## Topicality – Underlying structures – Bus fuel cells specific

A. Interpretation - Transportation infrastructure must be the underlying structures like building a road not accessories to a road like new road signs.

Trimbath, PhD in Economics, 11

(Susanne, US Chamber.com [website of the US Chamber of Commerce], former Senior Research Economist in the Capital Market Studies at the Milken Institute, Senior Advisor on corporate community investment for the Business Civic Leadership Center of the US Chamber of Commerce, PhD in economics from NYU, 2011, “Transportation Infrastructure: paving the way,” <http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/issues/infrastructure/files/2009TPI_Update_Economics_White_Paper_110712.pdf>, alp)

The strategy applied by the US Chamber of Commerce for the infrastructure performance index project presents a model for developing the way forward. A stakeholder-centric approach allows you to measure the right things, communicate to the people in a language they understand and get to ACTION faster. The process, detailed in the Technical Report last summer (US Chamber 2010), is basically this: 1. Clearly define “transportation infrastructure” as the underlying structures that support the delivery of inputs to places of production, goods and services to customers, and customers to marketplaces. The structures are: • Transit • Highways • Airports • Railways • Waterways (Ports) • Intermodal Links

**B. Violation** – new fuel cell buses aren’t topical. Building a new road for buses would be topical but just building buses isn’t.

**C. Voting issue –**

Limits – we set a fair limit. Aff’s can build new roads, new railways, new airports, new ports or new intermodal links combined with the various investment mechanisms that creates more than 25 different possibilities for the affirmative. However, allowing the aff to go beyond building new underlying structures justifies the “accessory affirmative”. There are thousands of potential possibilities including adding stoplights, new road signs, toll booths, and stickers on public buses, just to name a few. That type of topic explosion makes it impossible for the negative to effectively prepare hurting education and giving the affirmative an unfair advantage.

### Overview

Our interpretation allows the affirmative to create underlying structures for transportation which would include new roads, railways, airports, ports or intermodal links combined with the various investment mechanisms, grants, subsidies, tax credits, loans and loan guarantees, creating at least 25 different possibilities for the affirmative. The topical version of their affirmative is to build new roads for buses. Our interpretation excludes “accessory affs” that just add something to an underlying structure but aren’t an underlying structure. This would exclude the list of affirmatives we specified in the 1nc: stoplights, road signs, toll booths, bus stickers. Creating this type of limit is crucial for predictable limits which is the best internal link to both fairness and education. They clearly don’t meet our interpretation so if we win we have the best interpretation you should vote negative.

### AT We have contextual evidence that we are transportation infrastructure

#### They claim that their interpretation wouldn’t allow new automobiles but contextual evidence says rolling stock is included and that means automobiles.

Free Dictionary

(<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/rolling+stock>, no date cited, accessed 7-24-12, twm)

rolling stock

n.

The equipment available for use as transportation, as automotive vehicles, locomotives, or railroad cars, owned by a particular company or carrier.

**Reject their contextual evidence** – 2 reasons

**First,** it’s unlimiting - it would allow anything that was a part of the Recovery Act which was about infrastructure not TRANSPORTATION infrastructure. They link to our 1NC argument about accessories aff’s. If you allow this aff you can’t exclude any of those affirmatives.

**Second,** they don’t have an actual definition – that should be a pre requisite to accepting an interpretation.

## T Substantially – 1NC

#### “Substantial investment” must be an increase of at least 20%

Traficant 89 (“H.R.2489 -- Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act (Introduced in House - IH)”, 5-24, http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c101:H.R.2489.IH:)

SEC. 2. INCOME FROM RUNAWAY PLANTS OR FROM MANUFACTURING OPERATIONS LOCATED IN A COUNTRY WHICH PROVIDES A TAX HOLIDAY INCLUDED IN SUBPART F INCOME.

(a) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME ADDED TO CURRENTLY TAXED AMOUNTS- Subsection (a) of section 954 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining foreign base company income) is amended by striking `and' at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting `, and', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

`(6) the foreign base company manufacturing related income for the taxable year (determined under subsection (h) and reduced as provided in subsection (b)(5)).'

(b) DEFINITION OF FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME- Section 954 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

`(h) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME-

`(1) IN GENERAL- For purposes of this section, the term `foreign base company manufacturing related income' means income (whether in the form of profits, commissions, fees, or otherwise) derived in connection with the manufacture for or sale to any person of personal property by the controlled foreign corporation where the property sold was manufactured by the controlled foreign corporation in any country other than the United States if such property or any component of such property was manufactured--

`(A) in a tax holiday plant, or

`(B) in a runaway plant.

`(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS; SPECIAL RULES- For purposes of this subsection--

`(A) TAX HOLIDAY PLANT DEFINED- The term `tax holiday plant' means any facility--

`(i) operated by the controlled foreign corporation in connection with the manufacture of personal property, and

`(ii) with respect to which any economic benefit under any tax law of the country in which such facility is located accrued--

`(I) to such corporation,

`(II) for the purpose of providing an incentive to such corporation to establish, maintain, or expand such facility, and

`(III) for the taxable year of such corporation during which the personal property referred to in paragraph (1) was manufactured.

`(B) RUNAWAY PLANT DEFINED- The term `runaway plant' means any facility--

`(i) for the manufacture of personal property of which not less than 10 percent is used, consumed, or otherwise disposed of in the United States, and

`(ii) which is established or maintained by the controlled foreign corporation in a country in which the effective tax rate imposed by such country on the corporation is less than 90 percent of the effective tax rate which would be imposed on such corporation under this title.

`(C) ECONOMIC BENEFIT UNDER ANY TAX LAW DEFINED- The term `economic benefit under any tax law' includes--

`(i) any exclusion or deduction of any amount from gross income derived in connection with--

`(I) the operation of any manufacturing facility, or

`(II) the manufacture or sale of any personal property,

which would otherwise be subject to tax under the law of such country;

`(ii) any reduction in the rate of any tax which would otherwise be imposed under the laws of such country with respect to any facility or property referred to in clause (i) (including any ad valorem tax or excise tax with respect to such property);

`(iii) any credit against any tax which would otherwise be assessed against any such facility or property or any income derived in connection with the operation of any such facility or the manufacture or sale of any such property; and

`(iv) any abatement of any amount of tax otherwise due and any other reduction in the actual amount of tax paid to such country.

`(D) MANUFACTURE DEFINED- The term `manufacture' or `manufacturing' includes any production, processing, assembling, or finishing of any personal property or any component of property not yet assembled and any packaging, handling, or other activity incidental to the shipment or delivery of such property to any buyer.

`(E) CORPORATION INCLUDES ANY RELATED PERSON- The term `controlled foreign corporation' includes any related person with respect to such corporation.

`(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING WHICH TAXABLE YEAR AN ECONOMIC BENEFIT WAS OBTAINED- An economic benefit under any tax law shall be treated as having accrued in the taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation in which such corporation actually obtained the benefit, notwithstanding the fact that such benefit may have been allowable for any preceding or succeeding taxable year and was carried forward or back, for any reason, to the taxable year.

`(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (1) IN CERTAIN CASES- For purposes of this section--

`(A) IN GENERAL- The term `foreign base company manufacturing related income' shall not include any income of a controlled foreign corporation from the manufacture or sale of personal property if--

`(i) such corporation is not a corporation significantly engaged in manufacturing,

`(ii) the investment in the expansion of an existing facility which gave rise to a tax holiday for such facility was not a substantial investment, or

`(iii) the personal property was used, consumed, or otherwise disposed of in the country in which such property was manufactured.

`(B) CORPORATION SIGNIFICANTLY ENGAGED IN MANUFACTURING DEFINED-

`(i) GENERAL RULE- A corporation shall be deemed to be significantly engaged in manufacturing if the value of real property and other capital assets owned or controlled by the corporation and dedicated to manufacturing operations is more than 10 percent of the total value of all real property and other capital assets owned or controlled by such corporation.

`(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR ASSESSING PROPERTY VALUE- The value of any property owned by the corporation is the basis of such corporation in such property. The basis of the corporation in any property which was acquired other than by purchase shall be the fair market value of such property at the time of such acquisition. Any property controlled but not owned by such corporation under any lease (or any other instrument which gives such corporation any right of use or occupancy with respect to such property) shall be treated as property acquired other than by purchase in the manner provided in the preceding sentence.

`(C) SUBSTANTIAL INVESTMENT DEFINED- The term `substantial investment' means any amount which--

`(i) was added to the capital account for an existing facility during the 3-year period ending on the last day of any taxable year with respect to which such facility is a tax holiday plant, and

`(ii) caused the sum of all amounts added to such account during such period to exceed 20 percent of the total value of such facility (determined in the manner provided in subparagraph (B)(ii)) on the first day of such period.'

#### That means the plan must spend 9 billion dollars – and they don’t.

¾ of 60 billion = 45; 20% of that = 9 billion

CBO 8 (Congressional Budgeting Office, “Issues and Options in Infrastructure Investment”, May, http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/91xx/doc9135/05-16-infrastructure.pdf)

Federal spending on infrastructure is dominated by transportation, which accounted for nearly three-quarters of the roughly $60 billion total federal investment in infrastructure in 2004. Highways alone accounted for nearly half of the total. Spending by state and local governments that year was primarily for schools, highways, and water systems. Together, those categories accounted for about $135 billion in state and local government spending, which is about 80 percent of the $170 billion spent on infrastructure by state and local governments.

#### Anything less is “minor remodeling”, not “investment”

Delisle 10 (Deborah S., Superintendent of Public Instruction – Ohio Department of Education, “Weekly Update”, EdConnection, 10-4, http://www.ercoinc.org/updates/October10.html)

Certification required for improvements with ARRA Funds (SFSF and IDEA)

Section 1511 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) requires that any infrastructure improvements funded with ARRA funds are certified to have received the full review and vetting required by law, and that the chief executive accepts responsibility that the infrastructure investment is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. Districts that have reported infrastructure improvements made with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF) funds will be contacted in the near future and requested to complete a certification letter with a description of the project. Districts that are planning future infrastructure improvements with IDEA or SFSF funds should request certification documents from recovery@ode.state.oh.us.

Per guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education, an infrastructure investment is financial support for a physical asset or structure needed for the operation of a larger enterprise. Therefore, infrastructure investments include support for tangible assets or structures such as roads, public buildings (including schools), mass transit systems, water and sewage systems, communication and utility systems.

However, an infrastructure investment does not include “minor remodeling” according to 34 C.F.R.§ 77.1(c), which defines the term as minor alterations in a previously completed building. The term also includes the extension of utility lines, such as water and electricity, from points beyond the confines of the space in which the minor remodeling is undertaken but within the confines of the previously completed building. The term infrastructure investment does not include building construction, structural alterations to buildings, building maintenance or repairs.

#### Voting issue ---

#### 1. Impossible Affs --- a restrictive interpretation of ‘substantial’ is the only check on topic explosion. The ‘double whammy’ a huge topic with tiny cases that avoid core arguments makes it impossible for the Neg to compete.

#### 2. Hold the line --- substantially is hard to judge, but subjectivity is inevitable and it’s better to make a determination about what the word means than to allow an endless proliferation of Affs.

## DA Water Tradeoff

### DA Water Tradeoff 1NC

Funding is stable now but could be switched to other infrastructure policies at

any time

Copeland Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy et al 10 [Claudia Copeland Specialist in Resources and Environmental Policy Nicole T. Carter Specialist in Natural Resources Policy Betsy A. Cody Specialist in Natural Resources Policy Megan Stubbs Analyst in Agricultural Conservation and Natural Resources Policy “Water Infrastructure Funding in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009” 1/11/10 <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R40216_20100111.pdf>] crk

As described in this report, some of the water infrastructure funds included in the Recovery Act represented a significant increase above recent program funding levels—for some, from three to four times higher than the FY2009 amount. Many infrastructure stakeholder groups then urged Congress to sustain similar high levels in regular appropriations in FY2010 and beyond, because infrastructure projects typically involve outlays over multiple years. They argued that individual project planning and implementation would be disrupted if federal assistance is uneven or unpredictable, very large one year and much lower the next year. But because the infrastructure funds in P.L. 111-5 are to be available for obligation through FY2010 and will be spent out over several years, 35 some policymakers argued that it would not be necessary to appropriate increased levels for these programs in FY2010. Still, with Administration support in the FY2010 budget request, regular FY2010 appropriations for the water infrastructure programs discussed in this report, which were enacted later in 2009, were for the most part slightly higher than regular FY2009 appropriations, but generally not as large as the substantial supplemental amounts that agencies received under ARRA. Whether it will be possible to sustain high spending levels for these programs in future years, beyond the period covered by P.L. 111-5, is uncertain because of the significant fiscal challenges that policymakers face, but it is likely that there will continue to be calls for Congress to do that very thing

#### Lawmakers have trouble funding water infrastructure with such tight budgets

Kosik, business correspondent for CNN, ’11 (Alison, 1/21/11, CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2011/US/01/20/water.main.infrastructure/index.html,

But as they say, timing is everything. The aging infrastructure threat also comes in the wake of a recession, when politicians are struggling to maintain state and federal budgets. Also, water systems must compete with needs for other underground systems, such as communications networks.

