we have in the past. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. If you need any proof that unleashing government to plan our energy future is like giving car keys to drunken teenagers (to paraphrase P.J. O'Rourke), you need look no further than President Bush's 2002 "Freedom CAR" initiative. First, it was charged with delivering us into the hydrogen age. But then the president discovered switch grass; fuel cells were henceforth "out" and cellulosic ethanol was "in." Now it turns out that 200-proof grain alcohol is not the fuel of the future; electricity delivered via plug-in electric-gasoline hybrids is. And Freedom CAR is but one example of many that one could marshal; whole books have been written about the myriad economic disasters and quiet taxpayer waste associated with our ongoing practice of energy planning in post-World War II America. The problem isn't that ignorant or venal people are charged with making our collective energy decisions. The problem is that we can no more sensibly plan the energy economy than we can centrally plan any other sector of the economy, particularly given the fact that political decisions are inevitably made primarily on their political merits, not on their economic or environmental merits. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. The argument we frequently hear that "we need every source of energy in the future to meet our staggering energy needs" is ridiculous. Some energy — such as nuclear fusion and grid-connected solar energy — is simply too expensive to produce now, which is to say, it costs more to generate than it is worth. Subsidies and mandates to get "every energy source to market" simply force us to generate and consume energy that costs more than it is worth. In an ideal world, we would strip the energy market of all subsidies; liberate the energy industry to exploit resources on federal lands; leave prices alone so that they deliver accurate information to investors about wealth-creating opportunities and to consumers about relative scarcity; allow energy companies to structure themselves in any manner they like; and fully embrace free trade in energy markets, which keeps prices down. I don't disagree that we have a responsibility to police the public environmental commons. But the best way to do that is to set emission rules or regulations that apply fairly to all emitters in all sectors of the economy and that have some relationship to the harms being addressed. Once that's done, market actors will order their affairs efficiently to produce the lowest-cost energy possible and do a better job picking "winners" than would-be central planners.

#### Every dollar in government-directed spending trades off with innovation

Burnett 12 [Sterling, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, “Energy Loserville: U.S. DOE Picks in an Artificial Industry”, MasterResource, A Free Market Energy Blog, 7-9-12,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2012/07/losing-us-green-subsidies/>, RSR]

This latter point is perhaps the greatest weakness of any benefit/cost analysis of any government subsidies. These subsidies substitute the government’s judgment about what the public should want for the public’s own judgment as express through their choices in the marketplace. There are huge opportunity costs to such government directed spending. The money spent developing and promoting a green energy industry (especially one that has subpar development results) is \*money not spent innovating, not available to entrepreneurs to discover the next big thing(whether it be energy source or entertainment device), \* jobs not created in other sectors of the economy(and maybe in some industries that haven’t been created yet), \*money not available for better education or health care,or \* money not available to reduce the annual deficit and overall debt. This, in my opinion, is the real economic loss. More Bad Bets? In the face of these multiple “successes,” the Obama administration wants to double down and throw more good money after bad. It’s never worked before, but hey, there’s always a first time, Right? Election season, and bad ideology, have put the sitting President at odds with reality.

#### Innovation in the energy sector is vital to overall U.S. competitiveness

Deutsch 8 [John, Former undersecretary of DOE and Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Issues in Science and Technology, "Ending the Inertia on Energy Policy," Winter 08, RSR]

There is only one solution to the challenge: The United States must begin the long process of transforming its economy from one that is dependent on petroleum and high-emission coal-fired electricity to one that uses energy much more efficiently, develops alternative fuels, and switches to electricity generation that is low-carbon or carbon-free. The benefits of such a transformation are indisputable: It would avoid unnecessary cost and disruption to the U.S. economy, protect the environment, and enhance national security. The United States has sought to adopt an effective and coherent energy policy since the first oil crisis of 1973, but it has failed to do so. The challenge for U.S. political leaders is to craft, fund, and diligently sustain a range of policy measures that will make this critical transition as certain, rapid, and cost-effective as possible. In order to meet this challenge, the United States must undergo an innovation revolution. The rate at which the United States is able to develop and deploy new energy technologies will, to a great extent, determine the ultimate speed and cost of the economic transformation. Large-scale carbon capture and sequestration, advanced batteries, plug-in hybrid vehicle technologies, next-generation biofuels for the transportation sector, and a number of other innovations will be vital to achieving a low-carbon economy, and the United States must not only develop but deploy these technologies. The benefits of such innovation will accrue to other countries as well, for U.S. technical assistance programs and trade will carry these advances abroad.

#### Competitiveness is vital to U.S. hegemony and the economy.

Segal 4 [Adam, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, ‘4

Foreign Affairs, "Is America Losing Its Edge?" November / December 2004, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html>, RSR]

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

### Solvency

#### No future wind improvements – it has reached maturation

Moriarty and Honnery 12 (Patrick, Department of Design, Monash University-Caulfield, Damon, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Monash University-Clayton Campus, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, Volume 16, Issue 1, January, Pages 244–252, og)

Opposing declines in energy ratio will be improvements in technology, and cost reductions through learning as output of RE grows (although as Yeh and Rubin [47] have shown, reliance on simple log-linear curves for predicting lower future energy technology costs is misplaced). Mature RE technologies like hydroelectricity and wind can expect few further improvements, but for others, like PV cells, further technological breakthroughs and cost reductions with increased production are possible, or even likely. However, as experience with fossil fuel systems has shown, benefits from technological improvements can often only be attained once the operating life of existing plant has been reached; timing is therefore critical.

