### AT CP Aerotropolis - HSR specific

#### 1. Perm: do both- allows us to solve for our advantages and their net benefit faster than they could. Any additional solvency is a reason to vote AFF because of the increased magnitude of the impact. . High Speed Rail opens up space for more profitable long-haul flights – it only competes with short range travel

Reisman, 12

[Will Reisman, SF Examiner Staff Writer, 4/16/12 <http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/transportation/2012/04/high-speed-rail-could-free-valuable-space-sfo>, accessed on 6/27/12, K-fo]

While the state’s high-speed rail project is expected to redefine how people travel on trains, local officials are banking on the plan having an equally important impact in the skies. Small, inefficient flights between The City and the Los Angeles area account for 15 percent of all domestic travel at the San Francisco International Airport. With the option of traveling between the two cities in just two hours and 40 minutes on high-speed rail, travelers may start eschewing the short flights, a development that would open up more gates for lucrative international and trans-continental travel at SFO. “There is no question that international travel brings a much higher economic benefit to the region,” said Charles Shuler, a spokesman for SFO. “And with high-speed rail, we’ll be able to reduce the number of short-haul trips to the Los Angeles Basin and introduce more international flights.” Laurie Anderson, spokeswoman for the tourism group San Francisco Travel, said international travelers stay longer and spend more money than domestic visitors. An increase in such travel could introduce San Francisco to a whole new market of future tourists. “The more visitors we get, the healthier our city is,” said Anderson. Along with reducing air travel to Los Angeles, high-speed rail also could reduce connecting flights to SFO from Central Valley cities such as Fresno and Modesto. “A plane with 30 people from Fresno takes the same slot as a 400-person jumbo jet from Beijing,” said Jim Lazarus, public policy director at the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. “High-speed rail will eliminate that problem, and allow for a higher frequency of large planes to land at the airport.” A functioning high-speed rail system also could reduce congestion and delays at the airport. Since the hub provides so many trips to the Los Angeles region, the rest of its air travel must be squeezed into a relatively tight time slot, a precarious situation that has contributed to SFO’s woeful on-time performance rate. “Short-haul flights are inherently inefficient,” said Gillian Gillett, the transportation advisor for Mayor Ed Lee. “With high-speed rail, the airport can cater to larger flights with more people. That right there will reduce congestion and delays.” While the airport and many San Francisco officials have been longtime backers of high-speed rail, the $68 billion project still faces a tough battle before it’s completed. So far, only $13 billion has been identified for the plan, and $32 billion is projected to come from the federal government, which must withstand the opposition of many House Republicans. It’s also facing a potential recall challenge at the November state ballot. But, if things go as planned, the service could be completed by 2029, a date that will surely be anticipated eagerly by travelers stuck at SFO.

#### 2. The Counterplan will fail to solve – multiple reasons

Renn, 11

[Aaron Renn, senior technology architect and served in several strategy roles, including Director of IT Strategy for both Accenture and Focal Communications and syndicated author, October 2 2011, <http://www.urbanophile.com/2011/10/02/globalization-and-the-airport/>, accessed on 6/26/12, K-fo]

From a developed world perspective, the other thing that hit me from the book is that having an aerotropolis, even a successful one, doesn’t necessarily do much for you. Lindsay wrote extensively on Memphis (home to FedEx) and Louisville (home to UPS’s main air hub). Memphis likes to bill itself as “America’s Aerotropolis.” One of its local leaders [recently said](http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2011/apr/10/airport-conference-puts-memphis-in-global/), “While other communities are striving to create an aerotropolis in their community or region, many of those efforts are aspirational, whereas in Memphis, the aerotropolis model is a reality.” As my [recent coverage](http://www.urbanophile.com/2011/09/25/a-decade-in-college-degree-attainment/) noted, however, out of 51 US metro areas with greater than a million people, Memphis ranks #48 in college degree attainment. Its unemployment rate of 10.4% is higher than the nation as a whole. Between 2000 and 2010, Memphis lost nearly 6% of its jobs, a rate far worse than the US as a whole. It’s GDP per capita trails the US average, as does its per capita income. Fed Ex might be a great thing for Memphis, but it hasn’t changed the fact that Memphis is one of the most struggling cities economically in the US. (Louisville’s statistics are better, but it is still clearly an economic laggard). Meanwhile, aerotropolis-free Nashville is booming. More passenger hub type airport cities have done better – Dallas, Atlanta, Denver, etc. – yet this was based mostly on a pre-existing pattern (e.g., Chicago) or came into being as an artifact of the hub and spoke system, airline mergers, etc. well before anyone had thought of the aerotropolis concept. They are also generally based more on domestic than global connectivity. Even overseas, where airports have done better at building the fortunes of cities, particularly those that previously lacked good global connectivity, there are plenty of misses to go along with the hits. The lesson I draw is that while good air connectivity is critical for a city in the global economy – indeed, I almost draw my threshold population for what constitutes a minimum viable city in the globalized world in terms of whether or not it is big enough to support a major airport – the airport is only one ingredient needed for success, not the entire recipe. Cities that pin their hopes too heavily on airport led transformation are bound to be disappointed. And even if you go in with the best of intentions trying to do airport development right, you are far from guaranteed to have success. I should close with a few final words about Kasarda. I know I sound like I’m picking on him in this post, but that’s less from anything personally about him than it is about the trend he represents in globalization (much as one might say about the aerotropolis itself). I don’t get the impression he’s a nefarious or bad guy, but rather that he’s a technocrat in love with his idea of the master-planned aerotropolis. In fact, I give him a lot of credit for being willing to sign on to a book that actually highlights a number of places where he acknowledges he didn’t get it quite right, and projects that didn’t work where he was involved. He has certainly evolved his vision over time to take into account lessons from the past, but not yet the key lesson that there are limits to what we can plan. The aerotroplis, inhumane as it may seem at times, has its merits as an abstract idea, but the reality is likely rarely to match up to Kasarda’s expectations. As Dietrich Dörner put it in his classic [The Logic of Failure](http://www.urbanophile.com/2011/03/24/replay-the-logic-of-failure-by-dietrich-dorner/), “Because planning involves only imagining our actions, we are essentially free from the irksome conditions of reality, and nothing prevents us from simply ignoring the conditions necessary to carry out an operation.” Indeed.

#### 3. The counterplan is insufficient to solve – airlines are cutting back capacity, not expanding

Sharkey, 11

[Joe Sharkey, Staff writer, December 26, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/27/business/airlines-are-retrenching-and-alternatives-are-slim.html>, accessed on 6/27/12, K-fo]

THE coming year will be a time of reckoning in business travel, as airlines reduce service at many airports and prospects fade for practical alternatives to flying, including the long-term promises of [high-speed rail](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/high_speed_rail_projects/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) . Consider the new realities of air travel. Competition is decreasing, fares are rising and airlines are adjusting routes (and charging extra fees) in ruthless calculations to extract the greatest possible revenue per mile flown. Michael Boyd, the president of the consulting company Boyd Group International, sums up the phenomenon succinctly. “The cost of flying airplanes across the sky has eclipsed the ability to support it at many communities,” he said in a recent forecast. In 2012, he predicts, airlines will accelerate the mothballing of smaller 50-seat jets, the workhorses for connecting service between many midsize airports, and even some big ones. Many airlines will continue shrinking overall capacity and trimming domestic routes in 2012, and the Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing of AMR, the parent company of American Airlines, will merely exacerbate the situation. In 2012, American will “ground some planes and resize our network,” the company’s chief executive, Thomas W. Horton, recently told employees. In addition, John P. Heimlich, the chief economist of the trade group Airlines for America, said, “Capacity reduction is one of the steps the industry is taking to preserve profitability.” Some business travelers are driving more often on some trips for which they would once fly. But what about trains? I got a lot of enthusiastic reader reaction a couple of weeks ago, [after I wrote about](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/13/business/pleasures-return-on-a-long-train-trip.html) taking a pleasant overnight trip in a cozy sleeper compartment on Amtrak’s Silver Star from Tampa to New York City. The fare was $480.80.

#### 4. Perm: do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the counterplan

#### 5. Turn- The aerotropolis alone will be used by the elite to establish authoritarianism – it hands them total control of global economic life.

Renn, 11

[Aaron Renn, senior technology architect and served in several strategy roles, including Director of IT Strategy for both Accenture and Focal Communications and syndicated author, October 2 2011, <http://www.urbanophile.com/2011/10/02/globalization-and-the-airport/>, accessed on 6/26/12, K-fo]

A few things jumped at me out of the book. One of them is the close linkage between the aerotropolis and its boosters with authoritarianism (and by extension, similarly for globalization and its boosters). The second is that, despite vast sums of money and authoritarian rule, I didn’t come away with a sense of anyplace in the world that had fully pulled off Kasarda’s vision. Indeed, there are as many or more failures than successes. And even those successes are far from perfect ones. As Lindsay notes: “The aerotropolis and authoritarianism go hand in hand. The first is a city built from scratch to chase economies of speed; the second are the only ones in a position to sign off on a massive construction project before its too late. It’s no accident that Kasarda has found early adopters in the Middle East and China, followed close behind by Asian nations with a legacy of military rule.” Kasarda himself seems blissfully unconcerned with this. The book notes that “high-functioning dictatorships such as Dubai’s don’t faze [Kasarda]. If anything, they’re the only ones who move fast enough.” Kasarda is basically willing to consult with anyone, anywhere – as long as their money spends and they are interested in building an aerotropolis. I think this is a great summation of perhaps how we got to where we are with globalization. Globalization is often portrayed as an inevitable, inexorable process that sort of came about as an emergent property of advances in transportation and communications technology. But as with the aerotropolis – a master-planned environment conceived and dictated from the top down – illustrates, globalization is in fact a man-made creation, one willfully brought into existence by the efforts of various parties. Globalization was at least in part the product of human architects, and one of them is Kasarda. Globalization was also a product of elites, often unelected, who harnessed the market making power of government to shape the world to what they perceived as their advantages. Globalization has surely had many winners – but also many losers. But among the biggest winners have been architects themselves. When the globalization booster class profits from the very policies they recommend, we are perhaps entitled to view their prescriptions skeptically as we would anyone with a conflict of interest. Now, I’m no anti-globalization luddite. Let the record show that I’m an unabashed free trader. And in addition to the top-down nexus, there are plenty of stories of bottom-up entrepreneurship as hustlers of all nations look for ways to take advantage of what this new world gives them. Globalization has dramatically lifted the incomes of hundreds of millions of people around the world. That is something to be celebrated. But this isn’t a simple black and white “for” or “against” matter. We can support trade and an increase in global economic flows, while having serious reservations about the way it has been architected. In particular, the rise of authoritarian locales in this world order and the almost amoral embrace of them by Western boosters like Kasarda is something that concerns me. In the last 30-40 years or so, we in the developed West buried business and local communities under an increasing mountain of regulations. In a sense this was rational. As we grew more prosperous, we were increasingly able to use our new found wealth to purchase a cleaner environment, safer products and workplaces, better health care, etc. and to ensure that our decisions considered a wide range of impacts before they were implemented. But this logic assumed that we forever would remain top dog in the world, and thus, while we might pay some dollar cost for this out of our own pocket, it wouldn’t fundamentally threaten our economy or upward social mobility. Alas, the world didn’t turn out that way. In this new era, the era of the internet, containerized shipping, and the aerotropolis, localities may not be able to pick up and move, but businesses can. And moved they have. Maybe not physically a plant relocation, but the choice of location for expansions. This hasn’t always been to places with perhaps a more moderate regime of regulation, but increasingly to dictatorships that operate under a wild west type model and are willing to do almost anything, including rewriting laws, to accommodate this new business. The aerotropolis is but one example of this. As Lindsay notes, Kasarda “proposes building cities by corporations for corporations, guaranteeing their survival by tailoring them to clients’ specifications—beginning with the airport.” In effect, what we have done is delinked trade from any larger consideration, social or environmental. This enables not just cost arbitrage, but regulatory and even moral arbitrage. In the Cold War era the West was willing to do business and support a wide variety of unsavory regimes and practices – just as long as they didn’t go communist. That was a mindset that, perhaps in an unexamined way, continued after the Soviet Union’s collapse. But what might have been at least understandable in the context of the Cold War is less so today. The fact that we’ve basically said that, save for rules pertaining in a narrow sense to trade, we don’t care who you are or what you do in your country is a decision with consequences. As for Kasarda, the impression I get from the book and various articles I’ve read about him is less of a man interested in getting rich than of someone who is looking for someone to implement his new vision of the aerotropolis city. In the video above, Kasarda quotes Le Corbusier in the title slide. Corbu famously proposed demolishing much of historic Paris in order to build a city of freestanding modernist towers. He was more than willing to sweep away the entire urban order in order to remake the city in accordance with what he thought was a better vision – his vision naturally. Kasarda falls into this mode. There’s a new world coming, and the ones who will benefit most from it are those who are most prepared to reshape their urban geography to accommodate this new master planned form. The fact that Kasarda quotes Le Corbusier without any sense of irony is telling. But a funny thing happened on the way to the aerotropolis. Even where the nominal ingredients were in place (including authoritarian government), there seem to be precious few places where the aerotropolis has been pulled off successfully. In fact, the book probably relates as many failed as successful ones, and at no point did I read a case study and come away going, “Wow – that’s it.” But this should come as no surprise. Kasarda believes authoritarian rule makes things happen, then is shocked, shocked, to find that there is rampant cronyism, corruption, and clout seeking that compromises the vision. Kasarda also bemoans the failure of planners to truly get the aerotropolis concept and that even when they do, they often fail to follow through on their planning concepts correctly. This too was as predictable as the sun coming up in the east. In the full aerotropolis vision, infrastructure and land around the airport is controlled by a single entity that is chartered with not only allocating space to various types of uses, but also deciding what is the highest and best use for the sites. This is nothing less than central economic planning, something we should know by now isn’t going to work. And even in the best of cases and with the best of intent, planning never survives intact in its original vision when making contact with reality. Another thing that struck me is that given the extremely high rate of change and creative destruction this new air enabled globalization is creating, the notion of “highest and best” use is ephemeral. The minute you build something, it’s legacy. To stay in top of your game then would require in effect stripping people of their property rights so that you can scrape and start over whenever the economic flows shift in a new direction.

#### 6. Solvency deficit- increased risk of terrorism and air pollution

**Charles et al.,** School of Management, Faculty of Business, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia, **2007** (Michael B. Charlesa, , , Paul Barnesa, Neal Ryanb, Julia Claytona, a School of Management, Faculty of Business, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia b Executive Dean, Faculty of Business, Southern Cross University, Tweed Gold Coast, Australia, 13 April 2007, “Airport futures: Towards a critique of the aerotropolis model”, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328707000699>, HM)

The concept of the aerotropolis, or ‘airport city’, has been promoted in recent academic and commercial literature, most notably by Kasarda [1], [2] and [3]. Central to his vision is the ever-increasing importance of the airport, not only as a hub for human movement and its immediate ancillaries, but also as an industrial focus around which massive conurbations and concomitant support services will be located. Despite these prognostications, longer-term predictions relating to some aerotropolis inputs suggest a more uncertain future. In short, this paper seeks to identify some of the longer-term factors likely to impact on the aerotropolis, especially from a policy and planning perspective. In particular, this article focuses on three important areas, viz., energy, security and export pathways. The rationale for focussing on these areas is as follows. First, air travel, in its current form, relies on the relative abundance of oil [4]. Indeed, the use of fossil fuels currently represents around 15% of aircraft operating costs [5]. Yet hydrocarbon-based fuel sources in our increasingly energy-hungry and globalized world are limited [6] and [7]. Moreover, the transition from hydrocarbon-based fuel to its eventual replacement is likely to be difficult, with great economic, social and environmental cost [8]. Even before the expected transition to another form of fuel is made, rising oil prices will surely impact upon the aerotropolis, at least as it is presently envisaged. It will also affect the industries and urban environments that will have become attached to it. In addition, it is not understood whether future aircraft power sources will take the same form as those used by contemporary aircraft. Thus the current aerotropolis is an economic ‘focus’ based on a non-renewable resource. Second, in a world dominated by security concerns, it has become increasingly clear that commercial aircraft, critical infrastructure and important economic centres are subject to terrorist attack, in addition to natural phenomena [9]. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, in addition to the suicide bombing of the London Underground and Madrid's Metro, various studies have been undertaken in order to establish the best means to prevent catastrophic damage to a nation's economy as a result of asymmetric warfare, or, at least, mitigate the effects of a critical event of this nature [10]. In

particular, concerns have emerged with regard to the wisdom of concentrating critical infrastructure in one location. Yet the very concept of the aerotropolis calls for even greater geographic concentration of critical infrastructure around a central transport hub. Indeed, the very raison d’être of the aerotropolis is the airport itself, without which the interconnected facilities cannot function in their intended manner.

#### 7. Perm: do the plan and then the counterplan- allows us to first create mega-regions through HSR and develop them further in the future if needed

#### 8. Extend **Dutzik et al. 10- HSR dramatically reduces the emissions that cause air pollution. The counterplan would only increase CO2 levels, making it impossible to solve for our Air pollution advantage.**

### AT CP Carbon Tax

**Perm do both – solves better**

**WRI ’08** World Resources Institute, The Bottom Line on…Answers to frequently answered questions about climate and energy policy: Issue 7, “Carbon Taxes”, June, http://pdf.wri.org/bottom\_line\_carbon\_taxes.pdf

**Companies and individuals pay higher prices for** GHG-intensive energy (and other **goods and services) as the costs of a carbon tax are passed down** to consumers. **The extent to which these higher energy prices impact the overall income of companies and individuals depends on how the tax revenues are used**. The overall impact on a company also depends on how much fossil fuel-based energy it uses, how higher energy prices affect their business, and a company’s ability to either minimize or avoid increasing costs (e.g., by using fuel more efficiently or using cleaner fuels) and/or pass along costs to its customers. For example**, a carbon tax policy might lessen** overall economic **impacts on consumers by including provisions to make the carbon tax “revenue neutral**.” **This involves returning the** carbon tax **revenues to businesses and individuals through rebates or changes in the tax code (e.g., reducing corporate or capital gains taxes**). **A carbon tax policy might also direct revenues to fund programs that provide longer-term benefits to consumers and businesses, such as research and development** programs **or transportation infrastructure**.

**A carbon tax would work better if supplemented by other policies, like transportation investment infrastructure.**

**Litman ’10** Todd Litman, executive director of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, author of Online TDM Encyclopedia, chairperson of the TRB Sustainable Transportation Indicators Subcommittee, the VTPI, “Tax What You Burn, Not What You Earn”, June 4, page 4

**Carbon taxes support and are supported by other energy conservation strategies**. For example, **vehicle manufactures can offer more fuel efficient models, public transit agencies can improve transit service, and developers can build more walkable, smart growth neighborhoods**, **b[ut] without adequate financial incentives consumers will continue to purchase inefficient vehicles**, buses will have few passengers, and households will choose homes in automobile-dependent, sprawled locations. As a result, **it is best to implement carbon taxes together with other appropriate policies and programs which together encourage energy efficiency and emission reductions**.

**A carbon tax would hurt the economy – businesses can’t expand.**

**Johnson ’12** policy research associate at Americans for Tax Reform, June 14, “Kissing Cousins and Carbon Taxes”, Americans for Tax Reform, http://www.atr.org/kissing-cousins-carbon-taxes-a6970

**Testifying in front of the Senate** Finance Committee on tax and energy issues, Harvard’s Dr. Dale **Jorgenson proposed a tax increase on fossil fuels** equivalent to a 1.5 percent increase in federal revenues as a percent of GDP. Chairman **Baucus asked if the increase is a “cousin” to a carbon tax and Dr. Jorgenson replied “a kissing cousin.**” **Defending the tax increase as a way to reduce consumption of carbon based fuels**; Dr. **Jorgenson claimed such a tax would be most effective if heavily weighted towards coal—this sounds like a carbon tax** to us. **A carbon tax harms American industries and consumers** at a time **when businesses need access to cheap energy sources** so they can grow our way out of the Great Recession. The Energy Information Agency estimated that **coal, oil and natural gas represent 83 percent of US energy sources** as of 2010. The same study found that **76 percent of commercial and residential energy consumption and 41 percent of industrial consumption comes from natural gas while petroleum, as expected, represents 94 percent of transportation energy consumption**. Additionally, **92 percent of coal produced** in this country **goes to electrical power generation**—power plants designed to sell electricity to the public to heat and cool our homes. **Raising taxes on oil, coal and natural gas drives up costs for everyone and prevents businesses from expanding**. Dr. Jorgenson claimed **a carbon tax will raise revenues and reduce consumption of fossil fuels, but ignored the negative effects this has on economic growth**. **When the government taxes something we get less of it** so **hoping to increase revenues** and reduce consumption of fossil fuels with a carbon tax **seems like faulty logic to us**. This is the same logic behind cigarette taxes designed to curb smoking and raise revenue—the government wants to tax your cake and eat it too.

**They cannot solve our mega regions internal link because they do not do anything to change transportation infrastructure which means that our Todorovich evidence acts as a massive solvency deficit to the CP.**

**They do not solve our specific pollution scenario, the counterplan does nothing to reduce the amount of automobiles on the road, and our Dunzik card indicates that High Speed Rail is the key internal link into solving this specific impact scenario.**

**Perm: Do the Plan - there is nothing that the counterplan can solve that the plan can’t.**

Carbon taxes fail - Australia proves

Birmingham et al 12’ (Simon Birmingham and Julia Gillard , July 3rd 2012, shadow parliamentary secretary in Australian parliment)

AUSTRALIA now has the world's largest carbon tax. Apart from Julia Gillard's broken promise on this issue, there are at least five key reasons for citizens to be concerned by this initiative. First, the carbon tax will not work nor achieve its stated objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Government's own modelling shows carbon emissions will not decrease in Australia. Even with the carbon tax they will increase from 578 million tonnes in 2012 to 621 million tonnes in 2020. Second, about four million Australian households will be left worse off, on Labor's own assumptions, even after compensation payments. This will be an added burden that many will struggle to bear. As the Productivity Commission has noted, any carbon tax ``will directly increase product costs according to their emissions intensity, with these costs being passed on to consumers and user industries''. Given nearly every product or service requires electricity or transport in its production, this means the cost will flow through to almost everything. Even those Australians who receive supposed ``compensation'' payments are right to question if they will actually cover increases in everything from groceries to council rates, especially when the carbon tax will keep going up year after year. Third, the carbon tax places Australian businesses at a comparative disadvantage to our overseas competitors. It effectively works as a reverse tariff, benefiting overseas competitors at the expense of the Australian economy, businesses and jobs. As the managing director of Coca-Cola Amatil noted last year, the carbon tax is ``discriminatory because it advantages imported goods''. It also disadvantages our exports. The Productivity Commission has confirmed that no other country has an economy-wide carbon tax in place, which means that goods made in Australia pay the carbon tax, while those made overseas do not. In the absence of any comparable carbon tax among our major competitors and trading partners, Labor is inflicting economic harm on Australian industry and will be exporting Australian jobs. Fourth, the carbon tax creates a giant new bureaucracy, which will see more than $400 million wasted on administrative costs over the next few years alone. The new $256 million Clean Energy Regulator employs about 350 public servants and is being joined by the $10 billion Clean Energy Finance Corporation, the $3.2 billion Australian Renewable Energy Agency and the $25 million Climate Change Authority. Those new agencies are on top of existing outfits such as the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency and the Climate Commission. The complexity of the carbon tax has put Australia's climate change bureaucracy on steroids and lumped taxpayers with massive administration costs to fund its money-go-round policies. Finally, the carbon tax outsources any action on climate change to the rest of the world, at great cost to Australia. The only way Government claims to reduce emissions is through the purchase of carbon credits from foreign carbon traders. Forecasts indicate the carbon tax will result in Australian companies spending $3.5 billion in 2020 to buy foreign carbon credits, rising to $57 billion (in 2010 dollars) by 2050. Billions of dollars that could otherwise have been invested in Australia will instead be sent offshore and spent on climate action in other countries. These five failings are more than enough reason to make repealing the carbon tax the first order of business for a new government. Senator Simon Birmingham is the Shadow Parliamentary Secretary for the Environment.