#### Water Infrastructure is key to prevent the spread of diseases and increase economic growth so we turn the case.

American Society of Civil Engineers, ’09 (American Society of Civil Engineers, http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/fact-sheet/drinking-water, “Drinking Water,” AM)

Drinking water systems provide a critical public health function and are essential to life, economic development, and growth. Disruptions in service can hinder disaster response and recovery efforts, expose the public to water-borne contaminants, and cause damage to roadways, structures, and other infrastructure, endangering lives and resulting in billions of dollars in losses. The nation’s drinking-water systems are not highly resilient; present capabilities to prevent failure and properly maintain or reconstitute services are inadequate. Additionally, the lack of investment and the interdependence on the energy sector contribute to the lack of overall system resilience. These shortcomings are currently being addressed through the construction of dedicated emergency power generation at key drinking water utility facilities, increased connections with adjacent utilities for emergency supply, and the development of security and criticality criteria. Investment prioritization must take into consideration system vulnerabilities, interdependencies, improved efficiencies in water usage via market incentives, system robustness, redundancy, failure consequences, and ease and cost of recovery.

#### Timeframe and probability preempt magnitude – intervening actors can prevent terrorism, nuclear war, asteroid impact, but disease and mutation unpredictable – disease should be evaluated first.

Smil, Prof of Environment, 05

[Vaclav, Distinguished Professor in the Faculty of Environment at the University of Manitoba, June, “The Next 50 Years: Fatal Discontinuities,” Population and Development Review, Vol. 31, No. 2, last accessed 7/7/11, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3401359.pdf] TD

In contrast, there is a high probability of an influenza pandemic that would rival or surpass the greatest such event on record, and a simple probabilistic assessment shows that the risk of a transformational megawar is of the same order of magnitude (Figure 6). But I emphasize that the past record, while highly indicative and inevitably suggestive, is basically one of singularities, events that are too few and mostly too far apart to allow for any meaningful statistical evaluation beyond the simplest calculations of highly uncertain return frequencies and approximate recurrence probabili- ties. Still, we now know enough about near-Earth objects to rank the dan- ger from colliding asteroids as by far the least likely discontinuity with a potential to change near-term history. Moreover, the overall risk may be revised substantially downward during the coming years. We can take many steps to lessen the risk of a future megawar and even to reduce the likelihood of the worst imaginable terrorist attacks, but we are entirely at the mercy of unpredictable viral mutations. With luck the next pandemic may resemble much more the last bout than the 1918- 19 event, or it could be the greatest viral cataclysm in history. These are, indeed, the most disturbing marks of our ignorance: we have no way to know whether we are exaggerating or underestimating what is to come, be it from the depth of fundamentalist hatred or from random mutations of viral genomes. We can take many steps to be better prepared for another terrorist attack on the scale of 9/11 and for a pandemic mortality on the scale of the two last episodes. But if we are grossly underestimating these risks, then there is much less we are likely to do to make any fundamental difference: there is simply no way to prepare for a terrorist attack with a hijacked nuclear-tipped missile or for dealing with more than 2 billion in- fected people and more than 100 million deaths. But many steps we can take will make a marginal difference, and those margins may translate into a large number of saved lives. The probability of a terrorist campaign that would be sufficiently intense and prolonged to change the course of history is unknown and unknowable. Even so, a com- bination of rational steps (in contrast to the exaggerated, often plainly cos- metic, and patently wasteful post-9/11 responses) ranging from better evalu- ation of available intelligence (still marred by shortages of translators and coordinated data bases) and more flexible armed response to gradual social and political transformations can clearly reduce the likelihood of many ter- rorist attacks and moderate their consequences. But if we are to act as rational risk minimizers, then the current pre- occupation with this risk should not blind us to what are historically two much more likely threats: another megawar and another pandemic during the next 50 years. Early interventions to defuse any emerging causes of potentially massive armed confrontations and better preparedness for a major pandemic would be the most rewarding risk-reducing steps. Forget about near-Earth asteroids, supervolcanoes, and monster tsunamis; with foresight and some luck we can even live with terrorism, but we must not underestimate the chances of another megawar and must remember that unpredictably mutating viruses will be always with us.

## CP Ban energy subsidies

### CP Ban energy subsidies 1NC

Text: The United States federal government should end all energy subsidies.

#### The plan isn’t any different than past programs – the government always thinks they can pick the next winner. They already wasted $2 billion in subsidies on hydrogen fuel cells. These types of programs just stifle innovation and distort the private capital markets.

DeHaven, former deputy director of the Indiana Office of Management and Budget, 12

(Tad, Policy Analysis, July 25, “Corporate Welfare in the Federal Budget”, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/100695777/Corporate-Welfare-in-the-Federal-Budget-Cato-Policy-Analysis-No-703>, twm)

Energy Subsidies.¶ The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has been subsidizing the development and commercialization of “alternative” fuels for decades. Successive administrations have attempted to plan for the country’s future energy needs by effectively throwing taxpayer money against a wall and hoping that something will stick. For example, the DOE has been funding “clean coal” research for decades, but it has little to show for the effort.¶ 16¶ Every president from Ronald Reagan toBarack Obama has supported clean coal subsidies. Unfortunately, clean coal has been a costly and unproductive exercise from the taxpayers’point of view, and it remains unpopular withenvironmentalists. The Government Account-ability Office found that many clean-coal proj-ects have “experienced delays, cost overruns,bankruptcies, and performance problems.”¶ 17¶ More recently, the Obama administration’s costly campaign to increase subsidies for alternative energy sources, including solar and wind, has been marked by high-profile failures and scandal, which is discussed below.¶ Automaker Subsidies¶ . The Department of Energy’s Advanced Technology Vehicles Man-ufacturing (ATVM) Loan Program provides subsidies to companies to develop “greener”automobiles. Companies that have received assistance from the ATVM program include Ford and Nissan.¶ 18¶ In a 2009 article in¶ Wired ¶ magazine, Darryl Siry, a former executive withTesla Motors, which received an ATVM loan,wrote that startup companies applying for energy subsidies “have admitted that private fundraising is complicated by investor expectations of government support.”¶ 19¶ Siry notes that the government trying to pick winners distorts the market for private capital, which “will have a stifling effect on innovation, as private capital chases fewer deals and companies that do not have government backing have a harder time attracting private capital.”¶ 20¶ The ATVM program is just the latest attempt by policymakers to create greener cars. In 1993, the Clinton administration launched its Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. This program handed out $1.2 billionover eight years to U.S. automakers for the development of hybrid cars. The program was widely panned, but instead of eliminating such subsidies altogether, the George W. Bush administration replaced it with a new initiative called Freedom Car. This program focused on developing automobiles that would run on hydrogen fuel cells, and it cost taxpayers about$2 billion.¶ 21¶ The Obama administration announced in 2009 that the government was“moving away from funding vehicular hydrogen fuel cells to technologies with more immediate promise.”

#### Reducing fossil fuel subsidies key to reducing structural violence, improving our economy and solving global warming.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

It has been nearly three years since the G20 member states, representing the largest economies in the world, committed to “rationalize and phase out over the medium term inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption.” The move represented the strongest coordinated action to date focused on removing environmentally harmful subsidies. It had a number of potential benefits to member states as well:¶ • Fiscal savings. Reform could help stem the massive financial cost of fuel subsidies to consumers in many of the member states, a cost that was surging with rising global prices for oil and crowding out spending on social programs. In theory, these savings could be redirected towards programs of greater benefit to economic development and poverty reduction, and to instruments with less “leakage” to middle- and upper-classes than the fuel subsidies had.¶ • Alignment with environmental goals. Subsidy reform could more effectively align government spending with the environmental priorities of the countries and any existing commitments to address climate change.¶ • Reduce trade distortions. The reforms could also reduce trade distortions, as targeted subsidies to energy-intensive industries would be removed, allowing more efficient products and producers to gain market share.

#### Their claims of economic viability of hydrogen fuel cells are just hype from either politicians or people with a vested economic interest.

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

Conclusion¶ The economic problems involved in delivering¶ hydrogen to fuel cells are difficult to remedy¶ because they stem from fundamental thermodynamics.¶ Although technological improvement¶ may well increase the efficiency with¶ which energy is used along some if not all of the¶ production chain, the challenges are so immense¶ that the confident predictions of imminent¶ economic breakthroughs heard from the¶ political class are hard to take seriously. 25¶ Decisions about the relative merits of various¶ emerging technologies are best left to¶ the marketplace, where private investors have¶ every incentive to make the soundest bets. If¶ hydrogen-powered fuel cells hold economic¶ promise, investors will have every incentive to¶ promote their development. If they do not,¶ then investors will rightly put their money¶ elsewhere. Subsidies simply impose politically¶ inspired judgments on market actors, and¶ there is no reason to think that those judgments¶ are better informed than the ones that¶ reign in the marketplace.

### Decision Rules

#### Absent proof subsidies further a sustainable world you are obligated to reject them.

Lang,Project Manager Global Subsidies Initiative, 11

(Kerryn, former consultant with the International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO), International Adviser on trade and environment policy for New Zealand’s Ministry for the Environment. Bachelor of Laws (2003): Victoria University of Wellington, Bachelor of Arts (2002): University of Wellington, “The First Year of the¶ G-20 Commitment on¶ Fossil-Fuel Subsidies:¶ A commentary on lessons¶ learned and the path forward, January, twm)

But the case for scrutiny goes further. Even when subsidies are legitimate instruments of public policy, their¶ efficacy – their fitness for purpose – must still be demonstrated. All too often, the unintended and unforeseen¶ consequences of poorly designed subsidies overwhelm the benefits claimed for these programs. Meanwhile,¶ the citizens who foot the bills remain in the dark.¶ When subsidies are the principal cause of the perpetuation of a fundamentally unfair trading system, and lie¶ at the root of serious environmental degradation, the questions have to be asked: Is this how taxpayers want¶ their money spent? And should they, through their taxes, support such counterproductive outcomes?¶ Eliminating harmful subsidies would free up scarce funds to support more worthy causes. The GSI’s challenge¶ to those who advocate creating or maintaining particular subsidies is that they should be able to demonstrate¶ that the subsidies are environmentally, socially and economically sustainable.

### CP solves climate change

#### Fossil fuel subsidies stop investment in clean energy and distort the market

Lang,Project Manager Global Subsidies Initiative, 11

(Kerryn, former consultant with the International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO), International Adviser on trade and environment policy for New Zealand’s Ministry for the Environment. Bachelor of Laws (2003): Victoria University of Wellington, Bachelor of Arts (2002): University of Wellington, “The First Year of the¶ G-20 Commitment on¶ Fossil-Fuel Subsidies:¶ A commentary on lessons¶ learned and the path forward, January, twm)

During 2009 and 2010 government efforts to curb fossil-fuel subsidies burgeoned with fossil-fuel subsidy¶ reform, becoming a frequent topic on international agendas. In September 2009, G-20 leaders recognized¶ that “inefficient fossil fuel subsidies encourage wasteful consumption, distort markets, impede investment¶ in clean energy sources and undermine efforts to deal with climate change” and announced a commitment¶ to rationalize and phase out fossil-fuel subsidies over the medium term (G-20 Leaders, 2009). Following that¶ announcement, in November 2009 the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum made a similar¶ pledge to phase out fossil-fuel subsidies, extending the commitment to an additional 11 countries. To support¶ these initiatives, New Zealand established a Friends of Fossil-Fuel Subsidy Reform group of countries that¶ include Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. In addition, organizations such as the International Energy¶ Agency (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the World Bank¶ have boosted their research and policy programs that support fossil-fuel subsidy reform (see Box 1 for a¶ timeline of events).

#### Fossil fuel subsidies undermine solvency for climate change

Lang,Project Manager Global Subsidies Initiative, 11

(Kerryn, former consultant with the International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO), International Adviser on trade and environment policy for New Zealand’s Ministry for the Environment. Bachelor of Laws (2003): Victoria University of Wellington, Bachelor of Arts (2002): University of Wellington, “The First Year of the¶ G-20 Commitment on¶ Fossil-Fuel Subsidies:¶ A commentary on lessons¶ learned and the path forward, January, twm)

Subsidies to fossil fuels are not only costly—the IEA estimates that, globally, we spent US$ 312 billion¶ subsidizing fossil-fuel consumption in 2009—but they also work against global efforts to curb climate change¶ by making high-emitting fossil fuels cheaper to produce and consume, and by distorting the market against¶ renewable energies and clean technologies.

