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### Heidegger

#### Modern wind energy is still 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/~tbeckman/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. Only by doing this 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).

### Fiscal Cliff Politics

#### A. Compromise is coming now on the fiscal cliff, but Obama’s leadership is key

Hall and Lightman 11/8 (http://www.kansascity.com/2012/11/08/3907178/put-up-or-shut-up-time-for-congress.html#storylink=cpy)

Lawmakers sent mixed signals this week about serious negotiations vs. driving briefly off the cliff’s edge before settling.¶ Tuesday’s election results kept the same power players in place, the same group that went to that edge repeatedly during budget and debt ceiling negotiations over the last two years.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said Wednesday that he was ready to “find the common ground that has eluded us” and talk to Democrats, even about raising revenue.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., also talked conciliation, promising not to draw “any lines in the sand.”¶ The election’s status quo result – the same president, Republicans still controlling the House of Representatives and Democrats remaining in charge of the Senate – suggests the public “is obviously saying work together, meet halfway, come together,” said Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., usually a fierce partisan.¶ The rank and file may feel less sanguine. The election solidified conservatives’ hold on the House and liberals’ strength in the Senate, suggesting any deal could have a difficult time winning approval.¶ The key, said Republicans, is for President Barack Obama to take the lead and offer a detailed plan.¶ “The only thing that’s changed since the election is that the president is not campaigning,” said Don Stewart, spokesman for Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky.¶ Ultimately, say insiders, the doomsday alternative to inaction will force a deal. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said in a report Thursday that failing to act on the fiscal-cliff components could shave half a percentage point off of growth in the first half of 2013, raising the jobless rate to 9.1 percent and probably would trigger another recession. The CBO also said that addressing the components of the fiscal cliff results in a 3 or 4 percentage point swing between contraction and growth.¶

#### B. Wind tax breaks kill political capital – Solyndra

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.

#### C. Presidential leadership is key to a compromise – the alternative is the collapse of hegemony, a double-dip recession, and war in the Middle East

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

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

#### D. Middle East goes nuclear

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

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

### Carbon Tax CP

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

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

#### CP doesn’t link to politics - Republicans want to repeal all energy subsidies and stop picking winners

CNS News 12 (http://cnsnews.com/news/article/gop-congressmen-gov-t-should-stop-picking-winners-and-losers-energy-sector)

(CNSNews.com) – Several Republican leaders in the Senate and House spoke about their legislation to repeal all tax subsidies to the energy industry on Thursday, stating that government should not be in the business of “picking winners and losers” but should instead seek to ensure a level playing field for all competitors.¶ At a Capitol Hill press conference with Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.), Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah), and Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wisc.), House Rep. Mike Pompeo (R-Kan.) introduced his legislation, which mirrors that currently in the Senate, to repeal all energy tax credits.¶ The federal government must “stop picking winners and losers, stop supporting multi-million dollar, billion -dollar boondoggles, things like Solyndra, companies that simply can’t survive in the marketplace on their own,” said Sen. Johnson.¶ Rep. Pompeo said, “We have been uniform and broad and favor no one. We are literally trying to get the federal government’s tax code out of the business of picking winners and losers.”¶ “It’s time for these industries to compete, to enter their products into the marketplace, and convince customers that the energy that they provide is something that they can afford and they want,” he said.

### Solvency

#### Wind industry is better off without PTC – eliminates uncertainty and inefficient players

Anderson 12 (Jared, Editor, AOL Energy, former Senior Analyst at Energy Intelligence Group, “Wind Sector Considers Life Without the PTC”, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/06/25/wind-sector-considers-life-without-the-ptc/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

Wind power's competiveness with conventional fossil fuels erodes considerably without the PTC, going from about $.06/kWh to $.08/kWh, said Frantzis.¶ There is much "consternation" among frustrated developers that has paralyzed the sector, said Kevin Walsh, Managing Director, Power & Renewable Energy at GE Energy Financial Services. Given this situation domestically, GE EFS is investing outside the US in places with greater regulatory certainty like Canada, Australia and Europe, Walsh told AOL Energy on the sidelines of the conference.¶ But it's not all doom and gloom. The winners in a post PTC world will be "developers with portfolios of higher wind resource sites with access to transmission in liquid markets," said Tim Rosenzweig, CEO of Goldwind USA, a major turbine original equipment manufacturer (OEM) based in China.¶ Manufacturers able to most effectively solve the cost/performance equation could be among the post PTC winners, Rosenzweig said.¶ The operational advantages lost without the government incentive will need to be made up in other areas such as project capital expenditure, project operating expenditure and wind resource and turbine performance said Rosenzweig's slide presentation.¶ The US will still be an attractive business environment without the PTC because it will remain an available, sophisticated market that could interest foreign players. "It will be a proving ground," said Rosenzweig. Additionally, post consolidation, remaining players will be ready to enjoy a larger share of a "normal" market.¶ Read more about PTC expiration in the AOL Energy white paper "Wind Rush," here.¶ Some other positive outcomes of a declining PTC include greater regulatory certainty, increased ability to plan long term, the elimination of federal politics, a differentiation of the wind industry and the establishment of a year-to-year incentive, said Paul Gaynor, CEO of First Wind.¶ "Like Heroine"¶ The economics will be more difficult, said Gaynor, and turbine prices will need to come down, materials will need to improve and turbine lifetimes will need to lengthen to help balance the lost operational benefits afforded by the PTC.¶ And while developers "love their tax equity investors, they are expensive," said Gaynor. Tax equity investment is a financing mechanism that takes advantage of the PTC.¶ One reason it is difficult for the industry to get away from the incentive is that wind power was essentially a "garage band technology in 1992" and investment tax credits originated from that nascent business climate, it's hard to rip that system up and start from scratch now, Gaynor said.¶ Although he is confident that companies will be able to "make it work" without the tax credit, it won't be easy -"it's like heroine, hard to get off," said Gaynor.