#### Not sufficient wind power for airborne wind to produce enough energy and airborne wind would disrupt the earth’s climate

Energy Matters 11 (13 December, citing a study published by Lee Miller published in Earth System Dynamics on November 29th, 2011, http://www.energymatters.com.au/index.php?main\_page=news\_article&article\_id=1932

New findings from Germany’s Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry in regard to the nature of the jet stream that flows around the Earth’s upper atmosphere may put an end to hopes of harvesting its high-speed winds as an endless supply of renewable energy. ¶ ¶ According to researchers, the assumption that high wind speeds in the jet stream correspond with high wind power are incorrect. ¶ ¶ A study has found the lack of friction at high altitudes and the absence of any strong power source, the actual extractable energy from the jet stream is 200 times less than has been previously reported. ¶ ¶ The jet stream is a region of continuous winds that occurs at near-space altitudes of 7-16km. This flow of air is governed by an accelerating force produced by atmospheric pressure and the “Coriolis Effect,” created by the rotation of the Earth. At upper levels of the jet stream, wind speeds can reach as much as 320km per hour. ¶ ¶ Some companies and federal organisations – including NASA – believe that by developing the right technology, such as airborne wind turbines that could harness high-speed jet stream winds and funnel power back to Earth, the jet stream will become an unlimited source of renewable energy.¶ ¶ Not so, according to Dr. Axel Kleidon, head of the Max Planck Research Group Biospheric Theory and Modelling. Because the jet stream is so far removed from the influence of the surface and with low air density, the slow down by friction plays a very minor role. Hence, it takes only very little power to accelerate and sustain jet streams.¶ ¶ "It is this low energy generation rate that ultimately limits the potential use of jet streams as a renewable energy resource," Keidon says.¶ ¶ Not only is the jet stream far weaker than first thought, to actually disrupt the delicate flow by creating drag with massive floating wind turbines could cause profound damage to the Earth’s climate. ¶ ¶ The researchers estimate that if 7.5 terrawatts (TW) of energy were extracted from the jet stream using wind turbines, this would alter the driving force between the equator and the poles, depleting the jet stream of energy. ¶ ¶ "Such a disruption of jet stream flow would slow down the entire climate system. The atmosphere would generate 40 times less wind energy than what we would gain from the wind turbines," ex-plains v first author of the study. "This results in drastic changes in temperature and weather.

#### Not currently viable – technical challenges

Fagiano and Milanese 12 (Lorenzo Fagiano, Ph.D. in Engineering, wrote his dissertation on Airborne wind, Visiting Researcher at the Department of Mechanical Engineering at UC Santa Barbara; Mario Milanese, professor of system theory at Politecnico di Torino; 2012 American Control Conference, Fairmont Queen Elizabeth, Montréal, Canada June 27-June 29, 2012, Airborne Wind Energy: an overview)

In the last five years, significant developments in AWE technologies have been achieved. Theoretical and numerical studies concerned with many important aspects, particularly aerodynamics and control, have been carried out, moreover small-scale prototypes have been increasingly realized and tested in several projects carried out by small companies, uni- versities and research centers. The state-of-the-art of AWE, resulting from these recent activities, has been summarized in this paper. Together with such a steady and quite fast technical progress, there has been also a growing interest from investors and public bodies worldwide. The ongoing development activities are increasingly proving the viability of the concept, yet several technical issues remain and need to be addressed, in order to definitely show that this technology can be scaled up to an industrial size (i.e. with single AWE generators of about 2-MW rated power), meet the requirements of a commercial wind power generator, and provide the expected performance in terms of quantity and cost of the generated energy. Aspects like grid connection, line wear, and maintenance have not been addressed so far, especially for large scale generators, in which the expected forces on the lines are of the order of many tons. Automatic control systems have been tested for a limited amount of time, still not sufficient to demonstrate a satisfactorily high level of reliability. Particularly for GLGs, there is a lack of modeling studies and model validation with experimental data. The operation and control of AWE farms will pose additional technical problems, related to the coordination of the different generators. On the other hand, AWE tech- nologies are just at the dawn of their development, and there is a significant uncovered potential for the use of innovative solutions in multiple fields like materials, power electronics and aerodynamics, to tackle the above-mentioned problems. Ad-hoc designed wings and lines might be used to improve the system performance, reduce the required maintenance and augment the control capabilities. Energy storage systems like super capacitors or flywheels could be coupled with AWE generators to cope with the issue of grid connection. Advanced unmanned aerial vehicle technologies, sensors, and tracking systems could be applied to enhance the automatic control of AWE generators and reach the required reliability. All these aspects represent important challenges, but also a wealth of opportunities for future, multidisciplinary research and development activities.

#### Wind power is hopeless – zero real-time capacity values and depends on conventional fuels

Boone 10 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “OVERBLOWN: Windpower on the Firing Line (Part I)”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/09/windpower-overblown-part-1>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Unreliable wind volatility is the antithesis of supply stability; it has no capacity value. (Hence the title of Kent Hawkins’ recent series, Wind Has No Value.) What most experts don’t properly account for, even those who understand the data, is the difference in the production delivery between conventional power units and wind, which is typically masked by snapshot reports of wind performance data that don’t reveal wind’s continuous skitter. The former provides their whole power (their rated capacity) at a controlled rate, unless asked to change by grid operators.¶ Wind provides energy in fits and starts, always staggering its way around the grid, never controllable and rarely predictable except when shut down—in the process always entangled with supportive prosthetics—conventional generation—to make its production appear whole, steady, and precise. Beyond this, wind production is often inimical to demand requirements. For example, California’s independent system operator rarely sees more than 5% of wind’s installed capacity during the summer peak periods. It is this trait that is so “peculiar,” given the requirement for reliability and grid security.¶ Figure 1 illustrates the supportive prosthetics concept with the wind mirroring production required, typically by fossil fuel plants, to make wind output useful—i.e., steady and reliable, as described above. As is evident, wind output is a much smaller part of a larger fuel mix but enmeshed in a yin yang mode where polar or seemingly contrary forces are existentially interconnected and interdependent. As in the old song lyric, “you can’t have one without the other.”¶ Indeed, since wind’s average annual production rarely exceeds 30% of its installed capacity, electricity production from more than 70% of any wind project’s installed capacity must routinely come from conventional generation that performs inefficiently as it quickly ramps up and back to balance wind’s tempestuous ebb and flow. This is not “supporting” or back-up generation but rather proactive, reliable power that must be actively entangled with wind to make it work. Moreover, from the perspective of system reliability planning, wind requires conventional generators to cover nearly 100% of its installed capacity. (Even so, wind’s capacity value is zero in real time.) And all this is in addition to the requirement to balance demand fluctuations.¶ What must infill the breach when wind production falls by 10 MW? What must be running when 1000MW of installed wind is producing nothing? In terms of energy–or even power—density, one cannot equate the production from any wind installation with that of the output of a conventional generator.