#### Eliminating fossil fuel subsidies would spur clean energy, create jobs and reduce poverty.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

Further, the research mandates to track and quantify subsidies have remained strong in key global institutions including the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, the United Nations (UN), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While global coverage continues to be spotty in some important areas, the strong research mandates have helped to reduce these gaps. Data on fossil-fuel subsidies now covers more types of subsidies, more countries, and in more accessible formats for outside researchers than was the case even two years ago. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, key elements of the fossil-fuel subsidy problem now seem to be a firm part of the climate-change and fiscal restructuring agendas. Critical elements of this shift include the view that:¶ • Many fossil fuel subsidies do not make sense fiscally or environmentally.¶ • Funds saved from subsidy reform may be significant and can be used to transition to more effective policies to achieve the stated goals of the original subsidies (e.g., job creation or poverty reduction) without environmental downsides.¶ • Even in countries with low production costs and large domestic endowments of fossil fuels, continued sales of energy products below their global opportunity cost makes little sense and causes domestic problems over the medium term.

#### Fossil fuels receive six times more subsidies than renewable energy.

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

Fossil-fuel consumers worldwide received about six times more government subsidies than were given to the renewable-energy industry, according to the chief adviser to oil-importing nations.

#### Fossil fuel subsidies create market distortion creating wasteful consumption.

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

While fossil fuels meet about 80 percent of world energy demand, its subsidies are “creating market distortions that encourage wasteful consumption,” the agency said. “The costs of subsidies to fossil fuels generally outweigh the benefits.”

#### Eliminating subsidies would reduce global warming

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

Cutting the payments would also help tackle climate change, the report said. Eliminating subsidies by 2020 would cut global energy demand by 3.9 percent in that year, the equivalent of 600 million tons of oil, the report said. The saving would rise to 4.8 percent by 2035.

### CP Solves structural violence

#### Reducing fossil fuel subsidies key to reducing structural violence and solve global warming.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

It has been nearly three years since the G20 member states, representing the largest economies in the world, committed to “rationalize and phase out over the medium term inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption.” The move represented the strongest coordinated action to date focused on removing environmentally harmful subsidies. It had a number of potential benefits to member states as well:¶ • Fiscal savings. Reform could help stem the massive financial cost of fuel subsidies to consumers in many of the member states, a cost that was surging with rising global prices for oil and crowding out spending on social programs. In theory, these savings could be redirected towards programs of greater benefit to economic development and poverty reduction, and to instruments with less “leakage” to middle- and upper-classes than the fuel subsidies had.¶ • Alignment with environmental goals. Subsidy reform could more effectively align government spending with the environmental priorities of the countries and any existing commitments to address climate change.¶ • Reduce trade distortions. The reforms could also reduce trade distortions, as targeted subsidies to energy-intensive industries would be removed, allowing more efficient products and producers to gain market share.

#### Eliminating fossil fuel subsidies would spur clean energy, create jobs and reduce poverty.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

Further, the research mandates to track and quantify subsidies have remained strong in key global institutions including the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, the United Nations (UN), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While global coverage continues to be spotty in some important areas, the strong research mandates have helped to reduce these gaps. Data on fossil-fuel subsidies now covers more types of subsidies, more countries, and in more accessible formats for outside researchers than was the case even two years ago. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, key elements of the fossil-fuel subsidy problem now seem to be a firm part of the climate-change and fiscal restructuring agendas. Critical elements of this shift include the view that:¶ • Many fossil fuel subsidies do not make sense fiscally or environmentally.¶ • Funds saved from subsidy reform may be significant and can be used to transition to more effective policies to achieve the stated goals of the original subsidies (e.g., job creation or poverty reduction) without environmental downsides.¶ • Even in countries with low production costs and large domestic endowments of fossil fuels, continued sales of energy products below their global opportunity cost makes little sense and causes domestic problems over the medium term.

#### Fossil fuel subsidies hurt the poor.

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

While governments argue that fossil fuel subsidies are designed to help the poorest members of society, they generally fail to meet that goal, the IEA said. Just 8 percent of aid reached the poorest 20 percent of each country’s population last year.

“Fossil-fuel subsidies as presently constituted tend to be regressive, disproportionately benefiting higher income groups that can afford higher levels of fuel consumption,” the report said. “Social welfare programs are a more effective and less distortionary way of helping the poor than energy subsidies.”

### CP Solves jobs

#### Eliminating fossil fuel subsidies would spur clean energy, create jobs and reduce poverty.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

Further, the research mandates to track and quantify subsidies have remained strong in key global institutions including the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, the United Nations (UN), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While global coverage continues to be spotty in some important areas, the strong research mandates have helped to reduce these gaps. Data on fossil-fuel subsidies now covers more types of subsidies, more countries, and in more accessible formats for outside researchers than was the case even two years ago. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, key elements of the fossil-fuel subsidy problem now seem to be a firm part of the climate-change and fiscal restructuring agendas. Critical elements of this shift include the view that:¶ • Many fossil fuel subsidies do not make sense fiscally or environmentally.¶ • Funds saved from subsidy reform may be significant and can be used to transition to more effective policies to achieve the stated goals of the original subsidies (e.g., job creation or poverty reduction) without environmental downsides.¶ • Even in countries with low production costs and large domestic endowments of fossil fuels, continued sales of energy products below their global opportunity cost makes little sense and causes domestic problems over the medium term.

### CP solves deficits

#### The US wastes billions on fossil fuel subsidies including transport infrastructure to move bulk fossil fuels.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

Germany and the United States provided the largest producer subsidies according to OECD, at US$10 billion and US$12 billion, respectively. OECD estimates were higher than those submitted to the G20 team by the United States, though were still only a fraction of the estimates done by this author, which incorporated more tax breaks, power subsidies, security for oil shipments, and subsidized transport infrastructure to move bulk fossil-fuels.

### AT Perm do the plan and end fossil fuel subsidies

#### Extend our 1nc card from DeHaven 12 – that card proves why the perm isn’t net beneficial it undermines long term economic growth, wastes billions of dollars and empirically won’t solve – the government already put $2 billion into hydrogen fuel cells. Empirically, proves that subsidies won’t help fuel cells get off the ground.

No net benefit to the perm – we solve all the aff so there isn’t any reason to do the plan. Even small net benefits like wasteful spending and innovation are more than enough to vote neg on.

**Extend our 1nc Anthrop evidence.** You should privilege this evidence. He is a professor of environmental studies who did significant calculations of the viability of hydrogen fuel cells and he accurately predicted that the claims of politicians in 2003 that fuel cells would be economically viable quickly were wrong. So he is both more qualified and his work has been empirically validated.

#### We need to end all energy subsidies – the government empirically fails to pick winners and the real engines of economic growth are companies that produce energy without subsidies.

Payne 12

(Amy, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/07/24/morning-bell-the-green-graveyard-of-taxpayer-funded-failures/>, “Morning Bell: The Green Graveyard of Taxpayer-Funded Failures”, July 24, twm)

Solar-cell manufacturer Solyndra became a household name when it collapsed, taking $627 million in American taxpayer dollars with it. It’s the poster company for the government picking winners and losers—or really, just losers—in the energy market. But there are 12 more “green energy” losers that have declared bankruptcy despite attempts to prop them up with taxpayer money—and the list is growing.¶ There’s a reason why these companies could not rely solely on private financing and needed help from the government. They couldn’t make it on their own; they couldn’t even make it with extra taxpayer help.¶ These green government “investments” take from one (by taxing or borrowing) and give to another, but they merely move money around. They do not create jobs. They send labor and resources to areas of the economy where they are wasted. Proponents of special financing and tax credits for solar companies claim that these benefits will pay for themselves down the line—but when the companies receiving them are going bankrupt, that is highly unlikely.¶ Kate Adams, a member of Heritage’s Young Leaders Program, and Heritage’s Rachael Slobodien compiled a list of the 12 members of the Green Graveyard—companies that received taxpayer money for green initiatives yet have filed for bankruptcy.¶ Abound Solar (Loveland, Colorado), manufacturer of thin film photovoltaic modules.¶ Beacon Power (Tyngsborough, Massachusetts), designed and developed advanced products and services to support stable, reliable and efficient electricity grid operation.¶ Ener1 (Indianapolis, Indiana), built compact lithium-ion-powered battery solutions for hybrid and electric cars.¶ Energy Conversion Devices (Rochester Hills, Michigan/Auburn Hills, Michigan), manufacturer of flexible thin film photovoltaic (PV) technology and a producer of batteries and other renewable energy-related products.¶ Evergreen Solar, Inc. (Marlborough, Massachusetts), manufactured and installed solar panels.¶ Mountain Plaza, Inc. (Dandridge, Tennessee), designed and implemented “truck-stop electrification” technology.¶ Olsen’s Crop Service and Olsens Mills Acquisition Co. (Berlin, Wisconsin), a private company producing ethanol.¶ Range Fuels (Soperton, Georgia), tried to develop a technology that converted biomass into ethanol without the use of enzymes.¶ Raser Technologies (Provo, Utah), geothermal power plants and technology licensing.¶ Solyndra (Fremont, California), manufacturer of cylindrical panels of thin-film solar cells.¶ Spectrawatt (Hopewell, New York), solar cell manufacturer.¶ Thompson River Power LLC (Wayzata, Minnesota), designed and developed advanced products and services to support stable, reliable and efficient electricity grid operation.¶ Some lawmakers are looking for a solution. The aptly named No More Solyndras Act would prohibit any new loan guarantees from Title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.¶ As Heritage’s Nicolas Loris wrote,¶ Republicans and Democrats alike need to end their addiction to energy subsidies, or we’re going to continue down the same failed path of wasteful spending…We don’t need to fix the energy subsidy programs. We need to abolish them.¶ President Obama said in 2010 that “the true engine of economic growth will always be companies like Solyndra.” He couldn’t be more wrong. Companies that are innovating and creating real value for consumers are the engine of economic growth, and they’re doing it without millions in taxpayer funding.

#### Claims that subsidies for alternative energy create jobs are flawed - they don’t assess the costs of the subsidies. Subsidies are a net drain on the economy.

Kreutzer, Ph.D. in Economics, 12

(David, “Robbing Banks and Subsidizing Green Energy”, April 11, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/04/11/robbing-banks-and-subsidizing-green-energy/>, twm)

Do bank robbers stimulate economic growth? If you employ the logic used by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) to assess the impact of the stimulus bill’s renewable-energy subsidies, the answer would be “yes.”¶ The NREL recently issued a report on the economic impact of the Section 1603 Treasury Grant Program funded in the stimulus bill of 2009. The bullet points claim that the subsidies created 75,000 jobs and $44 billion in economic output.¶ The study uses an input-output table to trace the cascade of spending generated by the subsidies. It ignores the costs and employment losses of the tax revenue needed for the subsidies and the offsetting losses suffered by the conventional energy that gets crowded out (though there isn’t too much crowding out since the renewables do not produce very much energy). It ignores the economic impact on consumers’ energy bills. And the bullets attribute all of the positive impacts to the subsidies even though the subsidies are only a fraction of the costs of the projects analyzed.¶ What’s the point? If you ignore all the costs of any action, then it cannot be a loser.¶ The NREL input-output analysis starts with the spending on labor and equipment. It then traces the spending on equipment to the spending on the inputs for that equipment. For instance, the purchase of a wind turbine would trace the flow of spending to the parts suppliers to the turbine manufacturer, then to the steel mills that supply steel to the parts fabricators, then to the mines that provide the ore to the mills, etc. At each stage, it picks up a chunk of income and some jobs.¶ The problem is that process ignores a similar cascade of income and job creation that is cut off when the funds for the subsidies are extracted from the private sector of the economy.¶ Imagine a crime lord organizing a bank robbery. First he hires some thugs, creating jobs and income for them. He also has to give the thugs some guns, so the gun manufacturers see an employment increase, as do the suppliers to the gun makers and the suppliers to those suppliers, etc. Also, don’t forget the jobs in the production process for making the ski masks the robbers wear, the jobs producing and servicing the getaway car, the jobs at the motel where the thugs lie low, etc.¶ In this example, we ignore the losses to the bank and its depositors, the increased security costs that crime imposes on banks, the impact of higher interest rates on borrowers (that’s one of the ways banks cover losses from robberies), and every other negative impact of bank robbing, and then conclude bank robbing is an unambiguous gain for the economy. Wheeeee!¶ To the credit of the NREL study’s authors, they get the joke. In footnotes and in the text, they make it very explicit that the impacts they report are not net impacts. For instance, footnote 13 reads:¶ The…models do not estimate the displaced energy or associated jobs, earnings, and output related to existing or planned energy generation resources (e.g., jobs lost in the operation of natural gas or coal plants due to the need for less electricity production from these plants, given increased generation from wind) or increases or decreases in jobs related to changes in electric utility revenues and consumer energy bills, among other impacts. Therefore, the estimates represent gross rather than net impacts.¶ And how is it funded in the first place? Of course it has to come from taxpayers (taxpayers today if current taxes cover the bill, or taxpayers tomorrow if the government borrows the money). Though the authors seem to think other government expenditure is the only alternative to subsidizing wind and solar energy, they at least understand there is a very significant cost they do not include:¶ Similarly, the jobs and economic impacts associated with possible alternative spending of the federal funds used to support §1603 projects were not estimated in this study. Therefore, results presented in this paper should be interpreted as gross rather than net estimates.¶ In short, the NREL study tells us nothing about the overall impact of the subsidies. However, fundamental economic logic can guide us. Energy sources that require subsidies produce energy whose value is less than the costs of production. So these programs actually reduce national income since they take higher-valued resources and turn them into lower-valued output. There is no need for computer programs to reach this conclusion.¶ Looking at only the benefit side of a cost-benefit comparison, no matter how sophisticated that one-sided view may be, tells us nothing useful. It certainly doesn’t support the ridiculous job and income claims in the NREL’s bullet points.