Carbon Taxes hurt the economy by destroying jobs

Ferguson 12’ (John Ferguson , Victorian political editor ; The Australian on July 3rd 2012)

uncertainty among the Latrobe Valley power generators and potential sweeping cuts to the local economy and employment have been sheeted home to the new carbon pricing regime in a landmark report that examines the future of thousands of regional jobs. A committee set up by the Gillard and Victorian governments has cited carbon pricing and the planned winding back of old-technology power stations for the threats to jobs across an area that is on the frontline of Labor's efforts to sell its plans for the Clean Energy Future. The Latrobe Valley Transition Committee has warned the carbon price will have flow-on effects for "businesses, communities and families" across the valley, which contains one of the world's biggest brown-coal reserves and is the engine room that delivers much of southeastern Australia's power. It warns that the Gillard government-backed "contract for closure" strategy, which aims to cut about 2000 megawatts of high-emission power generation by 2020, could lead to the full or partial closure of one or more of the generators in the valley, about 150km east of Melbourne. RECOMMENDED COVERAGE Gas rule changes 'will kill compo' Swan G20 plan 'to set higher prices' Families bear the carbon brunt In a clear message to the federal government the day after its carbon tax came into effect, the committee said: "The introduction of a carbon price is expected to affect coal-fired power generators' profitability and cause a major transformation in the electricity industry as renewable generation and other transitional energy sources (such as gas) become more competitive relative to coal. "Transitional assistance for power generators has been made under the Clean Energy Future Plan through to 2016-17 to provide market stability and energy security. However, it would be expected that power generators will continue to assess their ongoing business model during and following the period of transitional assistance." The committee says the uncertainty about the scale and timing of the plant closures has already hit employment and investment and warns there is an urgent need to diversify the economy. "There are opportunities to offset some impacts but these are unlikely to create enough alternate employment to fully address the needs of displaced workers," it says. The committee found that "without assistance from governments, the power-generation sector workforce will experience difficulty securing similar employment within the region". On Friday, Energy Minister Martin Ferguson announced $50 million for a two-year restructuring package for Energy Brix to allow the plant in the Latrobe Valley to maintain briquette production and give regional businesses time to switch to cleaner fuels such as gas. Julia Gillard campaigned near the Latrobe Valley at the weekend, discussing the start of the carbon tax with residents at The Basin, east of Melbourne, alongside local member Laura Smyth and Families Minister Jennifer Macklin. In the lead-up to the carbon tax, ministers have frequently visited the Latrobe Valley, selling the federal household compensation measures as well as assuring locals about their jobs. Sunday marked the first day of the carbon price, with the scheme imposing a $23 a tonne levy for greenhouse gas emissions. The tax will be paid by about 300 companies emitting more than 25,000 tonnes of carbon equivalent a year, and will convert to an emissions trading scheme with a floating price in 2015. The LVTC committee was co-chaired by federal Regional Australia Department deputy secretary Dan O'Brien and Regional Development Victoria chief executive Lachlan Bruce. Its report to government was prepared over 14 months, with the assistance of industry, union and local figures. It will provide advice to federal and state governments on dealing with the economic turmoil caused by changes to energy sources and the national power market. Federal Regional Development Minister Simon Crean said yesterday the three levels of governments and the private sector were needed to help transform the valley economy, and that differences over carbon would have to be put to one side. "Despite political differences over carbon pricing, we are taking a bipartisan approach to building jobs and skills for the Latrobe Valley and diversifying the regional economy," Mt Crean said. Gippsland Trades and Labor Council secretary John Parker said it was crucial to act before the locks were placed on the gates of the dirty power generators. "What we are trying to do is identify where we can stimulate growth," he told The Australian. The LVTC report said that even if the CFC agenda was orderly and effective, the carbon price would be detrimental. "Regardless of the outcome of the CFC process, the introduction of a price on carbon is expected to create structural transition in the Latrobe Valley's power generation sector, with significant implications for the structure and diversification of the broader regional economy," it notes. Under CFC, the preferred closure period is July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2020, with a strategy to facilitate investment in replacement lower-emission power generation. The LVTC argues for a transitioning of the workforce away from heavily polluting industries.

**Revenue neutral carbon taxes do not solve because there is no monetary gain for the corporations because any money that is being taken out through the carbon tax is being put in through a reduction in income tax; this means that there is no benefit because the companies are not making any net gain.**

### AT CP Cellulosic Ethanol

#### Perm do the plan and the counterplan together

#### Ethanol makes climate conditions worse

Mufson, reporter, 2008 (Steve reporter for the Washington Post, April 30 2008, “Siphoning Off Corn to Fuel Our Cars”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/story/2008/04/29/ST2008042903585.html>, AM)

Although ethanol was once promoted as a way to slow climate change, a study published in Science magazine Feb. 29 concluded that greenhouse-gas emissions from corn and even cellulosic ethanol "exceed or match those from fossil fuels and therefore produce no greenhouse benefits." By encouraging an expansion of acreage, the study added, the use of U.S. cropland for ethanol could make climate conditions dramatically worse. And the runoff from increased use of fertilizers on expanded acreage would compound damage to waterways all the way to the [Gulf of Mexico](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Gulf%2Bof%2BMexico?tid=informline).

#### Ethanol requires major fossil inputs

Pimentel and Pimentel 2008 (David and Marcia, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Agricultural Sciences, Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University and Senior Lecturer, Division of Nutritional Sciences, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, June 6th 2008, “Corn and Cellulosic Ethanol Cause Major Problems”,http://www.mdpi.org/energies/papers/en1010035.pdf)

Cellulosic ethanol is being touted as the replacement for corn ethanol. Unfortunately, cellulose biomass contains only minimal amounts of starches and sugars and therefore requires major fossil energy inputs to release these tightly bound starches and sugars. With existing technology, about 170% more energy (oil and gas) is required to produce ethanol from cellulosic biomass than is in the ethanol produced [4].

#### Cellulosic Ethanol Unpopular in Congress

Bomgardner, 2011 (Melanie, B.A. in Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia blogger for Cleantech-Chemistry, July 5th, “It’s Stop and Go for Cellulosic Ethanol” <http://cenblog.org/cleantech-chemistry/2011/07/its-stop-and-go-for-cellulosic-ethanol/>, AM)

One example of a project on hold is Poet, a leading corn ethanol producer that is still waiting on a loan guarantee from the Department of Energy for its cellulosic operation. And politically, ethanol has been increasingly unpopular. The corn version has been blamed for increasing the cost of corn, and long-treasured subsidies are eyed for the chopping block. And the next-generation cellulose players might lose support in Congress as budgets get trimmed. One program that is at risk would help pay farmers to gather corn stover and corn cobs to feed Pilot’s plant.

#### Ethanol Production can be drastically worse than oil

Union of Concerned Scientist 2007 (“The Truth about Ethanol” <http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_vehicles/smart-transportation-solutions/cleaner_fuels/ethanol-and-other-biofuels/the-truth-about-ethanol.html>, AM)

If done wrong, the production of biomass for biofuels like ethanol could destroy habitats, worsen water or air quality, limit food production and even jeopardize the long-term viability of the biomass resource itself. The environmental impact of biofuels is comparable to certain agricultural crops. For example, the growing of corn has similar consequences whether the corn is grown for food, animal feed, or as a biofuel feedstock. The environmental impact is particularly high when forestland is cleared for monocrop farming of current generation feedstocks like corn. If done right, next generation feedstocks, such as mixed prairie grasses, may offer a lower-impact alternative, especially if grown with smart farming practices, such as no or low-till, plant diversification, and lower pesticide and fertilizer use. This potential for displacing some of our fossil fuel use makes next generation biomass feedstocks a worthwhile target for research and development. As we expand our biofuels production, there must be adequate safeguards in place to ensure that fuels are produced in a manner that safeguards the environment.

#### Biofuels reduce use of foreign oil

Dale 2011 (Bruce, Professor of Agricultural Bio at MSU, “Energy Crops — Sugar from Cellulosic Biomass”, <http://www.americanenergyindependence.com/energycrops.aspx>, AM

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) believes that biofuels—made from crops of native grasses, such as fast- growing switchgrass—could reduce the nation's dependence on foreign oil, curb emissions of the "greenhouse gas" carbon dioxide, and strengthen America's farm economy. The Biofuels Feedstock Development Program (BFDP) at DOE's Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), has assembled a team of scientists ranging from economists and energy analysts to plant physiologists and geneticists to lay the groundwork for this new source of renewable energy. Included are researchers at universities, other national laboratories, and agricultural research stations around the nation. Their goal, according to ORNL physiologist Sandy McLaughlin, who leads the switchgrass research effort, is nothing short of building the foundation for a biofuels industry that will make and market ethanol and other biofuels from switchgrass and at prices competitive with fossil fuels such as gasoline and diesel.

#### Oil key to Russian Economy

Li 10 (Hao, Journalist for the International Business Times http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/61065/20100909/russian-economy-struggles-budget-deficit-may-become-a-problem.htm)

One problem is that Russia's economy and government revenues depends heavily on oil and oil prices. About 80 percent of the country's exports are commodity-related and 45 percent of its government revenues derives from oil, according to Timothy Ash, head of emerging markets research at Royal Bank of Scotland. Ash said Russia's budget balances at oil prices of $90 per barrel. During the financial crisis, oil prices plunged. This, combined with the global economic turmoil, caused Russia to have a budget deficit in 2009, its first in a decade. In 2010, its deficit is estimated at 5 percent of GDP. To cover the deficits, Russia will tap into its Stabilization Fund, which was set up in 2004 to collect excess tax revenues from oil. The fund currently has $450 billion, said Aron. However, "nobody knows what will happen once this money runs out," he warned.The deficit-to-GDP ratio in Russia is actually lower than that of the U.S. and several European Union (EU) countries -- however, these countries have certain advantages -- e.g. the maturity of their capital markets and reserve status of their currencies -- that enable them finance deficits through borrowing.  For Russia, it is unclear if the market will be willing to finance its deficit at reasonable rates.  If the oil money runs out and the budget deficit remains persistent, Russia may be in trouble unless oil prices rally. Russia's struggles with its budget deficit and dreary economic outlook do not bode well for the need to "rebuild its crumbling infrastructure, salvage the collapsing state-pension system at a time of unprecedented population aging, and develop new gas and oil fields to replace the rapidly depleting current ones," said Aron.

#### Russian economic collapse causes a civil war that escalates and goes nuclear

David **99** , (Steven vice dean for undergraduate education, is a faculty member in the Department of Political Science and a longtime member of the School of Arts and Sciences’ leadership team David has directed the enormously successful Woodrow Wilson Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program since its inception in 1998, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, January/February 1999, p. http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19990101faessay955/steven-r-david/saving-america-from-the-coming-civil-wars.html

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

#### Extinction within 30 minutes.

Mintz 1 — Morton Mintz, former chair of the Fund for Investigative Journalism, former Washington Post reporter, 2001 (“Two Minutes to Launch,” *The American Prospect*, February 26th, Available Online at http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=two\_minutes\_to\_launch, Accessed 07-16-2011) SB

The bitter disputes over national missile defense (NMD) have obscured a related but dramatically more urgent issue of national security: the 4,800 nuclear warheads -- weapons with a combined destructive power nearly 100,000 times greater than the atomic bomb that leveled Hiroshima -- currently on "hair-trigger" alert. Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles carrying those warheads are armed and fueled at all times. Two thousand or so of these warheads are on the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) targeted by Russia at the United States; 1,800 are on the ICBMs targeted by the United States at Russia; and approximately 1,000 are on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. These missiles would launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews -- on duty every second of every day -- are under orders to send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command. In no more than two minutes, if all went according to plan, Russia or the United States could launch missiles at predetermined targets: Washington or New York; Moscow or St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the other side's missiles within tens of seconds, causing the intended -- or accidental -- enemy to mount retaliatory strikes. "Within a half-hour, there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us," explains Bruce Blair. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by checklist, by rote."

### AT CP Clean tech NIB

1. Perm do both
2. Links to politics
	1. They still spend $15 billion dollars/ year on clean energy research
	2. No one in the GOP will like the plan- hate clean tech
3. Links to their other net benefits
4. Doesn’t solve heg

Doesn’t solve heg- Our Khallizad 11 evidence indicates that economic decline is the single greatest threat to US competiveness, being a leader in clean tech in irrelevant.

#### Cherry-picking clean tech hampers competitiveness

Thomas A. Hemphill and Mark J. Perry 12, “A U.S. manufacturing strategy for the 21st century: what policies yield national sector competitiveness?”, April, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1094/is_2_47/ai_n58618168/pg_12/?tag=content;col1>

\* Energy and Environmental Policy. The U.S. manufacturing sector needs certainty in its long-term energy availability, and a comprehensive national energy policy needs to be established that emphasizes cost efficiency (such as cost per kWh or per Btu), domestic source reliability, and environmentally friendly impacts. These characteristics reflect the need to focus government policy support on three relatively clean and relatively inexpensive non-renewable (but domestically plentiful) fuel sources: low-emission coal, natural and shale gas and nuclear power. Although solar, wind, and biomass offer potential for future renewable sources of energy, these fuel sources are inherently only a minor source of energy, even if their respective costs-per-kWh were to decline to competitive levels with nonrenewable fuel sources (without direct government subsidies). While encouraging the use of energy-efficient and environmentally friendly technologies through tax credits and other incentives, a unilateral U.S. policy approach to reducing green-house gases is tantamount to global competitive capitulation on the part of the U.S. manufacturing sector and economy.

1. The CP cant solve for innovation

Our Lonardo 11 evidence indicates that the National Infrastructure Bank is the only way to solve for innovation- innovative funding solutions are key to solve for innovative projects.

1. NIB funding mechanisms are key to solve for R and D

Our O’Connell 11 evidence indicates that NIB is specifically key for solving for all types of innovative projects. The CP only provides $15 billion for projects and we guarantee long term- sustained funding for more projects.

#### Clean tech fails- can’t solve anything

Eilperin, bachelors in political science from Princeton, 2012 ( Juliet, January 20 2012, “Cleantech”, Wired Magazine, pg. 8-11) KH

Solar Promise: Enough sunlight hits Earth in one hour to power the world for a year. In 2010, the solar industry predicted that as many as 500,000 people would be directly or indirectly employed in the US solar sector by 2016.

Reality: As we head into 2012, the number is more like 100,000. Prices for conventional solar cells have fallen 40 percent in the past year, due largely to a flood of panels from Chinese manufacturers, which have benefited from plunging silicon prices and government support. The price drop has eviscerated the US solar manufacturing industry.

#### Clean tech fails- can’t solve anything

Eilperin, bachelors in political science from Princeton, 2012 ( Juliet, January 20 2012, “Cleantech”, Wired Magazine, pg. 8-11) KH

Wind Promise: The US has the potential to generate enough wind energy to

meet the nation’s total consumption 12 times over.

Reality: At $35 a megawatt-hour, wind looked like a good deal back in 2007, when wholesale electric prices ranged between $45 and $85 per megawatt-hour. But the natural gas boom, plus the 2008 recession, drove prices under $30 by 2009, eliminating wind’s financial edge. Also, NIMBY protests have made getting approval for a wind farm in the US as difficult as getting it for a coal-fired plant.

#### Clean tech empirically fails

Eilperin, bachelors in political science from Princeton, 2012 ( Juliet, January 20 2012, “Cleantech”, Wired Magazine, pg. 8-11) KH

Promise: Algae is, by some measures, up to 30 times more energy- dense than other biofuel crops. It ought to yield cheaper fuel, saving huge swaths of arable land.

Reality: A recent Department of Energy road map includes a 33-item list of R&D challenges—from assessing environmental risks to creating efficient conversion methods—that must be overcome for algae to be viable. In fact, researchers still aren’t able to cultivate the stuff on a large scale.

Outlook: In 2010, the DOE cautioned that “many years of both basic and applied science and engineering will likely be needed to achieve affordable, scalable, and sustainable algae-based fuels.”

#### Clean tech empirically fails

Eilperin, bachelors in political science from Princeton, 2012 ( Juliet, January 20 2012, “Cleantech”, Wired Magazine, pg. 8-11) KH

Promise: Zero-emission energy for everything from laptops to cars to power stations, all fueled by the most abundant element in the universe, hydrogen.

Reality: To compete with fossil fuels, the electricity from fuel cells needs to sell for around $30 per kilowatt. Right now, that figure is about $49. Also, there are only about 60 hydrogen refueling stations in the country, serving around 200 small vehicles and 15 buses. Industry leader FuelCell Energy lost $56.3 million in 2010 and has never turned a profit.

.

#### Clean tech empirically fails

Eilperin, bachelors in political science from Princeton, 2012 ( Juliet, January 20 2012, “Cleantech”, Wired Magazine, pg. 8-11) KH

Batteries Promise: Zero-emission vehicles (assuming that the power for

recharging the batteries comes from zero-emission sources).

Reality: The federal government injected $2.4 billion into the battery industry in 2009, under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, with the stated goal of getting more electric cars on the road. But expensive materials means that advanced lithium-ion batteries still cost about $650 per kilowatt-hour of usable energy. At that level, the 24- kWh battery pack for a Nissan Leaf costs more than some cars.

### AT CP Corporate Tax Cuts

#### 1. Perm: do both- we can build high speed rail while abolishing the corporate tax

#### 2. Perm solves:

#### A. Plan and eliminating the corporate income tax would make the United States *more* competitive because our Todorovich evidence indicates that we have direct job creation

#### B. Our Tierney evidence indicates that HSR is key to megaregions because they are the backbone of the American economy. Abolishing the corporate income tax would make those megaregions even *stronger*.

#### C. Both would solve for investor confidence because of high speed rail- that’s Todorovich and because stronger corporations without income taxes would thrive, boosting our hegemony.

#### 3. Solvency deficit: The counterplan solves nothing for our pollution advantage. Our Dutzik evidence from the 1AC indicates that *only* the plan is effective enough to solve for air pollution. Prefer this impact because it is systemic and it kills 70,000 a year and it will go unsolved in the counterplan.

#### 4. The counterplan links to politics: Many anti-corporation Americans and liberal Democrats in Congress would rather *increase* the corporate income tax. Also, there is zero chance Obama would even push for it.

#### Abolishing the corporate tax will cause more harm- Florida proves

FCFEP 11 (February 11, Florida Center for Fiscal and Economic Policy, Issue Brief, “Keeping and Modernizing the Corporate Income Tax

Will Best Serve Florida”, SS)

Governor Rick Scott’s proposal to cut corporate income taxes by $1.5 billion over the next two years would force deep budget cuts for services provided to millions of Floridians. Among those harmed: public school and college students, the poor, the elderly, health care providers, teachers, public safety workers, road construction contractors and workers, vulnerable children and families, people with disabilities, public employees, and almost every other Floridian touched by the services state government provides. Meanwhile, profitable corporations, many of them multistate operations headquartered outside of Florida, would pay less for the benefits they receive from the state’s education system, its transportation and infrastructure, and other services like law enforcement and the judicial system. Proponents of eliminating the corporate income tax maintain that it would unleash a flood of new business activity that would create hundreds of thousands of new jobs. Little evidence exists to bear out those claims. Slashing the corporate income tax would do little, if anything, to improve an already business-friendly tax structure or to create jobs. But it would do much to decrease the level of services necessary to support a decent quality of life, which is the foundation of economic development. Instead of cutting or eliminating the corporate income tax, the state could close loopholes to require that every corporation pays its fair share and that Florida small businesses and individuals don’t bear a disproportionate share of the cost of state services.

#### Offshore helps improve US competitiveness- creates jobs and saves money

PTI 4 (March 25, The Economic Times, <http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2004-03-25/news/27373342_1_offshoring-cost-savings-employment>, “Offshoring is an employment booster not threat”, SS)

NEW DELHI: Offshoring is not a threat to hi-tech employment rather it will create new jobs and boost economic growth, according to the US based Cato Institute. "The wild claims that offshoring will gut employment in the IT sector are totally at odds with reality", Centre for Trade Policy Studies, part of Cato Institute, specialising in free trade said in a briefing paper. Although offshoring does eliminate jobs, it also yields important benefits to the extent that companies could reduce costs by shifting certain operations overseas and increase productivity, it said. The process of competition ultimately passes the resulting cost savings on to consumers which then can spur demand for other goods and services. In particular, offshoring facilitates the diffusion of IT throughout the US economy. According to Catherine Mann at the Institute for International Economics, offshoring of computer-related manufacturing accounted for 10-30 per cent drop in hardware prices, the paper said. The resulting increase in productivity encouraged the rapid spread of computer use and thereby added some 230 billion dollar in cumulative additional GDP between 1995 and 2002, it pointed out.

# AT CP FERA – NIB Specific

#### READ AN ADD-ON (please) – like the State Budgets Advantage

#### Perm – do both

#### The CP can’t solve: The concept of FERA is based on the squo’s funding models for infrastructure and public works projects. Our Schwartz ’09 evidence indicates that the squo method is flawed since it is accompanied with red tape and a one-size-fits all approach; the NIB would change the system to more efficiently fund such projects.

#### Any increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote affirmative – it o/w the risk of a one-shot DA.

#### Links to Politics – the CP goes through Congress; their link evidence just indicates that the GOP opposes stimulus bills and a FERA CP would be just as, if not more, unpopular among the GOP. Their evidence saying it doesn’t link to politics is terrible – it just says that the CP might solve based on the work of one researcher; it has no reference to the political climate.

#### Creating an NIB would result in better public works awareness and organization for increasing jobs – that’s our O’Connel evidence and our Lonardo evidence. Additionally, the plan would take pressure off the states for such programs.

#### The Perm solves – an NIB would create better, more efficient investment in public works to generate employment – doesn’t link to politics

Plumer, Reporter at Washington Post, ’11 (Brad, 9/19/11, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/how-obamas-plan-for-infrastructure-bank-would-work/2011/09/19/gIQAfDgUgK\_story.html, “How Obama’s plan for infrastructure bank would work,” AM)

One of the key aspects of President Obama’s jobs plan is an idea that’s been knocking around Washington for some time: a national infrastructure bank that would leverage private investment to fund new roads, bridges, mass transit and other public-works endeavors. Here’s how it would work. The proposal, modeled after a bipartisan bill in the Senate, would take $10 billion in start-up money and identify transportation, water or energy projects that lack funding. Eligible projects would need to be worth at least $100 million and provide “a clear public benefit.” The bank would then work with private investors to finance the project through cheap long-term loans or loan guarantees, with the government picking up no more than half the tab — ideally, much less — for any given project.

#### Only the Permutation solves – it attracts private investment for public works projects; the CP would cost too much and links to politics

Bloomberg Editorial, ’11 (8/10/11, Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-11/a-bank-that-can-get-americans-on-the-road-and-on-the-job-view.html, “A Bank That Can Get Americans on the Road and on the Job: View,” AM)

Among the legion of problems facing the U.S., two stand out: Unemployment remains appallingly high, and the public works undergirding our economy are in alarmingly bad shape. Creating a national infrastructure bank presents a harmonized solution to these two problems that should be feasible even in austere times. Airports and transportation networks, levees and dams, water and energy systems are deteriorating. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that 25 percent of our bridges are deficient, 7 billion gallons of clean water are wasted each day because of leaking pipes, and a third of our major roads are in poor or mediocre condition. The costs of all this to U.S. businesses -- in delays, accidents, lost productivity, red tape -- are enormous. Yet improving such facilities adequately, the ASCE estimates, would require a five-year investment of $2.2 trillion. If you’ve been within shouting distance of Washington lately, you know that finding anything near such a sum is an impossibility. So a revitalization program that doesn’t rely entirely on federal munificence is crucial. Enter the infrastructure bank, which would provide loans or loan guarantees for big projects deemed to be in the public interest -- and attract private investment by offering cheap access to capital and a path to profit from tolls, fares and other charges. The bank could leverage the government’s outlay to lend more. An initial $5 billion a year for five years could result in $50 billion or more in loans. And because these loans would be paid back with interest, the institution could become self- sustaining. Financing for such a bank should be seen as an investment, not “spending.”