#### Picking winners bad - plans undermines innovation which turns case

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.¶ The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### 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.

#### Turbine parts 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 these problems will be solved.473 Green jobs proponents thus exhibit extensive technological optimism with respect to wind’s prospects.

### Econ

#### Solid economic growth now in jobs and manufacturing

Crutsinger 11-9

[Martin, AP, US economic growth was likely stronger in Q3, USNEWS, http://www.usnews.com/news/business/articles/2012/11/09/us-economic-growth-was-likely-stronger-in-q3]

The U.S. economy appears to have grown over the summer faster than first thought.¶ U.S. companies sold more goods overseas in September, helping narrow the nation's trade gap substantially. And wholesale companies boosted their stockpiles after reporting their best sales in 18 months.¶ Those figures could lead the government to sharply revise its estimate of the economy's growth rate in the July-September quarter up from the 2 percent annual rate it estimated last month.¶ Macroeconomic Advisers predicted Friday that the government will estimate the economy's third-quarter growth rate at 3.2 percent when it issues its second estimate on Nov. 29. Economists at Barclays also predict growth at that rate. Economists at High Frequency Economics said estimated growth could be raised to 3.1 percent.¶ If they are correct, it would mark only the third quarter since the recession officially ended in June 2009 that the economy has grown at an annual rate above 3 percent.¶ "The third quarter is coming in much stronger than anybody had expected," said Ben Herzon, an economist at Macroeconomic Advisers.¶ Economists grew more optimistic Friday after seeing two September reports from the Commerce Department that weren't included in the government's initial estimate of growth, released Oct. 26.¶ Wholesale stockpiles grew 1.1 percent in September, and sales at the wholesale level rose 2 percent, according to a report released Friday. When businesses order more goods, it generally leads to more factory production and that boosts economic growth.¶ The inventory data followed a government report Thursday that the U.S. trade deficit narrowed to its lowest level in nearly two years because exports rose in September to a record high. That means U.S. companies earned more from overseas sales while consumers and businesses spent less on foreign products.¶ The current October-December quarter began with promising signs on jobs and consumer spending.¶ Employers added 171,000 jobs in October, and hiring was stronger in August and September than first thought, the government said last week. And a separate report Friday showed that the University of Michigan's consumer sentiment index rose in early November to the highest level since July 2007.

#### Government spending on incentives for renewables destroys 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)

Finally, it is worth considering the distribution of the destroyed jobs across the economy. Obviously, the specific productive sectors affected will depend on how the government finances the subsidies to renewable energy. We can basically separate the approaches intro three groups: increases in energy rates, increase in taxes or an increase in public debt.¶ The first method aims to correct the rate deficit, which in part is caused by the subsidies to the renewables, evidenced by a higher future electric cost. According to the National Energy Commission, the price of a comprehensive energy rate (paid by the end consumer) in Spain would have to be increased 31% to begin to repay the historic debt generated by this deficit.58¶ It is obvious that, if the rates were to increase by 31% — or by a lower percentage which, while it would not eliminate the deficit, it would reduce it—the energy intensive companies would suffer a very pronounced decline in their profitability and would have to reduce or eliminate operations in Spain. In our country, the sectors that consume the most energy are metallurgy, non-metallic mining and food processing, beverage and tobacco.From the groups above, it is worth highlighting that some of the most affected industries59 would be producers of basic iron and steel products (in Spain, it consumed €470.77 million), basic chemical products (€382.13 million), plastics (€297.18 million), manufacture and first transformation of precious metals (€280.58 million) as well as producers of cement, lime and plaster (€202.22 million).¶ Unsurprisingly, the steel mills, the most electricity-intensive sector, have already been hurt by the high prices of electricity in Spain, exactly as the Acerinox example discussed below.¶ It is possible, of course, as it is indeed the case today in Spain, that the administration may try to prevent the most energy-intensive companies from leaving by bestowing upon them the privilege of paying a lower rate than the rest of the consumers pay. In Spain, it happens with the G4 rate, which is being taken advantage of by companies such as Arcelor Mittal, Asturiana de Zinc and Alcoa. But, as we have said, this privilege exacerbates the rate deficit, which, ultimately, must be financed through higher prices for the rest of non-privileged consumers or for the taxpayer.¶ And this leads us to the second possibility that we will mention to finance the rate deficit: an increase in taxation.¶ This method reduces the amount of income that consumers or businesses have available, reducing consumption and/or investment. For example, 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 2007.60 Regardless of whether the increase impacts consumption or investment more, the most affected sectors of the economy will be those with a greater pro-cyclical productions (such as automotive).¶ Finally, the subsidy to pay for “green jobs” or renewables could be financed by issuing public debt. This strategy poses a similar effect to the previous method but spread out over time (since it implies higher future taxes). However, debt has an additional effect: a restriction of present available credit that a business could use to refinance its debt or undertake new investments. Thus, employees of the most leveraged businesses or of investment projects that would need cheaper credit to be undertaken will suffer the costs of the renewables.¶ It is not possible to directly translate Spain’s experience with similar exactitude or confidence, and claim that the U.S. should expect a loss of from 6.6 million to eleven million jobs as a direct consequence were the promise to create 3 to 5 million “green jobs” met (in addition to the jobs lost due to the opportunity cost of private capital employed in renewable energy), although the study clearly reveals that if President Obama would dedicate the massive resources needed to create those 3 to 5 million jobs, the U.S. should certainly expect its results to follow such a tendency.

#### 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.

#### Renewable subsidies hurt the economy – they crowd out jobs and capital investment in other industries and lower overall economic potential.