### Warming

#### Wind doesn’t decrease emissions – best studies prove

Kielisch 9 (Kurt, President, Appraisal Group One, “WIND TURBINE IMPACT STUDY”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/AGO-WIND-TURBINE-IMPACT-STUDY.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

Spinning reserves provide no useful electricity and do not reduce emissions from power ¶ generation.¶ 189¶ Promoters of wind energy routinely overstate environmental benefits. They advocate ¶ that each kilowatt-hour (kWh) of electricity produced by a wind turbine displaces the same ¶ amount of fuel-use and emissions associated with a kWh of electricity produced by a fossil-fuel ¶ generating unit. However, the saving of CO2 emissions is not proportional to the amount of ¶ fossil-fueled power that it displaces. Necessary spinning reserve fossil-fired capacity emits ¶ more CO2/kWh than if the plant were optimized, thus offsetting much of the benefit of wind.¶ 190¶ ¶ In addition to the assumption of kWh-per-kWh offsets, wind energy advocates often use ¶ outdated information about emissions when making their claims, not taking into account the ¶ difference made by newer, cleaner burning fossil fueled plants.¶ 191¶ The more wind power capacity is in the grid, the lower percentage of traditional ¶ generation it can replace. A wind farm of 24,000 turbines with a generating capability of 48,000 ¶ MW would replace just 2,000 MW of conventional generation, the equivalent to two mediumsized coal stations.¶ 192¶ The greater the distance between the source of generation and center of demand, the ¶ greater the losses during transmission. Currently these losses are estimated at 10-15%.¶ 193¶ This ¶ is a problem since most wind turbines are in rural locations and far from the need. ¶ Even at 10,000 turbines across the country, the UK will still not be able to supply 15% of ¶ its energy through wind turbines by 2020. Environmentalists say it’s necessary to stop Global ¶ Warming while others point out how thousands of more wind turbines will blight their land.¶ 194¶ The high cost and low return of wind farms is acknowledged by the U.S. National ¶ Association of Attorney Generals. In a 2008 presentation, they concluded that, despite being ¶ “green” wind farms are a high-cost alternative with a large footprint but small power output.¶ 195¶ ¶ As we have seen from empirical research gleaned from a worldwide search, wind ¶ turbines produce very little electricity.¶ 196¶ They have a high capital cost,¶ 197¶ and poor capacity ¶ utilization.¶ 198¶ Why, then, is wind-power the beneficiary of such extensive support if it is ¶ incapable of providing consistent power to replace traditional power plants, does not achieve ¶ the CO2 reductions required, and causes cost increases in backup, maintenance and ¶ transmission, while at the same time discouraging investment in clean, firm generation ¶ capacity?¶

#### Wind power only increases emissions – scientific consensus

Boone 10 (Jon, PhD, Environmentalist, and Formal Intervenor in Wind Installation Hearings, “OVERBLOWN: Windpower on the Firing Line (Part I)”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/09/windpower-overblown-part-1>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Third, the National Academy of Science, in a report published in early 2007, concluded that, in the words of one of the researchers, “Wind power will thus not reduce carbon emissions; it will only slow the increase by a small amount.”[1] Engineers and environmentalists in Britain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Canada, and Australia followed suit, publishing papers that are not only skeptical of wind’s CO2 offsetting abilities but also offer methodological accounting systems for scientifically calculating wind’s carbon impact on the electricity grid. None are beholden to the fossil fuel industry and none are paid lobbyists like Goggin. All, including the NAS, have been rebuffed in their efforts to examine data on wind integration behavior at meaningful time intervals and amounts; instead, they’ve been told that such data is “proprietarily confidential,” and can’t be released without the consent of the affected wind companies. So much for the transparency and accountability that were once the pillars of public policy, not to mention the scientific precept of refutability.¶ A few sources do publish wind performance information, notably the Ontario IESO and, most thoroughly, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in the Pacific Northwest. One can also get, with some digging, historic wind data on a plant-by-plant basis in New York and Pennsylvania. This information has clarified the peculiar nature of wind performance per se. But it is insufficient, for reasons explained later, to account for the way that “peculiar nature” affects the thermal performance of conventional generators throughout the grid system. And it is this phenomenon that intrigued the researchers from Colorado.¶ Fourth, it is true that the Independent Petroleum Association of the Mountain States (IPAMS, which is now the Western Energy Alliance) commissioned the Colorado report produced by Bentek Energy, an energy analytics firm based in Colorado. It is also true that Bentek was the first to get real time performance data at sufficiently fine-grained time intervals, using an ingenious methodological approach that examined the heat rate penalties of (particularly) coal plants intimately involved with wind integration. (More on this later.)¶ What is astonishing, given the nearly universal aversion to sharing wind related performance data, is that Bentek got permission to do this at all. Bentek demonstrated that, in the regions it studied, the peculiar nature of wind performance caused coal plants to perform more inefficiently, “often resulting in greater SO2, NOx, and CO2 emissions than would have occurred if less wind energy were generated and coal generation was not cycled.” The report concluded by recommending that Colorado and Texas begin replacing their older coal units with flexible fossil-fired natural gas units that produce half the emissions.¶ Ironically, this is precisely the recommendation that the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) made in the EWITS study Goggin cited. It is also the basis of AWEA’s own prescription for making wind variability work. On the one hand, Goggin rejects the Bentek study as a creature of the evil fossil fuel empire. But, without a hitch in his giddy-up, he then embraces language in that study that places fossil fuels in service to the white knights of wind. Whether this flop was noticed is unclear.

#### Wind power increases emissions – cycling inefficiency outweighs reduction

Bentek 12 (BENTEK Energy is the leading energy markets information company, “How Less Became More”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/BENTEK-How-Less-Became-More.pdf>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

The study details the surprising conclusion that the use of wind energy in the PSCO and ¶ ERCOT context results in increased SO2 and NOX and, in the case of PSCO, CO2. The ¶ mechanism driving increased emissions is the need to cycle coal facilities in order to ¶ accommodate wind, which is considered a “must-take” resource due to the respective states’ ¶ RPS mandates. When wind generation comes online, generation from coal (and natural gasfired) plants is curtailed until the wind subsides, then their generation is once again ramped up ¶ to meet demand. Cycling coal units in this manner drives their heat rate up and their ¶ operating efficiency down, resulting in higher emissions of SO2, NOX and CO2 than would ¶ have been the case if the units had not been cycled.