#### The government is terrible at “picking winners” – the plan is no different than Solyndra.

Impellizzeri, MA in economics from George Mason, 12

(Phil, June 30, “Again, feds fail at picking winners and losers in our energy markets”, <http://www.bipps.org/again-feds-fail-at-picking-winners-and-losers-in-our-energy-markets/>, twm)

In the wake of this week’s U.S. Court of Appeals decision to uphold the EPA’s ability to unilaterally regulate greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel-fired power plants, a second striking instance of the ineffectiveness of “alternative energy sources” has hit mainstream news feeds.¶ Just as Solyndra, the solar panel manufacturer and darling of extreme environmentalists in D.C., flopped after swiping hundreds of millions of dollars of government support, Abound Solar has also gone belly up after receiving similar loan guarantees via tax payers like you and me. The federal government is about as adept at picking winners and losers in energy markets as Larry King is at picking life partners.

### AT DA’s – CP inevitable

#### International move to phase out fossil fuel subsidies

Lang,Project Manager Global Subsidies Initiative, 11

(Kerryn, former consultant with the International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO), International Adviser on trade and environment policy for New Zealand’s Ministry for the Environment. Bachelor of Laws (2003): Victoria University of Wellington, Bachelor of Arts (2002): University of Wellington, “The First Year of the¶ G-20 Commitment on¶ Fossil-Fuel Subsidies:¶ A commentary on lessons¶ learned and the path forward, January, twm)

During 2009 and 2010 government efforts to curb fossil-fuel subsidies burgeoned with fossil-fuel subsidy¶ reform, becoming a frequent topic on international agendas. In September 2009, G-20 leaders recognized¶ that “inefficient fossil fuel subsidies encourage wasteful consumption, distort markets, impede investment¶ in clean energy sources and undermine efforts to deal with climate change” and announced a commitment¶ to rationalize and phase out fossil-fuel subsidies over the medium term (G-20 Leaders, 2009). Following that¶ announcement, in November 2009 the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum made a similar¶ pledge to phase out fossil-fuel subsidies, extending the commitment to an additional 11 countries. To support¶ these initiatives, New Zealand established a Friends of Fossil-Fuel Subsidy Reform group of countries that¶ include Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. In addition, organizations such as the International Energy¶ Agency (IEA), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the World Bank¶ have boosted their research and policy programs that support fossil-fuel subsidy reform (see Box 1 for a¶ timeline of events).

### AT G20 Program will end fossil fuel subsidies

#### G20 program isn’t reducing fossil fuel subsidies.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

In this, our second review of progress in meeting this phase out commitment (an earlier review was published in November 2010), we reviewed formal submittals by member countries to the G20 and the WTO, reached out individually to staff from each member country, and reviewed third-party assessments of fossil fuel subsidies.¶ We conclude that most of the potential benefits from the G20 fossil fuel phase out remain untapped, and that tangible progress towards reform has thus far been quite limited.¶ G-20 nations are changing their definitions, not their subsidy policies. The vague definition fossil fuel subsidies in the G20 commitment has allowed many countries to “opt-out” even of reporting on their fossil fuel supports. The general language in the original commitment, combined with strategic interpretation of that language, has resulted in wide divergence in what different countries count as being a “subsidy,” an “inefficient subsidy,” and a subsidy that is both “inefficient” and “encourage[s] wasteful consumption.” The absence of an oversight mechanism for reporting under the G20 agreement or any penalty for inaccurate or incomplete data has led most member countries to minimize their reporting on fossil fuel subsidies. Non-reporting is growing. The number of countries opting out of reporting entirely tripled from two in 2010 to six in 2011. It is expected to increase further in the 2012 reporting cycle.

#### G20 program is just political posturing – won’t lead to eliminating fossil fuel subsidies.

Koplow, MBA Harvard, 12

(Doug, June, “Phasing Out¶ Fossil-Fuel subsidies¶ in the g20: A progress update”, <http://earthtrack.net/files/uploaded_files/FIN.OCI_Phasing_out_fossil-fuel_g20.pdf>, twm)

While this shift in perceptions on the fossil fuel subsidy issue is important, there is no guarantee that higher levels of “buzz” are easily translated into actual policy changes. Thus far, there have been very few real reforms, and it is these concrete changes in policy that will ultimately determine whether the phase out commitment was successful or not.

At present, it is equally plausible that the heightened level of activity and interest by member countries are not earnest and necessary steps on the path to subsidy elimination, but rather political maneuvering to create the perception of progress without putting domestic policy objectives at risk. Too many subsidy reform proposals over the past twenty years have unfortunately been the latter.

### CP Politics Net benefit

#### Solyndra ensures that alternative energy subsidies will be used against Obama.

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

The Group of 20 nations in 2009 pledged to phase out state aid for carbon-based fuels dug or pumped out of the earth. In the U.S., energy subsidies are becoming an issue in next year’s presidential election after Solyndra LLC went bankrupt with $535 million of loan guarantees by the federal government. Republican contender Rick Perry, the governor of Texas, has pledged to end all federal energy subsidies.

### AFF ANSWERS to CP

#### Fast removal of subsidies causes price increases.

Lang,Project Manager Global Subsidies Initiative, 11

(Kerryn, former consultant with the International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO), International Adviser on trade and environment policy for New Zealand’s Ministry for the Environment. Bachelor of Laws (2003): Victoria University of Wellington, Bachelor of Arts (2002): University of Wellington, “The First Year of the¶ G-20 Commitment on¶ Fossil-Fuel Subsidies:¶ A commentary on lessons¶ learned and the path forward, January, twm)

But the task of phasing out fossil-fuel subsidies is challenging and takes time. Much remains to be done by¶ the G-20 to fulfil their medium-term commitment. Removing subsidies often requires a transition period, as¶ there is a limit to which populations can easily adjust to fuel price increases. The transition needs to be¶ monitored to ensure that reform is progressing and reported regularly to the G-20. The G-20 could also use¶ this opportunity to improve the transparency of subsidy information by encouraging better national reporting¶ on all subsidies (not just those intended for reform) and supporting organizations like the IEA and OECD in¶ developing global data sets.

#### Removing fossil fuel subsidies would require congressional action.

Sills 11

(Ben, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-09/fossil-fuels-got-more-aid-than-clean-energy-iea.html>, “Fossil Fuel Subsidies Six Times More Than Renewable Energy”, Nov. 9, twm)

Perry’s approach may hurt renewable energy more than fossil fuel producers that have $4 billion of annual subsidies written into the tax code. Aid for oil and coal producers would require congressional action to change while aid for wind and solar power will simply expire, according to Michael Graetz, a tax law professor at Columbia University in New York.

## AT ADV Great Battery Race

### AT ADV Great Battery Race 1NC

#### The US has a huge lead in competitiveness – nobody can touch us.

Frederick E. Allen, May 30, 2012. “The US Still Leads the World in Competitiveness.” Frederick E. Allen, Forbes Staff.—Leadership of Editors at Forbes. http://www.forbes.com/sites/frederickallen/2012/05/30/the-u-s-still-leads-the-world-in-competitiveness/

Worried that we’re falling behind in the world economy, and that other nations, like maybe China, are pulling ahead of us? Relax. Here’s reassurance from IMD, the international business school in Lausanne, Switzerland: The findings of its annual World Competitiveness Yearbook are just out, and they show that the only place that can touch us is a relative pygmy, Hong Kong.¶ IMD ranked 59 economies across the world, measuring “how well countries manage their economic and human resources to increase their prosperity.” It used 329 ranking criteria, a third of them arising from a survey of more than 4,200 international executives. The 10 most competitive nations, with their scores relative to the first-place finisher, are:¶ 1. Hong Kong. Score: 100.00¶ 2. USA: 97.75¶ 3. Switzerland: 96.68¶ 4. Singapore: 95.92¶ 5. Sweden: 91.39¶ 6. Canada: 90.29¶ 7. Taiwan: 89.96¶ 8. Norway: 89.67¶ 9. Germany: 89.26¶ 10. Qatar: 88.48¶ ¶ The 10 Hardest Jobs to Fill in America¶ Jacquelyn Smith¶ Forbes Staff¶ ¶ The Red Hot Heart of Leadership¶ August Turak¶ Contributor¶ Last year the U.S. and Hong Kong were tied for first place, and Singapore, Sweden, and Canada were respectively third, fourth, and fifth. The last-place finisher is Venezuela, with a score of 31.45. It’s the only country to do worse than poor, beleaguered Greece (43.05). Mainland China, in case you were wondering, is No. 23, down from 19 last year. The rankings’ authors observe that in Europe, Ireland (20), Iceland (26), and Italy (40) look better positioned to recover economically, judging by the numbers, than Spain (39), Portugal (41), or Greece (58).¶ Prof. Stephane Garelli, director of IMD’s World Competitiveness Center, says, “U.S. competitiveness has a deep impact on the rest of the world because it is uniquely interacting with every economy, advanced or emerging. No other nation can exercise such a strong ‘pull effect’ on the world. Europe is burdened with austerity and fragmented political leadership and is hardly a credible substitute, while a South-South bloc of emerging markets is still a work in progress. In the end, if the U.S. competes, the world succeeds.”

#### Economy growing now—prefer our methodology

Adler 7/18/12 (Lee, Wall Street Examiner, “One Crucial Indicator Shows The US Economy Isn't Slowing At All”, http://www.businessinsider.com/federal-tax-revenues-economy-not-slowing-2012-7)

One Crucial Indicator Shows The US Economy Isn't Slowing At All The mainstream consensus has lately been that the economy is slowing. Based on my tracking of federal revenues in real time, I suspect that that view is incorrect. Instead the recent data reflects only normal oscillations within the ongoing slow growth trend. Total federal tax collections, including withholding taxes, are available to us with just a one day lag in the US Treasury’s Daily Treasury Statements, which makes them an excellent analytical resource. Withholding is mostly for compensation, and thus it is a good measure of the economy’s strength. However, it is extremely volatile day to day so I rely more on a monthly moving average of the 10 day total collections, comparing that with the prior year. Smoothing sacrifices a bit of timeliness to get a clearer picture of the trend without losing too much of the edge that the daily data provides. Unfortunately, I have found even the 10 day total data too noisy for meaningful comparison so I’ve had to resort to additional smoothing. As a result the smoothed data is a little slow, so I also look at raw month to date data after mid month. As of July 11, the 4 week average of the 10 day total of withholding taxes is now up 4.0% in nominal and 1.8% in real terms versus the same period in 2011 (adjusted by the monthly BLS data on average weekly employee compensation which in June rose by 2.2% year to year). This indicator has been in the +1% to +3% range since mid May, with most of that time above +2% suggesting that the economy’s current rate of growth is 2-3%, not the 1-1.6% that most Wall Street economists are now forecasting.

#### Turn - Only private sector spending can stimulate the economy

Williams 09 (<http://www.conservativecrusader.com/articles/republicans-try-to-stimulate-economy>)

Obama says that “spending” stimulates economic growth. But he leaves out a very vital fact. PRIVATE sector spending stimulates economic growth. Government spending is what bankrupted the nation and almost every state in the union. More government spending is the worst possible move at this hour...¶ Only the people can stimulate the economy. At best, all the government can do is get out of the way, which Democrats seem hell bent on not doing at present.¶ Government can only create government jobs at additional taxpayer expense. If we replace 3 million private sector jobs with 3 million government funded jobs, we just made the problem 6 million jobs worse... 3 million productive jobs lost, 3 million taxpayer funded jobs added...

#### Turn – key to helping the economy is to stop federal spending

Foster 11 —J. D. Foster, Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of Fiscal Policy in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Georgetown University, 2011 (“Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Unemployment in the U.S.,” Congressional Testimony, September 21st, Available Online at http://www.heritage.org/Research/Testimony/2011/09/Promoting-Job-Creation-in-the-US, Accessed 11-07-2011)

The federal government should adopt a very simple guiding principle for deciding what to do next. That principle is to do less harm. There is very little in terms of concrete actions government can do at this stage that would help, and a great deal of intended help that would harm, either by raising the deficit to no good effect or by creating more uncertainty and slowing the economy’s natural healing process.

Do less harm means getting spending under control and thereby cutting the budget deficit. Americans are worried about spending and the deficit. That worry by itself is holding us back.