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

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

#### Plan hurts the economy – increased electricity costs cause massive unemployment

Zycher 12 (Benjamin, Pacific Research Institute Senior Fellow, Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics adjunct professor, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, former senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers, March 27, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” <http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf>, d/a 8-1-12, ads)

Because renewable electricity generation is more costly than conventional¶ generation, policies driving a shift toward heavier reliance upon the former would¶ increase aggregate electricity costs, and thus reduce electricity use below levels that¶ would prevail otherwise. The 2007 EIA projection of total U.S. electricity consumption¶ in 2030 was about 5.17 million gWh.29 The latest EIA projection for 2030 is about 4.31¶ million gWh, a decline of about 16.6 percent.30 The change presumably reflects some¶ combination of assumptions about structural economic shifts, increased conservation, substitution of renewables for some conventional generation, and a price increase from¶ about 8.8 cents per kilowatt-hour to 9.0 cents (in 2009 dollars).¶ It would be surprising if that reduction in total U.S. electricity consumption failed¶ to have some employment effect. Figure 1 displays data on percent changes in real GDP,¶ electricity consumption, and employment for the period 1970 through 2009.31 It is obvious from the aggregate trends that electricity use and labor employment¶ are complements rather than substitutes; the simple correlation between the percent¶ changes for the two is 0.61, meaning, crudely, that a percent change in one tends to be¶ observed with a 0.61 percent change in the other, in the same direction. The simple¶ GDP/electricity and GDP/employment correlations are 0.67 and 0.85, respectively.

#### No reason they solve for the entirety of manufacturing. Only create a few jobs.

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy – it’s about service jobsPorter 12

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

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

### Warming

#### China won’t agree to emissions reductions - negotiators don’t want it and no way the plan changes the minds of the delegation members

Bello and Solon 12 (Walden, Foreign Policy In Focus columnist Walden Bello is a member of the House of Representatives of the Philippines and a senior analyst at the Bangkok-based think tank Focus on the Global South; Pablo Solon, former Bolivian Ambassador to the UN, “Breaking the Climate Stalemate”, 9/12, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/walden-bello/breaking-the-climate-stal\_b\_1873867.html)

In reality, both the United States and China want a weaker climate agreement. In the United States, influential politicians and corporations are not committed to deep real cuts. And China's leaders realize that the longer they can put off a legally binding agreement, the better, since China will be far ahead in GHG emissions in a few years and a weak agreement will be in its interest.¶ The climate talks stalemate is not therefore the result of a disagreement between the two biggest powers, but rather of a common desire not to be obliged to change their policies of consumption, production, and gaining control of natural resources around the world.¶ The position of the U.S. and Chinese delegations, as well as those from many other countries, reflects more the concerns of their elites than of their people. In China, there are massive protests against environmentally destructive development projects. In the United States and Canada, the movement against the exploitation of tar sands is the expression of a civil society that wants to stop polluting our planet.¶ The elites of emerging economies are using the just demand of "historical responsibility" or "common but differentiated responsibility" in order to steal time and secure a weak binding agreement. The deliberate prolonging of the stalemate means allowing business as usual. Given that this strategy has led to a dead end, it is imperative that civil society regain its independent voice and articulate a position distinct from that of the Group of 77 and China.

#### Can’t solve warming – its too late

Hamilton 10 – Professor of Public Ethics @ ANU

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

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights.v' And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

#### Can’t solve - India won’t stop polluting

McCarthy 11 (Michael, India emerges as chief opponent of a new global-warming treaty, December 5th, the Independent's Environment Editor, is one of Britain's leading writers on the environment and the natural world, http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/india-emerges-as-chief-opponent-of-a-new-globalwarming-treaty-6272332.html)

India is now the leading opponent of a new comprehensive global-warming treaty, it became clear at the weekend after the first week of negotiations at the UN Climate Conference in Durban, South Africa.¶ The world's second most populous country has resolutely set its face against a fresh climate deal that at some stage would involve every country in the world cutting its carbon emissions in an effort to bring climate change under control.¶ The Indians are refusing to approve anything that might put a brake on their economy, now expanding with growth in 2010 estimated at 10.4 per cent. Its carbon emissions are growing at more than 9 per cent a year, the fastest of any major nation, and the country has shot up to become the world's third biggest carbon emitter, after China and the US.¶ But the Indians are relying on this growth to take hundreds of millions of their nearly 1.2 billion people out of poverty and they want nothing to do with curbing these emissions.

#### Multiple scientific studies prove that their acidification impact is false – newest research

WSJ 1/7 (Wall Street Journal, “Taking Fears of Acid Oceans With a Grain of Salt,” 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203550304577138561444464028.html) Nisarg