#### Infrastructure investment through the NIB is key to the economy and competitiveness – only the permutation solves (and doesn’t link to politics)

**Thomasson, Director of Public Policy at Progressive Policy Institute, 11** (Scott, 10/12/11, Congressional Documents and Publications, ProQuest http://search.proquest.com/pqrl/docview/898274287/1378A5BB5D410FA3EA7/3?accountid=11091, “The National Infrastructure Bank: Separating Myths from Realities“, IS)

Building and maintaining world-class infrastructure is essential for America to compete in the global economy and to attract capital investment needed for-long-term growth and job creation. As other countries pour money and resources into modernizing their own infrastructure, the U.S. is lagging behind and surrendering one of our greatest competitive advantages: a strong system of infrastructure that was once the envy of the rest of the world. To regain our competitive edge, we need a national infrastructure strategy that takes advantage of modern financing and policy innovations that other countries are already using to out-invest and out-compete the U.S. The national infrastructure bank is an approach that has been adopted by developed countries around the world to facilitate investment in new transportation projects and other types of infrastructure, with strong track records of success. Many states in the U.S. have also established their own versions of infrastructure banks, with more being added and expanded every year. There is also strong support for a national infrastructure bank from a broad coalition of top corporate CEOs, Wall Street investors, organized labor, and local government leaders. Although leaders throughout the U.S. and around the world support infrastructure banks as a tool to supplement direct public funding, the idea is still new and unfamiliar- to many here in Washington. There remains a great deal of confusion and misinformation about the role of a national bank, and about the structure and features of specific bank proposals currently before Congress, including the president's own proposal included in the American Jobs Act. This testimony addresses many of the misconceptions in Washington about the bank proposals before Congress, and it specifically responds to frequently expressed concerns about the bank. Now more than ever, Congress needs to consider the full range of options we have to increase U.S. infrastructure investment. The time has come for a clear-eyed look at how a national bank might be one piece of a multi-pronged approach to making the investments we need. Doing that means putting aside polarizing rhetoric from both sides and talking frankly about what a national infrastructure bank is, and what it is not.

## AT CP Fuel Taxes

#### Permutation Do Both

#### Fuel Taxes does not solve for GW, technology main reason for inefficiency, means planes do not have direct route

#### Taxes make air travel a lot more expensive,

Seaney 12 (Rick Seaney, special for USA TODAY, Jan. 28, 2012, ABC news, http://abcnews.go.com/Travel/airfare-expert-taxes-fees-make-cheap-europe-flights/story?id=15432210#.T\_IvNuZOxJM, “Airfare Expert: How taxes and fees make 'cheap' Europe flights expensive”)

It is absolutely true - but there is a hitch. While the roundtrip airfare from Boston to London on Virgin Atlantic is just $81 - and JetBlue's Boston to New York fare is $112 - the taxes and surcharges on the trans-Atlantic flight are $609! For those keeping score, the surcharges and taxes on the domestic flight are just $21. In other words, the most expensive part of your ticket to Europe has nothing to do with the airfare. It's all about the surcharges and taxes. So who adds in all these surcharges, taxes and fees? Surcharges are added by airlines ostensibly to cover the cost of fuel, and to a lesser extent, for insurance coverage on some European carriers. But don't try to figure out the fuel surcharge by doing the obvious - calculating mileage - since the surcharge often has more to do with competitive price matching than any correlation to trip distance. Taxes and fees, on the other hand, are charged by over half a dozen entities ranging from federal governments and their various agencies to local airports. There is little if any transparency for consumers when it comes to either of these charges as they are both typically plunked under the catch-all phrase, "Taxes/Fees" on your airline ticket purchase page.

#### Thus there will be less customers if things get too out of hand

#### Corporate Taxes are bad

Vision America 11 (Vision to American, June 21, 2011, http://visiontoamerica.org/1755/corporate-taxes-are-bad-for-the-economy/ “Corporate Taxes are Bad for the Economy”

Most Americans believe that corporate taxes are good because we Americans want to make sure those big evil businesses pay their fair share. Sure, that sounds like a simple enough idea. The average American has to pay his share of income taxes so why shouldn’t corporations? Well, to be honest, you are a complete ignoramus for believing that. Anyone who has an inkling (common sense) of how Economics 101 works can work through the simple logic. Corporations should NOT be taxed. This is beneficial to the corporation, consumer, economy, and government tax revenue. Corporations pay exactly $0 in taxes. Corporations have two items that matter when it comes to selling goods or services. 1. Cost of Goods Sold. COGS truly encompasses ALL of a business’ expenses no matter how the financial statement is broken down. Every expense is truly a cost of doing business. All of those expenses are built into the selling price of a good. That includes taxes. 2. Income. Only after all expenses are accounted for and products properly priced can a business actually earn an income. If taxes go up, product prices go up to account for that change. A business has to earn money to survive. It needs a surplus of money to grow. If taxes go down, product prices go down (Think Wal-Mart). Corporate taxes are where the consumer gets reamed. Every purchase you make, you are paying corporate taxes.

#### Links to politics, Republicans hate new taxes

Klein 11 (Ezra Klein, staff writer, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/why-does-the-gop-hates-taxes-so-much/2011/05/09/AFBBnMzG\_blog.html “Why does the GOP hate taxes so much?”)

The GOP doesn’t just hate taxes. They hate taxes so much that their stated position is they’d prefer no deficit reduction, and even a default on the debt ceiling, to even a dollar in new taxes. They hate taxes, in other words, more than they like balanced budgets, or fear a federal default. Hating taxes is the absolute, number-one core belief of the modern GOP. The question is, why?

## AT CP FUEL TAXES-NEXT GEN SPECIFIC:

#### Perm Do Both, any increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote Aff because it outweighs any risk of their one shot DA.

#### Solvency deficit-even though their fuel taxes CP may solve our warming advantage, it in no way solves our aviation advantage, because it does not affect the aviation control systems, which make flying cheaper for the consumer, when you increase the price the airlines have to pay for fuel, they will inevitably contemplate by increasing prices for customers thus decreases the amount of customers therefore turning there economy point.

#### This links to their net benefit-links to politics, taxes are extremely unpopular in an election year

Cards

link to politics

Government becomes dependent on revenue from taxes, then they don’t help the environment, they do more flying to make more money

Fuel Taxes hurt economy

Skyrocketing Fuel Taxes Cause Huge Decreases in Airline Income-Scandinavia Proves Reuters, 12 (3 May 2012, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/03/sas-idUSL5E8G31CO20120503>, HS)

May 3 (Reuters) - Scandinavian airline SAS posted a first-quarter loss that was more than twice analyst forecasts, hurt by a weak economic environment and rocketing jet fuel prices. SAS has been struggling for years with higher costs than no-frills competitors like Ryanair and Norwegian Air Shuttle. The airline, half-owned by Sweden, Norway and Denmark, made a pretax loss of 1.1 billion Swedish crowns ($163 million) against a Reuters poll forecast loss of 514 million and compared with a 558 million crown loss in the year-ago period. "The negative trend was due to sharp increases in jet-fuel prices, the uncertain economic climate and the fact that the earnings effects of the 4Excellence program will not be generated until the latter part of 2012," Chief Executive Rickard Gustafson said in a statement on Thursday.

# AT CP He3 – HSR specific

#### Perm Do Both

#### Transportation Infrastructure Necessary For He3 Mining

Cunningham Former Apollo Astronaut 2010(Walter  [**http://www.chron.com/disp**/**story**.**mpl**/**editorial**/**outlook**/**6854790**.**html**](http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/outlook/6854790.html)**, helium 3,**  2-6 2011, RW)

There are obstacles in the path of a helium 3 fusion future, both technical and political. Developing a reactor that will create more energy than it consumes to create a helium 3 fusion reaction will be daunting. Then there are the problems of developing of lunar mining techniques and a cost effective transportation infrastructure between Earth and the moon. The political problem is almost as acute. The Fusion Technology Institute is funded with private money, as the Energy Department thinks that space based helium 3 is a NASA problem and NASA thinks fusion energy is an Energy Department problem.

#### Plan Solves Better than the CP alone – That’s our Dutzik et al 10 evidence. HSR cuts emissions dramatically and cleans up our air. Ay increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote aff

#### Counterplan isn’t competitive – they have no net benefit

**He3 Relies on Fusion – Still 50 Years Away**

**Irvine ‘06** (Dean Irvine, CNN Reporter, 12/18/06, “Mining the moon for a nuclear future,” http://articles.cnn.com/2006-12-18/tech/fs.moonmining\_1\_helium-3-moon-base-nuclear-fusion?\_s=PM:TECH, ESW)

However, while mining helium-3 from the moon will be one challenge, extracting energy from it is another, as it relies on nuclear fusion, rather than fission used in today's nuclear reactors. Scientists have been working to prove nuclear fusion works but much of it still remains theoretical. It is thought to be at least 50 years from being proven to work on a large scale.

#### 3 Million People die each year from air pollution and they don’t solve until 50 years later – that’s our Roberts 02 evidence

#### Also – they don’t solve for our economics advantage.

#### Fusion Years Away and Too Costly

**Than ‘10** (Ker Than, Masters in Science from NYU and Reporter for the National Geographic News, 1/28/10, “Fusion Power a Step Closer After Giant Laser Blast,” http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2010/01/100128-nuclear-fusion-power-lasers-science/, ESW)

If successful, the upcoming nuclear fusion experiment will create two classes of energetic particles: alpha particles and neutrons. "The neutrons escape and can be used to do things like heat up water"—which could potentially be used to produce steam to drive turbines in an electrical plant, Glenzer said. "The alpha particles remain trapped [in the burning sphere] and continue to heat the fuel and make it burn," as happens in a star. Scientists estimate that if they can get to the point where they can burn about five fuel pellets a second, a power plant could continuously generate up to a gigawatt of energy—about what the city of San Francisco is consuming at any given moment. A working prototype of a such a plant could be built in a decade, Glenzer said. Cheaper to Burn Cash? Nuclear fusion researcher Michael Mauel is "very excited" about the recent experiment and said it shows the ignition method works as expected. But "whether or not we'll have lasers imploding pellets to make fusion energy—it's way too early to tell," said Mauel, who was not involved in the study, which will be published in the journal Science tomorrow. In addition to the considerable engineering challenges involved in ramping up the laser systems for wide-scale use, the cost of the fuel pellets will also have to come down, said Mauel, a Columbia University physicist. "Each one of these costs between ten [thousand] and a hundred thousand dollars," Mauel said. To use the pellet method to generate nuclear fusion power, "they'll have to cost less than ten cents a piece."

#### Helium 3 takes too long to build to solve oil dependency and has too many tech barriers. Our internal link is much stronger

Hickman, writer at the guardian, 2011 ( Leo, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/aug/23/fusion-power-is-it-getting-closer>, Fusion power: is it getting any closer? August 23, RW)

ITER's projected costs are already rocketing, and politicians across Europe have expressed concern, demanding that budgets be capped. Fusion energy also has its environmental detractors. When the ITER project was announced in 2005, Greenpeace said it ["deplored"](http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/press/releases/ITERprojectFrance/) the project, arguing that the money could be better spent building offshore wind turbines. "Advocates of fusion research predict that the first commercial fusion electricity might be delivered in 50-80 years from now," said Jan Vande Putte, Greenpeace International's nuclear campaigner. "But most likely, it will lead to a dead end, as the technical barriers to be overcome are enormous." Meanwhile, there is criticism from some plasma physicists that the design of ITER is wrong and alternative designs might produce better results for much less money.

#### Economic collapse is the biggest impact in the round – that’s Khalilzad 11

**Their launches produce huge amounts of carbon which means they kill the environment before they can reduce dependence and turns the case**

 Patel-Predd, writer for Discover Magazine, 2007 (Prachi “A Spaceport for Treehuggers”, <http://discovermagazine.com/2007/dec/a-spaceport-for-tree-huggers>, November 26, RW, )

Starting in 2009, tourists with deep pockets will be able to enjoy something fewer than 500 people have been lucky enough to experience—spaceflight. For $200,000, if all goes well, they can orbit for two and a half hours in Virgin Galactic’s [SpaceShipTwo](http://discovermagazine.com/2007/oct/the-granddaddy-of-space-colonization). But the port for landing and takeoff—Spaceport America in New Mexico—will also be sensitive to the needs of those stuck on Earth. The [plans](http://www.spaceportamerica.com/photo-gallery/), revealed in September, show a teardrop-shaped building with high-tech ventilation systems, solar panels, and massive windows, all features that could earn it top [certification](http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=64&) for efficiency and energy savings by the U.S. Green Building Council. The port’s designer, Norman Foster, founder of Foster + Partners, says it will be “an ecologically sound model for future Spaceports.” For a place that may launch two rockets out of the atmosphere each day, will solar panels and natural light really make a difference in its environmental impact? What amount of carbon emissions are involved in space travel anyway? One trip in SpaceShipTwo along with its launch vehicle, WhiteKnightTwo, has a [carbon footprint](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbon_footprint) equal to that of one business-class passenger flying round-trip between New York and London, says Virgin Galactic president Will Whitehorn. By 2011, the company expects to be launching two flights a day. Although no firm figures for carbon dioxide emissions are available for SpaceShipTwo, a single NASA [space shuttle](http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/shuttle/main/index.html) launch produces 28 tons of carbon dioxide. With two space shuttle launches per year, on average, that amounts to roughly 5 tons of carbon dioxide per month (by comparison, your average car generates about half a ton per month). Where the numbers really pile up is in the operation of Kennedy Space Center, which includes pumping 300,000 gallons of water to protect the shuttle from launch vibrations, moving the rockets, and keeping hundreds of tons of liquid oxygen and hydrogen cool. That makes for a monthly carbon footprint over 900 times that given off by the shuttle’s solid rocket boosters in one launch. Furthermore, 23 tons of harmful [particulate matter](http://www.epa.gov/air/particles/) settle around the launch area each liftoff, and nearly 13 tons of hydrochloric acid kill fish and plants within half a mile of the site. In all, the environmental cost per launch is the same as that of New York City over a weekend, Whitehorn says.

#### He3 Unfeasible And Will Create Nuke Waste

**Williams ‘07** (Mark Williams, Technology Support Specialist and Writer for MIT Technology Review, 7/23/07, “Mining the Moon,” <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/408558/mining-the-moon/>. ESW)

Advocates of He3-based fusion point to the fact that current efforts to develop fusion-based power generation, like the ITER megaproject, use the deuterium-tritium fuel cycle, which is problematical. (See "International Fusion Research.") Deuterium and tritium are both hydrogen isotopes, and when they're fused in a superheated plasma, two nuclei come together to create a helium nucleus--consisting of two protons and two neutrons--and a high-energy neutron. A deuterium-tritium fusion reaction releases 80 percent of its energy in a stream of high-energy neutrons, which are highly destructive for anything they hit, including a reactor's containment vessel. Since tritium is highly radioactive, that makes containment a big problem as structures weaken and need to be replaced. Thus, whatever materials are used in a deuterium-tritium fusion power plant will have to endure serious punishment. And if that's achievable, when that fusion reactor is eventually decommissioned, there will still be a lot of radioactive waste. Helium-3 advocates claim that it, conversely, would be nonradioactive, obviating all those problems. But a serious critic has charged that in reality, He3-based fusion isn't even a feasible option. In the August issue of Physics World, theoretical physicist Frank Close, at Oxford in the UK, has published an article called "Fears Over Factoids" in which, among other things, he summarizes some claims of the "helium aficionados," then dismisses those claims as essentially fantasy. Close points out that in a tokamak--a machine that generates a doughnut-shaped magnetic field to confine the superheated plasmas necessary for fusion--deuterium reacts up to 100 times more slowly with helium-3 than it does with tritium. In a plasma contained in a tokamak, Close stresses, all the nuclei in the fuel get mixed together, so what's most probable is that two deuterium nuclei will rapidly fuse and produce a tritium nucleus and proton. That tritium, in turn, will likely fuse with deuterium and finally yield one helium-4 atom and a neutron. In short, Close says, if helium-3 is mined from the moon and brought to Earth, in a standard tokamak the final result will still be deuterium-tritium fusion. Second, Close rejects the claim that two helium-3 nuclei could realistically be made to fuse with each other to produce deuterium, an alpha particle and energy. That reaction occurs even more slowly than deuterium-tritium fusion, and the fuel would have to be heated to impractically high temperatures--six times the heat of the sun's interior, by some calculations--that would be beyond the reach of any tokamak. Hence, Close concludes, "the lunar-helium-3 story is, to my mind, moonshine." Close's objection, however, assumes that deuterium-helium-3 fusion and pure helium-3 fusion would take place in tokamak-based reactors. There might be alternatives: for example, Gerald Kulcinski, a professor of nuclear engineering at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, has maintained the only helium-3 fusion reactor in the world on an annual budget that's barely into six figures. Kulcinski's He3-based fusion reactor, located in the Fusion Technology Institute at the University of Wisconsin, is very small. When running, it contains a spherical plasma roughly 10 centimeters in diameter that can produce sustained fusion with 200 million reactions per second. To produce a milliwatt of power, unfortunately, the reactor consumes a kilowatt. Close's response is, therefore, valid enough: "When practical fusion occurs with a demonstrated net power output, I--and the world's fusion community--can take note." Still, that critique applies equally to ITER and the tokamak-based reactor effort, which also haven't yet achieved breakeven (the point at which a fusion reactor produces as much energy as it consumes). What's significant about the reactor in Wisconsin is that, as Kulcinski says, "We are doing both deuterium-He3 and He3-He3 reactions. We run deuterium-He3 fusion reactions daily, so we are very familiar with that reaction. We are also doing He3-He3 because if we can control that, it will have immense potential." The reactor at the Fusion Technology Institute uses a technology called inertial electrostatic confinement (IEC). Kulcinski explains: "If we used a tokamak to do deuterium-helium-3, it would need to be bigger than the ITER device, which already is stretching the bounds of credibility.

#### Mining links to politics- costs too much money, consumes more energy than it produces and too much confusion about the role of agencies.

Cunningham, Former Apollo Astronaut, 2010 (Walter,  <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/outlook/6854790.html>, helium 3, 2-6 2011, RW)

There are obstacles in the path of a helium 3 fusion future, both technical and political. Developing a reactor that will create more energy than it consumes to create a helium 3 fusion reaction will be daunting. Then there are the problems of developing of lunar mining techniques and a cost effective transportation infrastructure between Earth and the moon. The political problem is almost as acute. The Fusion Technology Institute is funded with private money, as the Energy Department thinks that space based helium 3 is a NASA problem and NASA thinks fusion energy is an Energy Department problem.

#### Lunar mining costs too much and links to politics

The Ecologist, 11 (<http://www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/962678/plans_to_strip_mine_the_moon_may_soon_be_more_than_just_sciencefiction.html>, “plans to strip mine the moon soon be more than just science-fiction, july 4, 2011, RW)

According to Genge it costs US$25,000 per kilo to lift things into space on a shuttle. Thus, whatever is mined in space in the future, it will have to be in high-enough demand to subsidise the cost of launching it. This is especially true for prospecting missions beyond the Moon. A mission to retrieve Helium-3 from Jupiter’s atmosphere, for example, would take ten years, and businesses will likely be reluctant to wait a decade for a return on such a pricy investment, says Genge. Another potential lunar resource – water – could fuel these future missions into deep space. Orbital scans suggest there are at least a billion tonnes of water frozen on the Moon after impacting in craters of the Moon’s surface – usually in the darker areas where temperatures can be as low as 35 degrees Kelvin. Texas-based Shackleton Energy Company has already begun operations aimed at mining the Moon within the next few years.   The company’s plans for mining and refining operations would involve melting the ice and purifying the water, converting the water into gaseous hydrogen and oxygen, and then condensing the gases into liquid hydrogen, liquid oxygen and hydrogen peroxide, all potential rocket fuels. Shackleton CEO Dale Tietz says the water extracted would be used almost exclusively as rocket fuel to power operations both within Low Earth Orbit (LEO) – such as space tourism and the removal of space-debris – on the Moon, and further out into space. ‘We are a for-profit business enterprise moving forward, and so we are only going there really for one reason and that is to mine, prospect mine and harvest water for rocket propellant production,’ says Tietz. Private investors interested in the moon Shackleton plans to set up several refuelling service stations in LEO that would free exploratory, commercial and tourist shuttles from lifting all their fuel from Earth. Shackleton believes the stations would also enable an entirely new category of space vehicle shuttles that operate only at or beyond LEO. Tietz says Shackleton is currently in phase one of a four-phase operation to mine water on the Moon. Phase one involves gathering teams for the mission and investors to fund it, as well as detailed mission planning. Phase two would involve launching two unmanned rover vehicles to prospect areas of the Moon for water deposits. The Shackleton crater at the south pole on the dark side of the Moon, among many others, is believed to retain a significant portion of the Moon’s water. Tietz says ‘there’s a great deal of interest out there’ from potential investors. ‘This will not be funded by any government or any federal agency like NASA. This is all going to be – if it ever happens – it will all be private investment,’ continues Tietz. In a June 2009 article in the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers magazine Spectrum, Shackleton founder Bill Stone wrote that lunar prospecting could cost as much as $20 billion over a decade. ‘At the moment, no country seems eager to foot the bill,’ writes Stone. ‘Where governments fail to act on a vitally important opportunity, the private sector can and should step in.’ Stone outlined that, to save $1 billion during the initial staging of the lunar mining base, the first human team would only take enough fuel to land and establish the base—not enough for a return trip to Earth. ‘This may sound radical, but the human crew who will undertake this mission will do so knowing that their success and survival depend on in situ fuel generation for the return. Should they fail, theirs will be a one-way trip; the risk is theirs to take,’ writes Stone. ‘For government-sponsored space agencies, such a concept is unthinkable; they cannot tolerate the political risk of failure. Yet it is the only viable business choice. Centuries of explorers made the same hard choice in pushing the limits on land, sea, and air. It’s time to carry it forward into space.’

# AT CP ITAR - HSR Specific

Perm do both

Perm do the counterplan

Any inclination of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote aff – it outweighs the risk of the one shot disad.

#### ITAR is key to preventing military technological transfer to maintain a US advantage

Hahn, Major in the United States Air Force, 9 – (Ila, April 2009, “Managing US Military Technology and Arms Release Policy to Israel,” <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA539666>) TJ

Military technology is protected by the DoD via the International Program Security Initiative. This multilayered approach to protect sensitive military program information is vital to ensure U.S. national security and to maintain the most technologically advanced military in the world. In accordance with the laws governing defense export, the Defense Technology Security Administration (DTSA) is chartered to be the DoD’s agency in administering the International Technology Security Program. DTSA’s mission includes “maintaining the U.S. military technological advantage while supporting interoperable coalition forces.” 42 Potential technology exchange is evaluated during the licensing process and only when it is determined to be in the U.S. national interest to share information, is technology release authorized. Each nation is treated differently based on its relationship to the U.S. and any international and bilateral agreements that may be in place. Within the guidelines of the export laws and directives listed above, there are two main channels for nations to obtain arms and military technology: government programs and commercial programs. Commercial programs are those that are initiated by a contractor, such as a direct commercial sale. 43 These programs, when used for defense articles, require licensing or export authorization through the ITAR processes. This method of export side-steps many of the other governmental controls in place to monitor arms exports and is typically used for items that are not as high-tech or sophisticated. Sales of items that are considered dual-use (items that have both a civilian and military use) also fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce under the Bureau of Industry and Security. Such items are additionally regulated to ensure that all national security controls are in place, sales are consistent with U.S. policy and items are not in short supply. 44

**Solvency deficit: The counterplan can’t solve for our air pollution advantage – only (high speed rail) can drastically reduce harmful air pollutants.**

#### ITAR doesn't interfere with competitiveness

Burris, Major, 10 – (Mathew, January 1, 2010, “Tilting at Windmills? The Counterposing Policy Interests Driving The US Commercial Satellite Export Control Reform Debate,” <http://www.faqs.org/periodicals/201001/2218309341.html>) TJ

I have been in this business for 23 years and can speak from first-hand experience - ITAR is not at the root of any levels of competition in our industry, especially for launchers and spacecraft... I would state that in only a small percentage of cases ITAR has had any significant impact on the numbers of spacecraft units or revenue figures. ITAR just does not have a significant impact... I don't see that compliance is bad at all. At Sea Launch we have learned to work with ITAR as we operate in so many cultures and foreign nations. We all work together in a seamless manner.