Do less harm means policymakers should stop threatening higher taxes. We can have debates about who should pay what when we’re at full employment. In the meantime, this threat is debilitating.

Do less harm means stop the onslaught of new regulations. The recent pullback of the EPA’s ozone regulation was a good example. Even the threat of new regulations creates bad uncertainty for those affected, freezing them in place. Again, we can work through these regulations when Americans are back to work.

Do less harm means policymakers should stop meddling with the economy. There is almost no limit to the harm Washington can do to the economy in its efforts to do something for the economy. The patient is in recovery, slowed by the incessant proddings and procedures of Washington’s policy doctors. The patient doesn’t need another procedure or a new nostrum. Let it heal. Do less harm.

#### Heg is inevitable: structural foundations buffer heg decline

NORRLOF ’10 - an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto (Carla, “ America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 1-2)

The United States has been the most powerful country in the world for more than sixty years. Throughout this period, it has had the world’s largest economy and the world’s most important currency. For most of this time, it had the world’s most powerful military as well – and its military supremacy today is beyond question. We are truly in an era of US hegemony, a unipolar moment, a Pax Americana, which has enabled Americans to enjoy the highest standard of living in human history. Is this privileged position being undercut by serial trade deficits? The pessimists are growing more numerous by the day. They see the country’s spendthrift ways as a disaster waiting to happen. They warn that the cavernous gap in merchandise trade, well above 6 percent in 2006, is an ominous sign of competitive slippage. In 2008, the liabilities acquired to finance the shortfall in exports reached an amazing 29 percent of GDP. A falling dollar, military overstretch, the rise of the euro, the rise of China, and progressively deeper integration in East Asia are among the factors that many believe herald the imminent decline of American hegemony. In my view, the doomsayers are mistaken. I argue that American hegemony is stable and sustainable. While the United States certainly does face a number of challenges, an analysis of the linkages between trade, money, and security shows that American power is robust. This book is a story about why and how American hegemony works, and what other states would have to do to emulate or, on other grounds, thwart, America’s power base. As I will show, the United States benefits from running persistent trade deficits as a result of its special position in the international system. I will argue that any comparably situated country would choose to pursue the same cyclical deficit policy as the one encouraged by the US government. A series of size advantages cut across trade, money, and security: the size of the American market, the role of the dollar, and American military power interact to make a trade deficit policy rewarding and buffer the United States from the extreme consequences that a sustained deficit policy would otherwise have.

#### No impact to the transition

IKENBERRY ‘8 professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University (John, The Rise of China and the Future of the West Can the Liberal System Survive?, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb)

Some observers believe that the American era is coming to an end, as the Western-oriented world order is replaced by one increasingly dominated by the East. The historian Niall Ferguson has written that the bloody twentieth century witnessed "the descent of the West" and "a reorientation of the world" toward the East. Realists go on to note that as China gets more powerful and the United States' position erodes, two things are likely to happen: China will try to use its growing influence to reshape the rules and institutions of the international system to better serve its interests, and other states in the system -- especially the declining hegemon -- will start to see China as a growing security threat. The result of these developments, they predict, will be tension, distrust, and conflict, the typical features of a power transition. In this view, the drama of China's rise will feature an increasingly powerful China and a declining United States locked in an epic battle over the rules and leadership of the international system. And as the world's largest country emerges not from within but outside the established post-World War II international order, it is a drama that will end with the grand ascendance of China and the onset of an Asian-centered world order. That course, however, is not inevitable. The rise of China does not have to trigger a wrenching hegemonic transition. The U.S.-Chinese power transition can be very different from those of the past because China faces an international order that is fundamentally different from those that past rising states confronted. China does not just face the United States; it faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations. The nuclear revolution, meanwhile, has made war among great powers unlikely -- eliminating the major tool that rising powers have used to overturn international systems defended by declining hegemonic states. Today's Western order, in short, is hard to overturn and easy to join. This unusually durable and expansive order is itself the product of farsighted U.S. leadership. After World War II, the United States did not simply establish itself as the leading world power. It led in the creation of universal institutions that not only invited global membership but also brought democracies and market societies closer together. It built an order that facilitated the participation and integration of both established great powers and newly independent states. (It is often forgotten that this postwar order was designed in large part to reintegrate the defeated Axis states and the beleaguered Allied states into a unified international system.) Today, China can gain full access to and thrive within this system. And if it does, China will rise, but the Western order -- if managed properly -- will live on.

#### Turn - Plan would require a substantial increase in natural gas which would send prices for that fuel skyrocketing, increase dependency and decrease national security.

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

The “Steam Reforming” Calculation¶ Virtually all of the hydrogen produced in¶ the world today is derived from natural gas in¶ a process called “steam reforming.” In that¶ process, natural gas is mixed with steam and¶ heated in a reformer tank. Once again, however,¶ the chemical reactions that produce hydrogen¶ require the input of energy. Additional¶ energy inputs are required to generate steam,¶ heat the reformer tank, and separate the products.¶ The overall efficiency of the whole¶ process is only about 30 percent—much less¶ than if the natural gas were simply burned in¶ an electrical power generating plant.20¶ In order to provide the 1.16 trillion kilowatt-¶ hours of fuel-cell output needed to power¶ the U.S. vehicle fleet, 66.7 billion kilograms of¶ hydrogen would be needed. Accordingly, about¶ 15 trillion cubic feet of natural gas would be¶ required to produce that hydrogen by the¶ steam reforming process.21¶ In 2002, the last year for which we have¶ data, domestic natural gas consumption was¶ about 22.6 trillion cubic feet.22 Thus, powering¶ the domestic vehicle fleet with hydrogen¶ derived from natural gas would increase natural¶ gas consumption by about 66 percent.¶ That figure is particularly striking given¶ that domestic production and imports of¶ Canadian gas are declining while demand is¶ rapidly increasing, a combination of events¶ that has sent natural gas prices skyrocketing.¶ Preliminary data indicate that the average¶ wellhead price in 2003 was about $5.10 per¶ thousand cubic feet (mcf) compared with¶ $2.95 per mcf in 2002.23¶ Furthermore, there is growing concern that¶ natural gas prices are destined to remain high¶ and that the imbalance between supply and¶ demand can be satisfied only with imports of¶ liquefied natural gas (LNG).24 Accordingly,¶ most if not all of the 15 trillion cubic feet of natural¶ gas needed to produce hydrogen for fuel¶ cells would have to come from LNG imported¶ primarily from the Middle East. That would do¶ little to reduce energy costs or enhance the security¶ of our energy supplies.

#### No China war

**Brendon 10**—fellow of Churchill College, Cambridge University (Piers, 20 October 2010, “China Also Rises”, http://nationalinterest.org/print/article/china-rises-4236, RBatra)

HERE, THEN, is an account calculated to show that the reinvigorated Chinese dragon will endeavor to retaliate against the American eagle, itself seeking a new foe in lieu of the Soviet bear. China is bound to regain face, so the argument goes, by using its newfound resources to arm itself and to confront the United States in military terms. The idea that progress heads westward and that power follows the sun was heard, it has rightly been said, “from Horace to Horace Greeley.” Now Chinese authorities such as Wang Jisi (dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University) quote the adage that “the torch of history seems to be relayed from the West to the East.” A clash between the two titans, divided for so long by so much bad blood, is widely supposed to be inevitable.

This is not the case. Not only does history not repeat itself, it contains no rhythms or patterns which enable its students to make sure predictions. It is a “flickering lamp,” wrote Winston Churchill, in a world governed by time and chance. Human beings and all their works are subject, as Edward Gibbon said, to “the vicissitudes of fortune.” Or, in the somewhat less coherent words of Margaret Thatcher, “the unexpected happens” and “fail-safe plans are designed to go wrong.” But while certainty is unattainable, history does offer more optimistic possibilities than the saga of Chinese humiliation at foreign hands may suggest. One conceivable outcome that deserves serious consideration is that **we are at the dawn of an era of fruitful cooperation between China and America.**

It must be said that commercially successful states do not automatically or immediately beat their pruning hooks into swords. For all its overwhelming industrial and mercantile dominance, the United States remained a tenth-rate military power (except for its navy) until galvanized by Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor. Deng’s China itself put the modernization of its armed forces behind that of agriculture, manufacturing and science, and in the two decades after 1981 its troop numbers fell by half, to 2.3 million. Admittedly, its defense spending rose thereafter, but it remains a much-lower percentage of GDP than does America’s. And this year the rise has been checked, apparently in order to assuage foreign worries about its military modernization.

In other words, **there is no necessary correlation between economic growth and military strength**. Witness Stalin’s Russia, which made guns at the expense of butter during the 1930s, starving itself great. As Hitler and Mussolini also showed, this is a policy to which totalitarian states are particularly prone. Yet China’s leaders seem dedicated to augmenting prosperity in order to secure stability. Having been racked by internal convulsions for generations, the country evidently prefers tyranny to anarchy, even to democracy. Anything is better than a return to the bloody turmoil of the Taiping or the warlord era or to the horrors of the Cultural Revolution. As Deng Xiaoping insisted, “Stability supersedes all.”

The ideal of harmony is quintessentially Confucian. The philosopher stressed that good order is the basis of prosperity and security. **Violence is a last resort** and will probably be ineffective. Historically, China has assimilated aggression, rolling with punches, overcoming hardness with softness. Where possible it has avoided taking the offensive. This is not to say, of course, that the Beijing government avoids coercion close to home, as became tragically clear in the suppressing of the 1989 demonstrations in Tiananmen Square and the crushing of resistance in Tibet. But it is to suggest that China prefers, particularly in a nuclear age, to use “soft power” and “smile diplomacy” abroad.

**THERE IS little evidence** that China wishes to jeopardize its burgeoning affluence by adventurist attempts to contest American hegemony. On the contrary, the Chinese leadership is all too conscious that the Soviet Union’s endeavor to compete militarily with the United States was a major factor in its collapse. Prosperity breeds contentment. As Jonathan Swift noted in The Battle of the Books, quarrels usually stem from want rather than plenty, and “we may observe in the republic of dogs . . . that the whole state is ever in the profoundest peace after a full meal.”

Needless to say, accidents do happen, and when American bombers destroyed the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in 1999, a wave of spontaneous fury engulfed the People’s Republic. The bombing was said to be a “barbarian” act of aggression comparable to the imperialist invasion of China after the Boxer Rebellion. It was even compared to a Nazi war crime. Fearing domestic and international damage, however, the authorities did their best to calm the storm. The kept press assuaged popular passions. Television reports were emollient. Censorship of the Internet was tightened via a list of some thousand taboo words, the building blocks of the Great Firewall of China.

There was a similar response to George W. Bush’s disastrous invasion of Iraq, which replaced Chinese sympathy for the United States in the wake of 9/11 with feelings of anxiety and mistrust—feelings exacerbated by President Obama’s failure to pull America out of the Afghan quagmire. Just as England’s difficulty was once Ireland’s opportunity, so America’s difficulty might have been China’s. But, no. The Chinese media tamped down outbursts of chauvinism which might have led to public protests. One result, according to Susan Shirk’s excellent book China: Fragile Superpower, was that the American abuse of prisoners in Abu Ghraib was condemned much more vehemently in the Great Republic than in the People’s Republic.

Perhaps nationalism has succeeded Communism as the creed of Red China, but its rulers show signs of wanting to make their country a good citizen of the world. They have signally reduced the number of land-border disputes with their fourteen neighbors. They have participated eagerly in international forums such as the World Trade Organization. They have eased relations with Japan and, horrified by the nuclear brinkmanship of Kim Jong Il, mediated with Korea. They have muted criticisms of the United States, even when Jiang Zemin’s Boeing 767 was found to contain twenty-seven sophisticated bugging devices after being refitted in Texas in 2001—a covert operation which might have been designed to demonstrate that the term “intelligence agency” is an oxymoron.

Wang Jisi articulates the official Chinese position: since Mao’s victory in 1949 the Communist elite has generally believed that America and other hostile outside forces have been intent on conquering and destabilizing China. But **globalization has increased the cost of conflict and reduced the danger of war.** It has also magnified many of the problems from which China suffers, such as pollution, urban overcrowding and huge disparities of wealth—100 million people live on less than a dollar a day and a quarter of the population lacks access to clean drinking water. So China’s priority is to tackle these problems. It aims to build a rich and great society, dedicated to peace, progress, harmony, sustainable development and international cooperation.