Coral reefs around the world are suffering badly from overfishing and various forms of pollution. Yet many experts argue that the greatest threat to them is the acidification of the oceans from the dissolving of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. The effect of acidification, according to J.E.N. Veron, an Australian coral scientist, will be "nothing less than catastrophic.... What were once thriving coral gardens that supported the greatest biodiversity of the marine realm will become red-black bacterial slime, and they will stay that way." This is a common view. The Natural Resources Defense Council has called ocean acidification "the scariest environmental problem you've never heard of." Sigourney Weaver, who narrated a film about the issue, said that "the scientists are freaked out." The head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration calls it global warming's "equally evil twin." But do the scientific data support such alarm? Last month scientists at San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography and other authors published a study showing how much the pH level (measuring alkalinity versus acidity) varies naturally between parts of the ocean and at different times of the day, month and year. "On both a monthly and annual scale, even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification," say the authors of the study, adding that because good instruments to measure ocean pH have only recently been deployed, "this variation has been under-appreciated." Over coral reefs, the pH decline between dusk and dawn is almost half as much as the decrease in average pH expected over the next 100 years. The noise is greater than the signal. Another recent study, by scientists from the U.K., Hawaii and Massachusetts, concluded that "marine and freshwater assemblages have always experienced variable pH conditions," and that "in many freshwater lakes, pH changes that are orders of magnitude greater than those projected for the 22nd-century oceans can occur over periods of hours." This adds to other hints that the ocean-acidification problem may have been exaggerated. For a start, the ocean is alkaline and in no danger of becoming acid (despite headlines like that from Reuters in 2009: "Climate Change Turning Seas Acid"). If the average pH of the ocean drops to 7.8 from 8.1 by 2100 as predicted, it will still be well above seven, the neutral point where alkalinity becomes acidity. The central concern is that lower pH will make it harder for corals, clams and other "calcifier" creatures to make calcium carbonate skeletons and shells. Yet this concern also may be overstated. Off Papua New Guinea and the Italian island of Ischia, where natural carbon-dioxide bubbles from volcanic vents make the sea less alkaline, and off the Yucatan, where underwater springs make seawater actually acidic, studies have shown that at least some kinds of calcifiers still thrive—at least as far down as pH 7.8. In a recent experiment in the Mediterranean, reported in Nature Climate Change, corals and mollusks were transplanted to lower pH sites, where they proved "able to calcify and grow at even faster than normal rates when exposed to the high [carbon-dioxide] levels projected for the next 300 years." In any case, freshwater mussels thrive in Scottish rivers, where the pH is as low as five. Laboratory experiments find that more marine creatures thrive than suffer when carbon dioxide lowers the pH level to 7.8. This is because the carbon dioxide dissolves mainly as bicarbonate, which many calcifiers use as raw material for carbonate. Human beings have indeed placed marine ecosystems under terrible pressure, but the chief culprits

#### Can’t solve warming - deforestation

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

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

#### Economic factors block cooperation on climate change

Christian Science Monitor 7 [Warming's bad guys made good, lexis]

Leaders of the world's two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, the United States and China, laid out plans in the past week to reduce their impact on the planet. But these two giants on the global scene also suggested two won'ts: They won't be bound to action by other nations and they won't hurt their own economies. ¶ Even with those caveats, the fact that the Bush administration and China's top governing body, the State Council, acted just before the G-8 summit of industrial leaders this week is a healthy sign.¶ They now recognize their interests, and perhaps the welfare of all nations - especially poor ones - are at stake. They should be welcomed for joining the effort to save the global "commons" that is the atmosphere and oceans.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction – newest climate simulations

Stampf 8 (Olaf, Staff Writer for Spiegel Online, “Not the End of the World as We Know It,” May 5th,[http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html](http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0%2C1518%2C481684%2C00.html))\

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

credibility of the president to negotiate agreements that serve the country's interest.
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#### Permutation is worse - causes crowd-out—decreases domestic investments and innovations

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)

4. Crowding Out To some (for example, those lucky enough to receive the loan guarantee), government money may seem to be free. But it isn’t, of course. The government has to borrow the money on the open market too. This additional borrowing comes from Americans’ savings, as does the money that Americans invest in the private sector’s growth. There comes a point when there just aren’t enough savings to satisfy both masters. In other words, when government runs a deficit to finance its preferred projects, it can affect private sector access to capital, and lead to a reduction in domestic investment. Economists use the term “crowding out” to describe the contraction in economic activity associated with deficit- financed spending.[30] In addition, the competition between public and private borrowing raises interest rates for all borrowers, including the government, making it more expensive for domestic investors to start or complete projects. Over time, this could mean that American companies will build fewer factories, cut back on research and development, and generate fewer innovations. As a result, our nation’s future earning prospects will dim, and our future living standards could suffer.

#### A carbon tax will lead to private investment in renewable energy in the long term, solving the aff

Podesta et al 9 (John D. Podesta, Chair and Counselor of the Center for American Progress, Kate Gordon, Senior Fellow at American Progress, Bracken Hendricks, Senior Fellow at American Progress and Benjamin Goldstein, Energy Policy Analyst for Center for American Progress, September 2009, The Clean-Energy Investment Agenda: A Comprehensive Approach to Building the Low-Carbon Economy)

A host of market failures and distortions have conspired to inhibit the deployment of clean, renewable energy. First, a century of subsidies and infrastructure investments to support the provision of carbon-based energy has severely tilted the playing field. Second, the hidden costs associated with greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants have been typically treated as negative externalities and never factored in to the market price that¶ we pay for traditional energy. These costs affect our public health, national security, and our environment—indeed, the unchecked release of global warming pollution into the atmosphere has been called the greatest market failure of all time. And third, clean-energy solutions face major market barriers specific to their sector—the fact that landlords often do not pay their own utility bills hinders energy efficiency investments in buildings; the lack of distribution infrastructure inhibits the availability of ethanol and other alterna- tive fuels; and our outdated transmission grid poses major obstacles to deploying greater quantities of utility-scale renewable energy. A comprehensive policy approach will help us to overcome these numerous market failures and increase demand for clean energy.¶ Establishing a cap and a price on global warming pollution¶ Putting a cap and price on pollution is a critical first step and a major component in the mix of policies that will help build a prosperous low-carbon future. A price on pollution turns the negative environmental effects of carbon emissions into a real business cost for emitters, thus correcting a major market failure. A cap on emissions sets a clear goal and establishes a long-term signal in the market, encouraging innovation and allowing busi- nesses to plan their investment strategies.¶ The American Clean Energy and Security Act proposes a cap-and-trade system as the mechanism to establish a cap and a price on greenhouse gas pollution. This system has the additional benefit of allowing companies to trade emissions permits, which results in the highest-emitting firms and industries buying permits from—and therefore investing in— the lowest-emitting, most efficient firms and technologies.¶ ￼￼￼¶ ￼5