**We have the vital internal link into competitiveness - Not shifting to a post-industrial knowledge economy poses the greatest threat to US competitiveness – the plan reinvigorates the US economy by generating long term growth – that’s Florida and Todorovich.**

### AT CP microalgae

#### 1. Perm: Do both

#### Perm solves best

DTE 12 (Down To Earth, an Indian environmental organization, citing Pushpito Ghosh, diraector of the marine chemicals association in India, May 30th 2012, <http://www.downtoearth.org.in/content/biodiesel-microalgae-becomes-reality>, DS)

Haridas says there are a few major bottlenecks that need to be overcome before this technology can be commercialised. “We have to reduce the cost of production which added up to Rs 150/litre for the project,” he says “Our first goal is to make it cheaper than vegetable oils. Then we’re going to try and make it cheaper than fossil fuel,” Haridas adds. The cost can be brought down, says Ghosh. “There are ways to go about it. Dry microalgal mass has nutrients which can be used for poultry. Also, we extracted 10 per cent of biofuel from the biomass. If we can up this to 20 per cent it will automatically cut cost,” he notes. Algae grow for 120 days a year. “If we can grow it year-long, that would be beneficial too,” Ghosh adds. India’s diesel needs are 60 million tonnes a year, says Ghosh. “Solving the fuel crisis is a multipronged approach. One type of fuel cannot solve it. We need a combination of fossil and biofuels to combat the problem,” he states.

#### 2. It can’t be proven that the CP will help the economy-more testing has to be done

Schulz 6 (Thomas Schulz, Research associate at the Western Austrailian dept. of agriculture, December 2006, <http://www.climatebabes.com/documents/Algae_biodieselTSDec06.pdf>, DS)

R&D has to be done before the production of micro-algae as a stand alone biofuel project can play a competitive role in the fuel industry. One requirement to achieve the potential of the micro-algae industry is the development of long-term large scale demonstration projects so it can be shown that it is commercially viable to produce biofuels through micro-algae. The cost of these projects will be very high. Hence, the initial application of micro-algae mass cultures for renewable energy production and Greenhouse gas abatement are in the area of human, animal and industrial wastes which contain enough nutrients for algal growth. Nevertheless if algae oil can be produced as a by-product of higher valued algal products and carbon credits can be used to increase the revenue side of these businesses algae oil can play much earlier a role in the future transportation fuel mix.

3. The counterplan has no inherency-it’s being researched now
Richardson et al. 10 (James Richardson, Regents professor and Texas Agrilife Reseach senior faculty fellow, at the Texas A&M Department of agricultural economics, date not specified, 2010 <http://www.agbioforum.org/v13n2/v13n2a04-richardson.htm>, DS)

Presently, the US Department of Energy has requested proposals to fund a three-year research project for inter-disciplinary consortiums to rapidly advance our ability to produce economical biodiesel from algae. Several consortiums have been formed with the top algae researchers in the United States and a large number of industrial partners. The charge is to develop the science to support a sustainable algae industry in the United States. This turn of events confirms there is continued interest in producing algal oil.

#### 4. The counterplan costs a ton more than regular fuel-it links to spending/tradeoff

Briggs 4 (By Michael Briggs, University of New Hampshire, Physics Department 10/3/04 “Widescale Biodiesel Production from Algae” http://www.americanenergyindependence.com/algaefarms.aspx)

In "The Controlled Eutrophication process: Using Microalgae for CO2 Utilization and Agircultural Fertilizer Recycling"3, the authors

estimated a cost per hectare of $40,000 for algal ponds. In their model, the algal ponds would be built around the Salton Sea (in the Sonora desert) feeding off of the agircultural waste streams that normally pollute the Salton Sea with over 10,000 tons of nitrogen and phosphate fertilizers each year. The estimate is based on fairly large ponds, 8 hectares in size each. To be conservative (since their estimate is fairly optimistic), we'll arbitrarily increase the cost per hectare by 100% as a margin of safety. That brings the cost per hectare to $80,000. Ponds equivalent to their design could be built around the country, using wastewater streams (human, animal, and agricultural) as feed sources. We found that at NREL's yield rates, 15,000 square miles (3.85 million hectares) of algae ponds would be needed to replace all petroleum transportation fuels with biodiesel. At the cost of $80,000 per hectare, that would work out to roughly $308 billion to build the farms. The operating costs (including power consumption, labor, chemicals, and fixed capital costs (taxes, maintenance, insurance, depreciation, and return on investment) worked out to $12,000 per hectare. That would equate to $46.2 billion per year for all the algae farms, to yield all the oil feedstock necessary for the entire country. Compare that to the $100-150 billion the US spends each year just on purchasing crude oil from foreign countries, with all of that money leaving the US economy.

#### 5. It can’t be harvested, and isn’t economically feasible

Richardson et al. 10 (James Richardson, Regents professor and Texas Agrilife Reseach senior faculty fellow, at the Texas A&M Department of agricultural economics, date not specified, 2010 <http://www.agbioforum.org/v13n2/v13n2a04-richardson.htm>, DS)

The laboratory experiments showed that the production of algae oil was feasible in 1998 (Sheehan et al., 1998). However, we have yet to see any full-scale algae farms because three issues have yet to be addressed. An efficient process to harvest the algae has not been demonstrated. An efficient process to separate the natural oil from the algae has not been created. The economic viability of algae farms at realistic prices has not been proven. Research has been conducted around the world to find the best strains of algae for different climates/seasons, to develop the best growth medium, to develop the best pond structure, and to test harvesting and separation technologies (Sheehan, et al. 1998).

#### 6. Microalgae unpopular with GOP opposing

Peek 12 (Liz is a staff writer for fox news 3/6/12 “Make no mistake, President Obama is already in full campaign mode <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/03/06/make-no-mistake-president-obama-is-already-in-full-campaign-mode/#ixzz1zVlyNpde>)

Rising gasoline prices allow Republicans to revisit the president’s decision to block construction of the Keystone XL pipeline – an unpopular move widely seen as a bone tossed to the environmental lobby. Though the pipeline itself would have made no difference to gsoline prices any time soon, it feeds the GOP narrative that the president’s love affair with green energy (most recently algae) is fanciful and unrealistic. This is the realm of ice-cold economics in which Mitt Romney can score some hits (think Solyndra, the Chevy Volt et al), and the White House knows it.

### AT CP Naval Power

#### 1. Permutation: Do Both

There is no reason not to do both. Plus we can solve for economic hegemony and hard power hegemony by doing both. Any increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote aff because of the affirmatives impact of [specify impact]. That increase of solvency, it outweighs the risk of a one-shot disadvantage.

#### 2. Solvency Deficit

CP can’t solve [Econ Advantage] because [increasing the size of the military doesn’t help the economy.]

CP can’t solve [air pollution advantage] because [ the US military is the largest emitter of carbon dioxide and greenhouse gases so increasing the size and strength of the Navy will only increase the amount of pollution going into the air.]

#### Turn: The US Military is the biggest polluter in the world. The only way to solve would be to not do the CP.

Merchant, Freelance writer with treehugger.com, 2010 n(Brian Merchant Brian Merchant is a freelance writer and editor living in Brooklyn, NY. He covers politics for TreeHugger, with a focus on climate and energy issues. Brian has written for Slate, Paste, Salon, GOOD, and the Huffington Post, among many others. November 1, 2010 <http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/us-military-still-the-worlds-largest-polluter.html> “US Military: Still the World's Largest Polluter” KT)

Recent news that the US military was striving -- and investing heavily -- to improve its renewable energy technologies inspired a good deal of commentary and optimism. Here, after all, was an ironclad case where greener tech saved lives, further reports noted. When the military dumps money into a technology, after all, that means that breakthroughs in the private sector could follow suit. The US military, therefore, could be a prime driver of solar power to mass market by scaling up manufacturing infrastructure. But let's not forget that the US military, that most massive influence on industry, is still the world's largest polluter. Period. It's a nice to think that the military's push for renewable power will spill over into the private sector, but it's also important to recognize what an environmentally destructive and debilitating force the military is in the first place. Here's Earth Talk: According to the nonprofit watchdog group, Project Censored, American forces generate some 750,000 tons of toxic waste annually--more than the five largest U.S. chemical companies combined. Although this pollution occurs globally on U.S. bases in dozens of countries, there are tens of thousands of toxic "hot spots" on some 8,500 military properties right here on America soil. Meanwhile, the U.S. military manages 25 million acres of land that provides habitat for some 300 threatened or endangered species. The military has harmed endangered animal populations by bomb tests (and been sued for it), reports Project Censored, and military testing of low-frequency underwater sonar technology has been implicated in the stranding deaths of whales worldwide. Despite being linked to such problems, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) has repeatedly sought exemptions from Congress for compliance with federal laws including the Migratory Bird Treaties Act, the Wildlife Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. And all this is to say nothing of the greenhouse gas emissions the military produces, which, though tougher to tally, are huge. The military's efforts to "go green" have been widely documented, since it makes for a captivating sort of 'opposites attract' narrative, and it's undeniably a good thing that the military is reducing its carbon footprint. But don't forget that there's a truly massive industrial complex built into the core of the military that pollutes on a breathtaking scale -- and that the greenest thing that could be done to the military would be to scale it down.

#### Air pollution causes extinction

Driesen 3 (David, Associate Professor – Syracuse Univeristy Law, 10 Buff. Envt'l. L.J. 25, Fall/Spring, Lexis)

Air pollution can make life unsustainable by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development's meaning for air quality. The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." 3 While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. 4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns. 5

#### 3. CP links to the politics disadvantage. Obama’s recent military cuts prove that he would have to use political capital to increase military spending when he had already cut it. That means it’s a flip-flop.

#### Flip-flops destroy the agenda and kill political capital.

Goddard, Creator of Political Wire, 2009 (Taegan (One of the Most Widely-Read and Influential Political Web Sites on the Internet), "Does Obama Practice a Different Kind of Politics?", CQ Politics, 3-19, http://innovation.cq.com/ liveonline/51/landing KT)

# Dan from Philadelphia: How quickly is Obama burning through his political capital? Will he have anything left to actually keep some of his promises? With potential shifts from his campaign stances on the question of Gitmo, Iraq troop withdrawals and taxing employer healthcare benefits, it seems he is in for tough fights on all fronts. # Taegan Goddard: That's a great question. I think Obama spends some of his political capital every time he makes an exception to his principles -- such as hiring a lobbyist to a key position or overlooking an appointee not paying their taxes. Policy reversals such as the ones you note burn through even more of this precious capital.

#### CP Politically impossible – trades-off with Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid and increases taxes

 Clifton, national security reporter **bachelor's degree from Bates College and a master's degree in international political economy from the London School of Economics,** 12 (Eli, June 18th 2012, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/06/18/501157/experts-stumped-romney-military-spending/?mobile=nc>.,”Budget Experts Stumped By Romney’s Plan To Grow Military Spending While Cutting Revenue”, BK)

Mitt Romney’s pledge to massively increase military spending — close to a $2 trillion increase over the next ten years and boosting the Pentagon’s base budget to 4 percent of GDP — combined with his promises to cuts taxes and reduce the national debt is leaving many national security and defense experts scratching their heads, particularly because the presumptive GOP presidential nominee has not said how he’d pay for it. A poll of defense budget experts conducted by Defense News finds that Romney’s pledge to grow the defense budget “appears politically impossible, if technically doable.” Todd Harrison, a senior fellow for defense budget studies at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments said about Romney’s plan: If you put all of the promises together, it doesn’t all add up. The administration may change, but the math remains the same. Harrison said. If you want to increase spending on defense over the next decade and reduce the deficit, then that necessarily means sharp reductions in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid or sharp increases in taxes, or some combination of the two. Indeed, previous increases in defense costs, specifically those incurred by wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, were largely paid for by increasing the deficit instead of through reductions in domestic spending or raising taxes. That decision, said Defense Leon Panetta last week, was a “mistake.” “Frankly all of us bear the responsibility to bear those costs if we’re willing to engage in war,” said Panetta. But that commitment to balance defense spending against budget cuts and/or tax hikes is nowhere to be seen in Romney’s proposals to grow military spending. “I think with any discussion of major increases to any aspect of federal spending at this point, you have to say what the offset is,” Michèle Flournoy, who until recently served as President Obama’s undersecretary of defense for policy, told DefenseNews. “You have to say what you are cutting instead. Are you increasing revenues to do that?” Peter Singer of the Brookings Institution said last month that Romney’s military spending plan doesn’t “reflect fiscal reality.” Indeed, Romney, who has committed to cutting taxes, has already effectively ruled out the possibility of raising taxes to pay for military spending. That leaves unpopular reductions in Medicare and other domestic spending to balance the budget in a Romney presidency. But “they don’t want to specify those, because they don’t want to lose the senior citizen vote,” said Gordon Adams, who oversaw defense budgeting at the White House’s Office of Management and Budget during the Clinton administration.

#### United States naval capabilities are rivaled by no one. We will not be challenged for 50 years

Farley 07 (Robert is an assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, University of Kentucky. He contributes to the blogs Lawyers, Guns, and Money and TAPPED, October 23, 2007, The False Decline of the U.S. Navy <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the_false_decline_of_the_us_navy>) KT

The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years.

#### Naval power resilient—no challengers to overwhelming U.S. power

Posen, Professor of Political Science at MIT 2003 (Barry R., 2003, “Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony”, International Security, Vol. 28, No. 1, UTDallas McDermott Library, KT)

Command of the commons is the military foundation of U.S. political preeminence. It is the key enabler of the hegemonic foreign policy that the United States has pursued since the end of the Cold War. The military capabilities required to secure command of the commons are the U.S. suit. They leverage science technology, and economic resources. They rely on highly trained, highly skilled, and increasingly highly paid military personnel. On the whole, the U.S. military advantage at sea, in the air, and in space will be very difficult to challenge –let alone overcome. Command is further secured by the worldwide U.S. base structure and the ability of U.S. diplomacy to leverage other sources of U.S. power to secure additional bases and overflight rights as needed.

#### CP can’t solve, it’s based on false assumptions that an increased military increases power projection

The Herald Sun 7/1/12 (The Herald Sun is the newspaper of Durham, NC, July 1, 2012 <http://www.heraldsun.com/view/full_story/19167965/article-Shaky-assumptions-about-military-spending> “Shaky Assumptions About Military Spending” KT

Fear can be a great motivator – and a great manipulator. Those who oppose cuts to military funding play on our fears to convince us that any reduction in the defense budget would be a dangerous threat to our national security and to our economy. But is this level of panic justified? An examination of the assumptions that underlie the fears will expose just how shaky those assumptions are. Shaky Assumption 1: The US must control, by force, the air, seas, and land of the entire planet. Why such overwhelming military power? The United States spends more on our military than our next 14 military competitors combined -- six times more than China, 13 times more than Russia, and 73 times more than Iran. While we funnel roughly half of our discretionary tax dollars into military programs, China is capturing the market for solar panels. Most countries are fearlessly investing in health care and education for their citizens while the U.S. is pulling funding from those very hallmarks of a great society. The result is that the U.S. now ranks 37th on health indicators and our students rank 14th in reading, 17th in science and 25th in math. Shaky Assumption 2: We need high priced weapons systems such as the F-15 and the “advanced multi-role stealth fighter jet” to keep us safe. Our current “enemies” have no air force and no navy, and it is a stretch to claim that terrorists even have an army. The Rand Corporation, a think-tank allied with U.S. government military and intelligence forces, concluded that there is no battlefield solution to terrorism. Since 1968, only 7 percent of all terrorist groups were taken down by military force. In contrast, 40 percent of those groups were defeated through police and intelligence work, and 43 percent gave up their terrorist tactics as they were integrated into the political process. Shaky Assumption 3: The military is a good jobs program. According to analysts at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, spending $1 billon on education and mass transit would produce more than twice as many jobs as spending $1 billion on defense. Spending on healthcare and construction for home weatherization and infrastructure would produce about 1-1/2 times as many jobs. The Pentagon spends $1 million a year to field a soldier in Afghanistan. With that same amount, we could hire nearly 30 teachers for a year. Additionally, many jobs learned in the military do not translate to civilian employment, so the jobless rate for returning veterans is far higher than for the general population.

### AT CP No Child Left Behind (Econ DO NOT USE FOR NEOLIBERALISM)

#### Perm do both: Not mutually exclusive anything that increases the chance at solvency should be done and there’s no textual competition

#### Perm do the plan and all non competitive parts of the CP

#### Solvency deficit: They can’t solve our I/L on economy they don’t provide any direct stimulus and the benefits of repealing NCLB would be too far off to help

#### [Put in analysis for why they link to their net benefit]

#### No Child Left Behind is good for everyone

Byrne lawyer who represents special-needs children, no date (Bill, http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/nclb.byrne.gazette.htm, “No Child Left Behind Really? Why I like this law” JG)

The federal No Child Left Behind law changes all this, and puts the burden on school systems to show that schools are doing their job. The law requires schools to be accountable for the progress of students — all students — not just “the best and the brightest.” The law requires schools to test all children to see where they are, to establish a baseline, and then to measure progress. Importantly, schools can’t lump all kids together so that the bright ones bring up the average for all. Schools have to measure progress in subgroups, so we can see on annual report cards how the school is doing with disabled kids, poor kids, minority kids and kids of migratory workers for whom English is a second language. These are the groups of kids who historically get left behind. In addition to this report card aspect, there are provisions for reading programs, tutoring and teacher improvement. There is valid criticism about these provisions being an “unfunded mandate,” but history teaches us that this kind of criticism puts the cart before the horse. If we waited for “adequate funding” for anything important, we’d never get anywhere. Like wheelchair ramps and nonsmoking sections, the law has to demand certain behavior and accountability — and then the system finds the money to follow the law. Some say that No Child Left Behind is an indirect attack on public education, by those who want vouchers in lieu of public schools. But this is a diversion. The fact is that in many, many public schools, kids with disabilities are not learning to read and do math — while the vast majority of them can master these skills with proper instruction. I see nothing valuable in allowing a child (disabled or otherwise) to pass through the public education system for 12 years without learning to read and do math.

#### NCLB ensures good teaching

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: NCLB requires that all teachers be certified in the subject area they are teaching. This is intended to ensure that students have the best-trained teachers delivering instruction. It also specified minimum criteria for teacher assistants.

#### NCLB ensures academic improvement

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

NCLB developed an accountability model that required states to analyze progress of schools and the composite groups of children within them. In many states, for the first time, score analysis of groups of children by race, socioeconomic status, and disability was required. Further, it required that all groups of children must make adequate yearly progress. NCLB made it necessary to schools to focus on children with disabilities (and others), develop and implement strategies to move those students forward academically, and maintain continuous improvement.

#### NCLB holds schools accountable for their student’s failures

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: Accountability. NCLB has a series of consequences for covered schools (those with high numbers of low-income students) that fail to make adequate yearly progress. For example, if a school fails to make adequate progress in reading or math for two consecutive years, they must provide free tutoring services to the lowest performing, low-income students in the school until the school is no longer in need of improvement. Consequences become progressively serious. Ranging from allowing students to change schools to the most significant consequence, takeover by the state for a complete restructuring of management and instructional programs. NCLB also includes provisions to allow children to change schools if they attend a persistently dangerous school. This point, I applaud.

#### No Child Left Behind is extremely beneficial to all-around education, starts at an early age and drastically improves test scores- statistically proven

NCLB- No Child Left Behind is a non-profit organization dedicated to improving the education of America’s youth. 2009 ( No Child Left Behind, 2/2/09, <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/importance/nclbworking.html>, JV)

Multiple studies and reports show that student achievement is rising across America: The long-term Nation's Report Card (NAEP) results, released in July 2005, showed elementary school student achievement in reading and math at all-time highs and the achievement gap closing. For America's nine-year-olds in reading, more progress was made in five years than in the previous 28 combined. America's nine-year-olds posted the best scores in reading (since 1971) and math (since 1973) in the history of the report. America's 13-year-olds earned the highest math scores the test ever recorded. Reading and math scores for African American and Hispanic nine-year-olds reached an all-time high. Math scores for African American and Hispanic 13-year-olds reached an all-time high. Achievement gaps in reading and math between white and African American nine-year-olds and between white and Hispanic nine-year-olds are at an all-time low. The state-by-state Nation's Report Card results, released in October 2005, showed improved achievement in the earlier grades in which NCLB is focused. In the last two years, the number of fourth-graders who learned their fundamental math skills increased by 235,000—enough to fill 500 elementary schools! Across-the-board improvements were made in mathematics and in fourth-grade reading. African American and Hispanic students posted all-time highs in a number of categories. Forty-three states and the District of Columbia either improved academically or held steady in all categories (fourth- and eighth-grade reading and fourth- and eighth-grade math). The Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessments for Reading and Math, released in Dec. 2005, showed students in select urban school districts improving faster than their peers over the last two years. Fourth-graders in 8 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in math than the national average. Fourth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in reading than the national average. Eighth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made more progress in basic math skills than the national average. The Nation's Report Card Science 2005 Report found significant academic gains by fourth-graders. Overall, fourth-graders improved four points in science achievement over 1996 and 2000 levels, with the lowest-performing students making the largest gains. African American and Hispanic fourth-graders made significant gains as well, narrowing the achievement gap. And the Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessment for Science, released in Nov. 2006, showed narrower achievement gaps for low-income students than for the entire student body, between nearly all of the participating school districts and the nation.

### AT CP No Child Left Behind – HSR specific

#### Perm do both: Not mutually exclusive anything that increases the chance at solvency should be done and there’s no textual competition

#### Perm do the plan and all non competitive parts of the CP

#### Solvency deficit: They can’t solve our I/L on economy they don’t provide any direct stimulus, HSR is the only way to jumpstart our knowledge economy, to keep the US competitive, that’s Florida ‘5 they can’t solve the jobs internal because it would take too long to see any change that happens because of the bill, and they can’t solve mega regions because only HSR can solve that’s Tierney ‘12

#### [Analysis on why the link to net benefit]

#### Pltx: NCLB passed with resounding bipartisan support if he tried to repeal it Obama would look like he was making a political move for the election.

#### No Child Left Behind is good for everyone

Byrne lawyer who represents special-needs children, no date (Bill, http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/nclb.byrne.gazette.htm, “No Child Left Behind Really? Why I like this law” JG)

The federal No Child Left Behind law changes all this, and puts the burden on school systems to show that schools are doing their job. The law requires schools to be accountable for the progress of students — all students — not just “the best and the brightest.” The law requires schools to test all children to see where they are, to establish a baseline, and then to measure progress. Importantly, schools can’t lump all kids together so that the bright ones bring up the average for all. Schools have to measure progress in subgroups, so we can see on annual report cards how the school is doing with disabled kids, poor kids, minority kids and kids of migratory workers for whom English is a second language. These are the groups of kids who historically get left behind. In addition to this report card aspect, there are provisions for reading programs, tutoring and teacher improvement. There is valid criticism about these provisions being an “unfunded mandate,” but history teaches us that this kind of criticism puts the cart before the horse. If we waited for “adequate funding” for anything important, we’d never get anywhere. Like wheelchair ramps and nonsmoking sections, the law has to demand certain behavior and accountability — and then the system finds the money to follow the law. Some say that No Child Left Behind is an indirect attack on public education, by those who want vouchers in lieu of public schools. But this is a diversion. The fact is that in many, many public schools, kids with disabilities are not learning to read and do math — while the vast majority of them can master these skills with proper instruction. I see nothing valuable in allowing a child (disabled or otherwise) to pass through the public education system for 12 years without learning to read and do math.