### Economy

#### Incentives for renewables will kill 11 million jobs

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)

Europe’s current policy and strategy for supporting the so-called “green jobs” or renewable energy dates back to 1997, and has become one of the principal justifications for U. S. “green jobs” proposals. Yet an examination of Europe’ s experience reveals these policies to be terribly economically counterproductive.¶ This study is important for several reasons. First is that the Spanish experience is considered a leading example to be followed by many policy advocates and politicians. This study marks the very first time a critical analysis of the actual performance and impact has been made. Most important, it demonstrates that the Spanish/EU-style “green jobs” agenda now being promoted in the U.S. in fact destroys jobs, detailing this in terms of jobs destroyed per job created and the net destruction per installed MW.¶ The study’s results demonstrate how such “green jobs” policy clearly hinders Spain’s way out of the current economic crisis, even while U.S. politicians insist that rushing into such a scheme will ease their own emergence from the turmoil.¶ The following are key points from the study:¶ 1. As President Obama correctly remarked, Spain provides a reference for the establishment of government aid to renewable energy. No other country has given such broad support to the construction and production of electricity through renewable sources. The arguments for Spain’s and Europe’s “green jobs” schemes are the same arguments now made in the U.S., principally that massive public support would produce large numbers of green jobs. The question that this paper answers is “at what price?”¶ 2. Optimistically treating European Commission partially funded data, we find that for every renewable energy job that the State manages to finance, Spain’s experience cited by President Obama as a model reveals with high confidence, by two different methods, that the U.S. should expect a loss of at least 2.2 jobs on average, or about 9 jobs lost for every 4 created, to which we have to add those jobs that non-subsidized investments with the same resources would have created.¶ 3. Therefore, while it is not possible to directly translate Spain’s experience with exactitude to claim that the U.S. would lose at least 6.6 million to 11 million jobs, as a direct consequence were it to actually create 3 to 5 million “green jobs” as promised (in addition to the jobs lost due to the opportunity cost of private capital employed in renewable energy), the study clearly reveals the tendency that the U.S. should expect such an outcome.¶ 4. At minimum, therefore, the study’s evaluation of the Spanish model cited as one for the U.S. to replicate in quick pursuit of “green jobs” serves a note of caution, that the reality is far from what has typically been presented, and that such schemes also offer considerable employment consequences and implications for emerging from the economic crisis.¶ 5. Despite its hyper-aggressive (expensive and extensive) “green jobs” policies it appears that Spain likely has created a surprisingly low number of jobs, two- thirds of which came in construction, fabrication and installation, one quarter in administrative positions, marketing and projects engineering, and just one out of ten jobs has been created at the more permanent level of actual operation and maintenance of the renewable sources of electricity.¶ 6. This came at great financial cost as well as cost in terms of jobs destroyed elsewhere in the economy.¶ 7. The study calculates that since 2000 Spain spent €571,138 to create each “green job”, including subsidies of more than €1 million per wind industry job.¶ 8. The study calculates that the programs creating those jobs also resulted in the destruction of nearly 110,500 jobs elsewhere in the economy, or 2.2 jobs destroyed for every “green job” created.¶ 9. Principally, the high cost of electricity affects costs of production and employment levels in metallurgy, non-metallic mining and food processing, beverage and tobacco industries.¶ 10. Each “green” megawatt installed destroys 5.28 jobs on average elsewhere in the economy: 8.99 by photovoltaics, 4.27 by wind energy, 5.05 by mini-hydro.¶ 11. These costs do not appear to be unique to Spain’s approach but instead are largely inherent in schemes to promote renewable energy sources.¶ 12. The total over-cost – the amount paid over the cost that would result from buying the electricity generated by the renewable power plants at the market price - that has been incurred from 2000 to 2008 (adjusting by 4% and calculating its net present value [NPV] in 2008), amounts to 7,918.54 million Euros (appx. $10 billion USD)¶ 13. The total subsidy spent and committed (NPV adjusted by 4%) to these three renewable sources amounts to 28,671 million euros ($36 billion USD).¶ ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼14. The price of a comprehensive electricity rate (paid by the end consumer) in Spain would have to be increased 31% to being able to repay the historic debt generated by this rate deficit mainly produced by the subsidies to renewables, according to Spain’s energy regulator.¶ 15. Spanish citizens must therefore cope with either an increase of electricity rates or increased taxes (and public deficit), as will the U.S. if it follows Spain’s model.¶ 16. The high cost of electricity due to the green job policy tends to drive the relatively most electricity-intensive companies and industries away, seeking areas where costs are lower. The example of Acerinox is just such a case.¶ 17. The study offers a caution against a certain form of green energy mandate. Minimum guaranteed prices generate surpluses that are difficult to manage. In Spain’s case, the minimum electricity prices for renewable-generated electricity, far above market prices, wasted a vast amount of capital that could have been otherwise economically allocated in other sectors. Arbitrary, state-established price systems inherent in “green energy” schemes leave the subsidized renewable industry hanging by a very weak thread and, it appears, doomed to dramatic adjustments that will include massive unemployment, loss of capital, dismantlement of productive facilities and perpetuation of inefficient ones.¶ 18. These schemes create serious “bubble” potential, as Spain is now discovering. The most paradigmatic bubble case can be found in the photovoltaic industry. Even with subsidy schemes leaving the mean sale price of electricity generated from solar photovoltaic power 7 times higher than the mean price of the pool, solar failed even to reach 1% of Spain’s total electricity production in 2008.¶ 19. The energy future has been jeopardized by the current state of wind or photovoltaic technology (more expensive and less efficient than conventional energy sources). These policies will leave Spain saddled with and further artificially perpetuating obsolete fixed assets, far less productive than cutting- edge technologies, the soaring rates for which soon-to-be obsolete assets the government has committed to maintain at high levels during their lifetime.¶ 20. The regulator should consider whether citizens and companies need expensive and inefficient energy – a factor of production usable in virtually every human project- or affordable energy to help overcome the economic crisis instead.¶ 21. The Spanish system also jeopardizes conventional electricity facilities, which are the first to deal with the electricity tariff deficit that the State owes them.¶ 22. Renewable technologies remained the beneficiaries of new credit while others began to struggle, though this was solely due to subsidies, mandates and related programs. As soon as subsequent programmatic changes take effect which became necessary due to “unsustainable” solar growth its credit will also cease.¶ 23. This proves that the only way for the “renewables” sector - which was never feasible by itself on the basis of consumer demand - to be “countercyclical” in crisis periods is also via government subsidies. These schemes create a bubble,¶ which is boosted as soon as investors find in “renewables” one of the few profitable sectors while when fleeing other investments. Yet it is axiomatic, as we are seeing now, that when crisis arises, the Government cannot afford this growing subsidy cost either, and finally must penalize the artificial renewable industries which then face collapse.¶ 24. Renewables consume enormous taxpayer resources. In Spain, the average annuity payable to renewables is equivalent to 4.35% of all VAT collected, 3.45% of the household income tax, or 5.6% of the corporate income tax for 2007.