#### Cap and trade is a more effective and less costly way to reduce emissions than incentives for wind

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

Consumers ultimately bear the cost of renewable energy promotion. In 2008, the price mark-up due to the subsidization of green electricity was about 1.5 Cent per kWh (2.2 Cents US $), meaning the subsidy accounts for about 7.5% of average household electricity prices.¶ Given the net cost of 41.82 Cents/kWh for PV modules installed in 2008, and assuming that PV displaces conventional electricity generated from a mixture of gas and hard coal, abatement costs are as high as 716 € (US $1,050) per tonne.¶ Using the same assumptions and a net cost for wind of 3.10 Cents/kWh, the abatement cost is approximately 54 € (US $80). While cheaper than PV, this cost is still nearly double the ceiling of the cost of a per-ton permit under Europe’s cap-and- trade scheme. Renewable energies are thus among the most expensive GHG reduction measures.¶ There are much cheaper ways to reduce carbon dioxide emissions than subsidiz ing renewable energies. CO2 abatement costs of PV are estimated to be as high as 716 € (US $1,050) per tonne, while those of wind power are estimated at 54 € (US $80) per tonne. By contrast, the current price of emissions certificates on the European emissions trading scheme is only 13.4 Euro per tonne. Hence, the cost from emission reductions as determined by the market is about 53 times cheaper than employing PV and 4 times cheaper than using wind power.¶ Moreover, the prevailing coexistence of the EEG and emissions trading under the European Trading Scheme (ETS) means that the increased use of renewable energy technologies generally attains no additional emission reductions beyond those achieved by ETS alone. In fact, since the establishment of the ETS in 2005, the EEG’s net climate effect has been equal to zero.¶

#### Carbon cap key get China on board

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

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

#### Carbon cap solves environmental leadership

Greenstone 10 (Michael Greenstone¶ Director, The Hamilton Project and Senior Fellow¶ The Hamilton Project¶ Michael Greenstone is the 3M Professor of Environmental Economics in the Department of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology., “The Benefits of Cap-and-Trade Would Have Exceeded Its Costs” http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2010/07/30-climate-change-greenstone)

Of course, it is natural to ask why Americans should pay for benefits in other countries. Climate change is a global problem and, as such, some of the benefits from U.S. action will spill over to other countries. In the same vein, we will also reap the benefits from carbon reduction programs abroad. What we have learned through past negotiations in the international arena is that if the United States takes a clear leadership position, it will greatly increase the chances of a global agreement to reduce emissions.¶ The passage of an economy wide cap-and-trade system would exert just such leadership. Indeed, the real payoff from a domestic cap-and-trade system is that it could pave the way for global action toward emission reductions along the lines that were discussed at the Copenhagen climate change summit in December. If there are global emissions reductions like those spelled out in the Copenhagen Accord, then the domestic benefits would easily exceed the domestic costs.

#### Soft power fails – persuasion is difficult and the US isn’t trusted

Kroenig et. al 10 (Matthew, assistant professor of Government at Georgetown University and a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations; Melissa McAdam, Ph.D. candidate in political science at the University of California; Steven Weber, professor of political science at the University of California; December 2010, “Taking Soft Power Seriously”, Comparative Strategy, 29: 5, 412 – 431**¶** [http://www.matthewkroenig.com/Kroenig\_ Taking%20Soft%20Power%20Seriously.pdf](http://www.matthewkroenig.com/Kroenig_Taking%20Soft%20Power%20Seriously.pdf), RSR)

Foreign policy actors have many reasons to experiment with soft power, not merely because its use can be less costly than hard power. But, soft power comes with its own quite striking limitations. Our research suggests that soft power strategies will be unlikely to succeed except under fairly restrictive conditions. It may very well be, then, that the U.S. foreign policy elite is at risk of exaggerating the effectiveness of soft power (rather than underutilizing it) as a tool of foreign policy. After all, international communication is fraught with difﬁculties, persuading people to change ﬁrmly held political views is hard, and individual attitudes are often thought to have an insigniﬁcant role in determining international political outcomes. Soft power, therefore, will probably be considered a niche foreign policy option useful for addressing a small fraction of the problems on Washington’s foreign policy agenda. Analysts who suggest that soft power can easily be substituted for hard power or who maintain that soft power should provide an overarching guide to the formulation of U.S. foreign policy are badly mistaken. It is not conducive to good policy to employ the idea of soft power as a way of arguing against the use of military force, for example.

#### Revenue neutrality solves

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.7

Despite the clear merits of the proposed energy taxes, many Americans are¶ likely to oppose them on philosophical as well as macroeconomic grounds. To¶ overcome objections to energy taxes. I propose that they be revenue neutral.¶ Under any energy-tax legislation adopted, the tax revenues should be ear-¶ marked for oﬁsetting reductions in income and payroll taxes and increases in the earned income tax credit. The net effect on consumers’ pocketbooks would thus be oﬂset by income-tax reductions. Again, this approach has an important¶ advantage over cap-and-trade proposals because it allows for greater beneﬁts to¶ the public—through relief from income and other taxes—at the expense of¶ carbon-emitting industries. It is no accident that large carbon emitters Favor a¶ cap-and-trade system—they see it as a means of obtaining valuable emissions¶ permits for Free and acquiring for themselves competitive advantages vis-a-vis¶ new entrants that lack the beneﬁt offree emissions permits.¶

### Econ

#### Incentives fail empirically – Spain – and Spain would be the model for US incentives

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

On January 16th, 2009, president-elect Barack Obama visited an Ohio business that manufactures components for wind power generators. Under the watchful eyes of both factory workers and the press, Obama assured, amid deepening unemployment and the onset of one of the gravest economic crises in recent history, that renewable energy “can create millions of additional jobs and entire new industries.”¶ The president then defended his energy subsidy package by citing examples from other countries: “And think of what’s happening in countries like Spain, Germany and Japan, where they’re making real investments in renewable energy. They’re surging ahead of us, poised to take the lead in these new industries.” He repeated this reference to the Spanish model as a basis for his plan on several other occasions.¶ President Obama is correct in observing that 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 20-20-20 “green energy” 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 we and my colleagues have tried to answer through extensive academic research is “at what price?”