**No impact to China war.**

**Lieber and Press 9** (Keir A.,  Associate Professor @ Georgetown University,  Daryl G., Associate Professor of Government, Dartmouth College, Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec)

MODELING THE UNTHINKABLE To illustrate the growth in U.S. counterforce capabilities, we applied a set of simple formulas that analysts have used for decades to estimate the effectiveness of counterforce attacks. We modeled a U.S. strike on a small target set: 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in hardened silos, the approximate size of China's current long-range, silo-based missile force. The analysis compared the capabilities of a 1985 Minuteman ICBM to those of a modern Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missile. [The technical details of the analysis presented in this essay are available online [2].] In 1985, a single U.S. ICBM warhead had less than a 60 percent chance of destroying a typical silo. Even if four or five additional warheads were used, the cumulative odds of destroying the silo would never exceed 90 percent because of the problem of "fratricide," whereby incoming warheads destroy each other. Beyond five warheads, adding more does no good. A probability of 90 percent might sound high, but it falls far short if the goal is to completely disarm an enemy: with a 90 percent chance of destroying each target, the odds of destroying all 20 are roughly 12 percent. In 1985, then, a U.S. ICBM attack had little chance of destroying even a small enemy nuclear arsenal. Today, a multiple-warhead attack on a single silo using a Trident II missile would have a roughly 99 percent chance of destroying it, and the probability that a barrage would destroy all 20 targets is well above 95 percent. Given the accuracy of the U.S. military's current delivery systems, the only question is target identification: silos that can be found can be destroyed. During the Cold War, the United States worked hard to pinpoint Soviet nuclear forces, with great success. Locating potential adversaries' small nuclear arsenals is undoubtedly a top priority for U.S. intelligence today. The revolution in accuracy is producing an even more momentous change: it is becoming possible for the United States to conduct low-yield nuclear counterforce strikes that inflict relatively few casualties. A U.S. Department of Defense computer model, called the Hazard Prediction and Assessment Capability (HPAC), estimates the dispersion of deadly radioactive fallout in a given region after a nuclear detonation. The software uses the warhead's explosive power, the height of the burst, and data about local weather and demographics to estimate how much fallout would be generated, where it would blow, and how many people it would injure or kill. HPAC results can be chilling. In 2006, a team of nuclear weapons analysts from the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) used HPAC to estimate the consequences of a U.S. nuclear attack using high-yield warheads against China's ICBM field. Even though China's silos are located in the countryside, the model predicted that the fallout would blow over a large area, killing 3-4 million people. U.S. counterforce capabilities were useless, the study implied, because even a limited strike would kill an unconscionable number of civilians. But the United States can already conduct nuclear counterforce strikes at a tiny fraction of the human devastation that the FAS/NRDC study predicted, and small additional improvements to the U.S. force could dramatically reduce the potential collateral damage even further. The United States' nuclear weapons are now so accurate that it can conduct successful counterforce attacks using the smallest-yield warheads in the arsenal, rather than the huge warheads that the FAS/NRDC simulation modeled. And to further reduce the fallout, the weapons can be set to detonate as airbursts, which would allow most of the radiation to dissipate in the upper atmosphere. We ran multiple HPAC scenarios against the identical target set used in the FAS/NRDC study but modeled low-yield airbursts rather than high-yield groundbursts. The fatality estimates plunged from 3-4 million **to less than 700** -- a figure comparable to the number of civilians reportedly killed since 2006 in Pakistan by U.S. drone strikes. One should be skeptical about the results of any model that depends on unpredictable factors, such as wind speed and direction. But in the scenarios we modeled, the area of lethal fallout was so small that very few civilians would have become ill or died, regardless of which way the wind blew. Critics may cringe at this analysis. Many of them, understandably, say that nuclear weapons are -- and should remain -- unusable. But if the United States is to retain these weapons for the purpose of deterring nuclear attacks, it needs a force that gives U.S. leaders retaliatory options they might actually employ. If the only retaliatory option entails killing millions of civilians, then the U.S. deterrent will lack credibility. Giving U.S. leaders alternatives that do not target civilians is both wise and just. A counterforce attack -- whether using conventional munitions or low- or high-yield nuclear weapons -- would be fraught with peril. Even a small possibility of a single enemy warhead's surviving such a strike would undoubtedly give any U.S. leader great pause. But in the midst of a conventional war, if an enemy were using nuclear threats or limited nuclear attacks to try to coerce the United States or its allies, these would be the capabilities **that would give a U.S. president real options.**

### AT ADV Great Battery Race 1NR extensions – economy high now

#### Econ growing now

IANS 7/19/12 (IANS is the leading provider of in-depth security insights and decision support delivered through its research, community, and consulting. Fueled by interactions among IANS Faculty and end users, IANS’ experience-driven advice helps information security, risk management, and compliance executives make better, faster technical and managerial decisions, “US economy growing at modest pace, jobs tepid: Federal Reserve”, http://businesstoday.intoday.in/story/us-economy-growing-at-modest-pace-jobs-tepid-federal-reserve/1/186418.html)

The Federal Reserve has said the US economy expanded at a "modest to moderate pace" in June and early July, but the employment situation only improved at a "tepid" pace. In its latest national economic performance survey, the central bank noted that retail sales rose slightly in most areas and manufacturing activity continued to expand slowly in most districts, reported Xinhua. The residential housing market was gaining momentum in recent months, and overall loan demand grew modestly in most districts, according to the Fed report. The survey, known as the Beige Book, is based on economic information supplied by the Fed's 12 regional banks, and released eight times each year to provide a snapshot of the US local economy.

#### The current rate of growth staves off recession—shocks kill the economy

Bloomberg 7/19/12 (“Economists Argue If U.S. Economy Recovering Or Back In Recession”, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-19/economists-argue-if-u-s-economy-recovering-or-back-in-recession.html)

Ironically, the slow pace of the recovery could help stave off a recession. Although the economy remains vulnerable to external shocks, like the euro’s collapse or a sharp slowdown in China, growth’s been so weak that the U.S. doesn’t have the sorts of internal imbalances that tend to bring on recessions, like an overheated housing sector or high inflation. “Things are so lean and mean, there aren’t a lot of excesses that need to be reduced,” says Julia Coronado, chief economist at BNP Paribas. “In a way, that’s insulated us” from a deeper downturn. So look on the bright side: If a recession does hit, it might not be so bad.

### AT ADV Great Battery Race 1NR extensions – competitiveness uniqueness

#### Extend our 1NC Allen evidence – every other economy is a pygmy compared to the US.

#### US is the leader in global competitiveness in the status quo.

Graham White, June 1, 2012. “World Competitiveness Rankings: What do they tell us.” The Conservation—Latest ideas and research in Australia and around the world. Graham White is a Senior Lecture in the School of Economics at the University of Sydney. http://theconversation.edu.au/world-competitiveness-rankings-what-do-they-tell-us-7397

The IMD World Competitiveness Rankings released this week are worth reflecting on, not so much because of the relative positioning of various countries – including Australia – but rather because of the reasoning which underpins the rankings.¶ The press release accompanying the rankings gives some indication of this reasoning. The first point worth noting is the potentially misleading use of the term competitiveness. When this term is used by economists it usually refers to the price competitiveness of a country’s exports and import-competing goods. And for many economists this would over time be bound up with the relative real unit labour costs across different countries.¶ The reasoning accompanying the IMD rankings suggest however a much looser use of the term “competitiveness”. What’s suggested is rather a view about the potential of different countries for sustained economic prosperity.¶ Now, price competitiveness of one’s exports and import-substitutes may be part of this, but is certainly never the whole story.¶ Moreover, as a number of economists over the years have noted, the world economy is not an open economy, but a closed economy. This means that one country’s improved competitiveness is at the expense of another country.¶ In other words, growing your economy through exports at the expense of other countries can mean exporting not just goods and services, but exporting unemployment to other countries as well.¶ IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook 2012¶ So one needs to be cautious in drawing links between competitiveness and economic prosperity – it is not a game everyone can win.¶ Another interesting feature of the IMD release relates to the position of the US. It is suggested that the “US remains at the centre of world competitiveness because of its unique economic power”.¶ Undoubtedly the element of truth in this statement is the continued hegemony of the US in the global economy.¶ But one could reasonably contend that this is much less to do with any superiority in competitiveness of the US in the narrow economic sense and much more to do with the continued dominant status of the US dollar as a de facto reserve currency in the international monetary system.¶ And this dominance – effectively emerging as far back as the end of the First World War – has continued, interestingly, while the external accounts of the US – specifically, its current account – have been deteriorating.¶ In fact the US current account has been deteriorating since the breakdown of the Bretton Woods era in the early 1970’s.This in turn has reflected a long-run deterioration in US trade performance. Yet this has not seemingly impeded the economic dominance of the US.¶

### AT ADV Great Battery Race 1NR extensions – hegemony

#### Extend our 1NC cards – US still has a massive hegemonic lead and any transition will be peaceful

#### Heg high – no challengers now

Farley 3/7/12

(Robert Farley, Dr. Robert Farley is an assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky. His interests include national security, military doctrine and maritime affairs. He blogs at Lawyers, Guns and Money and Information Dissemination. His weekly WPR column, Over the Horizon, has appeared every Wednesday, “Over the Horizon: The Future of American Hegemony,” 3/7/12, World Politics Review, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11696/over-the-horizon-the-future-of-american-hegemony> /mr)

The intellectual battle over the future of American hegemony has been joined. Andrew Bacevich argues that the American Century has ended and that further American pretentions to hegemony will lead to disaster. Michael Cohen argues that the United States suffers from critical domestic problems that undermine long-term U.S. capability. On the other side of the debate, Dan Drezner, Robert Kagan and others (.pdf) argue that U.S. military and economic advantage are likely to persist over the foreseeable future. ¶ How might we know that the American Century has actually ended? Shifts in hegemony rarely come with a herald; even when the U.S. was at its most dominant in 1945, the shape of the future was hardly clear. Indeed, the United States surpassed the United Kingdom in economic power -- and in latent military power -- around the turn of the 20th century, yet no one claims that the American Century began in 1900, or that British hegemony ended when the GDP numbers turned south. Indeed, while the United States surely played a pre-eminent role in global politics after 1945, the existence of the Soviet Union put a wide swath of the globe off limits to direct U.S. influence. In military terms, we are still many years from a replay of the kind of global military and ideological competition that characterized the Cold War, even if we accept worst-case assumptions about China’s growth and belligerence. ¶ The rise of China and India seems inevitable, and it is quite likely that both will exceed the total GDP of the United States before the end of the 21st century. However, the rise of Japan and Europe relative to the U.S. seemed inevitable 25 years ago. Moreover, while the rise of China and India might introduce uncertainty, economic power does not translate automatically into military and political influence. Recall again that the United States possessed the world’s largest economy for some 40 years before “its” century is supposed to have begun. The U.S. also benefitted from advantages that neither China nor India currently enjoy, such as a relatively high per capita GDP and a secure geographic position. Even if the United States holds only a plurality of global military and economic power, it still may remain the most influential state in the world. Russia, China, Japan and India will have more to fear from one another than from the United States, allowing the U.S. to play a critical balancing role. Moreover, the United States has weathered the financial crisis better than some, particularly the European Union. And while China and India have maintained robust growth during the past five years, social, economic and political cracks may be emerging. ¶ Intentions matter, too. The United States could have pursued, if not military hegemony, then at least military primacy in 1918. At the time, its economic power and industrial production could have overwhelmed -- albeit with some difficulty -- the combined capacity of both Japan and the United Kingdom. The 1922 Washington Naval Treaty effectively allowed Japan and the U.K. to avoid a ruinous arms race with the United States, a race that the U.S. could have run and won but chose not to. As long as the United States continues to pursue the tasks associated with hegemony -- such as maintenance of the reserve currency, defense of global maritime trade and the underwriting of major international institutions -- some sort of American Century will persist. ¶ What can the U.S. do to extend the American Century? The most important step for the U.S. to take is to gain the acquiescence, grudging or not, of most of the rest of the major international players in modern global society. Accommodating Indian, Chinese or even Russian concerns within the U.S.-managed global framework demonstrates the utility and flexibility of that system, and reinforces the sense that the United States plays a unique role. The strength and resilience of a system -- and when we speak of U.S. hegemony, we really mean the system of norms and institutions that the United States has established -- depends more on its ability to co-opt competitors than to crush or isolate them. This hardly means that the United States must concede to every demand from every competitor, but we shouldn’t think of the need for careful diplomacy as weakness; rather, the ability to handle problems diplomatically reflects strength.

