### 1NC

#### Interpretation

#### Restrictions are legal limits an activity

Gerald N. Hill and Kathleen T. Hill – 2005, the Free Dictionary, http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Restrictions

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects, managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions," intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property, recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### “on” indicates the object affected by the action

American Heritage Dictionary – 2000, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/ON

on (n, ôn)

prep.

1.

a. Used to indicate position above and supported by or in contact with: The vase is on the table. We rested on our hands and knees.

b. Used to indicate contact with or extent over (a surface) regardless of position: a picture on the wall; a rash on my back.

c. Used to indicate location at or along: the pasture on the south side of the river; a house on the highway.

d. Used to indicate proximity: a town on the border.

e. Used to indicate attachment to or suspension from: beads on a string.

f. Used to indicate figurative or abstract position: on the young side, but experienced; on her third beer; stopped on chapter two.

2.

a. Used to indicate actual motion toward, against, or onto: jumped on the table; the march on Washington.

b. Used to indicate figurative or abstract motion toward, against, or onto: going on six o'clock; came on the answer by accident.

3.

a. Used to indicate occurrence at a given time: on July third; every hour on the hour.

b. Used to indicate the particular occasion or circumstance: On entering the room, she saw him.

4.

a. Used to indicate the object affected by actual, perceptible action: The spotlight fell on the actress. He knocked on the door.

b. Used to indicate the object affected by a figurative action: Have pity on them.

c. Used to indicate the object of an action directed, tending, or moving against it: an attack on the fortress.

d. Used to indicate the object of perception or thought: gazed on the vista; meditated on his actions.

5. Used to indicate the agent or agency of a specified action: cut his foot on the broken glass; talked on the telephone.

6.

a. Used to indicate a medicine or other corrective taken or undertaken routinely: went on a strict diet.

b. Used to indicate a substance that is the cause of an addiction, a habit, or an altered state of consciousness: high on dope.

7.

a. Used to indicate a source or basis: "We will reach our judgments not on intentions or on promises but on deeds and on results" (Margaret Thatcher).

b. Used to indicate a source of power or energy: The car runs on methane.

8.

a. Used to indicate the state or process of: on leave; on fire; on the way.

b. Used to indicate the purpose of: travel on business.

c. Used to indicate a means of conveyance: ride on a train.

d. Used to indicate availability by means of: beer on tap; a physician on call.

9. Used to indicate belonging to: a nurse on the hospital staff.

10. Used to indicate addition or repetition: heaped error on error.

11.

a. Concerning; about: a book on astronomy.

b. Concerning and to the disadvantage of: We have some evidence on him.

12. Informal In one's possession; with: I haven't a cent on me.

13. At the expense of; compliments of: drinks on the house.

#### Energy production of solar power is the generation of electricity

US EIA (Energy Information Administration) - October 19, 2011, Annual Energy Review 2010, http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/annual/pdf/aer.pdf

Primary Energy Production: Production of primary energy. The U.S. Energy Information Administration includes the following in U.S. primary energy production: coal production, waste coal supplied, and coal refuse recovery; crude oil and lease condensate production; natural gas plant liquids production; dry natural gas—excluding supplemental gaseous fuels—production; nuclear electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the nuclear heat rates); conventional hydroelectricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates); geothermal electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates), and geothermal heat pump energy and geothermal direct use energy; solar thermal and photovoltaic electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossilfuels heat rates), and solar thermal direct use energy; wind electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates); wood and wood-derived fuels consumption; biomass waste consumption; and biofuels feedstock.

#### Incentives are direct support for a specific activity

Doris, NREL researcher, 12

(Elizabeth Doris, researcher at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, “Policy Building Blocks: Helping Policymakers Determine Policy Staging for the Development of Distributed PV Markets,” Paper to be presented at the 2012 World Renewable Energy Forum, 5/13-5/17, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/54801.pdf>)

3.3 Market Expansion

This stage of policy development targets the development of projects and includes both incentives that attempt to distribute the high first costs of distributed technologies and policies that facilitate project installation. The purpose of this category is to increase the installation of individual projects through monetizing the non-economic benefits of distributed generation for the developer. Because the value of those benefits vary in different contexts, these policies can be politically challenging to put in place and technically challenging to design and implement. There is a large body of literature (encompassing the energy field as well as other fields) that discusses the design and implementation of effective market incentives. Specific policy types include:

• Incentives. In the context of this framework, incentives are defined as direct monetary support for specific project development. Incentives, especially in the current economic environment, can be politically challenging to implement and require detailed design to ensure that they are effectively reaching the intended market at levels that spur development without creating over-subsidization. Because of the complications and expense of these types of policies, they are most used and most cost-effective in environments where the market is prepared for project development. There are three primary types of incentives:

• Investment incentives directly alter the first cost of technologies. These incentives can take the form of grants, rebates, or tax incentives, depending on the market needs. Grants are typically applied to larger scale projects and are paid in advance of development, and so target development that would not take place without advance investment. Rebates are most commonly based on equipment purchases and can be applied at the time of purchase or through a post-purchase mechanism. Tax incentives can be deductions or credits, can be applied to entire installations, and are applied after purchase, annually. Tax incentives target development that does not need direct capital investment, but instead prioritizes reduction in pay-back period.

• Production incentives provide payment for electricity produced from the distributed electricity. These are different from net metering because the aim is not to provide the economic value of electricity sold into the grid, but instead, to monetize the indirect benefits of distributed generation and apply that on a production basis to projects. These incentives do not directly remove the challenge of higher first costs, and so are most effective in situations in which those high first costs can be spread over the course of the project lifetime (e.g., where direct priori investment is not a priority). In the last decade, incentives for distributed generation have tended toward the production type, because it assures the public that the investment is resulting in clean energy development (whereas investment incentives have the potential to be invested in projects that do not materialize).

• Feed-in-Tariffs. This incentive type reduces investment risk by providing fixed payments for projects based on the levelized cost of renewable energy generation. This (among other design characteristics) distinguishes feed-in-tariffs from production-based incentives, which are based on monetizing the value of the electricity to the grid or the value to the electricity purchaser.

#### “For” means the incentive must directly influence energy production

WORDS AND PHRASES 04

(Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “For,” Volume 17, p. 338-343)

W.D.Tenn. 1942. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 uses the words “production for commerce” as denoting an intention to deal in a restricted way with question of coverage in connection with those employed directly in production of articles to be sold, shipped or transported across state lines in commerce, producing goods “for” a certain purpose implying a direct relation as distinguished from producing something which only “affects” a certain purpose which implies an indirect relation.

#### Violation – The aff does not remove a limitation on the conversion of solar energy into electricity; it only removes limitations on the construction of plants/facilities that MIGHT produce electricity LATER

#### Vote Neg

#### Predictable Limits – There are hundreds of factors that influence whether solar power gets produced – Allowing affs to remove restrictions on factors of production means they could do things like revoke panel patents. Only requiring the aff’s restriction to DIRECTLY LIMIT the generation of electricity from solar power creates a predictable limit on aff mechanisms

#### Ground – Deregulating capital instead of production means the aff doesn’t have to defend “production good.” At best they are effectually topical which guts stable CP and DA ground and forces us to concede solvency to get back to square 1.
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#### Obama is still ahead but Romney is closing the gap --- especially in the critical swing state of Ohio

Murray, 10/3 (Sara, The Wall Street Journal Online, 10/3/2012, “Obama Lead Shrinks in Two Battlegrounds; Polls Tighten in Florida and Virginia, But Romney Still Faces Big Gap in Ohio,” Factiva)

Mitt Romney has closed in on President Barack Obama in the battleground states of Florida and Virginia, new polling shows, but a substantial gap with the president in Ohio leaves the Republican with a daunting path to victory in the Electoral College.

Biting into Mr. Obama's lead over the past three weeks, Mr. Romney now trails the president by a single percentage point among likely voters in Florida and by two points in Virginia, new Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist Poll surveys show. Both races are statistical dead heats, as Mr. Obama's leads fall within the surveys' margins of error.

But the GOP nominee trails by eight percentage points among likely voters in Ohio, the nation's largest swing state after Florida and a central component of both candidates' plans for building an Electoral College majority, the new polling shows.

The polls show that the race for the White House remains fiercely competitive roughly a month before Election Day. The state surveys mirror tightening nationwide: Mr. Obama held a three-point lead in a new nationwide Wall Street Journal/NBC News survey released Tuesday, down from five points in early September.

"This is going to be—and always was going to be—a close election," Robert Gibbs, an adviser to the Obama campaign, said in a Politico forum Wednesday. He singled out Ohio and Virginia as particularly important states for both candidates. "Places like Ohio and Virginia…have seen as much if not more attention than almost anything else."