#### Negative economic effects – decline in other sectors

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

There is the further matter that an expansion of the renewable electricity sector¶ must mean a decline in some other sector(s), with an attendant reduction in resource use¶ there; after all resources in the aggregate are finite. If there exists substantial¶ unemployment, and if labor demand in renewables is not highly specialized, a short-run¶ increase in total employment might result. But in the long run---not necessarily a long¶ period of time---such industrial policies cannot “create” employment; they can only shift¶ it among economic sectors. In short, an expanding renewables sector must be¶ accompanied by a decline in other sectors, whether relative or absolute, and creation of¶ “green jobs” must be accompanied by a destruction of jobs elsewhere. Even if an¶ expanding renewables sector is more labor-intensive (per unit of output) than the sectors¶ that would decline as a result, it remains the case that the employment expansion would¶ be a cost for the economy as a whole, and the aggregate result would be an economy¶ smaller than otherwise would be the case.28 There is no particular reason to believe that¶ the employment gained as a result of the (hypothetically) greater labor intensiveness of¶ renewables systematically would be greater than the employment lost because of the¶ decline of other sectors combined with the adverse employment effect of the smaller¶ economy in the aggregate. There is in addition the adverse employment effect of the¶ explicit or implicit taxes that must be imposed to finance the expansion of renewable¶ power.

#### 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 energy literature is overly optimistic about job potential – manufacturing would be done abroad

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)

The optimism in the green jobs literature is so omnipresent that there is almost no bad news anywhere except related to fossil fuels. For example, air travel will be greatly reduced by proposed environmental restrictions, reducing employment in the airline industry.150 Yet the report does not see this as a problem because we will have an increase in employment in the virtual conferencing services.151 New farming techniques are needed – not a cost, but an opportunity for more USDA extension agents to teach farmers how to grow crops with fewer capital inputs.152 This optimism extends to the quality of the jobs these policies will produce – despite the dominance of existing green job growth by green secretarial and janitorial positions153– green jobs advocates are quick to assure the public that green jobs are not just jobs, but good jobs that pay high wages.154 Even the lower-paying green jobs are good ones because they “offer career ladders that can move low-paid workers into better employment positions over time.”155¶ Where green means fewer jobs, green jobs proponents punt. For example, the UNEP report notes that data limitations prevent accurate calculations for the steel industry: “Steel industry employment data are incomplete and data collection for many aspects of this industry are still in its infancy in many developing countries. This limits the extent to which even rough green jobs calculations can be undertaken beyond the numbers suggested here.”156¶ Wind power is greatly touted for green energy expansion, as good technology exists. However, the position of the U.S. in wind power is much like, but the reverse, of the position of China with respect to the U.S. Consider the iPod. The U.S. captures most of the economic value from iPods, but China gets the assembly work, which is little more than one percent of its retail value.157 Wind turbines are much the same. The technology and patents are largely European. The United States imports most high-valued turbine parts. The largest maker, Vestas, is Danish, at about a quarter of the market. Gamesa from Spain and Enercon from Germany are next at about 15 percent of the market each. GE and Suzlon from India are next, but most of GE’s components come from Europe. GE is not considered a strong player in the market, but is the only U.S. firm of significance in the production market.158 Turbine technology is highly technical and not easy to replicate. Hence, most wind energy work in the U.S. consists of importing the key technology and performing the assembly work.159¶ We do have some evidence about how technology is changing. Hybrid electric-internal combustion vehicles are darlings of the environmental movement and their sales are growing, from 353,000 this year to a projected 578,000 in 2014.160 A more efficient gasoline engine, using direct injection, will likely sell 5.1 million vehicles that same year, according to the same forecasting firm, up from 585,000 this year.161 These engines can get up to 10 percent improved mileage at the fraction of the cost of a hybrid’s 20 percent improvement.162 Yet the green jobs forecasts rarely discuss the impact of such incremental improvements in existing technologies, relying instead on unknowable technological revolutions that will need to happen rapidly to expand the technologies they favor.¶ The selective technological optimism exhibited by the green jobs literature is evidence of important embedded assumptions within the literature. Before public resources are committed to promoting an economic vision based on these unstated assumptions, we must careful explore how realistic these assumptions are and how desirable policies based on them would be.

#### The components would be produced abroad – Denmark proves

Schwartz 5 (L.M. Schwartz is the Chairman of the Virginia Land Rights Coalition. “Wind Power Dollars and Sense” http://www.vlrc.org/articles/3.html)

Ironically, Denmark benefited more than anyone else from California’s renewable energy program. In 1985, 67 percent of the wind turbines installed in California were manufactured in the US. By 1999, 65 percent of the wind turbines operating in California were manufactured overseas. Today, 90 percent of the world’s wind turbine manufacturers are based in Europe, with Denmark remaining the world’s dominant supplier of wind turbines. GE Wind, formerly Enron Wind Corp., is the only major US wind turbine manufacturer to survive the 1990s. And its new turbines are largely based on designs of the German firm Tacke, bought by Enron in 1999.

### Warming

#### Can’t dispatch fossil fuels

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.