## 1NR

### Politics

#### Southeast Asian conflict escalation is highly probable.

Geller 5 (Daniel S. – Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Wayne State University, The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry, Ed. T. V. Paul, p. 99)

In fact, both the May-July 1999 military engagement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and the crisis of December 2001-June 2002 after the terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament mirrored the conflict escalation pattern for nuclear-armed states. Each side initiated troop mobilization and general military alerts, coupled with the evacuation of civilians from border-area villages. However, the outcome of the future confrontations for India and Pakistan may not adhere to the pattern established by other nuclear dyads. Elements are present in this dyad that were largely absent between other nuclear-armed antagonists and that make the escalation of war more probable. Among those factors are the presence of a contiguous border between India and Pakistan, a history of multiple wars, and an ongoing territorial dispute. These factors, among others,79 increase the likelihood that an Indo-Pakistani dispute will turn violent and that the violence will escalate to war irrespective of the presence of nuclear weapons.

#### That escalation has a high probability of being nuclear.

Raghavan 1 (Fall-Winter, Lieutenant General V. R. – former Director General of Military Operations for India, Limited War and Nuclear Escalation in South Asia, The Nonproliferation Review, p. 1)

The status of India and Pakistan as declared nuclear powers with growing nuclear arsenals has raised the risks of a nuclear exchange between them, if the two countries engage in a large military conflict. The political leadership in both countries does not seem to have fully grasped the implications of nuclear weapons in relation to the ongoing conflict in Jammu and Kashmir. This conflict could lead to a limited war, as it has triggered three wars in the past. The risks involved in fighting a limited war over the Kashmir issue and the potential for such a war to escalate into a nuclear exchange are at best inadequately understood, and at worst brushed aside as an unlikely possibility. Despite this official stance, however, a close examination of Indian and Pakistani military and nuclear doctrine reveals elements that could contribute to the rapid escalation of a limited war to include nuclear weapons. Strikingly, India and Pakistan have not revealed warfighting doctrines for the post-1998 condition of nuclear weapons readiness. It is not clear, for example, what threats to its security would compel India to declare a state of war with Pakistan. There is also no indication of the circumstances that would induce Pakistan to seek a larger war with India. The political objectives that a limited war might seek to achieve have also not been articulated in official and public discourse in the two countries. This article examines the possibility of limited war between India and Pakistan, and the potential of such a conflict triggering a nuclear war. It examines the considerations that could push each of the two countries to fight a limited war. It discusses how such a war might be waged and the circumstances that would likely precipitate an escalation to a nuclear exchange. The doctrinal beliefs and decisionmaking processes of the two countries are examined to trace the likely escalatory spiral towards a nuclear war. The article concludes that the probability of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan is high in the event the two countries engage in a direct military conflict.

#### Chinese economic growth prevents global nuclear war

Kaminski 7 (Antoni Z., Professor – Institute of Political Studies, “World Order: The Mechanics of Threats (Central European Perspective)”, Polish Quarterly of International Affairs, 1, p. 58)

As already argued, the economic advance of China has taken place with relatively few corresponding changes in the political system, although the operation of political and economic institutions has seen some major changes. Still, tools are missing that would allow the establishment of political and legal foundations for the modem economy, or they are too weak. The tools are efficient public administration, the rule of law, clearly defined ownership rights, efficient banking system, etc. For these reasons, many experts fear an economic crisis in China. Considering the importance of the state for the development of the global economy, the crisis would have serious global repercussions. Its political ramifications could be no less dramatic owing to the special position the military occupies in the Chinese political system, and the existence of many potential vexed issues in East Asia (disputes over islands in the China Sea and the Pacific). A potential hotbed of conflict is also Taiwan's status. Economic recession and the related destabilization of internal policies could lead to a political, or even military crisis. The likelihood of the global escalation of the conflict is high, as the interests of Russia, China, Japan, Australia and, first and foremost, the US clash in the region.

#### Indian economic growth is crucial to stabilize South Asia

Garten 95 (Jeffrey, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, FDCH, 3-7, Lexis)

Paramount among those interests are the commercial opportunities that are increasingly at the heart of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy. But it is impossible to separate those commercial interests from our broader interests. Economic reforms enable our companies to take advantage of the opportunities within the Indian market and enable Indian companies to better enter the global marketplace. Economic growth in India is a powerful stabilizing force in a region of the world where stability is of Supreme importance. Stability and growth in India are of enormous importance through southern Asia, from the Middle East to Indochina. Peace and prosperity in that part of the world are essential to the peace and prosperity

#### a. current immigration law endangers all innovation – reform is key

McCraw, professor emeritus at Harvard Business School, 11/1/2012

(Thomas, “Innovative Immigrants,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/02/opinion/immigrants-as-entrepreneurs.html?pagewanted=all>)