#### No challengers to US dominance

Qian 08—reporter of Yale Global [Jiang, February 29th, Is the Sun Setting on US Dominance? – Part II, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display.article?id=10435>

The proponents of such a "multipolar worldview" often confuse the immense potential of their favored giants with their actual influences. They often overlook the immense internal difficulties these rising giants must overcome to realize their potential. Most importantly, they do not take full account of the strategic interactions between these giants during their simultaneous rise and the strategic opportunities that such interactions present for the US. Among the rising powers, the European Union boasts by far the largest economy, with a strong currency and a comparatively large and prosperous population. However, after a long drive of expansion, Europe faces a serious cohesion problem. It still suffers from a weak security framework that's dependent on NATO and a legalistic rather than executive center in Brussels. Although the EU does chase strategic interests in its proximities such as the central Asia and North Africa, it does so, not for any overreaching vision to compete globally, but mostly for parochial economic reasons. Europe is not yet competing in any "Great Game," for the simple reason that Europe is not yet unified. Recent rejections of the EU constitution show that serious resistance remains towards further integration. After recent stabilization of its economy, a resurgent Russia is often mentioned as a future global power. However, Russia faces severe long-term internal challenges. Its population is declining and aging, its vast Siberia territories hollowing out after the end of Soviet subsidies. Extractive industries such as hydrocarbon, mining and timber account for 80 percent of Russia's exports and 30 percent of its government revenue, whereas its manufacturing industries are mostly outdated and uncompetitive.Russia therefore will have serious issues with its self-image as a major world power, finding it hard to forge an assessment of its global role commensurate with its long-term demographic and economic realities. Japan has a similar problem of updating its self-image as the most "advanced" nation in Asia for more than 100 years. Today Japan faces the harsh reality that, after its neighbors catch up, Japan will again find itself a geographically small, resource-poor island nation dependent on trade, living uneasily among large, populous continental neighbors. It has a largely pacifist, prosperous population in a neighborhood still rife with nationalism.Unlike Europe, East Asia has yet to extinguish historical grievances, border disputes and a taste for raw national powers. As Japan itself proved, economic rises, once initiated, can be rapid indeed, so its current economic strength does not guarantee its future influence. Furthermore, barring a rapid re-militarization, Japan's growth in national strengths is bound to be slower than that of its still maturing neighbors, therefore its relative strategic position in East Asia will only grow weaker. Either re-militarization or an erosion of its self-perceived leadership in the region is likely to require a profound reassessment of Japan's postwar consensus of national purposes. India sees itself as an up-and-coming power, proud to be a democracy yet simultaneously aspiring to more traditional "hard" powers. As a diverse and still poor country, it faces immense internal challenges. Its manufacturing base and infrastructure need major overhaul. Beyond these, India is limited by its geographical constraint in the South Asia and the thorn in its side that’s Pakistan. Sandwiched between Pakistan, Burma and the Himalayas, India’s ambition beyond the subcontinent could not blossom until its geographical perimeter is secured. China borders three of the ambitious giants – India, Russia and Japan. China's neighborhood is far tougher than that of either Europe or the US. Like India, China is a large, poor country rife with internal tensions. Unlike Europe or America, its current form of government does not enjoy wide ideological appeal. Compared with Russia’s or even Japan’s, its military is still modernizing. It has recently become fashionable in America and Europe to describe Chinese "expansions" in Africa and South America. But the evidence is mostly economic deals over raw materials. This is not expansionism, but mercantilism. China is indeed playing an active geopolitical game in its immediate environment: Southeast Asia, Central Asia and Korea Peninsula. But this only serves to show that China is still mired in local complexities.

### AT ADV Great Battery War 1NR extensions – No china war

**Extend our 1nc card from Brendon – US and China have entered an era of peaceful cooperation. War wouldn’t benefit either side and if a war did start it won't escalate that’s our Lieber and Press evidence.**

#### Won’t go nuclear or draw in outside powers

Roger **Cliff,** Ph.D. in international relations, Princeton, M.A. in history (Chinese studies), University of California, San Diego, Assistant for Strategy Development, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and David A. Shlapak, Ph.D., senior international policy analyst, RAND Project Air Force Report, 20**07**, nkj

This situation would occur if China attempted to use force to achieve unification, the United States intervened, and China’s efforts were defeated, but Beijing refused to accept Taiwan’s independence.10 Analysis at RAND has found that a conflict between the United States and China over Taiwan would likely be confined to the use of conventional weapons, even though both the United States and China possess nuclear weapons, and that it would not likely escalate into a broader war between the United States and China. That is, the war would be contained in the area around Taiwan; the main combatants would probably be limited to the United States, China, and Japan; and active hostilities would probably end after a relatively short time. Nonetheless, such a war would probably result in a bitter relationship between the United States and China, comparable in some ways to that between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. China might well accelerate the buildup of its military capabilities with an eye toward waging a second, this time successful, campaign to claim Taiwan. This military competition would likely also be accompanied by a broader deterioration in Sino-U.S. relations, with mutual trade and investment falling dramatically or even ceasing, and each country demanding that its allies not cooperate with its rival. Countries in Asia might find themselves under pressure to choose between good relations with the United States and good relations with China. Nonetheless, even under these circumstances, the relationship between the United States and China after an inconclusive war over Taiwan would have important differences from the one between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Unlike the Soviet Union, China is closely integrated into the world economy. With the exception of Japan, most countries in Asia would likely regard the importance of maintaining good relations with Beijing as outweighing any concerns about China having used force against Taiwan. They would resist U.S. pressure to choose between Washington and Beijing, preferring to maintain good relations with both. This logic would apply even more strongly to countries outside the region, which would be even less concerned about China’s use of force.

#### Economic interdependence checks war

**Doctoroff 10** 11/28—MBA at the University of Chicago, North Asia Area Director of JWT advertising firm (Tom, 28 November 2010, “Standing Up to China, the Obama Way”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tom-doctoroff/standing-up-to-china-the\_b\_788704.html, RBatra)

Third, and fortunately, China knows its ascent will not continue without Western complicity. No matter how successful the central government is in rebalancing the economy toward domestic consumption, exports to Western markets, which have fueled more than 60% of economic expansion since 1990, will determine growth rates for decades to come. Even the military acknowledges armed conflict with the United States would strike a fatal blow to China's "peaceful rise." Importantly, China has always productively engaged with other societies -- from Indian Buddhism to American capital markets, absorbing new influences and applying them in Chinese contexts. After the Great Leap Backwards -- thirty years of economic and social disaster triggered by post-Liberation isolation -- it knows walls, at least outside cyberspace, are counterproductive. As one street smart sixty-year-old confided, "We're afraid of not having any friends." In China, **there is no desire, even amongst reactionary military factions, to become divorced from global forces of progress**.

## AT Solvency

#### Their argument is empirically denied – they claim $395 million will spur the fuel cell industry but in 2003 politicians said the same thing and gave fuel cells $1.8 billion

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

Hydrogen energy is all the rage among¶ American politicians at the moment. A $1.8¶ billion, 10-year federal program to underwrite¶ research in hydrogen-powered fuel cells—¶ termed the “FreedomCar initiative” by the¶ Bush administration—is a popular component¶ of energy legislation passed by both the House¶ and the Senate in 2003. In his campaign for the¶ White House, Sen. John F. Kerry (D-MA) put¶ forth an even more ambitious, $5 billion¶ hydrogen fuel-cell initiative. And even though¶ all observers agree that economically viable¶ hydrogen-powered vehicles will not be available¶ for at least a couple of decades (if then),1¶ California governor Arnold Schwarzenegger is¶ promoting the use of state funds to help start¶ building a statewide network of hydrogen¶ refueling stations in the here and now.2 If¶ hydrogen refueling stations are available, the¶ theory goes, automakers will build vehicles¶ powered by fuel cells and people will buy them.¶ Before any more taxpayer money is spent¶ pursuing the dream of a “hydrogen economy,”¶ however, policymakers need to get out their¶ calculators and seriously consider the environmental¶ costs of bringing this dream to reality.¶ If they do, they’ll find that harnessing hydrogen¶ for widespread use in the energy sector will¶ consume more energy than it will save, and it¶ will worsen, not better, environmental quality.

## AT ADV Global Warming

#### Turn - Fuel cells will double greenhouse gas emissions

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

The Challenge¶ Advocates of a hydrogen economy do not¶ envision that hydrogen will be burned directly¶ to create energy; instead, they envision using¶ hydrogen primarily as an input for fuel cells. A¶ fuel cell is basically a gas battery, although fuel¶ cells come in a variety of types and employ a¶ range of different materials.3 Because fuel cells¶ emit only water vapor and heat, environmentalists¶ tout them as a source of pollution-free¶ energy.¶ That characterization is grossly misleading,¶ however, because it fails to consider the¶ issue of hydrogen production. After all, hydrogen¶ does not exist in subterranean pockets¶ waiting to be tapped by drilling equipment.¶ Hydrogen is an atom fused with other atoms¶ that together constitute molecules of various¶ chemical substances. Separating hydrogen¶ atoms from other atoms on an industrial scale¶ is a technologically challenging and energy intensive¶ undertaking.¶ There are basically two ways to produce¶ hydrogen. The first method (called “electrolysis”)¶ is to send through water an electric current¶ that separates the water’s hydrogen¶ atoms from its oxygen atoms. The second¶ method is to mix steam with some sort of¶ fossil fuel (usually natural gas) in a superheated¶ chamber. The ensuing chemical reaction¶ produces hydrogen.¶ The Electrolysis Calculation¶ Environmentalists and other advocates of¶ fuel cells often cite the electrolysis route as a¶ viable and attractive way to reduce fossil fuel¶ consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.¶ But is it? Let’s take a look at the numbers.¶ It takes 39.4 kilowatt-hours of energy to¶ extract a kilogram of hydrogen from water.¶ But the energy efficiency of the electrolysis¶ process is only about 70 percent (that is, 30¶ percent of the energy used in the course of¶ electrolysis is wasted).4¶ Let’s suppose the electrical energy for the¶ electrolysis process is provided by a coal-fired¶ power plant with an overall conversion efficiency¶ of 40 percent (that is, 40 percent of the thermal¶ energy input to the plant is converted into¶ electrical energy—a typical figure).5 Accordingly,¶ the energy input to the boiler of the power plant¶ required to produce the kilogram of hydrogen¶ is 140.8 kilowatt-hours.¶ Now, let’s look at the fuel cell. Because the¶ reaction that occurs in the fuel cell produces¶ water vapor, the most energy we could produce¶ from the fuel cell is 33.4 kilowatt-hours¶ per kilogram of hydrogen. Given that the¶ best fuel cells operate at about 70 percent¶ efficiency,6 the energy actually obtained from¶ the reaction of a kilogram of hydrogen in the¶ fuel cell is 23.3 kilowatt-hours.¶ 2¶ Separating¶ hydrogen atoms¶ from other atoms¶ on an industrial¶ scale is a¶ technologically¶ challenging and¶ energy-intensive¶ undertaking.¶ There is one final matter to consider. If¶ hydrogen is to be used as a transportation fuel,¶ it must be compressed to at least 4,000¶ pounds per square inch, and that compression¶ requires energy. After subtracting the energy¶ needed for compression, we find the net output¶ from the kilogram of hydrogen in the fuel¶ cell is only about 17.4 kilowatt-hours.7¶ In sum, one must put 140.8 kilowatt-hours¶ of energy into the front end of a power plant¶ to produce 17.4 kilowatt-hours of electricity¶ from a hydrogen-powered fuel cell in an automobile.¶ The overall conversion efficiency of¶ the whole process is a dismal 12 percent.¶ Now, let’s estimate the electrical output¶ from fuel cells that would be needed to power¶ the U.S. vehicle fleet. According to data from¶ the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the¶ total vehicle-miles traveled by passenger cars,¶ pickup trucks, vans, and SUVs in the United¶ States in 2000 was 2,526 billion.8 Extensive¶ tests performed by Southern California¶ Edison Company suggest that it would take¶ an average of at least 0.46 kilowatt-hour of¶ electricity to drive a passenger vehicle a mile¶ down the road.9 Applying that figure to the¶ total 2,526 billion vehicle-miles traveled in¶ 2000, we find that fuel cells would need to¶ produce 1.16 trillion kilowatt-hours to power¶ the U.S. vehicle fleet. Given the ratios discovered¶ above, that implies the need for 9.38 trillion¶ kilowatt-hours of energy to feed into¶ coal-fired power plants (the equivalent of 32¶ quadrillion British Thermal Units, or “32¶ quads” in engineering jargon).¶ It is interesting to compare that number¶ with the energy content of the U.S. gasoline¶ supply. In 2000 U.S. motor gasoline consumption¶ averaged 8.472 million barrels per day.10¶ Since reformulated gasoline has an energy¶ content of 5.150 million BTU per barrel, we¶ find that the energy content of the gasoline¶ consumed in 2000 equals 16 quads, or exactly¶ half the energy required for the fuel-cell route¶ using coal to generate the electricity for¶ hydrolysis.11¶ The environmental implications of moving¶ vehicles with hydrogen-powered fuel cells¶ rather than with gasoline are bracing. Replacing¶ 16 quads of gasoline-fired energy with 32¶ quads of coal-fired energy to produce electrolysis¶ hydrogen would result in a 2.7-fold increase¶ in carbon emissions.12 Replacing gasoline with¶ electricity fired by the fuel mix currently¶ employed in the generation sector would¶ increase net carbon emissions from 309 million¶ metric tons to 610 million metric tons.13

## AT ADV Global warming 1nr extensions

#### Extend our 1nc evidence from Anthrop –increase in fuel cells will create a doubling of greenhouse gases

#### Fuel cells would double net greenhouse gas emissions

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

Politicians on both the Left and the Right have¶ increasingly embraced subsidies for hydrogen powered¶ fuel cells as a promising way to move¶ America away from reliance on petroleum.¶ Although advocates concede that such technologies¶ are at least several decades away from penetrating¶ the market in any significant manner¶ because of cost considerations, less attention has¶ been paid to the environmental implications of¶ such a transition.¶ Given current technology, switching from gasoline¶ to hydrogen-powered fuel cells would greatly¶ increase energy consumption even if the hydrogen¶ were extracted from water rather than from fossil¶ fuels. That’s because it takes a tremendous amount¶ of electricity to harvest hydrogen and to deliver it to¶ consumers. Moreover, a transition from gasoline to¶ hydrogen would nearly double net greenhouse gas¶ emissions attributable to passenger vehicles, given¶ the current fuel mix in the electricity sector.