#### NCLB ensures good teaching

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: NCLB requires that all teachers be certified in the subject area they are teaching. This is intended to ensure that students have the best-trained teachers delivering instruction. It also specified minimum criteria for teacher assistants.

#### NCLB ensures academic improvement

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

NCLB developed an accountability model that required states to analyze progress of schools and the composite groups of children within them. In many states, for the first time, score analysis of groups of children by race, socioeconomic status, and disability was required. Further, it required that all groups of children must make adequate yearly progress. NCLB made it necessary to schools to focus on children with disabilities (and others), develop and implement strategies to move those students forward academically, and maintain continuous improvement.

#### NCLB holds schools accountable for their student’s failures

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: Accountability. NCLB has a series of consequences for covered schools (those with high numbers of low-income students) that fail to make adequate yearly progress. For example, if a school fails to make adequate progress in reading or math for two consecutive years, they must provide free tutoring services to the lowest performing, low-income students in the school until the school is no longer in need of improvement. Consequences become progressively serious. Ranging from allowing students to change schools to the most significant consequence, takeover by the state for a complete restructuring of management and instructional programs. NCLB also includes provisions to allow children to change schools if they attend a persistently dangerous school. This point, I applaud.

#### No Child Left Behind is extremely beneficial to all-around education, starts at an early age and drastically improves test scores- statistically proven

NCLB- No Child Left Behind is a non-profit organization dedicated to improving the education of America’s youth. 2009 ( No Child Left Behind, 2/2/09, <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/importance/nclbworking.html>, JV)

Multiple studies and reports show that student achievement is rising across America: The long-term Nation's Report Card (NAEP) results, released in July 2005, showed elementary school student achievement in reading and math at all-time highs and the achievement gap closing. For America's nine-year-olds in reading, more progress was made in five years than in the previous 28 combined. America's nine-year-olds posted the best scores in reading (since 1971) and math (since 1973) in the history of the report. America's 13-year-olds earned the highest math scores the test ever recorded. Reading and math scores for African American and Hispanic nine-year-olds reached an all-time high. Math scores for African American and Hispanic 13-year-olds reached an all-time high. Achievement gaps in reading and math between white and African American nine-year-olds and between white and Hispanic nine-year-olds are at an all-time low. The state-by-state Nation's Report Card results, released in October 2005, showed improved achievement in the earlier grades in which NCLB is focused. In the last two years, the number of fourth-graders who learned their fundamental math skills increased by 235,000—enough to fill 500 elementary schools! Across-the-board improvements were made in mathematics and in fourth-grade reading. African American and Hispanic students posted all-time highs in a number of categories. Forty-three states and the District of Columbia either improved academically or held steady in all categories (fourth- and eighth-grade reading and fourth- and eighth-grade math). The Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessments for Reading and Math, released in Dec. 2005, showed students in select urban school districts improving faster than their peers over the last two years. Fourth-graders in 8 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in math than the national average. Fourth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in reading than the national average. Eighth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made more progress in basic math skills than the national average. The Nation's Report Card Science 2005 Report found significant academic gains by fourth-graders. Overall, fourth-graders improved four points in science achievement over 1996 and 2000 levels, with the lowest-performing students making the largest gains. African American and Hispanic fourth-graders made significant gains as well, narrowing the achievement gap. And the Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessment for Science, released in Nov. 2006, showed narrower achievement gaps for low-income students than for the entire student body, between nearly all of the participating school districts and the nation.

### AT CP No Child Left Behind - Infrastructure Bank specific

#### Perm do both: Not mutually exclusive anything that increases the chance at solvency should be done and there’s no textual competition

#### Perm do the plan and all non competitive parts of the CP

#### Solvency deficit: They can’t solve our I/L on economy they don’t provide any direct stimulus and our McConaghy & Kessler, 11 card talks about how transportation is key to competitiveness that means we’re the only ones that can solve heg and the NiB is the only way to jumpstart employment, now is key that’s O’Connell ‘11

[Analysis on why they link to the net benefit]

#### Pltx: NCLB passed with resounding bipartisan support if he tried to repeal it Obama would look like he was making a political move for the election.

#### No Child Left Behind is good for everyone

Byrne lawyer who represents special-needs children, no date (Bill, http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/nclb.byrne.gazette.htm, “No Child Left Behind Really? Why I like this law” JG)

The federal No Child Left Behind law changes all this, and puts the burden on school systems to show that schools are doing their job. The law requires schools to be accountable for the progress of students — all students — not just “the best and the brightest.” The law requires schools to test all children to see where they are, to establish a baseline, and then to measure progress. Importantly, schools can’t lump all kids together so that the bright ones bring up the average for all. Schools have to measure progress in subgroups, so we can see on annual report cards how the school is doing with disabled kids, poor kids, minority kids and kids of migratory workers for whom English is a second language. These are the groups of kids who historically get left behind. In addition to this report card aspect, there are provisions for reading programs, tutoring and teacher improvement. There is valid criticism about these provisions being an “unfunded mandate,” but history teaches us that this kind of criticism puts the cart before the horse. If we waited for “adequate funding” for anything important, we’d never get anywhere. Like wheelchair ramps and nonsmoking sections, the law has to demand certain behavior and accountability — and then the system finds the money to follow the law. Some say that No Child Left Behind is an indirect attack on public education, by those who want vouchers in lieu of public schools. But this is a diversion. The fact is that in many, many public schools, kids with disabilities are not learning to read and do math — while the vast majority of them can master these skills with proper instruction. I see nothing valuable in allowing a child (disabled or otherwise) to pass through the public education system for 12 years without learning to read and do math.

#### NCLB ensures good teaching

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: NCLB requires that all teachers be certified in the subject area they are teaching. This is intended to ensure that students have the best-trained teachers delivering instruction. It also specified minimum criteria for teacher assistants.

#### NCLB ensures academic improvement

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

NCLB developed an accountability model that required states to analyze progress of schools and the composite groups of children within them. In many states, for the first time, score analysis of groups of children by race, socioeconomic status, and disability was required. Further, it required that all groups of children must make adequate yearly progress. NCLB made it necessary to schools to focus on children with disabilities (and others), develop and implement strategies to move those students forward academically, and maintain continuous improvement.

#### NCLB holds schools accountable for their student’s failures

Logsdon 08 (Ann Logsdon, a school psychologist with 18 years of experience, and has a degree in educational supervising, March 10 2008, <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/b/2008/03/10/learning-disability-term-of-the-week-nclb.htm>, DS)

The Good: Accountability. NCLB has a series of consequences for covered schools (those with high numbers of low-income students) that fail to make adequate yearly progress. For example, if a school fails to make adequate progress in reading or math for two consecutive years, they must provide free tutoring services to the lowest performing, low-income students in the school until the school is no longer in need of improvement. Consequences become progressively serious. Ranging from allowing students to change schools to the most significant consequence, takeover by the state for a complete restructuring of management and instructional programs. NCLB also includes provisions to allow children to change schools if they attend a persistently dangerous school. This point, I applaud.

#### No Child Left Behind is extremely beneficial to all-around education, starts at an early age and drastically improves test scores- statistically proven

NCLB- No Child Left Behind is a non-profit organization dedicated to improving the education of America’s youth. 2009 ( No Child Left Behind, 2/2/09, <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/importance/nclbworking.html>, JV)

Multiple studies and reports show that student achievement is rising across America: The long-term Nation's Report Card (NAEP) results, released in July 2005, showed elementary school student achievement in reading and math at all-time highs and the achievement gap closing. For America's nine-year-olds in reading, more progress was made in five years than in the previous 28 combined. America's nine-year-olds posted the best scores in reading (since 1971) and math (since 1973) in the history of the report. America's 13-year-olds earned the highest math scores the test ever recorded. Reading and math scores for African American and Hispanic nine-year-olds reached an all-time high. Math scores for African American and Hispanic 13-year-olds reached an all-time high. Achievement gaps in reading and math between white and African American nine-year-olds and between white and Hispanic nine-year-olds are at an all-time low. The state-by-state Nation's Report Card results, released in October 2005, showed improved achievement in the earlier grades in which NCLB is focused. In the last two years, the number of fourth-graders who learned their fundamental math skills increased by 235,000—enough to fill 500 elementary schools! Across-the-board improvements were made in mathematics and in fourth-grade reading. African American and Hispanic students posted all-time highs in a number of categories. Forty-three states and the District of Columbia either improved academically or held steady in all categories (fourth- and eighth-grade reading and fourth- and eighth-grade math). The Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessments for Reading and Math, released in Dec. 2005, showed students in select urban school districts improving faster than their peers over the last two years. Fourth-graders in 8 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in math than the national average. Fourth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made larger gains in reading than the national average. Eighth-graders in 7 of 10 urban districts made more progress in basic math skills than the national average. The Nation's Report Card Science 2005 Report found significant academic gains by fourth-graders. Overall, fourth-graders improved four points in science achievement over 1996 and 2000 levels, with the lowest-performing students making the largest gains. African American and Hispanic fourth-graders made significant gains as well, narrowing the achievement gap. And the Nation's Report Card Trial Urban District Assessment for Science, released in Nov. 2006, showed narrower achievement gaps for low-income students than for the entire student body, between nearly all of the participating school districts and the nation.

### AT CP Oil Reform

#### 1) Perm do both: any increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote aff to solve for more of the 70,000 lives per year

#### 2) An oil reform agenda wouldn’t actually regulate the oil industry – it’s just annoy them – the plan actually takes 500,000 cars off of the road, that’s Dutzik – and can’t solve our economy advantage, it’s destroy the jobs in the oil industry and wouldn’t fuel a shift to a post-industrial knowledge economy to make us competitive in the long run –that’s Florida

#### 3) **Turn -- Oil Regulations kill jobs and increase foreign dependence --****Senator Inhofe 2011** (James Inhofe, 07/19/11, <http://thehill.com/special-reports/energy-july-2011/172393-federal-interference-in-regulation-of-energy-development-a-bad-idea>, "Federal interference in energy development regulation a bad idea", James Inhofe is the ranking Republican on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, RR)

The United States reached an extraordinary milestone in 2009: A flood of domestic natural gas production propelled America past Russia to become the world’s largest producer of natural gas. But considering the Obama administration’s aggressive anti-fossil-fuel agenda, how could this possibly have occurred? Two key reasons stand out: First, American ingenuity combined cutting-edge, horizontal drilling technologies with advancements in hydraulic fracturing to allow producers to tap America’s truly massive natural gas shale deposits. But more importantly, these immense shale deposits are predominantly located in areas of the country where the states — not the federal government — primarily regulate oil and gas development. In such states as Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan and North Dakota, a virtual boom in natural gas and oil development is transforming America’s energy outlook, all thanks to the absence of federal red tape. But unfortunately, this lack of federal control has not gone unnoticed by the Obama administration and the environmental lobby. Looking to reverse America’s newfound status as the world’s natural gas powerhouse, many on the left now are pressing a sympathetic Obama administration to flex its regulatory muscles and expand its reach over hydraulic fracturing, a practice that for decades has been effectively and efficiently regulated by states. Lately, President Obama has been touting the virtues of natural gas — but don’t be fooled: Without question, his administration is working actively to shut down fossil-fuel development, and natural gas is no exception. Just take a look at his “green team,” which has included such outspoken fossil-fuel opponents as Carol Browner and Van Jones. In a speech in March at Georgetown, Obama said he would be putting Energy Secretary Steven Chu in charge of hydraulic fracturing policy. This is the same secretary who, speaking a year ago at Georgetown, said “we are going to have some regulation on that.” Now the president has chosen Rebecca Wodder, a staunch critic of hydraulic fracturing, to be the assistant secretary for fish, wildlife and parks for the Department of the Interior. Ms. Wodder recently said hydraulic fracturing “has a nasty track record of creating a toxic chemical soup that pollutes groundwater and streams, threatening public health and wildlife.” But this is clearly not the case. Since the first use of hydraulic fracturing — in 1949 in my home state of Oklahoma — producers have completed more than 1.5 million fracturing jobs without one confirmed case of groundwater contamination from these fracked formations. Not only is hydraulic fracturing thoroughly regulated by states, the practice has allowed for jobs and dollars to stay on American soil and in American pockets. In fact, as was recently reported in The Oklahoman, my state’s 2.5 percent growth in personal income ranked fifth in the nation in the first quarter of 2011. Instead of working to expand federal reach, the president should look to the states, which showcase that economic growth and job creation can coexist with effective environmental protection. Even Sen. Ben Cardin (Md.), a Democrat, said in April at an Environment and Public Works Committee hearing that we could learn from such states as Colorado and Oklahoma that “have taken aggressive action to protect the public health of their citizens.” Calls for federal regulation of hydraulic fracturing are not based on any credible threat to drinking water. This is all part of Obama’s war on affordable energy, an effort to regulate fossil fuels out of existence. Without hydraulic fracturing, not one cubic foot of shale gas would be commercially producible. If the president is successful, he will be responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs and for the elimination of shale gas as a source of abundant, secure, reliable and affordable energy.

#### 3) The counterplan obviously links to politics

1. **Oil lobby has massive congressional influence**

**Stein ‘11**

Sam Stein is a Political Reporter at the Huffington Post, based in Washington, D.C. Previously he has worked for Newsweek magazine, the New York Daily News and the investigative journalism group Center for Public Integrity. He has a masters from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and is a graduate of Dartmouth College. Huffington Post – May 19, 2011 – http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/19/oil-lobbying\_n\_864270.html

In the month **leading up to an** early May **vote** over whether to expand oil drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and open the coastal waters of Virginia for exploration, three of the nation's **top oil companies made donations through their political action committees to** 26 **House lawmakers.** **All but one of those lawmakers, including five Democrats, ended up supporting the oil-industry-backed bill.** The 26th lawmaker, Rep. Sam Johnson (R-Tex.), abstained from voting, according to data compiled for The Huffington Post by the good government group Public Campaign. The House of Representatives ultimately passed the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act by a 266 to 149 margin, meaning that even if these 26 lawmakers had flipped their votes, the measure would have passed anyway. The amount donated by Exxon, Chevron and ConocoPhillips -- information for other oil company PACs has not yet been made public -- was a relative pittance: Just $40,000 in total was distributed among the 26 House members in the month leading up to the vote. By contrast, the 67 **co-sponsors** of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act **have received a** combined total **of $8.8 million in campaign contributions from the oil** and gas **industry over** the course of **their careers.** That said, **the last minute tending the oil industry paid to House members is emblematic of** how invested it was in the outcome of that particular legislation and **its ability to quickly flex its political clout.** "**The pattern doesn't get more clear than this** -- **those who sided with Big Oil received campaign contributions,**" said David Donnelly, National Campaigns Director for Public Campaign Action Fund. "**Those who didn't got nothing**. Oil companies walk away with record profits while sticking it to Americans at the pump. But it's really these **politicians** who are **in the tank."**

#### b) Fossil Fuel lobby has enormous influence on Congress

Cobb ‘11

(Kurt Cobb is a columnist who writes frequently on energy and the environment. His column appears on the Paris-based science news site Scitizen and his work has been featured on Energy Bulletin, Common Dreams, Le Monde Diplomatique, and many other sites. He is a founding member of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas — and serves on the board of the Arthur Morgan Institute for Community Solutions. Economic Forecasts & Opinions – August 13, 2011 – lexis)

And so, I do agree with my economist acquaintance that taxation could be an elegant method for facilitating an energy transition. But is such taxation **p**ractical and even adequate? One might point to Europe where extremely high fuel taxes have been part of the reason that the average European uses one-half the amount of energy of the average American. **Whether high fuel taxes could become a reality in the U**nited **S**tates **is an open question**. **So far no American politician has dared to propose a level of taxation comparable to Europe**. **The main reason** for this **is that** the United States still has enormous fossil fuel reserves and as a consequence **a well-funded fossil fuel lobby** that **has a stranglehold on the U.S. Congress**. Europe is now largely bereft of fossil fuels and therefore has a fossil fuel lobby without the necessary influence to prevent high energy taxes and heavy expenditures on public transportation.

#### 4) Insert add-on here

5) The status squo solve - natural gas replacing oil now

Singer 5/30 [S. Fred Singer is professor emeritus at the University of Virginia and director of the Science & Environmental Policy Project. An expanded version of this commentary can be found on americanthinker.com. “Romney's historic opportunity; Plan for low-cost energy will fuel economic recovery” Washington Post May 3th 2012 lexis] crk

Mr. Romney can confidently promise to reduce the price of gasoline to $2.50 a gallon. The world price of oil would have to fall below $60 a barrel from its present $90. That's entirely possible because the low price of natural gas - down to $2 per 1,000 cubic feet from its 2008 peak of $13 - is helping relieve demand for oil. Many wells also produce high-value oil and natural gas liquids, so natural gas becomes a byproduct that can be profitably sold at even lower prices. Natural gas currently sells for less than 15 percent of the average price of crude oil, on an energy per British thermal unit basis. It pays to replace oil-based fuels, such as diesel and gasoline, with either liquefied natural gas or compressed natural gas - for heavy road vehicles, earth movers, diesel-electric trains, buses and fleet vehicles. Lower prices also make it profitable to convert natural gas directly to gasoline or diesel. Direct conversion would use the existing distribution infrastructure; the technology is proven and commercially feasible. Forget about methanol, hydrogen and other exotics. At present, 60 percent of all imported energy expenditures are for oil. The U.S. can become not only energy-independent but even an exporter of fuels - with a huge improvement in balance of payments.

#### 6) Oil dependency isn't a bad thing-

Eland,Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace and Liberty,2008 (Ivan Eland, Sept 1 2008, <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2306>, U.S. Dependence on Foreign Oil: Why We Shouldn’t Be Alarmed ",Ivan Eland is Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace & Liberty at The Independent Institute. Dr. Eland is a graduate of Iowa State University and received an M.B.A. in applied economics and a Ph.D. in Public Policy from George Washington University. He has been Director of Defense Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, and he spent 15 years working for Congress on national security issues, including stints as an investigator for the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Principal Defense Analyst at the Congressional Budget Office, RR)

But can’t the world run out of oil, especially with developing nations, such as China and India, using more? Theoretically, the answer is yes because there are only finite deposits in the earth. Yet because exploration and recovery technology is constantly improving, proven oil reserves have tended to increase over time. Also, as oil prices go up, conservation increases and alternative energy sources—natural gas, solar, geothermal, etc.--become more attractive economically. For example, the conventional wisdom was that U.S. natural gas fields were in irreversible decline, but the high price of oil has led to a drilling boom to find more of this substitute. New technology to extract natural gas from shale beds has increased production in the U.S. dramatically and will probably also do so around the world. So who knows, similar technological leaps might also increase the amount of recoverable oil around the world. But one thing is sure: it’s a myth that being dependent on imported oil is bad. As a way to stump politicians who perpetuate this nonsense, perhaps we should ask them this question: If oil is so critical and will become even more valuable when world supplies allegedly dwindle in the future, shouldn’t we use other countries’ oil now and have the U.S. government require that our limited production be saved to use or sell as the shortages worsen and future prices go even higher? Diametrically opposed to the present time, with the prevalent fears of dependency on foreign oil, this “conservation theory” was all the rage in the late 1930s and 1940s when a slowdown in finding new oil deposits seemed to threaten chronic future shortages (similar to the dire predictions after World War I and in the early 1920s before big oil discoveries were made late in the 1920s). Of course, this is not the right policy prescription either. We should instead treat oil as any other product and let the market provide ample supplies at the lowest cost to the consumer.

Would have no chance of clearing Congress without fiat

Silverleib 3/28 [Alan Silverleib, CNN Congressional Producer “Who will win Senate 'big oil' tax fight?” 3/28/12 <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-03-28/politics/politics_senate-oil-fight_1_gas-prices-oil-companies-end-oil?_s=PM:POLITICS>] crk

Your pain at the pump is the U.S. Senate's top issue this week. Senate Democrats and Republicans are arguing over a bill that would end billions in tax breaks for large oil companies -- a proposal designed to tap into voter anger over rising gas prices heading into the general election. The Democratic-sponsored measure -- which is opposed by most conservatives and has virtually no chance of clearing Congress -- would repeal billions of dollars in subsidies currently benefitting BP, Exxon, Shell, Chevron, and ConocoPhillips. Savings would be used to renew various alternative clean energy initiatives and reduce the deficit.

Obama will get the blame – he’s pushed in the past

Silverleib 3/28 [Alan Silverleib, CNN Congressional Producer “Who will win Senate 'big oil' tax fight?” 3/28/12 <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-03-28/politics/politics_senate-oil-fight_1_gas-prices-oil-companies-end-oil?_s=PM:POLITICS>] crk

Members on both sides of the aisle want to talk about the bill -- which is backed by President Barack Obama -- but for very different reasons. Democrats are trying to cast Republicans as defenders of unpopular big oil companies, while Republicans are highlighting rising pump prices under Obama's watch.

Oil reform is empirically a fight

Silverleib 3/28 [Alan Silverleib, CNN Congressional Producer “Who will win Senate 'big oil' tax fight?” 3/28/12 <http://articles.cnn.com/2012-03-28/politics/politics_senate-oil-fight_1_gas-prices-oil-companies-end-oil?_s=PM:POLITICS>] crk

Top senators in both parties believe the issue can play to their benefit at the polls in November. The biggest oil companies "are making money hand over fist," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nevada, said Monday at the start of the debate. "If Republicans continue to stand up for oil companies making record profits, one thing will be obvious: Republicans care less about bringing down gas prices than about helping big oil companies that don't need the help." Noting that the five large companies earned $137 billion in profits last year, Reid insisted that repealing "wasteful subsidies" won't lead to a hike in oil and gas prices -- an assertion immediately dismissed by his GOP counterpart. Democrats have proposed "raising taxes on American energy manufacturers ? something common sense and basic economics tell us will lead to even higher prices at the pump," said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Kentucky. "Frankly, I can't think of a better way to illustrate how completely out of touch they are on this issue." McConnell said Republicans are using the debate "to explain how out of touch Democrats are on high gas prices." "At a time when gas prices are at a national average of nearly $4 a gallon, this is what passes for a response to high gas prices for Washington Democrats ? a bill that does nothing about it," he added Wednesday.

### AT CP Patent Box – NIB

Perm do Both – Any increment of additional solvency for the perm is another reason to vote aff – It outweighs the risk of a one shot DA

Solvency deficit- even though the CP may solve US competitiveness, they don’t solve for the vast job creation that comes as a result of the plan. We also have much stronger internal links to competitiveness as outlined by Lonardo and DeLauro. They explain that the BEST way for US competitiveness is through the National Infrastructure Bank. O’Connel and Lonardo indicate that the NIB is a perfect way to create middle class jobs.

The CP links to politics. Their Atkinson card says that the Patent Box corporate tax reform would have to be passed by Congress meaning that it will also take Obama’s political capital, because nothing is popular in election year politics.

#### Nobody will use the Patent Box scheme – Empirics prove

Moules, writer for Financial Times, 12 (Jonathan, 6/29/12, Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/789269ba-c1cc-11e1-8e7c-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1zVk36L00, “Tax Initiatives Miss the Target“, IS)

One of the government’s flagship tax initiatives to help IP-rich small businesses is unknown to many of the people it is designed to help, according to accountants. The Patent Box scheme, which offers a preferential tax rate for profits arising from UK-owned patents, is only being taken up by 2 per cent of the senior managers interviewed for RSM Tenon’s quarterly survey of small businesses. Nearly a quarter said they had not even looked into whether their companies qualified. A further 2 per cent said that, although they fell into the criteria for qualification, they felt the regime was too complicated to apply for – so they were not doing so. Paul Belsman, RSM Tenon’s head of tax, said the findings do not bode well for either the Patent Box scheme – or other incentives designed to complement this tax break, such as the line tax credit for larger companies.