## 1NR

### Politics

### Overview

#### Magnitude—Mid east war causes extinction—miscalc, prolif, and accidental escalation

Fraser, former PM of Australia, 7/4/11

(Malcom, “Dealing with nuclear terror means plants and weapons,” Taipei Times)

Recent history is peppered with a litany of false alerts and near misses, each unforeseen, each a combination of technical and human failure. The growing potential for a nuclear disaster by cyber attack adds to the existential danger.¶ We now know that just 100 relatively “small” Hiroshima-size nuclear weapons, less than one-thousandth of the global nuclear arsenal, could lift millions of tonnes of dark smoke high into the atmosphere. There, it would abruptly cool and darken the planet, slashing rainfall and food production in successive years — and thus causing worldwide starvation on a scale never before witnessed.¶ This could result from the arsenals of any of the 10 currently nuclear-armed states, with the exception of North Korea.¶ Intent, miscalculation, technical failure, cyber attack, or accident could cause the nuclear escalation of a conflict between India and Pakistan, in the Middle East (embroiling Israel’s nuclear weapons), or on the Korean Peninsula. Such outcomes are at least as plausible or likely — if not more so — than a massive earthquake and tsunami causing widespread damage to four Japanese nuclear reactors and their adjacent spent-fuel ponds.

#### Probability—Volatility makes it the most likely scenario

Ephraim Kam, Deputy Head-Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, ‘7 (A Nuclear Iran, p. 50,

http://d.scribd.com/docs/2o4yoqqhx2btgchcpfug.pdf)<http://www.tau.ac.il/jcss/memoranda/memo88.pdf>

The statements by Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad about wiping Israel off the map are not qualitatively new and resemble those by other Iranian leaders. Their reiteration at a time when Iran is under pressure on the nuclear issue, however, suggests increasing extremism on the part of the Iranian leadership towards Israel, as well as diminished sensitivity towards international public opinion. Even if it is unlikely, the possibility that a fanatical group, whether within the regime or a faction emerging from a split in the leadership, will gain control of nuclear weapons and decide to use them against Israel cannot be categorically ruled out. Moreover, the Middle East is a volatile region that has witnessed much violence and military force. Ballistic missiles and chemical weapons have already been used on a large scale, including in wars between Muslim countries. The risk that nuclear weapons will be used in the Middle East is greater than in other regions and is greater than the risk between the superpowers during the Cold War. Rules of behavior and channels for dialogue capable of reducing the risk do not yet exist

#### Turns econ – reduces government and private investment

Maniere 11 (George, contributor to Seeking Alpha, “U.S. Debt Downgrade and Its Consequences Too Close for Comfort,” 7/28, http://seekingalpha.com/article/282627-u-s-debt-downgrade-and-its-consequences-too-close-for-comfort

Despite what you may have heard in the media let me clarify something, the probability of the U.S. defaulting on its debt is very low. The probability of the credit rating getting downgraded grows with every minute. The consequences of a lowering of our credit rating would have disastrous effects. A downgrading of our “AAA” credit rating would mean higher interest rates and subsequently higher costs not only for the U.S. debt but for home loans, credit card rates, student loans and loans to small businesses. The cost of borrowing money would skyrocket for consumers and businesses alike. Likewise, states and municipalities would also face higher borrowing costs. The cost of all capital projects like road repairs, water systems, hospitals and schools would become much more expensive. The ensuing credit crunch would lead to higher borrowing costs for all and we would find ourselves back in March of 2008, only this time we would be 14 trillion dollars deeper in debt. Add to this, with the dollar already in a year-long slump it would continue to sink against the other world’s currencies. S&P has estimated that a downgrade would cause the dollar to drop 10% or more in value. And **a downgrade would cause the dollar to lose its status as the world’s reserve currency**, **an event that would be catastrophic for the U.S. economy**. Combine all of the factors above and I think you will conclude as I have that **the already shaky economy would implode**. **A recession would return** - but this time **with a vengeance**. If Congress cannot get a measure passed in 6 short days I see the economy sinking even lower than it did in 2008 – 2009. The worst part of all is that this scenario would cause the global markets to freeze up and make the failure at Lehman Brothers look like a day at the beach.

### A2: Gridlock

#### Compromise coming, but it’s fragile – Republicans feel pressure from their base to get at least some concessions

Bloomberg 11/7 (http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-11-07/obamas-holding-the-cards#p2)