SOME 70 million **immigrants** have come to America since the first colonists arrived. The role their labor has played in economic development is widely understood. Much less familiar is the extent to which their remarkable **innovations have driven American prosperity**. Indeed, while both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney have lauded entrepreneurship, innovation and “job creation,” neither candidate has made comprehensive immigration reform an issue, despite immigrants’ crucial role in those fields. Yet understanding how **immigrants have fueled innovation through history** is critical to making sure they continue to drive prosperity in the future. At the country’s beginning, the three most important architects of its financial system were immigrants: Alexander Hamilton, from St. Croix, then part of the Danish West Indies; Robert Morris, born in Liverpool, England; and Albert Gallatin of Geneva. Morris was superintendent of finance during the Revolutionary War, using every resource at his command to support the army in the field. Hamilton, as the first secretary of the Treasury, rescued the country from bankruptcy and designed its basic financial system. Gallatin paid down much of the national debt, engineered the financing of the Louisiana Purchase and remains the longest-serving Treasury secretary ever. Immigrants’ financial innovations continued through the 19th century. In 1808 Alexander Brown, from Ireland, founded the nation’s first investment bank, and his immigrant sons set up Brown Brothers. The Lehman brothers, from Germany, began as dry-goods merchants and cotton brokers in Alabama, then moved to New York just before the Civil War and eventually founded a bank. Many other immigrants, including Marcus Goldman of Goldman Sachs, followed similar paths, starting very small, traveling to new cities and establishing banks. Meanwhile, “Yankee” firms like Kidder, Peabody and Drexel, Morgan — whose partners were native-born — remained less mobile, tied by family and high society to Boston and New York. Immigrant innovators were pioneers in many other industries after the Civil War. Three examples were Andrew Carnegie (Scotland, steel), Joseph Pulitzer (Hungary, newspapers) and David Sarnoff (Russia, electronics). Each came to America young, poor and full of energy. Carnegie’s mother brought the family to Pittsburgh in 1848, when Andrew was 12. He became a bobbin-boy in a textile mill, a telegram messenger, a telegraph-key operator, a low-level manager at the Pennsylvania Railroad, a division superintendent for the same railroad and a bond salesman for the railroad in Europe. Recognizing the limitless market for the rails that carried trains, Carnegie jumped to steel. His most important innovation was “hard driving” blast furnaces, wearing them out quickly. This violated the accepted practice of “coddling” furnaces, but he calculated that his vastly increased output cut the price of steel far more than replacing the furnaces cost his company. In turn, an immense quantity of cheap steel found its way into lucrative new uses: structural steel for skyscrapers, sheet steel for automobiles. Pulitzer was the home-tutored son of a prosperous Hungarian family that lost its fortune. He came to the United States in 1864 at age 17, recruited by a Massachusetts Civil War regiment. Penniless after the war ended, he went to St. Louis, a center for German immigrants, whose language he spoke fluently. He worked as a waiter, a railroad clerk, a lawyer and a reporter for a local German newspaper, part of which he eventually purchased. In 1879, he acquired two English-language papers and merged them into The St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In 1883, he moved to New York, where he bought The New York World and began a fierce competition with other New York papers, mainly the Sun and, later, William Randolph Hearst’s New York Journal. The New York World was pro-labor, pro-immigration and, remarkably, both serious and sensationalist. It achieved a huge circulation. Sarnoff was just 9 years old when he arrived from Russia in 1901. He earned money selling Yiddish newspapers on the street and singing at a synagogue, and then worked as an office clerk, a messenger and, like Carnegie, a telegraph operator. From there he became part of the fledgling radio firm RCA and rose rapidly within its ranks. Sarnoff was among the first to see radio’s potential as “point-to-mass” entertainment, i.e., broadcasting. He devoted a huge percentage of profits to research and development, and won an epic battle with CBS over industry standards for color TV. For decades, RCA and electronics were practically synonymous. As these men show, **one of the key traits of** immigrant **innovators is geographic mobility**, both from the home country and within the United States. Consider the striking roster of 20th-century immigrants who led the development of fields like movies and information technology: the Hollywood studios MGM, Warner Brothers, United Artists, Paramount and Universal; the Silicon Valley companies Intel, eBay, Google, Yahoo and Sun Microsystems. The economist Joseph Schumpeter — yet another immigrant, and the most perceptive early analyst of innovation — considered it to be the fundamental component of entrepreneurship: “The typical entrepreneur is more self-centered than other types, because he relies less than they do on tradition and connection” and because his efforts consist “precisely in breaking up old, and creating new, tradition.” For that reason, innovators always encounter resistance from people whose economic and social interests are threatened by new products and methods. Compared with the native-born, who have extended families and lifelong social and commercial relationships, **immigrants without** such ties — without businesses to inherit or family **property to protect** — **are** in some ways **better prepared to play** the i**nnovator**’s role. A hundred academic monographs could not prove that immigrants are more innovative than native-born Americans, because each spurs the other on. **Innovations by the blended population** were, and still **are**, **integral to the economic growth of the** United States. **But our** overly complex **immigration law hampers** even the most obvious **innovators**’ efforts to become citizens. **It endangers our tradition of entrepreneurship**, and it must be repaired — soon.

#### b. Lack of innovation makes renewable energy development impossible

Norris and Jenkins 9, \*Project Director at the Breakthrough Institute, \* Director of Energy and Climate Policy, The Breakthrough Institute,(Teryn and Jessie, “ Want to Save the World? Make Clean Energy Cheap,” Huffington Post, March 10, <http://www.thebreakthrough.org/blog/2009/03/want_to_save_the_world_make_cl.shtml>)

Whatever the cause, we have very little chance of overcoming climate change without enlisting young innovators at a drastically greater scale. Simply put, they represent one of the most important catalysts for creating a clean energy economy and achieving long-term prosperity. The reason is this: at its core, climate change is a challenge of technology innovation. Over the next four decades, global energy demand will approximately double. Most of this growth will happen in developing nations as they continue lifting their citizens out of poverty and building modern societies. But over the same period, global greenhouse gas emissions must fall dramatically to avert the worst consequences of climate change. Shortly before his untimely death in 2005, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Richard Smalley coined this the "Terawatt Challenge": increasing global energy production from roughly 15 terawatts in 2005 to 60 terawatts annually by 2100 in a way that simultaneously confronts the challenges of global warming, poverty alleviation, and resource depletion. The single greatest obstacle to meeting the Terawatt Challenge is the "technology gap" between dirty and clean energy sources. Low-carbon energy technologies remain significantly more expensive than fossil fuels. For example, solar photovoltaic electricity costs up to three to five times that of coal electricity, and plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles can be twice as expensive as their gasoline-fueled competitors. Unless this technology gap is bridged and clean energy technologies become affordable and scalable, poor and rich nations alike will continue opposing significant prices on their carbon emissions and will continue relying primarily upon coal and other fossil fuels to power their development. This will virtually assure massive climate destabilization. So the task is clear: to avoid climate catastrophe and create a new energy economy, we must unleash our forces of innovation - namely, scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs- to invent a new portfolio of truly scalable clean energy technologies, chart new paths to bring these technologies to market, and ensure they are affordable enough to deploy throughout the world.