#### ADD ON vvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvv

#### Infrastructure is a perfect case for China – US cooperation which helps the economies of both

Jiechi, Ministry of Foreign Affairs in China, 12 (03/18/12, Promoting China-US Partnership through Mutual Respect and Win-win Cooperation, http://english.qstheory.cn/resources/speeches/201204/t20120407\_149880.htm, “Promoting China-US Partnership through Mutual Respect and Win-win Cooperation“, IS)

Third, continue to expand and deepen China-US mutually beneficial cooperation. China-US cooperation is mutually beneficial in nature. The two sides should expand and deepen exchanges and cooperation on business, energy, environment, agriculture, law enforcement and culture in a more pragmatic and effective manner. China and the US should strengthen cooperation on energy and infrastructure construction, forge new cooperation highlights, open new cooperation areas, inject fresh vigor into the bilateral relations and bring more benefits to the two peoples. At present, both china and the US are faced with the tasks of adjusting economic structure and boosting growth and the bilateral business cooperation embraces major opportunities of further growth. Problems emerging in the process of business cooperation should be properly handled by the two sides through equal consultations and in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual benefit.

#### The National Infrastructure Bank is Key to US- China cooperation

US Treasury,12 (5/04/12, State News Service, <http://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/tg1567.aspx>, “ Joint U.S.-China Economic Track Fact Sheet- Fourth Meeting of the U.S. China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) “, IS)

The United States supports improving its infrastructure sector, enhancing market mechanisms for infrastructure investment, incorporating best practices and lessons learned from all applicable global infrastructure systems, and working to enhance Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) investment opportunities where appropriate, including from foreign investors. In recognition of this goal, President Obama’s FY 2013 Budget proposes a plan to renew and expand America’s infrastructure systems and calls for the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank to enhance investment opportunities for all public and private capital to invest in transportation, water, and energy infrastructure sectors. The United States and China recognize the potential for their firms to play a positive role in infrastructure financing in each country, and commit to explore opportunities for deepening cooperation in this field.

#### China-US cooperation is key to Northeast Asian stability

Peng, Director, Institute of American Studies, China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, 11 (June 2011, Global Asia, http://www.globalasia.org/V6N2\_Summer\_2011/Yuan\_Peng.html, Awaiting the Handshake: China-US Relations Are the Key to Stability In Northeast Asia“, IS)

The other obvious issue requiring China-US collaboration is the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and the rest of Northeast Asia. In this regard, the Six-Party talks have proven to be the most successful and effective mechanism for dialogue. Premised on Pyongyang’s readiness to return to the negotiating table, China and the US should reinvigorate the talks by moving beyond the Cheonan incident and temporarily setting aside the issue of abductions of Japanese hostages by North Korea. Gaining control of the North Korean nuclear issue is the first step toward encouraging Pyongyang to abandon nuclear weapons altogether. At the same time, China and the US should try to prevent Japan and South Korea from pursuing their threats to “go nuclear” in response to North Korea’s nuclear program. Indeed, only denuclearization can genuinely safeguard peace, stability and development in the region. While the original source of the faltering progress toward a regional security mechanism is Pyongyang’s unwillingness to abandon its nuclear ambitions, the situation has since become far more complicated. The regional security landscape has expanded beyond the North Korean nuclear issue to include strategic disputes among nearly all states in the region. The complex setting of Northeast Asia requires that China and the US abandon the legacies of the Cold War and embrace an innovative mechanism for security co-operation that considers the security concerns and interests of all the parties in the region. This would usher in a future-oriented political atmosphere of enduring peace and prosperity. In light of this, it is perhaps worth concluding with an ancient Chinese verse that captures both the current challenges and opportunities for Northeast Asia: “The hills and mountains have no end, there seems to be no road beyond; but dim with willows, bright with flowers, another village appears: one has a sudden glimpse of hope in the midst of bewilderment.”

#### China-US cooperation solves proliferation

Kissinger, Former Secretary of State, 11 (1/14/11, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/13/AR2011011304832.html, “Avoiding a U.S.-China cold war“, IS)

The upcoming summit between the American and Chinese presidents is to take place while progress is being made in resolving many of the issues before them, and a positive communique is probable. Yet both leaders also face an opinion among elites in their countries emphasizing conflict rather than cooperation. Care must be taken lest both sides analyze themselves into self-fulfilling prophecies. The nature of globalization and the reach of modern technology oblige the United States and China to interact around the world. A Cold War between them would bring about an international choosing of sides, spreading disputes into internal politics of every region at a time when issues such as nuclear proliferation, the environment, energy and climate require a comprehensive global solution. Conflict is not inherent in a nation's rise. The United States in the 20th century is an example of a state achieving eminence without conflict with the then-dominant countries. Nor was the often-cited German-British conflict inevitable. Thoughtless and provocative policies played a role in transforming European diplomacy into a zero-sum game. Sino-U.S. relations need not take such a turn. On most contemporary issues, the two countries cooperate adequately; what the two countries lack is an overarching concept for their interaction. During the Cold War, a common adversary supplied the bond. Common concepts have not yet emerged from the multiplicity of new tasks facing a globalized world undergoing political, economic and technological upheaval. That is not a simple matter. For it implies subordinating national aspirations to a vision of a global order. Neither the United States nor China has experience in such a task. Each assumes its national values to be both unique and of a kind to which other peoples naturally aspire.

Proliferation causes nuclear war –it uniquely increases the risk and magnitude of conflicts.

Sokolski, 2009 (Henry, Executive Director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center and serves on the US congressional Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, “Avoiding a nuclear crowd,” Policy Review, June/July)

AT A MINIMUM, such developments will be a departure from whatever stability existed during the Cold War. After World War II, there was a clear subordination of nations to one or another of the two superpowers' strong alliance systems —the U.S.-led free world and the Russian-Chinese led Communist Bloc. The net effect was relative peace with only small, nonindustrial wars. This alliance tension and system, however, no longer exist. Instead, we now have one superpower, the United States, that is capable of overthrowing small nations unilaterally with conventional arms alone, associated with a relatively weak alliance system (NATO) that includes two European nuclear powers (France and the UK). NATO is increasingly integrating its nuclear targeting policies. The U.S. also has retained its security allies in Asia (Japan, Australia, and South Korea) but has seen the emergence of an increasing number of nuclear or nuclearweapon- armed or -ready states. So far, the U.S. has tried to cope with independent nuclear powers by making them "strategic partners" (e.g., India and Russia), NATO nuclear allies (France and the UK), "non-NATO allies" (e.g., Israel and Pakistan), and strategic stakeholders (China); or by fudging if a nation actually has attained full nuclear status (e.g., Iran or North Korea, which, we insist, will either not get nuclear weapons or will give them up). In this world, every nuclear power center (our European nuclear NATO allies), the U.S., Russia, China, Israel, India, and Pakistan could have significant diplomatic security relations or ties with one another but none of these ties is viewed by Washington (and, one hopes, by no one else) as being as important as the ties between Washington and each of these nuclear-armed entities (see Figure 3). There are limits, however, to what this approach can accomplish. Such a weak alliance system, with its expanding set of loose affiliations, risks becoming analogous to the international system that failed to contain offensive actions prior to World War I. Unlike 1914, there is no power today that can rival the projection of U.S. conventional forces anywhere on the globe. But in a world with an increasing number of nuclear-armed or nuclear-ready states, this may not matter as much as we think. In such a world, the actions of just one or two states or groups that might threaten to disrupt or overthrow a nuclear weapons state could check U.S. influence or ignite a war Washington could have difficulty containing. No amount of military science or tactics could assure that the U.S. could disarm or neutralize such threatening or unstable nuclear states.^^ Nor could diplomats or our intelligence services be relied upon to keep up to date on what each of these governments would be likely to do in such a crisis (see graphic below): Combine these proliferation trends with the others noted above and one could easily create the perfect nuclear storm: Small differences between nuclear competitors that would put all actors on edge; an overhang of nuclear materials that could be called upon to break out or significantly ramp up existing nuclear deployments; and a variety of potential new nuclear actors developing weapons options in the wings. In such a setting, the military and nuclear rivalries between states could easily be much more intense than before. Certainly each nuclear state's military would place an even higher premium than before on being able to weaponize its military and civilian surpluses quickly, to deploy forces that are survivable, and to have forces that can get to their targets and destroy them with high levels of probability. The advanced military states will also be even more inclined to develop and deploy enhanced air and missile defenses and long-range, precision guidance munitions, and to develop a variety of preventative and preemptive war options. Certainly, in such a world, relations between states could become far less stable. Relatively small developments —e.g., Russian support for sympathetic near-abroad provinces; Pakistani-inspired terrorist strikes in India, such as those experienced recently in Mumbai; new Indian flanking activities in Iran near Pakistan; Chinese weapons developments or moves regarding Taiwan; state-sponsored assassination attempts of key figures in the Middle East or South West Asia, etc. —could easily prompt nuclear weapons deployments with "strategic" consequences (arms races, strategic miscues, and even nuclear war). As Herman Kahn once noted, in such a world "every quarrel or difference of opinion may lead to violence of a kind quite different from what is possible today."^^ In short, we may soon see a future that neither the proponents of nuclear abolition, nor their critics, would ever want.

### AT CP Research and Development

#### Perm do both-

Any increment of additional solvency for the perm is a reason to vote affirmative it outweighs the risk of a one shot DA

#### Solvency deficit-

The one card read in the 1nc specifies 4 things that must be done including making the tax credit permanent, Expand the Alternative Simplified Credit, Make it clear that process R&D is a qualifying R&D expenditure, and Broaden the credit for collaborative energy-related research to any area of collaborative research and expand the rate from 20 percent to 40 percent. They do one of these things meaning that they can’t solve.

#### Links to politics-

Their plan still has to go through congress too, meaning it would force Obama to spend political capital.

#### Tax credits unpopular in congress

Holt 12 (Kelly is senior staff writer for The New American 5/31/12 “ObamaCare Tax Credit Unpopular With Small Business” <http://thenewamerican.com/usnews/item/11562-obamacare-tax-credit-unpopular-with-small-business>” AB)

A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report dated May 2012 revealed that a paltry percentage of small businesses took advantage of the Small Employer Health Insurance Tax Credit in 2010. Of the 1.4 to 4 million small businesses and government agencies estimated to be eligible, only 170,300 claimed it. Part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), commonly known as ObamaCare, the measure that, according to cnsnews.com, “gets strong support in public opinion polls has turned out to be a disappointment.” Of the 170,300 claiming the credit most claimed only a partial percentage, with only 28,100 claiming the full credit. According to the GAO report, “One factor limiting the credit’s use is that most very small employers, 83 percent by one estimate, do not offer health insurance.” Analysts meeting with the GAO reported that “the credit was not large enough to incentivize employers to begin offering insurance.” Other deterrents were the complexity of the rule and the heavy time commitment required to figure it out. Cnsnews added, “The credit, which once had support in principle from lawmakers of both parties, was supposed to help businesses already providing coverage afford the premiums." John Arensmeyer, founder of Small Business Majority, said, "We agree it is not a panacea for all costs.” The advocacy group supports the healthcare law. “The problem is all the negative publicity around the health care law has discouraged business owners from applying for the credit.” He claimed, "There has been more heat than light shone on this,” adding, "There is no reason why small businesses shouldn't be taking advantage of this credit." But his position is at odds with the large number of small businesses who have voluntarily chosen not to take advantage of the credit and with the much larger independent business federation. And the GAO report identified another group whose decision has played a part in the tax credit's failure. Low-wage employees working for small employers generally prefer to receive wages over insurance benefits as part of total compensation. Critics note that employees and employers know what they want, yet the Obama administration is expected to ask Congress for ways to fix the lack of interest by small business. Republicans say they want to repeal ObamaCare, not change it. "They completely missed the target on this thing," said Rep. Sam Graves, R-Mo. (Chair of the House Small Business Committee), according to cnsnews. "I don't think expanding it is going to make any difference whatsoever." The cnsnews report continued, “It doesn't help the administration's plea that the biggest small-business lobbying group is a lead plaintiff asking the Supreme Court to overturn the Affordable Care Act. The National Federation of Independent Business isn't likely to spend much time tinkering with the tax credit or promoting it to members.” The biggest benefits of the tax credit go to very small companies paying low wages. These businesses typically don’t offer coverage, and the tax credit is not sufficient to encourage them to start doing so. An unidentified tax preparer was quoted in the GAO report as saying that "people get exc

#### Funding R&D is bad for the economy

Bhidé, Professor at Tuffts university, 2010 (Amar, 9/11/10, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704644404575481534193344088.html>, “ Don't Expect Much From the R&D Tax Credit” TG)

President Barack Obama has called for making the on-again, off-again R&D tax credit permanent, as had Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, in the name of promoting long-term economic growth. Big companies with large R&D budgets, unsurprisingly, favor the proposal. But it's a bad idea. Tax credits for R&D don't encourage the broad-based innovation that is crucial for widespread prosperity. Advocates for the tax breaks that riddle our tax code usually invoke a public good that results from an activity that people would not otherwise undertake. Biofuels may be more costly than traditional gasoline, but they reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Renting may be more prudent for individuals with uncertain incomes but homeownership improves neighborhoods. Why not use the tax credits or deductions to tilt the balance? Similarly, investment in research often produces "spillovers" that benefit everyone, not just the business that incurred the expense. If the spillovers are large enough, the argument goes, it behooves society to subsidize research that is only marginally profitable. As it happens, evidence of a large gap between public and private returns cited by advocates of R&D subsidies is underwhelming. The 2005 National Academies of Sciences "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report, which favors public subsidies, cites only eight studies, the most recent of which was published in 1993. Even if it were true that R&D produces higher returns for society, the argument that we would be better off with larger subsidies turns on heroic assumptions. Larger subsidies do little to increase research effort if most capable engineers and scientists are already productively employed. Moreover, larger research programs don't necessarily translate into better results. Huge R&D budgets didn't save Detroit from disaster. Yet this week Gloria Bergquist of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers told the Detroit News, without irony, that "The auto industry is one of the leading centers of R&D in all industries—even higher than computers and pharmaceuticals. Making a permanent R&D tax credit sends us a strong signal that we should invest in a lot of the technology. To the extent it can encourage R&D and generate investment, that translates into jobs." Most crucially, subsidizing traditional research is a bad idea because it risks diverting resources from more valuable activities. But this does not occur to supporters of public subsidies. They fail to realize that widespread prosperity requires broad-based innovation. A breakthrough microprocessor developed by Intel's R&D staff, for example, has no value unless its production personnel figure out how to manufacture it in high volumes, its marketing staff communicates its benefits to customers, and customers design it into their products and sell the new products to end-users. Everyone's favorite example of innovation—Apple—has certainly benefitted from the R&D investments of its suppliers. But Apple itself does little of the kind of classic R&D that is eligible for tax credits. Nor do the thousands of entrepreneurial companies that develop applications and accessories for iPhones and iPads. Like R&D, innovations in design, marketing, logistics and organization require the investment of funds, time and effort. And although less obvious and visible than technological breakthroughs, these other kinds of developments also generate spillovers. For more than half a century IBM's sales and marketing innovations have helped promote wider and more effective use of its products. They have also served as a model for innumerable high-tech companies. A tax break for R&D doesn't even make political sense, especially under current conditions. Less than 2% of the American work force is now employed in traditional R&D. This proportion is declining as the economy becomes more service based and a relatively small proportion of service innovations fall under the rubric of traditional R&D. The manufacturing sector, which produces just 12% of our gross domestic product, accounts for 42% of R&D undertaken in the country. The inclusive view of innovation I have outlined does not mean that the government should cast a wider net to correct underinvestment in socially desirable activities. Advances undertaken by autonomous entrepreneurs will never be perfectly in sync. But in the shortages that a mainstream economist might call market failures and underinvestment, entrepreneurs see opportunity. The challenge for public policy is to provide evenhanded incentives for all to pursue the opportunities they find most promising.

# AT CP Social Care

#### Perm – do the plan and the counterplan together

#### The permutation is best—plenty of money to do both.

Antonopoulos et al. 11 — Rania Antonopoulos, Senior Scholar and Director of the Gender Equality and Economy program at the Levy Institute, served as served as an expert adviser and consultant for the United Nations Development Programme, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the New School for Social Research, et al., with Kijong Kim, Research Scholar in the Gender Equality and Economy program at the Levy Institute, Thomas Masterson, Research Scholar at the Levy Institute, and Ajit Zacharias, Senior Scholar at the Levy Institute, 2011 (“Investing in Social Care Delivery,” Levy Institute One-Pager, Number 11, August 5th, Available Online at http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/op\_11.pdf, Accessed 06-23-2012)

Direct job creation through investment in social care is an effective and equitable piece of the unemployment puzzle. In an ideal policymaking climate, there would be no reason to choose between physical infrastructure projects and investments in social care delivery. Given the government’s current rock-bottom borrowing costs and the stable inflationary environment, there is more than enough fiscal room for both. But whereas the economic logic suggests that these two options should not be in competition, there appears to be little current political room for increases in public outlays. Given this scarcity of political will, there is a good deal of evidence that, from the standpoint of employment alone, investing in social care would produce a higher return on our investment.

#### No solvency – corrupt and Texas empirics

Langford, investigative reporter for the Chron Newspaper, 11 [December 3, 2011; Home health care firms breaking rules, raking in Medicare dollars; http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/article/Home-health-care-firms-breaking-rules-raking-in-2342534.php]

The nation's Medicare program has dished out $1.25 billion for home-based health care in Houston over four years - and yet nearly every agency that provides nurses, therapists and drugs for the elderly and disabled has violated state and federal standards, a Houston Chronicle investigation has found. Still, little stops the flow of taxpayer dollars to the nearly 470 companies based in America's fourth largest city. Dubbed "deficiencies" by the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services, they include violations like failure to make sure drugs and treatments are administered properly and failure to report abuse of a patient. Federal authorities say not only are companies falling short on certain standards of care, some also are bastions for potential fraud - its victims patients and taxpayers.

#### Turn – kills economy; fraud and costs are too high

Langford, investigative reporter for the Chron newspaper, 11 [December 3, 2011; Home health care firms breaking rules, raking in Medicare dollars; <http://www.chron.com/news/houston-texas/article/Home-health-care-firms-breaking-rules-raking-in-2342534.php>]

"You need to know the story," she said. "I live above-board. If I didn't, I wouldn't be in business." Dorothy Smith, a registered nurse who created her Lanoitan Home Health Care of Texas in 1978, was cited for 21 deficiencies last year, all of which she says were corrected immediately. "If you look at my record, it's superb," she said. "I think I'm getting the flak because there's so much fraud in home health care. I refuse to be a part of it. I'm old school. I go by the rules." In 2009, the General Accountability Office reported Medicare's spending on home health care totaled $12.9 billion in 2006, up 44 percent in 2002. It also zeroed in on several problems, some in Houston, including home health care agencies' propensity to overstate a patients' condition in order to get Medicare money. Nearly 700 patients deemed most severe "were served by potentially fraudulent (home health care)," the audit stated. Federal officials in Houston also are investigating kickback schemes and billing for "services not rendered" but could not comment on specifics.

### AT CP Student Draft

#### Perm do both—any increment of additional solvency for the perm is another reason to vote affirmative it outweighs the risk of a one shot DA

#### Solvency Deficit—your student draft may solve for hegemony but it does not solve for the vast amount of jobs that \_\_\_(insert aff here)\_\_\_ can create

#### Links to politics—obama would have to push the plan through just like how we have to push our plan through

#### **Compulsory Military service destroys the American sense of volunteerism Spalding, director of the B. Kenneth Simon Center for American Studies at the Heritage Foundation,2010**(Matthew, October 10, 2010, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/10/19/compulsory-national-service-would-undermine-the-american-character)

Americans have always exhibited a strong sense of compassion toward their neighbors and those less fortunate. Volunteerism, what Alexis de Tocqueville called our "spirit of association," is in the national DNA. Policymakers have long recognized the importance of citizen engagement and philanthropic volunteerism to a thriving civil society. But government should not attempt to compel its citizens to engage in these worthwhile endeavors. Its proper role is merely to energize a culture of personal commitment to those in need as a way of strengthening the natural grounds of citizenship and community. The goal of citizen service should be to protect and strengthen civil society. Tocqueville observed that one of American society's great virtues is its tendency to create local voluntary associations to meet the most important needs of the people. Other nations handled these needs through and by government; but in the United States, private individuals of all ages, conditions, and dispositions formed associations. "I have often admired the extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object to the exertions of a great many men, and in getting them voluntarily to pursue it," Tocqueville wrote in Democracy in America. "What political power could ever carry on the vast multitude of lesser undertakings which American citizens perform every day, with the assistance of the principle of association?" He added, "The more [government] stands in the place of associations, the more will individuals, losing the notion of combining together, require its assistance." The traditional associations of civil society—families, schools, churches, and voluntary organizations—sustain social order and public morality, moderate individualism and materialism, and cultivate personal character. The concept of national service is altogether different. Government programs, like AmeriCorps, do not encourage sacrificial giving of time and resources, which has the character-forming effect of teaching compassionate responsibility. Instead, they suggest that "volunteerism" could just as well mean a paid job with benefits—or worse, a mandatory obligation. Such government-directed "volunteerism," by encouraging individuals and associations to look to the state as the provider of assistance, belittles authentic volunteerism, the process by which individuals choose without economic benefit to help their neighbor. It also threatens the independence of the private associations that have always been the engine of moral and social reform in America. The American way. The call to service is best answered not by government, but by the citizens in voluntary associations, local communities, and private organizations that are at the heart of American charity. Last year alone, 63.4 million Americans volunteered, well exceeding the 500,000 involved in national service. Total private giving is estimated to exceed $300 billion a year, with individuals accounting for 75 percent of that, overwhelming the Corporation for National and Community Service's budget of just under $1 billion. One organization, the Knights of Columbus, made charitable contributions of over $150 million and generated some 70 million volunteer service hours. The depth of private American charity and the vast potential to expand these great activities ought to be highlighted and strongly encouraged. These private voluntary organizations thrive today precisely because their work is privately organized, highly decentralized, and directly focused on community needs and local conditions. At a time when Americans are volunteering in unprecedented numbers (and ways), policymakers should reject the model of government-centered national service, which undermines the American character and threatens to weaken private associations. The better course is to bolster the call to service by encouraging a true and voluntary citizen service that is consistent with principles of self-government, is harmonious with a vibrant civil society, and promotes a service agenda based on personal responsibility, independent citizenship, and civic volunteerism. Read why the United States needs compulsory national service, by William A. Galston, a former adviser to President Clinton and the Ezra K. Zilkha chair in governance studies at the Brookings Institution.

#### Undermines the military and goes against the ideals of America

Krembs, over 35 years of experience as a consultant to major U.S. and International Corporations in leadership development and change leadership. He specializes in the unique issues found in professional and expert-based cultures, including science, technology, financial services and health care,2003(peter, 1-20-2003,http://capitalismmagazine.com/2003/01/an-idea-not-worth-drafting-conscription-is-slavery/)

This columnist joins several prominent Republicans and America’s Founding Fathers in being patriotically hostile to the concept of compulsory military service. Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan both questioned the legitimacy of conscription during their respective career pinnacles. In fact, Ronald Reagan’s opposition to compulsory military service was not all that dissimilar from Ayn Rand’s reasoning. Reagan stated: “[T]he most fundamental objection to draft registration is moral…a draft or draft registration destroys the very values that our society is committed to defending.” Although Goldwater supported the war in Vietnam, he opposed the draft in favor of an all-volunteer military. The Founding Fathers weren’t exactly keen on conscription either: not only is there no provision in the constitution for compulsory service, King George’s “standing” armies are condemned in the Declaration of Independence. “He [the King] has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.” During the War of 1812, Daniel Webster fervently condemned the draft on constitutional grounds: “Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war, in which the folly or the wickedness of Government may engage it?” The United States went on to win that war without a single conscript. Proof that when liberty is truly threatened, there is no shortage of Americans willing to take up arms in its defense. Some conservative entities, such as The National Review and Bill Bennett, support compulsory military service in lieu of some sort of civics education that will supposedly make one more patriotic. A civics class in a school can be patriotic, but lowering the collective professional standard of our military by requiring conscripts is not. While he was Defense Secretary, Dick Cheney stated “The reason to be prepared to fight and win wars…it’s not a jobs program.” What proponents of compulsory military service fail to realize: that the armed forces of the United States would be morphed into little more than a public works project for societal rejects. And this author has too much respect for the institution of the military for it to be bamboozled into an AmeriCorps with nukes. In turn, the morale of the professional volunteers would suffer, and the United States could soon find itself with a military more preoccupied with delivering food to the hungry than it would be with national security. But the fundamental case against compulsory military service is because it is simply bad in practice, but because it is immoral on principle. Or, to quote the philosopher Ayn Rand in her Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal, “Of all the statist violations of individual rights in a mixed economy, the military draft is the worst. It is an abrogation of rights. It negates man’s fundamental right–the right to life–and establishes the fundamental principle of statism: that a man’s life belongs to the state, and the state may claim it by compelling him to sacrifice it in battle. If the state may force a man to risk death or hideous maiming and crippling, in a war declared at the state’s discretion, for a cause he may neither approve of nor even understand, if his consent is not required to send him into unspeakable martyrdom–then, in principle, all rights are negated in that state, and its government is not man’s protector any longer. What is there left to protect?”