In Obama’s second term, leverage will shift to the Democrats on almost every issue of importance. And that shift has already begun.¶ Once the economy stabilized, the defining struggle in Obama’s first term was the battle for revenue. From his efforts to end the Bush tax cuts for the rich, close the carried-interest deduction, and enact the Buffett Rule, Obama failed in every attempt to generate higher tax revenue to pay for new spending and reduce the deficit. Obama confronted a Republican party determined to starve government and convinced that its path back to power lay in engineering his failure. As Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said in 2010, “The single most important thing we want to achieve is for President Obama to be a one-term president.” Republicans mostly held the line.¶ To keep the economy afloat, the White House cut the deals it felt it had to. Many, such as Obama’s agreement to extend all of the Bush tax cuts in 2010, were poorly received by Democrats. Now comes the payoff. The expiration of those cuts and the automatic reductions set to take effect at year’s end—the so-called fiscal cliff—mean that Obama and the Democrats can gain a huge source of new revenue by doing nothing at all. Republican priorities are the ones suddenly in peril. The combination of tax increases on the rich, higher capital-gains taxes, and sharp cuts in defense spending have congressional Republicans deeply worried. To mitigate these, they’ll have to bargain.¶ Despite their post-election tough talk, Republican leaders have dealt themselves a lousy hand. Obama can propose a “middle-class tax cut” for the 98 percent of American households earning less than $250,000 a year—while letting the Bush tax cuts expire for those earning more—and dare the Republicans to block it. If they do, everyone’s taxes will rise on Jan. 1. It’s true that going over the fiscal cliff, as some Democrats believe will happen, would set back the recovery and could eventually cause a recession. But Democratic leaders in Congress believe the public furor would be too intense for Republicans to withstand for long.¶ Going over the cliff would also weaken the Republicans’ greatest point of leverage: renewing their threat to default on the national debt. Right now, the Treasury expects to hit the debt ceiling in February. But if the cliff can’t be avoided, tax rates will rise and government coffers will swell, delaying the date of default—thus diminishing the Republicans’ advantage. Alice Rivlin, the founding director of the Office of Management and Budget and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, says that “as quickly as the IRS began changing the withholding schedule, the date would be pushed back.”¶ This new, post-election reality should compel both sides toward the “Grand Bargain” on entitlement and tax reform that President Obama and John Boehner tried, and failed, to strike in the summer of 2011. Most people in Washington expect these negotiations to dominate the 2013 calendar year. Here again, leverage has shifted from Republicans to Democrats. “The message of this election is twofold,” says Senator Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.). “Americans want us to come together around a balanced compromise. And the major issue surrounding the fiscal cliff that was litigated in the election was revenues—voters clearly sided with us. The president made it a campaign issue, and he won.”¶ Privately, some Republicans, especially in the Senate, share this assessment. Many more do not. The battle to control the Republican Party and determine its course could inflict further damage on the conservative cause. “The ‘right wing of the Republican Party’ has become a redundancy,” says GOP strategist Rich Galen. “It now is the Republican Party, and there simply aren’t enough voters who agree with all of the Tea Party doctrine to win a national election.” Establishment conservatives recognize this problem. “It’s clear that with our losses in the presidential race and a number of key Senate races we have a period of reflection and recalibration ahead,” Senator John Cornyn (Tex.), the chairman of the National Republican Senate Committee, said on Nov. 7. “While some will want to blame one wing of the party over the other, the reality is candidates from all corners of our GOP lost tonight. Clearly, we have work to do in the weeks and months ahead.”¶ The trouble for the GOP is that it’s dominated not by Washington figures like Cornyn and the consulting class, but by its activist base. Once a welcome source of energy that catapulted Republicans to control of the House in 2010, the Tea Party has become a millstone. Flawed candidates have twice cost Republicans control of the Senate—in 2010 and 2012—and could do so again in 2014.¶ At the same time, the Republican Senate caucus has moved further to the right. Relative moderates such as Kay Bailey Hutchison (Tex.) and Scott Brown (Mass.) are departing; staunch right-wingers like incoming Senators Ted Cruz (Tex.) and Deb Fischer (Neb.) will replace them. And the senior party members who might steer a safer path are hemmed in by the threat of Tea Party challenges back home: Cornyn, McConnell, Lindsey Graham (S.C.), and Saxby Chambliss (Ga.) are all up for reelection in two years, and they are aware of the fate that befell ousted colleagues such as Richard Lugar (Ind.) and Bob Bennett (Utah).

### Link

#### Extending the PTC for more than a year costs political capital

Leone 12 (June 4, 2012 Steve Leone, Associate Editor, RenewableEnergyWorld.com “Looming Deadline for PTC Extension is Major Focus at Windpower 2012” http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/06/looking-deadline-for-ptc-extension-is-major-focus-at-windpower-2012)

“We’re willing to talk in the future about all sorts of alternatives,” said Bode. “But we need to stop the bleeding now.”¶ A short-term deal may not be the ideal solution from a stability standpoint, but it may be all the political capital the wind industry can muster up in an election year in which the government’s role in energy investment has become a central issue.

#### Reduced spending key to a deal

Beutler 11/7 (http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/11/republicans-to-obama-on-taxes-lets-compromise-by-not-raising-taxes.php)

“Because the American people expect us to find common ground, we are willing to accept some additional revenues, via tax reform,” House Speaker John Boehner said in the Capitol Wednesday — his first major address since Tuesday’s election. “But the American people also expect us to solve the problem. And for that reason, in order to garner Republican support for new revenues, the president must be willing to reduce spending and shore up the entitlement programs that are the primary drivers of our debt.”

#### New spending kills fiscal cliff negotiations – top Republicans fear that new spending causes tax hikes.

Berman, correspondent for The Hill, 11-9 (Russell, Boehner: Obama has 'opportunity to lead' negotiations on fiscal cliff, The Hill, 9 November 2012, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/267059-boehner-obama-has-qopportunity-to-leadq-on-fiscal-cliff, da 11-9-12)

Boehner's comments came as Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) pushed back against suggestions by Democratic leaders that the GOP was prepared to compromise on its opposition to raising taxes. ¶ “One issue I’ve never been conflicted about is taxes,” McConnell said in a statement released to Breitbart News. “I wasn’t sent to Washington to raise anybody’s taxes to pay for more wasteful spending, and this election doesn’t change my principles."¶ McConnell added: “I know some people out there think Tuesday’s results mean Republicans in Washington are now going to roll over and agree to Democrat demands that we hike tax rates before the end of the year. I’m here to tell them there is no truth to that notion whatsoever.”

#### Tax credit may have been popular in the past but it’s not bipartisan enough to get through the lame duck.

Geman, 11-10

(Ben, “Study by oil-backed group says wind industry doesn't need tax credit”, The Hill,

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/265449-wind-credit-foes-ramp-up-attacks-ahead-of-lame-duck>, RSR)

The thrust-and-parry over the credit will intensify in coming weeks when Congress returns for what's shaping to be a frenzied stretch of battles and deal-making. The Senate Finance Committee in August approved a one-year extension of the credit, which carries an estimated cost of $12 billion over the next decade. But the committee bill, which extends a series of expiring tax incentives, did not make it to the Senate floor. The credit has backing from many Democrats, and Republicans in Iowa and other heartland states where the industry is growing. But it remains unclear whether the incentive — which has historically had bipartisan support — will clear Congress at a time when many Republicans oppose green energy programs.