#### Turns heg and econ - immigration reform is key to both hard and soft power

Nye, ‘12 --- Harvard Prof and former US assistant secretary of defense, state and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council (12/10/2013, “Immigration and American Power,” <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>)

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.” In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans. As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades. During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008. Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively. But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors. While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population. For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades. Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies. Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US. Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both. Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US. That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### Issue selection is key --- Obama can only get momentum if he starts with an issue like immigration where the public mood is changing. Overreaching with an unpopular issue empirically triggers backlash.

THEIR AUTHOR 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)>)

¶ Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories.¶ In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### Obama’s capital is key to getting moderates on board

Dallas Morning News 1/2 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, 2013, http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece)

President Barack Obama said all the right things Sunday about immigration reform. The president told NBC’s Meet the Press that he is serious about getting Congress to overhaul the laws governing immigrants. He even declared that he will introduce an immigration bill this year.¶ This newspaper welcomes that announcement. Texans particularly understand the unique challenges that an outdated immigration system presents. Even though the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S. has subsided in the last few years, the many holes in the system leave families, schools, businesses and law enforcement struggling. And those are just some of the constituents challenged by flawed immigration laws.¶ The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year.¶ We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans.¶ Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either.¶ And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, § Marked 08:15 § while also reaching out to Republicans.¶ In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer.¶ The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change.¶ But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count.¶ HE SAID IT …¶ “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.”¶ President Barack Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

#### The leaked plan boosts chances of passage – gives Obama and Republicans the opportunity to move to the middle and look like they’re compromising

Robinson 2/20 (Eugene, Washington Post Writers Group, Obama’s decoy plan could deliver a winner on immigration reform, http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/02/20/2695035/obamas-decoy-plan-could-deliver.html)

WASHINGTON — Republicans spent the weekend trumpeting shock and outrage over President Obama’s leaked “backup plan” on immigration. In dysfunctional Washington, this means that prospects for comprehensive reform – including what amounts to an amnesty for the undocumented – are getting brighter.¶ “Dead on arrival” was the verdict from Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., who has taken on the thankless task of leading his party back within shouting distance of reasonable on the immigration issue. The president’s plan, obtained by USA Today, would leave the nation with “unsecured borders and a broken legal immigration system for years to come,” Rubio charged.¶ Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., said the White House proposal – which hasn’t actually been proposed – shows that Obama is “really not serious” about reform. Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., said Obama’s plan “tells us that he’s looking for a partisan advantage and not a bipartisan solution.”¶ Translation: Things are looking up!¶ Here’s the state of play: In the November election, Obama carried both the nation’s largest minority – Hispanics – and its fastest-growing minority – Asian-Americans – by nearly 3-to-1. Rubio, the son of Cuban immigrants, has been trying to explain to his party that immigration is a “threshold” issue for communities with fresh memories of arrival. Mitt Romney’s notion of reform, which he summed up as “self-deportation,” communicated hostility rather than empathy. Voters returned the favor.¶ So a bipartisan group of eight senators, led by Rubio, has been working to develop a comprehensive reform package that would provide some kind of legal status for the 11 million migrants who are here without papers.¶ The outlines of a solution are obvious. There would be a clear path to citizenship for those who were brought here as children. There would be provisional legal status, and a route to permanent legal status, for those who came as adults. There would be measures to tighten security along the border with Mexico. There would probably be some kind of guest-worker program for those who seek only to come for seasonal employment. And there would be changes to streamline the legal immigration system, especially for high-tech workers and potential entrepreneurs.¶ The problem is that Republicans have spent years demonizing undocumented immigrants as a way of appealing to xenophobic, jingoistic sentiment. So how can members of Congress switch § Marked 08:16 § from “these people are a plague” to “these people are welcome to stay” without facing the ire of the party’s activist base?¶ Enter the president’s draft proposal, which administration officials described as a “backup” plan that Obama may put forward if Congress is not able to reach agreement.

#### House GOP would still support without due to electoral calculus.

PBS 3/21 (http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2013/03/progress-on-immigration-reform-leaves-leading-advocate-elated-wary.html)

Latinos voted overwhelmingly for the president and other Democrats, and that changed the calculus of Republicans as well, Gutierrez said. "That vote was so huge and numerous that Republicans, who had always wanted to either take this [immigration reform] off the table or -- many more -- who were our allies, our partners" could now support comprehensive reform, he said.¶ Working closely with Republicans, as he did several years ago during the last run at comprehensive immigration reform, Gutierrez is part of a small group in Congress quietly fashioning a bill.It's allowed the liberal former Chicago city council member to forge new bonds despite ideological differences.¶ "There are a lot of wonderful personal relationships that are being developed across the aisle between people who politically have nothing else in common, who come to this issue, this 'public policy matter,' [they] you would say, so that it would be drained of any emotion, right? - from a different perspective. I see it as a civil rights issue, as a human rights issue," Gutierrez said.¶ As the economic, political, and practical advantages of immigration reform get voiced by both parties, he believes potential obstacles to passing a final bill continue to fall away. And he says he's less worried than before about one such pitfall -- the demand by some conservatives that undocumented residents not be allowed to become U.S. citizens but only legalized residents."I start from the premise that never again will we allow America to let there be a permanent second-class anything. We had a civil war over that," Gutierrez said. "We're not going to revisit it now. We're not gonna allow a permanent subclass of Americans."¶ Predictions are that immigration bills in the House and Senate will be unveiled formally after next week's Spring congressional recess. Legislation could arrive on the president's desk before summer's end.