#### **Military Recruitment is high right now**

**ABC World News, 2010**(December 29, 2010,http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/us-army-waiting-list-record-levels-high-unemployment/story?id=12495054&page=2)

Young Americans looking to join the armed forces may have to wait to serve. The combination of lower recruitment target numbers, a weak economy and the implementation of the GI bill has made waiting lists, officially known as the Delayed Entry Pool, longer than they have been in recent years. The Marine Corps, which has traditionally had a smaller recruiting base, has fulfilled more than 65 percent of its target for fiscal year 2011. The Army entered the new recruiting year in October having fulfilled 50 percent, or half its targeting goals for next year. The number is a near record for the Army. The last time in recent decades the waiting list was so long was 1996, when the Delayed Entry Pool was at 42.9 percent at the start of the fiscal year. In recent years, the Army lowered standards to boost recruitment, including allowing those with low test scores and even criminal records to join. But after years of such incentives and hefty bonuses, recruitment interest has not only surged but the quality of Americans who have expressed interest has improved considerably. For the first time since fiscal year 1992, nearly all of the Army recruits -- 99.9 percent -- in fiscal year 2010 were high school graduates. "It's a great time for us. We're very pleased with the way things are going. The characteristics of the people we're recruiting are near all time highs," Maj. Douglas Smith, spokesman for the Army recruitment command at Ft. Knox, Ky., told ABC News. The higher number of high school graduates "was a good sign and we have been able to restrict the number of waivers we give for conduct, so that's been an improvement as well," he said. A number of factors are behind the surging numbers. The military has cut back recruitment goals across the board. The Army target, for example, for the fiscal year 2011 is 67,000, lower than 74,500 in 2010 and well below the average recruitment goal of 80,000 between 2005 and 2008. The economy also plays a crucial part. Unemployment remains relatively high at 9.8 percent, the same level as last year, and among 18-to-24-year-olds -- the Pentagon's prime recruiting age -- it's even higher. Officials admit that unemployment has led more volunteers to visit recruitment centers, but caution that it's only part of the equation. U.S. Military Recruitment Surges "Our economy has something to do with this, but not everything," Col. David Lapan, deputy assistance secretary of defense for media operations, said at a briefing in October. "A lot of people would think that, as we look at where we are right now in terms of the challenges facing us, it's more to it than the economy." The post-9/11 GI Bill has also created a new incentive for young men and women to join the armed forces. Passed last year, the bill pays for education and housing for family and service members who have served at least 90 days and were honorably discharged. "The post-9/11 GI Bill has made a big difference in United States Army recruiting, as I look and talk to our noncommissioned officers and our officers who are out providing the strength for the Army every day," said Maj. Gen. Donald M. Campbell, Jr., commanding general of the U.S. Army recruiting command.

### AT CP Teaching Suggestion Motivation

#### Perm do both – Solves for competitiveness – Neg says TSM reinstatement is key - nowhere does the neg state that the CP and the plan can’t coexist.

#### CP links to net benefit – Their evidence is indicative that TSM is popular and that many are pushing to have it reinstated – overwhelms the link to the net benefit thus triggering their impact

#### Their evidence assumes that the current patent is broken. Current patent system is not broken – no need for the CP

#### Lustig 12 (Kenneth Lustig, vice president and head of strategic acquisitions at Intellectual Ventures, an invention and patent firm, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesleadershipforum/2012/02/09/no-the-patent-system-is-not-broken/>, No, the Patent System Is Not Broken 7/2/12 RS)

To hear some critics tell it, the explosion of patent suits in the smartphone industry is evidence of a patent system that is fundamentally broken, at great cost to U.S. innovation. Such histrionics, however, ignore a crucial but little known fact: Throughout American history, the buying, selling, and litigating of patents has always been essential to U.S. economic success. Not only that, the truth is that today’s patent litigation rate is less than half what it was in the mid-nineteenth century, a period widely recognized as the golden age of American innovation. Tomorrow To appreciate the role played by patent trading and litigation in U.S. economic growth, remember that our patent system was the first in the world to unleash the innovative potential of ordinary citizens. To create this democratized patent system, the Founding Fathers deliberately designed it to facilitate the growth of patent trading markets. As the economists Naomi Lamoreaux and Kenneth Sokoloff, two of most respected experts on early American invention, have noted, the first U.S. patent law, in 1790, was unique in the world for containing “an explicit provision for the sale of patent rights [that] both the courts and the U.S. Patent Office acted to facilitate.” Why facilitate the buying and selling of patents? Because doing so made it economically feasible for ordinary worker or farmer inventors without the capital to commercialize their own discoveries to still participate in invention, earning income instead by licensing or selling their patents to enterprises that could. This ability to license patent rights—along with application fees that were less than 5% of those in Britain—turned inventing into a new career path for technically creative citizens and sparked a huge surge in invention among the U.S. citizenry. By 1865 the per capita patenting rate in the U.S. was triple that of Britain, and the vast majority of those citizen-inventors were what we now call “non-practicing entities,” or NPEs, who licensed their patents to others to commercialize into new products. Indeed, patent and legal records from the nineteenth century indicate that more than two-thirds of the 160 so-called “great inventors” of the Industrial Revolution, including Thomas Edison, were NPEs. Their licensing activities were critical to U.S. industrial development. In the 1894 annual report of the American Bell Telephone Company, for example, the company reported that it had licensed 73 patents from outside inventors while developing only 12 inventions internally. “The growth of market trade in patents raised the returns to invention and encouraged a division of labor whereby technologically-creative individuals increasingly specialized in their comparative advantage—invention,” observed Lamoreaux and Sokoloff. “It was the expanded opportunities to trade in patented technologies that enabled the independent inventors of this golden age to flourish—and that stimulated the growth of inventive activity more generally.” Just as with other property rights, of course, patents rights would be meaningless without the ability to enforce them in court. And throughout U.S. history, patent litigation has served to settle the disputed ownership of rights to critical new technologies—the litigation between telephone inventors Alexander Graham Bell and Elisha Gray being the most famous case in point—and provide certainty regarding the value of such rights to entrepreneurs and investors alike. But with the recent explosion of patent suits in the smartphone industry, where the lineup of litigants resembles a circular firing squad, isn’t patent litigation now out of control? The evidence hardly suggests, therefore, that patent litigation is out of control today. In fact, according to retired chief judge Paul Michel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the main court for patent appeals, “It’s rather modest for a nation with two million active patents and hundreds of thousands of firms competing against each other.”

### AT- CP Telework

1. Perm Do both- no reason why the CP and the Aff are mutually exclusive as plans.
2. The CP can’t solve mega regions- Our 6 I/L’s aren’t accessed by telework or face to face interaction, but rather worker access- that’s what the Neg fails to realize. Workers and job access increases ten fold with a high speed rail system, while workers cant telecommute to their build sites.
3. Air Pollution- The CP does nothing to solve Air Pollution- The second advantage is a solvency deficit to the CP, and if you vote neg on the CP and NB, the systemic impacts of Plumer 12 from the aff go on- that’s 6 million people per year by 2050 you are condemning to death.
4. Links to politics-

#### Republicans hate telework

O'Keefe, Editor for “Keeping tabs on the Government,” 10 (Ed, May 6, 2010, Washington Post, <http://voices.washingtonpost.com/federal-eye/2010/05/congress_set_to_pass_telework.html>, AJ)

Federal workers will have to wait a bit longer for the option to work from home, as the House failed to pass a bill that would have expanded telework options across the government. [The House voted mostly along party lines](http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2010/roll251.xml) on Thursday and failed to get the two-thirds majority needed to proceed on the measure. A Senate version remains pending. Though slightly different, the bills essentially require federal agencies to appoint telework managing officers to oversee new policies developed by each agency and the Office of Personnel Management. Employees could telework only if doing so would not impact agency operations. The bills prohibit workers who handle secure or classified materials or information or who perform tasks that cannot be performed remotely from teleworking. About 61 percent of federal workers are currently eligible to telework, but only 5 percent do so regularly, according to OPM. The agency's director, **John Berry** has devoted most of his tenure to convincing lawmakers and other skeptics that telework options are necessary to help retain and recruit potential federal hires. The [Congressional Budget Office](http://www.cbo.gov) estimated the House measure would cost about $30 million, a price too high for most Republicans, who also don't like that the bill requires agencies to hire a telework manager. Agencies should be able to decide on their own whether to hire a manager, a Republican aide said.

#### Those who aren’t currently telecommuting don’t want to

WorldatWork 9 [WorldatWork (www.worldatwork.org) is a global human resources association focused on compensation, benefits, work-life and integrated total rewards to attract, motivate and retain a talented workforce. Founded in 1955, WorldatWork provides a network of more than 30,000 members and professionals in 75 countries with training, certification, research, conferences and community. Telework Trendlines 2009 February 2009 2] crk

Responding to a new series of questions that were added to the survey in 2008, 38 percent of respondents who reported they were not currently telecommuting said they had job-related tasks that they thought they could perform from home. Conversely, 61 percent of those not currently telecommuting said they did not have job tasks that could be performed remotely. (See Figure 4.) Among the subset of those who thought some of their job could be performed remotely, the most common answer was “less than 40 percent” of their job could be performed at home. However, 24 percent of respondents reported a belief that 80 percent of more of their job could be performed at home. (See Figure 5.) When asked how interested they were in potentially doing some or all of the tasks that could be performed remotely from home if their employer agreed, a combined 50 percent answered in one of the top two boxes corresponding to “more” interested. Twenty-one percent said they were “not at all interested” in working remotely or from home. (See Figure 6.) When further asked whether they thought their employer would be willing to allow them to work at home at least some of the time, a 54-percent majority said yes. (See Figure 7 on page 8.) But when the subject of pay or compensation was injected into the questionnaire, a stronger 61-percent majority said they would not be willing to be paid slightly less by their employer in exchange for being allowed to telecommute two days per week. (See Figure 8 on page 8.)

#### Companies and individuals won’t switch to Telework Details- compensation failures

Donoghue, Consultant for Multinational Tech Corporation to study the effects of Teleworking on offices, 8 (Mike, December 4, 2008, When Telecommuting Fails, <http://ihrim.org/Pubonline/Wire/jan2009/When%20Telecommuting%20Fails.pdf>, AJ)

Another impetus to telecommuting is the cost factor. Never mind the added expense of a company’s IT staff configuring systems for people to use remotely and the additional support issues that need to be addressed for hardware and software…what about the utilities? Some employers provide allowances for services necessary to run a home office. Electricity, oil, gas, phone, connectivity--there are firms that expense these necessities and others that provide flat amounts of compensation. These conditions are not the norm, however. While an employee may save in their daily commute costs for gas, vehicular wear and tear, and other transportation associated fees such as buses, trains, subways and ferries, they are often responsible for the costs of normal working conditions. In this day, when fuel prices are skyrocketing, employers certainly benefit. There are tax considerations that help offset these financial problems, but they don’t fully compensate for home office use.

#### Counterplan fails—doesn’t solve management resistance and corporate culture

Horn and Storen 1—Carl E. Van Horn, Ph.D., Professor and Director, John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Duke Storen, Senior Project Manger, John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey (“Telework: Coming of Age? Evaluating the Potential Benefits of Telework,” Published by the National Asscosiation of State Workforce Agencies on January 12, 2001, Available Online at http://www.naswa.org/assets/utilities/serve.cfm?path=/sections/pdf/2001/p1\_1.pdf)

Although conditions exist for dramatic increases in telework, significant barriers remain. Many employers embrace an industrial management style not conducive to managing teleworkers. Second, the potential financial advantages of telework are not universally understood or realized by employers and the evidence is not sufficiently persuasive. Many employers still regard telework as cost-prohibitive or lack the management expertise to implement telework programs. Finally, several public policy issues that influence telework are unresolved. Examples of important public policy issues include the interpretation and application of OSHA regulations for home office work, the success of tax incentives encouraging telework, and use of telework as an urban and rural economic development strategy.

The mindset of managers is widely regarded as a significant barrier to the growth of telework in the American economy. Firms that prefer to manage by seeing and checking on employees resist the idea of teleworking because of a “fear of loss of control.” Human resource managers reported in a survey that the main obstacles to teleworking are the lack of supervision of employees, the absence of upper management support, and concerns about communicating with employees. For telework to grow more rapidly, managers will be required to emphasize results, rather than attendance. Interestingly, software exists to monitor workers’ output based on the number of keystrokes performed, time online, and tasks completed. Despite fears that managers will lose control over low-wage workers if they are not in sight, the digital management tools are more effective in tracking the performance of this strata of workers than they are for monitoring mid-level and more senior staff whose work products are less quantifiable.

“Corporate culture” or the customs and expectations of businesses present another barrier to the growth of telework. In a study by Joanne H. Pratt & Associates, 35% of employers in the Houston area cited corporate culture as a major barrier. One respondent representing a law firm stated, “We have no inclination towards telework. Law work is not set up for it except possibly accounting.” Another aspect of corporate culture is what is considered “legitimate” in the business world. For many home-office entrepreneurs who have teleworked, moving into an office suite lends legitimacy to their venture and a more professional corporate image. One executive suite tenant also points out, “When you’re on your own, you get in your own little world and lose sight of what’s going on. Here you can share war stories.”

#### Management resistance is the primary obstacle to teleworking

Lister and Harnish 11— Kate Lister is the principal researcher at the Telework Research Network where she studies alternative workplace strategies. She has coauthored three books on the subject with Tom Harnish, who is Senior Scientist at the Telework Research Network. (“The State of Telework in the U.S.: How Individuals, Business, and Government Benefit,” Published in July 2011 by the Telework Research Network, Available Online at http://www.workshifting.com/downloads/downloads/Telework-Trends-US.pdf)

When asked to indicate the primary obstacles to telework (among those who did not offer it), management resistance was overwhelmingly cited as the most common holdback. Job incompatibility was second (see Chart 13). This data is consistent with a wide body of research that shows that while interest in WAH (of any frequency) is very high among employees and more than half of jobs are conducive to it, management resistance remains the biggest obstacle to WAH.

### AT CP Visas—Infrastructure Bank specific

#### 1. Perm Do Both—allows for more solvency and jobs to be created, more infrastructure allows for the workers to commute easier on better infrastructure

#### 2. Plan outweighs—McConaghy & Kessler, Delauro all advocate that we need infrastructure investment now because infrastructure displays American competitiveness in the global economy—furthermore building infrastructure directly creates jobs to spur long term growth that’s O’Connell and Rohatyn—we access two scenarios of global conflict which is greater than their net benefit, and if there is any risk of our impacts happening you prefer the plan over the CP because 2 global nuclear wars is ALWAYS greater than 1

#### 3. Changing H-1B Visas cap has been *rejected* by both sides of Congress and is a major issue—proves CP links to politics

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Mitt Romney, a top candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, has released an economic plan that would make it easier for foreign college graduates with advanced degrees in math, science and engineering to work in the U.S. Romney's plan, unveiled this week, includes a proposal "to raise the ceiling" on visas for holders of advanced degrees in math, science "who have job offers in those fields from U.S. companies." "These workers would not displace unemployed Americans. Rather, they would fill high-skill job openings for which there is currently an acute shortage of labor," wrote Romney, a former Massachusetts governor, in his plan. The U.S. caps H-1B visas at 85,000 a year. Current regulations set aside 20,000 of those visas for advanced degree graduates of U.S. universities. Romney's proposal doesn't stipulate that advanced degree holders be graduates from U.S. universities. Romney's plan also calls for "stapling" green cards to the diplomas of technical degree graduates of U.S. universities, a plan that has been proposed by lawmakers on both sides in Congress without success. "Even in this tough unemployment climate, as of this past spring nearly 1.25 million high-skill jobs remained unfilled," said Romney, in the economic plan released Tuesday. "A skills gap of that magnitude suppresses the productivity of our businesses and slows the overall economy. Highly educated immigrants would help fill that gap and get our economy rolling again."

#### 4. Even if they bring foreign workers into the US—they don’t solve the problem of **domestic unemployment**, when the workers Visa expires they will go back home leaving the US at its misery—we solve the problem of American unemployment in the short term and for the long term while they only access short term solvency

#### Majority of the H-1B Visa holders will “go home” at the end of their visa and foreign skilled workers will displace American workers for cheap wages—empirical studies show, gutting any long term solvency

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Ron Hira, a public policy professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, characterized as "dubious" Romney's claim that there is 1.25 million unfilled high-skilled positions. "None of the official statistics support a claim that there's a shortage of these occupations," said Hira. "Unemployment rates for these occupations continue to be twice what they should be at full employment." Hira, who recently testified on high skills immigration reform before a U.S. Senate committee, also took exception to Romney's claim that "a great majority" of the nearly 300,000 foreign students enrolled in advanced degree programs in the U.S. "will return home." Hira cites a study last year Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, a group funded by the National Science Foundation, which found 67% of foreign students earning doctoral degrees from U.S. colleges in 2005 have remained in the country. By not limiting H-1B visas to advanced degree holders of U.S. universities, Romney "increases the pool of candidates, especially at the Masters level, enormously," said Hira. Conditioning an H-1B visa on a job offer from a U.S. company is not a labor market test, said Hira. "We know that foreign workers, even advanced degree holders, will accept less pay and poorer working conditions, displacing even more American workers and undercutting their wages and working conditions," Hira said. John Miano, the founder of the Programmers Guild, was dismissive of Romney's position. "The American people expect that a president will look at all the facts and make the best decision on those facts," said Miano. Romney's statements "show that he is a pure politician who discards facts in favor of talking points fed to him by lobbyists who can buy access to him."

#### 5. The H-1B visa program is *flawed* and should be closed for US long term success—4 warrants

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Both of these visa programs need immediate and substantial overhaul. The goals of the H-1B and L visa programs have been to bring in foreign workers who complement the U.S. workforce. Instead, loopholes in both programs have made it too easy to bring in cheaper foreign workers, with ordinary skills, who directly substitute for, rather than complement, workers already in the country. They are clearly displacing and denying opportunities to U.S. workers. The loopholes also provide an unfair competitive advantage to companies specializing in offshore outsourcing, undercutting companies that hire American workers. For at least the past five years nearly all of the employers receiving the most H-1B and L-1 visas are using them to offshore tens of thousands of high-wage, high-skilled American jobs. Offshoring through the H-1B program is so common that it has been dubbed the “outsourcing visa” by India’s former commerce minister. H-1B and L-1 visa use has become antithetical to policy makers’ goals due to **four fundamental flaws**: 1. Neither visa requires a labor market test. Employers can and do bypass American workers when recruiting for open positions and even replace outright existing American workers with H-1B and L-1 guest workers. 2. Wage requirements are too low for H-1B visas, and they are non-existent for L-1. The programs are extensively used for wage arbitrage. Employers have told the GAO that they hire H-1Bs because they can legally pay below-market wages. The Department of Labor has certified wages **as low as $12.25 per hour** for H-1B computer professionals. The arbitrage opportunities for L-1 visas can be even greater because employers pay home-country wages. In the case of workers from India—the largest source country for L-1 visas—this can mean a 90% discount for importing an L-1 guest worker compared to hiring an American. 3. Visas are held by the employer rather than the worker. H-1B and L-1 visa workers can be easily exploited and put into poor working conditions but have little recourse because the working relationship is akin to **indentured servitude**. 4. Program oversight and enforcement is deficient. Department of Labor review of H-1B applications has been called a “rubber stamp” by its own Inspector General. A DHS IG report found that one in five H-1Bs were granted under false pretenses. The L-1 visa program has not been reviewed for more than four years even though the last DHS IG report found that there were “significant vulnerabilities to abuse.” By closing the H-1B and L-1 visa loopholes described above, we would create and *retain* tens of thousands of good quality American jobs and ensure that our labor market works fairly for American and foreign workers alike. Bi-partisan legislation, the H-1B and L-1 Visa Reform Act of 2009, would accomplish that. The United States benefits enormously from high-skilled permanent immigration, especially in the technology sector. When we need foreign workers with truly specialized skills, we should rely on permanent immigration rather than guest- worker visas.

#### Changing H-1B Visas cap has been *rejected* by both sides of Congress and is a major issue—proves CP links to politics

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Mitt Romney, a top candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, has released an economic plan that would make it easier for foreign college graduates with advanced degrees in math, science and engineering to work in the U.S. Romney's plan, unveiled this week, includes a proposal "to raise the ceiling" on visas for holders of advanced degrees in math, science "who have job offers in those fields from U.S. companies." "These workers would not displace unemployed Americans. Rather, they would fill high-skill job openings for which there is currently an acute shortage of labor," wrote Romney, a former Massachusetts governor, in his plan. The U.S. caps H-1B visas at 85,000 a year. Current regulations set aside 20,000 of those visas for advanced degree graduates of U.S. universities. Romney's proposal doesn't stipulate that advanced degree holders be graduates from U.S. universities. Romney's plan also calls for "stapling" green cards to the diplomas of technical degree graduates of U.S. universities, a plan that has been proposed by lawmakers on both sides in Congress without success. "Even in this tough unemployment climate, as of this past spring nearly 1.25 million high-skill jobs remained unfilled," said Romney, in the economic plan released Tuesday. "A skills gap of that magnitude suppresses the productivity of our businesses and slows the overall economy. Highly educated immigrants would help fill that gap and get our economy rolling again."

#### Majority of the H-1B Visa holders will “go home” at the end of their visa and foreign skilled workers will displace American workers for cheap wages—empirical studies show, gutting any long term solvency

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Ron Hira, a public policy professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, characterized as "dubious" Romney's claim that there is 1.25 million unfilled high-skilled positions. "None of the official statistics support a claim that there's a shortage of these occupations," said Hira. "Unemployment rates for these occupations continue to be twice what they should be at full employment." Hira, who recently testified on high skills immigration reform before a U.S. Senate committee, also took exception to Romney's claim that "a great majority" of the nearly 300,000 foreign students enrolled in advanced degree programs in the U.S. "will return home." Hira cites a study last year Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, a group funded by the National Science Foundation, which found 67% of foreign students earning doctoral degrees from U.S. colleges in 2005 have remained in the country. By not limiting H-1B visas to advanced degree holders of U.S. universities, Romney "increases the pool of candidates, especially at the Masters level, enormously," said Hira. Conditioning an H-1B visa on a job offer from a U.S. company is not a labor market test, said Hira. "We know that foreign workers, even advanced degree holders, will accept less pay and poorer working conditions, displacing even more American workers and undercutting their wages and working conditions," Hira said. John Miano, the founder of the Programmers Guild, was dismissive of Romney's position. "The American people expect that a president will look at all the facts and make the best decision on those facts," said Miano. Romney's statements "show that he is a pure politician who discards facts in favor of talking points fed to him by lobbyists who can buy access to him."