#### Their solvency global warming relies on massive increase in renewable energy sources to create the hydrogen fuel cells but that is a pipe dream.

Anthrop, Prof Environmental Studies 4

(Donald, professor emeritus of environmental studies at San Jose State University and the author of more than 60 papers and articles on energy and water resources, “Hydrogen’s Empty Environmental Promise”, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/briefs/bp90.pdf>, twm)

Renewables to the Rescue?¶ Environmentalists argue that renewable¶ energy sources could in theory supply the¶ needed electrical energy and thereby reduce¶ use of fossil fuel and, relatedly, net carbon¶ emissions. The calculations, however, are¶ daunting. Hydroelectric power, for instance,¶ dwarfs all other renewable energy production¶ in the United States, yet the 3.75 trillion kilowatt-¶ hours of electricity necessary to deliver¶ hydrogen from water to fuel cells 14 is almost¶ 15 times the total hydroelectric energy produced¶ in the United States last year.15 Given¶ the mounting public pressure to remove existing¶ dams, it’s unlikely that the construction of¶ any significant new hydroelectric generating¶ capacity will occur in the foreseeable future.¶ Photovoltaic (PV) cells, which are used to¶ produce solar power, are an even worse choice.¶ Doing an input-output analysis of the energy¶ obtained from a PV array vs. the energy¶ required to produce it is extremely difficult,¶ but some analysts have performed those calculations¶ and found that it would take about¶ eight years for a PV panel to produce as much¶ energy as was used to produce the panel in the¶ first place.16 A modern PV panel operating¶ over a period of 25 years can probably be¶ expected to convert no more than about 12¶ percent of the incident solar radiation striking¶ the cell into electrical energy.17 Since we need¶ 56.3 kilowatt-hours of electricity to power the¶ electrolyzer in order to obtain an output of¶ 17.4 kilowatt-hours from the fuel cells, if PV¶ cells are used to provide that electrical energy,¶ the efficiency of the whole process is a minuscule¶ 4 percent (that is, 4 percent of the energy¶ in the incident solar radiation captured by the¶ PV cells appears as electrical output from the¶ fuel cells).18¶ 3¶ One must put¶ 140.8 kilowatthours¶ of energy¶ into the front end¶ of a power plant¶ to produce 17.4¶ kilowatt-hours¶ of electricity from¶ a hydrogenpowered¶ fuel cell¶ in an automobile.¶ That dismal conversion efficiency has two¶ consequences. First, the energy required to¶ make the PV panel will exceed the energy produced¶ by the fuel cells. Second, the cost of¶ that energy will be prohibitively expensive.¶ Using wind power rather than solar power¶ requires a different set of calculations. Unfortunately,¶ the data for those calculations are¶ not readily available. Like solar power facilities,¶ however, wind power facilities are quite¶ capital intensive, and the power from those¶ facilities is only intermittently available.¶ Accordingly, the calculations for wind-generated¶ electricity are unlikely to be much different¶ from the calculations for solar-generated¶ electricity.19

## DA Politics

### DA Elections Obama good links

#### The plan puts a focus on green tech which hurts Obama’s chance to win the election.

Munro 12

(Neil, http://dailycaller.com/2012/05/30/democrats-squirm-at-solyndra-vs-bain-questions/

“Democrats squirm at Solyndra vs. Bain questions” 5-30-12, twm)

Republicans are scoffing at Democrats’ attempts to explain why President Barack Obama’s failed green-tech investments are unimportant but Mitt Romney’s few failures at Bain Capital, an otherwise wildly successful private equity firm, are a scandal.¶ Obama deputy campaign manager Stephanie Cutter tried out the new tactic during a May 30 appearance on MSNBC’s “Daily Rundown,” when she was asked about the president’s support for Solyndra.¶ “The president’s not picking winners and losers, he’s making strategic investment to promote clean energy,” she said. “Mitt Romney’s role at Bain Capital was to make profits for his investors and for himself. … There were winners and losers, but Mitt Romney always won.”¶ Solyndra went bankrupt in 2010 after being given $535 million in taxpayers’ funds, and has since become a GOP watchword for crony capitalism.¶ The Solyndra money is a small portion of a larger $70 billion effort by the White House industrial policy to displace oil and gas energy with green-tech, including windmills, algae and the Chevy Volt.¶ Public debate over green-tech waste is damaging to Obama’s 2012 campaign because of the lack of tangible payoff in terms of increased employment.¶ “Well, no, it’s not fair. … Let’s just take a look at the facts of Solyndra,” Cutter said at the start of a 104-second answer.¶ On Tuesday, Carney fended off a similar question with a 42-second evasive answer. “Look, there, there, there is the … the difference in that … your overall view of what your responsibilities are as president, and what your view of the economic future is,” he said.¶ Republicans scoffed at the answers from Cutter and Carney.¶ “Obama’s investment decisions were infused with politics, based on political optics and not workers’ fates, and the administration chose winners and losers — all while taxpayers held the bag,” said a statement from Jonathan Collegio, the communications director at the GOP-aligned American Crossroads group.¶ Joe Pounder, the research director at the Republican National Committee. sent reporters a series of quotes from officials showing cooperation between White House officials and Solyndra executives and lobbyists.¶ “Obama’s deputy campaign manager tried to explain why it was okay that Solyndra laid off 1,100 workers after Obama invested taxpayer money and Obama administration officials sat in on board meetings,” Pounder said.

### DA Elections Obama good - AT Rust Belt Turn

#### Obama winning in Ohio now

Andrews July 27

(Cindi, 7-27-12, “Obama, HUD secretary book trips to Ohio”, <http://news.cincinnati.com/article/20120727/NEWS01/307270132/Obama-HUD-secretary-book-trips-Ohio?odyssey=nav|head>, twm)

President Barack Obama is returning to the heart of Ohio’s rust belt next week – his ninth visit to the state this year and the third visit by an Obama in three weeks. No word yet on whether Republican opponent Mitt Romney will make tracks here, as well.¶ Obama will visit Akron and Mansfield on Wednesday as part of a swing through three swing states, his campaign has announced. He’ll visit Orlando, Fla., and Leesburg, Va., on Thursday. Ohio, Florida and Virginia are among the largest states that aren’t firmly in either camp as the fall presidential election approaches.¶ Recent polls put Obama ahead in Ohio by 2 to 9 percentage points; Quinnipiac University found him leading Romney 47 percent to 38 percent in late June, with a margin of error of 2.8 percent.¶ The president was in Cincinnati on July 16, and First Lady Michelle Obama was in Columbus and Dayton earlier this week.¶ Obama’s campaign said his speeches next week will focus on rebuilding the economy “from the middle out” and cutting taxes for the middle class.¶ Christopher Maloney, Romney’s spokesman, said: “With 420,000 Ohioans looking for work, it’s clear that President Obama’s frequent fundraising and campaign trips are taking their toll on his ability to fix our struggling economy.”¶ However, Maloney had no comment Friday afternoon about Romney’s schedule next week. The presumptive Republican nominee has often made trips to Ohio within days of Obama.¶ In addition to the president’s visit, Shaun Donovan, his secretary of Housing and Urban Development, will also be in Ohio next week. Donovan will talk about Obama’s proposal to allow homeowners who owe more than their homes are worth to refinance. He will be in Cleveland on Monday with U.S. Sen. Sherrod Brown and in Cincinnati on Tuesday with Mayor Mark Mallory.

#### Obama ahead in the Rust belt now – Democratic incumbents prove.

Kane and Nakamura 12

(Paul and David, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-begins-rust-belt-tour-assisted-by-popular-senators/2012/07/05/gJQAAgbKPW_story.html>, “Obama begins Rust Belt tour, assisted by popular senators”, 7-5-12, twm)

The 2010 Republican electoral rout in the industrial Rust Belt was decisive and complete, with the GOP sweeping the gubernatorial and Senate races in the presidential battleground states of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan. In the aftermath, Democratic prospects for 2012, particularly President Obama’s, seemed bleak.¶ But less than two years later, the dynamics have changed. Things are looking up for the president, and the best evidence may be three Senate Democrats who will head into the final sprint of this year’s campaign as clear favorites, having weathered the worst of the tea party storm in the region.¶ President Obama told an Ohio campaign crowd that he's betting they won't lose interest in the November election despite political stalemates. He says the outcome will determine the nation's economic future for the next 10 to 20 years.¶ President Obama told an Ohio campaign crowd that he's betting they won't lose interest in the November election despite political stalemates. He says the outcome will determine the nation's economic future for the next 10 to 20 years.¶ Their good standing and an improving economy in the area are encouraging for the president, who desperately needs to engage white working-class voters in these must-win states.¶ Obama is helped by the better-than-average employment picture in Ohio and Pennsylvania, both of which recorded a rate of 7.3 percent in May, while the national level remained at 8.2 percent. Michigan’s unemployment rate in May was 8.5 percent.¶ The economic instability that continues to threaten Obama’s reelection hopes has not been a vulnerability for Democratic incumbents in these states.¶ Approval ratings for Sens. Sherrod Brown (Ohio), Robert P. Casey Jr. (Pa.) and Debbie Stabenow (Mich.) have held steady despite continued unease among voters about the pace of the economic recovery and an overall disgust toward Congress, providing some optimism for how Obama can campaign in this critical part of the country.¶ As he embarked Thursday on a two-day bus tour through Ohio and Pennsylvania, the president had Brown at his side. He will stump with Casey on Friday. The tour, which runs from Toledo to Pittsburgh, presents a stark contrast to the 2010 midterm-election campaigns, when virtually no endangered Democratic incumbent sought the spotlight with Obama.¶ Some experts think that these Democrats might be able to help shore up the president’s support among wavering party members and swing voters. This is particularly true of Casey, who endorsed Obama early in 2008. The senator has deep support in western, central and northeastern Pennsylvania, areas of uncertainty for the president that have created an opening for Republican challenger Mitt Romney and his party to contemplate an upset in the state.¶ “Casey will be so far ahead that he can be a messenger to blue-collar voters,” said former Pennsylvania governor Edward G. Rendell (D).¶ On the bus tour his campaign is calling “Betting on America,” Obama spent his first day emphasizing gains in manufacturing and his administration’s bailout of the U.S. auto industry, hoping to appeal to voters in areas with many union workers. The title is an unsubtle jab at Romney, who has faced questions about offshore personal bank accounts and investments by Bain Capital, made during his time as head of the firm, in companies that eventually outsourced jobs abroad.¶ “When the American auto industry was on the brink of collapse . . . Governor Romney said we should just let Detroit go bankrupt,” Obama told a crowd of 500 supporters in this manufacturing town just south of Toledo. “I refused to turn my back on communities like this one. . . . And three years later, the American auto industry is coming roaring back.” The president is paying special attention to Ohio, where he began his 2012 campaign with a speech in Columbus in May and delivered a major address on the economy in Cleveland last month. The Buckeye State has voted for the winning candidate in 10 consecutive presidential elections, and no Republican has won the presidency without capturing Ohio. Consequently, both campaigns are spending much time and ­advertising money in the state.¶ A Quinnipiac poll released last week gave Obama an edge in Ohio (47 percent to 38 percent) and Pennsylvania (45 percent to 39 percent).

### DA Elections Uniqueness – Obama not winning in Rust Belt

#### Popularity of democratic senators in Rust Belt won’t help Obama

Kane and Nakamura 12

(Paul and David, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-begins-rust-belt-tour-assisted-by-popular-senators/2012/07/05/gJQAAgbKPW_story.html>, “Obama begins Rust Belt tour, assisted by popular senators”, 7-5-12, twm)

The Romney campaign is not ceding any ground, however, dispatching Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal (R) and former Minnesota governor Tim Pawlenty (R) to make appearances along Obama’s bus route to counter the president’s message.¶ Despite the positive trends for Obama, some political analysts doubt that the popularity of Democratic senators in the Rust Belt will be enough to secure a victory for him, especially if Friday’s employment report shows a third consecutive month of sluggish growth.¶ “It’s not something that you can transfer from one person to another,” said Mike Dawson, a former GOP adviser to Ohio politicians.¶ Neil Oxman, Rendell’s former campaign consultant, agreed that it’s going to be difficult for the Democratic Senate candidates to boost Obama, but he suggested that it’s always better to have other popular candidates on the ticket.