#### Party leaders ensure that support will happen.

The Hill 3/20 (Emerging immigration deal receives House leaders’ bipartisan backing

Read more: http://thehill.com/homenews/house/289169-emerging-immigration-deal-receives-house-leaders-bipartisan-backing#ixzz2OJIIxZs2)

Leaders in both parties voiced confidence in an emerging House immigration agreement, giving momentum to an issue that has been a bright spot early in President Obama’s second term.¶ Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) praised a bipartisan group for coming up with “a pretty responsible solution” on immigration, the first public endorsement the Speaker has made on the substance of secretive talks that have gone on for more than four years.¶ A group of eight lawmakers — four Republicans and four Democrats — has been meeting privately to craft a comprehensive immigration overhaul, and they told Boehner and other Republican leaders last week that they were close to a deal.¶ “They’re essentially in agreement over how to proceed,” Boehner told reporters at a press conference. “But this is just the beginning of the process. There’s a lot of education that needs to be done, because more than half of our members have never dealt with the issue of immigration reform, both on the legal side and on the illegal side.”¶ “There’s a lot of issues here that have to be dealt with,” he added. “I think what the bipartisan group came up [with], frankly, is a pretty responsible solution.”¶ House Democratic leaders received a similar briefing, and the party’s second-ranking member, Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.), said that the group was “very close to an agreement” and that an announcement could come in the “near term.”¶ Hoyer said Democratic leaders have had “a long discussion” with the Democrats on the informal panel, including Reps. Xavier Becerra (Calif.) and Luis Gutierrez (Ill.).¶ “They are close,” he said. “I think they’ve made real progress.”

#### Renewables SPENDING distracts away from the rest of the agenda.

Opalka, Editor and Chief, ‘12

[Bill, “Groups Want to Stop Politicizing Green Energy,” EnergyBiz, June 24, http://www.energybiz.com/article/12/06/groups-want-stop-politicizing-green-energy]

The U.S. Partnership for Renewable Energy Finance (US PREF) released a series of white papers at the American Council On Renewable Energy (ACORE)'s Renewable Energy Finance Forum - Wall Street in New York on June 19.¶ The groups say the effort is to rebalance the debate about renewable energy toward a fact-based business analysis instead of the politicized rhetoric that dominates discussions currently.¶ PREF members provided analyses that show how crucial renewable energy is as part of the nation's overall energy mix.¶ “There's never been a more important time for our country to adopt a genuine all-of-the-above energy strategy,” said Neil Auerbach, co-managing partner of Hudson Clean Energy Partners, a private equity firm that invests exclusively in clean energy. “We have the opportunity now to cultivate American business and innovation, support long-term job growth, fortify national security, decrease energy costs, and realize a host of environmental benefits.”¶ A common, bemoaned refrain at renewable energy gatherings is to hear reference to “Republican electrons” from coal and nuclear power and “Democratic electrons” from wind and solar.¶ US PREF cites international competition as a threat to continued U.S. innovation and global leadership.¶ The U.S. invested $48.1 billion in clean energy in 2011. “We are working with the renewable energy, power and technology industry leaders to pursue continued development of the U.S. renewable energy sector. This is an important opportunity to underscore U.S. leadership as we seek technologies to power future global growth and redefine our national energy strategy,” said Jeff Holzschuh, vice chairman at Morgan Stanley.¶ The white papers released by US PREF illustrate how large-scale deployment of renewable electricity sources has produced dramatic cost reductions, while fostering innovation that has increased efficiency across entire supply chains. State and federal policies are working in concert to drive this large-scale deployment and innovation. While federal incentives such as the production and investment tax credits bolster the supply of renewable energy, support for renewable energy demand has been augmented by state renewable portfolio standards (RPS). RPS “demand pull" is now reaching a plateau, however, of 3.25 GW per year of new renewable generating capacity through 2030.¶ To publicize the renewables message, ACORE on June 20 launched EnergyFactCheck.org and @EnergyFactCheck, two new resources designed to address the imbalance in the American debate.¶ “Clean and renewable energy is popular, productive, growing and essential to America’s economy, energy independence and national security.” said ACORE President and CEO Vice Admiral Dennis McGinn. “Unfortunately, misperceptions of clean and renewable energy abound, and opponents of renewables are pushing the occasional bad news as if it’s the only news. They are dominating the conversation through misrepresentation, exaggeration, distraction and millions of dollars in lobbying and advertising.”

#### All renewable subsidies are now associated with Solyndra – ensures unpopularity.

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.

#### Obama would have to use PC to get Republicans on board for the plan.

Geman 12 (Ben, “Obama to Congress on green-energy tax-break extension: 'Do it now'”, The Hill, May 24, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/229457-obama-to-congress-on-green-energy-tax-break-extension-do-it-now)

The wind power industry and supply-chain companies are lobbying hard for an extension of the credits, arguing that uncertainty about the incentives is already hurting the sector and that some layoffs have begun. “Wind projects typically have an 18- to 24-month development cycle. So effectively the PTC is already expiring,” said Denise Bode, CEO of the American Wind Energy Association, a trade group, in a statement this week. “That is why an extension is urgently needed now. We can’t afford to wait until the [production tax credit] runs out.” But the fate of the credits — which have not lapsed since 2004 — remain highly unclear this year. The credits are tethered to wider election-year tax policy and reform debates that could drag any action past the 2012 elections, or even into next year. House Republicans have promised wide-ranging examination of expiring tax policy provisions, while Senate Democrats have pressed for an across-the-board extension of a suite of expiring provisions. Also, while the wind credits have long enjoyed bipartisan support, many Republicans are increasingly criticizing federal green energy programs. Sen. Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa), who has floated legislation to extend the credit, issued a statement ahead of Obama’s speech alleging the White House must engage more with Congress on various expiring tax provisions. “The provision is hung up in the lack of a way forward on dozens of expiring tax provisions. The President could exert his leadership by working with Congress on a way forward instead of calling for a provision that’s a no-brainer for many of us. He’s focusing on the easy part of a bigger task,” Grassley said Wednesday