#### The H-1B visa program is *flawed* and should be closed for US long term success—4 warrants

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Both of these visa programs need immediate and substantial overhaul. The goals of the H-1B and L visa programs have been to bring in foreign workers who complement the U.S. workforce. Instead, loopholes in both programs have made it too easy to bring in cheaper foreign workers, with ordinary skills, who directly substitute for, rather than complement, workers already in the country. They are clearly displacing and denying opportunities to U.S. workers. The loopholes also provide an unfair competitive advantage to companies specializing in offshore outsourcing, undercutting companies that hire American workers. For at least the past five years nearly all of the employers receiving the most H-1B and L-1 visas are using them to offshore tens of thousands of high-wage, high-skilled American jobs. Offshoring through the H-1B program is so common that it has been dubbed the “outsourcing visa” by India’s former commerce minister. H-1B and L-1 visa use has become antithetical to policy makers’ goals due to **four fundamental flaws**: 1. Neither visa requires a labor market test. Employers can and do bypass American workers when recruiting for open positions and even replace outright existing American workers with H-1B and L-1 guest workers. 2. Wage requirements are too low for H-1B visas, and they are non-existent for L-1. The programs are extensively used for wage arbitrage. Employers have told the GAO that they hire H-1Bs because they can legally pay below-market wages. The Department of Labor has certified wages **as low as $12.25 per hour** for H-1B computer professionals. The arbitrage opportunities for L-1 visas can be even greater because employers pay home-country wages. In the case of workers from India—the largest source country for L-1 visas—this can mean a 90% discount for importing an L-1 guest worker compared to hiring an American. 3. Visas are held by the employer rather than the worker. H-1B and L-1 visa workers can be easily exploited and put into poor working conditions but have little recourse because the working relationship is akin to **indentured servitude**. 4. Program oversight and enforcement is deficient. Department of Labor review of H-1B applications has been called a “rubber stamp” by its own Inspector General. A DHS IG report found that one in five H-1Bs were granted under false pretenses. The L-1 visa program has not been reviewed for more than four years even though the last DHS IG report found that there were “significant vulnerabilities to abuse.” By closing the H-1B and L-1 visa loopholes described above, we would create and *retain* tens of thousands of good quality American jobs and ensure that our labor market works fairly for American and foreign workers alike. Bi-partisan legislation, the H-1B and L-1 Visa Reform Act of 2009, would accomplish that. The United States benefits enormously from high-skilled permanent immigration, especially in the technology sector. When we need foreign workers with truly specialized skills, we should rely on permanent immigration rather than guest- worker visas.

#### H-1B visas have much scrutiny with small regulations—leads to high-skilled workers being exploited and subject to poor conditions—studies prove

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Until very recently, there has been little enforcement of existing regulations and scant oversight of either program. Lately, the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Service (USCIS) has increased its scrutiny of the H-1B program, including per- forming site visits and asking for documentation (Overby 2009). The new scrutiny was triggered by a 2008 study conducted by USCIS that showed that more than one in five H-1B visas were obtained under false pretenses—either through outright fraud or with significant violations (DHS 2008). In one egregious case, an H-1B worker, certified as highly skilled, was working in a laundromat doing laundry and maintaining washing machines. Stepped-up enforcement and oversight of the H-1B program is a welcome change from past government negligence but is insufficient. Ultimately, only Congress can fix the problems inherent in the programs’ design.

#### H-1B Visas displace American workers

**Dwoskin, 12** (Elizabeth Dwoskin, staff writer for Bloomberg Businessweek Washington, “H-1B Visas Hit the Cap, Sending Companies to Plan B”, June 13 2012, Bloomberg Businessweek, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-06-13/h1-b-visas-hit-the-cap-companies-go-to-plan-b, NP)

Since Congress created the H-1B in 1965 and the L-1 for specialized skills and managers five years later, opponents have argued that American workers would be displaced. There’s evidence on both sides: A 2009 report from New York University’s Stern School of Business and the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton school found that despite the prevailing wage requirement, H-1Bs depress wages in the tech sector by 6 percent. But a Public Policy Institute of California study reached the opposite conclusion: When you take raises into account, H-1B workers ultimately get paid more than their American counterparts. The debate remains a lively one.

#### High-tech companies like Microsoft, IBM, and HP all are in favor of H-1B visas because of low wages—they displace and lay off American workers, statistics prove

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

IBM, a leading U.S. and state government contractor, has topped the lists of H-1B and L-1 visa users while simultaneously eliminating nearly 28,000 net positions from its U.S. workforce from 2005-09 (Lohr 2009; Thibodeau 2010). In 2009, the NewYork Post article, “NYC Hit by Nerd Job Rob,” described how IBM decided to import 17 workers from India to work on a $1.9 mil- lion contract with the city of New York rather than use American workers. This is not an isolated case. According to Lee Conrad, head of Alliance@IBM, an employee organization and a part of the Communication Workers of America: IBM employees nationwide are deeply concerned that the company is abandoning them in favor of offshore or H-1B and L-1 visa workers. IBM employees have reported that they are being forced to train their offshore replacement or they will forfeit their severance pay when they are dismissed, or be fired outright for non compliance with a management directive. This affects job classifications such as IT specialists, desk side support, from IT architects to finance. For example, IBM U.S. payroll and records employees had to train their offshore replacements and then the work was moved to the Philippines. IBM employees are also reporting that H-1B and L-1 visa workers are staffing formerly U.S. employee positions as the U.S. employees have been terminated during resource actions [IBM’s euphemistic phrase for layoffs].6 The IT industry continues to import large numbers of H-1B and L-1 visas in spite of the fact that the sector’s employment is shrinking in the United States. The U.S. high-tech industry lost 245,600 jobs in 2009, according to Cyberstates 2010, an analysis of BLS data by TechAmerica, the leading technology employer association, while more than 100,000 new H-1Bs were granted in FY09. In early 2009, Microsoft announced it would lay off 5,000 workers. After meeting that target by late 2009 it announced another round of 800 layoffs.7 Yet it continued to import H-1B workers, ranking fifth in FY08 and moving up to second in FY09 on the top H-1B employers list. It received 2,355 H-1Bs in those two years alone. Microsoft also extensively contracts with leading offshore outsourcing firms like Infosys and Satyam (now Mahindra Satyam), which provide on-site personnel on guest worker visas (Lohr 2005). In addition, it recently signed a major three-year contract with Infosys to “handle all the technology services and support for Microsoft itself” (Lohr 2010). Given Infosys’ statements in its SEC filings, the vast majority of the workers servicing the Microsoft contract will almost surely be guest workers on H-1B and L-1 visas. Hewlett-Packard announced layoffs of nearly 25,000 employees after its acquisition of EDS in 2008, yet H-P and EDS, and its offshore outsourcing subsidiary MPhasis, received 1,047 H-1Bs and L-1s in 2008 and 2009. Not all of those 25,000 jobs would be lost—approximately half of them were going to be offshored to workers in low-cost countries (Hewlett-Packard 2009). Hewlett- Packard employees are so afraid for their job security that many have agreed to multiple rounds of pay cuts totaling as much as 50% for some (Godinez 2009). When confronted with these facts, firms sometimes explain that the workers being laid off have “cold” skills that cannot be utilized for new business and that guest workers have the right sets of skills. But given the fact that there is no labor market test and guest workers can be paid more cheaply, it is possible that the reality is that guest workers are simply less expensive than the American workers being laid off, creating larger profit margins for the company.8 Given the importance of every job, especially in a struggling economy, there is no reason to accept the firms’ explanation at face value. It must be verified by government oversight. After all, investors do not simply accept a company’s unverified financial statements. They are safeguarded through the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. Why should American workers be afforded any less protection than investors?

### AT CP Visas HSR - specific

#### 1. Perm Do Both—allows for more solvency and jobs to be created, more infrastructure allows for the workers to commute easier to mega regions where they will innovate

#### 2. Changing H-1B Visas cap has been *rejected* by both sides of Congress and is a major issue—proves CP links to politics

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Mitt Romney, a top candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, has released an economic plan that would make it easier for foreign college graduates with advanced degrees in math, science and engineering to work in the U.S. Romney's plan, unveiled this week, includes a proposal "to raise the ceiling" on visas for holders of advanced degrees in math, science "who have job offers in those fields from U.S. companies." "These workers would not displace unemployed Americans. Rather, they would fill high-skill job openings for which there is currently an acute shortage of labor," wrote Romney, a former Massachusetts governor, in his plan. The U.S. caps H-1B visas at 85,000 a year. Current regulations set aside 20,000 of those visas for advanced degree graduates of U.S. universities. Romney's proposal doesn't stipulate that advanced degree holders be graduates from U.S. universities. Romney's plan also calls for "stapling" green cards to the diplomas of technical degree graduates of U.S. universities, a plan that has been proposed by lawmakers on both sides in Congress without success. "Even in this tough unemployment climate, as of this past spring nearly 1.25 million high-skill jobs remained unfilled," said Romney, in the economic plan released Tuesday. "A skills gap of that magnitude suppresses the productivity of our businesses and slows the overall economy. Highly educated immigrants would help fill that gap and get our economy rolling again."

#### 3. Even if they bring foreign workers into the US—they don’t solve the problem of **domestic unemployment**, when the workers Visa expires they will go back home leaving the US at its misery—we solve the problem of American unemployment in the short term and for the long term while they only access short term solvency

#### Majority of the H-1B Visa holders will “go home” at the end of their visa and foreign skilled workers will displace American workers for cheap wages—empirical studies show, gutting any long term solvency

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Ron Hira, a public policy professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, characterized as "dubious" Romney's claim that there is 1.25 million unfilled high-skilled positions. "None of the official statistics support a claim that there's a shortage of these occupations," said Hira. "Unemployment rates for these occupations continue to be twice what they should be at full employment." Hira, who recently testified on high skills immigration reform before a U.S. Senate committee, also took exception to Romney's claim that "a great majority" of the nearly 300,000 foreign students enrolled in advanced degree programs in the U.S. "will return home." Hira cites a study last year Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, a group funded by the National Science Foundation, which found 67% of foreign students earning doctoral degrees from U.S. colleges in 2005 have remained in the country. By not limiting H-1B visas to advanced degree holders of U.S. universities, Romney "increases the pool of candidates, especially at the Masters level, enormously," said Hira. Conditioning an H-1B visa on a job offer from a U.S. company is not a labor market test, said Hira. "We know that foreign workers, even advanced degree holders, will accept less pay and poorer working conditions, displacing even more American workers and undercutting their wages and working conditions," Hira said. John Miano, the founder of the Programmers Guild, was dismissive of Romney's position. "The American people expect that a president will look at all the facts and make the best decision on those facts," said Miano. Romney's statements "show that he is a pure politician who discards facts in favor of talking points fed to him by lobbyists who can buy access to him."

#### 4. The H-1B visa program is *flawed* and should be closed for US long term success—4 warrants

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Both of these visa programs need immediate and substantial overhaul. The goals of the H-1B and L visa programs have been to bring in foreign workers who complement the U.S. workforce. Instead, loopholes in both programs have made it too easy to bring in cheaper foreign workers, with ordinary skills, who directly substitute for, rather than complement, workers already in the country. They are clearly displacing and denying opportunities to U.S. workers. The loopholes also provide an unfair competitive advantage to companies specializing in offshore outsourcing, undercutting companies that hire American workers. For at least the past five years nearly all of the employers receiving the most H-1B and L-1 visas are using them to offshore tens of thousands of high-wage, high-skilled American jobs. Offshoring through the H-1B program is so common that it has been dubbed the “outsourcing visa” by India’s former commerce minister. H-1B and L-1 visa use has become antithetical to policy makers’ goals due to **four fundamental flaws**: 1. Neither visa requires a labor market test. Employers can and do bypass American workers when recruiting for open positions and even replace outright existing American workers with H-1B and L-1 guest workers. 2. Wage requirements are too low for H-1B visas, and they are non-existent for L-1. The programs are extensively used for wage arbitrage. Employers have told the GAO that they hire H-1Bs because they can legally pay below-market wages. The Department of Labor has certified wages **as low as $12.25 per hour** for H-1B computer professionals. The arbitrage opportunities for L-1 visas can be even greater because employers pay home-country wages. In the case of workers from India—the largest source country for L-1 visas—this can mean a 90% discount for importing an L-1 guest worker compared to hiring an American. 3. Visas are held by the employer rather than the worker. H-1B and L-1 visa workers can be easily exploited and put into poor working conditions but have little recourse because the working relationship is akin to **indentured servitude**. 4. Program oversight and enforcement is deficient. Department of Labor review of H-1B applications has been called a “rubber stamp” by its own Inspector General. A DHS IG report found that one in five H-1Bs were granted under false pretenses. The L-1 visa program has not been reviewed for more than four years even though the last DHS IG report found that there were “significant vulnerabilities to abuse.” By closing the H-1B and L-1 visa loopholes described above, we would create and *retain* tens of thousands of good quality American jobs and ensure that our labor market works fairly for American and foreign workers alike. Bi-partisan legislation, the H-1B and L-1 Visa Reform Act of 2009, would accomplish that. The United States benefits enormously from high-skilled permanent immigration, especially in the technology sector. When we need foreign workers with truly specialized skills, we should rely on permanent immigration rather than guest- worker visas.

#### Changing H-1B Visas cap has been *rejected* by both sides of Congress and is a major issue—proves CP links to politics

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Mitt Romney, a top candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, has released an economic plan that would make it easier for foreign college graduates with advanced degrees in math, science and engineering to work in the U.S. Romney's plan, unveiled this week, includes a proposal "to raise the ceiling" on visas for holders of advanced degrees in math, science "who have job offers in those fields from U.S. companies." "These workers would not displace unemployed Americans. Rather, they would fill high-skill job openings for which there is currently an acute shortage of labor," wrote Romney, a former Massachusetts governor, in his plan. The U.S. caps H-1B visas at 85,000 a year. Current regulations set aside 20,000 of those visas for advanced degree graduates of U.S. universities. Romney's proposal doesn't stipulate that advanced degree holders be graduates from U.S. universities. Romney's plan also calls for "stapling" green cards to the diplomas of technical degree graduates of U.S. universities, a plan that has been proposed by lawmakers on both sides in Congress without success. "Even in this tough unemployment climate, as of this past spring nearly 1.25 million high-skill jobs remained unfilled," said Romney, in the economic plan released Tuesday. "A skills gap of that magnitude suppresses the productivity of our businesses and slows the overall economy. Highly educated immigrants would help fill that gap and get our economy rolling again."

#### Majority of the H-1B Visa holders will “go home” at the end of their visa and foreign skilled workers will displace American workers for cheap wages—empirical studies show, gutting any long term solvency

**Thibodeau, 11** (Patrick Thibodeau, covers SaaS and enterprise applications, outsourcing, government IT policies, data centers and IT workforce issues for Computerworld, “Romney sees tech skills shortage, and H-1B visa need”, Computerworld, September 7 2011, http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9219797/Romney\_sees\_tech\_skills\_shortage\_and\_H\_1B\_visa\_need, NP)

Ron Hira, a public policy professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, characterized as "dubious" Romney's claim that there is 1.25 million unfilled high-skilled positions. "None of the official statistics support a claim that there's a shortage of these occupations," said Hira. "Unemployment rates for these occupations continue to be twice what they should be at full employment." Hira, who recently testified on high skills immigration reform before a U.S. Senate committee, also took exception to Romney's claim that "a great majority" of the nearly 300,000 foreign students enrolled in advanced degree programs in the U.S. "will return home." Hira cites a study last year Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, a group funded by the National Science Foundation, which found 67% of foreign students earning doctoral degrees from U.S. colleges in 2005 have remained in the country. By not limiting H-1B visas to advanced degree holders of U.S. universities, Romney "increases the pool of candidates, especially at the Masters level, enormously," said Hira. Conditioning an H-1B visa on a job offer from a U.S. company is not a labor market test, said Hira. "We know that foreign workers, even advanced degree holders, will accept less pay and poorer working conditions, displacing even more American workers and undercutting their wages and working conditions," Hira said. John Miano, the founder of the Programmers Guild, was dismissive of Romney's position. "The American people expect that a president will look at all the facts and make the best decision on those facts," said Miano. Romney's statements "show that he is a pure politician who discards facts in favor of talking points fed to him by lobbyists who can buy access to him."

#### The H-1B visa program is *flawed* and should be closed for US long term success—4 warrants

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Both of these visa programs need immediate and substantial overhaul. The goals of the H-1B and L visa programs have been to bring in foreign workers who complement the U.S. workforce. Instead, loopholes in both programs have made it too easy to bring in cheaper foreign workers, with ordinary skills, who directly substitute for, rather than complement, workers already in the country. They are clearly displacing and denying opportunities to U.S. workers. The loopholes also provide an unfair competitive advantage to companies specializing in offshore outsourcing, undercutting companies that hire American workers. For at least the past five years nearly all of the employers receiving the most H-1B and L-1 visas are using them to offshore tens of thousands of high-wage, high-skilled American jobs. Offshoring through the H-1B program is so common that it has been dubbed the “outsourcing visa” by India’s former commerce minister. H-1B and L-1 visa use has become antithetical to policy makers’ goals due to **four fundamental flaws**: 1. Neither visa requires a labor market test. Employers can and do bypass American workers when recruiting for open positions and even replace outright existing American workers with H-1B and L-1 guest workers. 2. Wage requirements are too low for H-1B visas, and they are non-existent for L-1. The programs are extensively used for wage arbitrage. Employers have told the GAO that they hire H-1Bs because they can legally pay below-market wages. The Department of Labor has certified wages **as low as $12.25 per hour** for H-1B computer professionals. The arbitrage opportunities for L-1 visas can be even greater because employers pay home-country wages. In the case of workers from India—the largest source country for L-1 visas—this can mean a 90% discount for importing an L-1 guest worker compared to hiring an American. 3. Visas are held by the employer rather than the worker. H-1B and L-1 visa workers can be easily exploited and put into poor working conditions but have little recourse because the working relationship is akin to **indentured servitude**. 4. Program oversight and enforcement is deficient. Department of Labor review of H-1B applications has been called a “rubber stamp” by its own Inspector General. A DHS IG report found that one in five H-1Bs were granted under false pretenses. The L-1 visa program has not been reviewed for more than four years even though the last DHS IG report found that there were “significant vulnerabilities to abuse.” By closing the H-1B and L-1 visa loopholes described above, we would create and *retain* tens of thousands of good quality American jobs and ensure that our labor market works fairly for American and foreign workers alike. Bi-partisan legislation, the H-1B and L-1 Visa Reform Act of 2009, would accomplish that. The United States benefits enormously from high-skilled permanent immigration, especially in the technology sector. When we need foreign workers with truly specialized skills, we should rely on permanent immigration rather than guest- worker visas.

#### H-1B visas have much scrutiny with small regulations—leads to high-skilled workers being exploited and subject to poor conditions—studies prove

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

Until very recently, there has been little enforcement of existing regulations and scant oversight of either program. Lately, the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Service (USCIS) has increased its scrutiny of the H-1B program, including per- forming site visits and asking for documentation (Overby 2009). The new scrutiny was triggered by a 2008 study conducted by USCIS that showed that more than one in five H-1B visas were obtained under false pretenses—either through outright fraud or with significant violations (DHS 2008). In one egregious case, an H-1B worker, certified as highly skilled, was working in a laundromat doing laundry and maintaining washing machines. Stepped-up enforcement and oversight of the H-1B program is a welcome change from past government negligence but is insufficient. Ultimately, only Congress can fix the problems inherent in the programs’ design.

#### H-1B Visas displace American workers

**Dwoskin, 12** (Elizabeth Dwoskin, staff writer for Bloomberg Businessweek Washington, “H-1B Visas Hit the Cap, Sending Companies to Plan B”, June 13 2012, Bloomberg Businessweek, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-06-13/h1-b-visas-hit-the-cap-companies-go-to-plan-b, NP)

Since Congress created the H-1B in 1965 and the L-1 for specialized skills and managers five years later, opponents have argued that American workers would be displaced. There’s evidence on both sides: A 2009 report from New York University’s Stern School of Business and the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton school found that despite the prevailing wage requirement, H-1Bs depress wages in the tech sector by 6 percent. But a Public Policy Institute of California study reached the opposite conclusion: When you take raises into account, H-1B workers ultimately get paid more than their American counterparts. The debate remains a lively one.

#### High-tech companies like Microsoft, IBM, and HP all are in favor of H-1B visas because of low wages—they displace and lay off American workers, statistics prove

**Hira, Ph.D., Public Policy, 10** (Ron Hira, also a Economic Policy Institute research associate, Economic Policy Institute, “The H-1B and L-1 Visa programs: Out of Control”, October 14 2010, EPI Briefing Paper #280, http://www.epi.org/publication/bp280/, NP)

IBM, a leading U.S. and state government contractor, has topped the lists of H-1B and L-1 visa users while simultaneously eliminating nearly 28,000 net positions from its U.S. workforce from 2005-09 (Lohr 2009; Thibodeau 2010). In 2009, the NewYork Post article, “NYC Hit by Nerd Job Rob,” described how IBM decided to import 17 workers from India to work on a $1.9 mil- lion contract with the city of New York rather than use American workers. This is not an isolated case. According to Lee Conrad, head of Alliance@IBM, an employee organization and a part of the Communication Workers of America: IBM employees nationwide are deeply concerned that the company is abandoning them in favor of offshore or H-1B and L-1 visa workers. IBM employees have reported that they are being forced to train their offshore replacement or they will forfeit their severance pay when they are dismissed, or be fired outright for non compliance with a management directive. This affects job classifications such as IT specialists, desk side support, from IT architects to finance. For example, IBM U.S. payroll and records employees had to train their offshore replacements and then the work was moved to the Philippines. IBM employees are also reporting that H-1B and L-1 visa workers are staffing formerly U.S. employee positions as the U.S. employees have been terminated during resource actions [IBM’s euphemistic phrase for layoffs].6 The IT industry continues to import large numbers of H-1B and L-1 visas in spite of the fact that the sector’s employment is shrinking in the United States. The U.S. high-tech industry lost 245,600 jobs in 2009, according to Cyberstates 2010, an analysis of BLS data by TechAmerica, the leading technology employer association, while more than 100,000 new H-1Bs were granted in FY09. In early 2009, Microsoft announced it would lay off 5,000 workers. After meeting that target by late 2009 it announced another round of 800 layoffs.7 Yet it continued to import H-1B workers, ranking fifth in FY08 and moving up to second in FY09 on the top H-1B employers list. It received 2,355 H-1Bs in those two years alone. Microsoft also extensively contracts with leading offshore outsourcing firms like Infosys and Satyam (now Mahindra Satyam), which provide on-site personnel on guest worker visas (Lohr 2005). In addition, it recently signed a major three-year contract with Infosys to “handle all the technology services and support for Microsoft itself” (Lohr 2010). Given Infosys’ statements in its SEC filings, the vast majority of the workers servicing the Microsoft contract will almost surely be guest workers on H-1B and L-1 visas. Hewlett-Packard announced layoffs of nearly 25,000 employees after its acquisition of EDS in 2008, yet H-P and EDS, and its offshore outsourcing subsidiary MPhasis, received 1,047 H-1Bs and L-1s in 2008 and 2009. Not all of those 25,000 jobs would be lost—approximately half of them were going to be offshored to workers in low-cost countries (Hewlett-Packard 2009). Hewlett- Packard employees are so afraid for their job security that many have agreed to multiple rounds of pay cuts totaling as much as 50% for some (Godinez 2009). When confronted with these facts, firms sometimes explain that the workers being laid off have “cold” skills that cannot be utilized for new business and that guest workers have the right sets of skills. But given the fact that there is no labor market test and guest workers can be paid more cheaply, it is possible that the reality is that guest workers are simply less expensive than the American workers being laid off, creating larger profit margins for the company.8 Given the importance of every job, especially in a struggling economy, there is no reason to accept the firms’ explanation at face value. It must be verified by government oversight. After all, investors do not simply accept a company’s unverified financial statements. They are safeguarded through the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. Why should American workers be afforded any less protection than investors?