In Florida, Mr. Obama leads Mr. Romney 47% to 46% among likely voters, after holding a five-point lead in early September. In Virginia, the president leads 48% to 46%, after topping Mr. Romney by five points in a September survey.

In Ohio, the new survey finds Mr. Obama with 51%, to 43% for Mr. Romney, after Mr. Obama led by seven percentage points in early September.

The pool of undecided voters is relatively small—just 4% in Ohio, 5% in Virginia and 6% in Florida—but a substantial shift toward Mr. Romney among independent voters in Florida in the past three weeks suggests that a larger subset remains persuadable.

"If Romney can make a better showing for who he is personally, this race could get even tighter," said Andrew Kohut, president of the nonpartisan Pew Research Center. So far, many swing voters "have a negative view of Obama's performance and a negative view of Romney personally."

The Romney campaign will need to make swift progress in Ohio if it hopes to make the state competitive. A major challenge there: More than half of likely Ohio voters—some 51%—had an unfavorable impression of Mr. Romney, compared with 42% who viewed him positively. It was roughly the opposite for the president: 52% viewed Mr. Obama favorably, while 44% had a negative impression of him.

Ben Ginsberg, counsel to the Romney campaign, said in the Politico forum it is possible for Mr. Romney to eke out an Electoral College victory without the Buckeye State, but that "it'd be a lot better to win Ohio."

Across all three swing states, the candidates were at a standoff in molding likely voters' economic perceptions. "Basically Obama and Romney are fighting to a draw as to who's better able to handle the economy," said Lee Miringoff, the director of the Marist Institute for Public Opinion, which conducted the surveys of the three states.

Mr. Romney's Medicare stance remains an issue that is sure to continue to draw attention, particularly in Florida, with its heavy concentration of seniors. Some 48% of likely voters in Florida said Mr. Obama was better prepared to deal with Medicare, compared with 43% who said Mr. Romney was.

But older voters were more amenable to Mr. Romney's plan, which would keep benefits unchanged for people in or near retirement but move younger Americans to a system where they buy insurance policies in retirement subsidized by the government. Of likely Florida voters 60 years or older, 47% said Mr. Romney would do a better job handling Medicare, compared with 43% who said the president would.

#### Strong trade pressure on China is key to Obama reelection --- the plan reignites GOP bashing on a key issue

Dawson and Mason, 12 (2/13/2012, Jeff Mason and Stella Dawson, “Tough calculus for Obama in Chinese leader's election-year visit,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/13/us-usa-campaign-obama-china-idUSTRE81C0DG20120213>)

(Reuters) - Even as he greets China's vice president in the Oval Office on Tuesday, President Barack Obama is quietly overhauling U.S. economic policy toward Beijing, looking for new ways to extract results on issues such as market access and currency manipulation that have bedeviled him and his predecessors.

Obama's need to boost U.S. exports and show he can be firm with China, and his simultaneous hopes for a smooth start with Vice President Xi Jinping, who is due to become China's leader in 13 months, illustrate the conflicting tugs on Washington's China policy.

Making the calculus even more complicated, Xi arrives in the middle of a U.S. election year, in which Obama's dealings with Beijing are a popular punching bag for Republican presidential candidates aiming to challenge the Democratic incumbent.

Xi is getting the full Washington tour: visits to the State Department, Pentagon and Capitol Hill, as well as meetings with U.S. and Chinese business leaders.

But he won't be offered the complete red-carpet treatment. For all his power within the Chinese system, Xi is still for now No. 2, leader-in-waiting behind outgoing President Hu Jintao.

Obama's aides say the visit will produce few, if any, formal agreements. Rather they expect the president and Xi to size one another up. There will be firm talk from Obama on U.S. gripes, and perhaps from Xi as well.

While there has been progress in increasing U.S. exports to China, "we've also raised very directly instances where we believe that China is not living up to the rules of the road that all nations need to with regard to business practices," deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters.

POLICY AND POLITICS

China is not beloved by the American electorate. Its trade and currency policies are blamed for job losses in the U.S. manufacturing sector that hit important election battleground states such as Ohio especially hard. Beating up on Beijing is an easy way for candidates from both parties to score political points.

Obama knows that, and he set the stage for tough talk at the Asia-Pacific summit in Hawaii in November, telling China to act like a "grown-up" by reforming trade and currency practices viewed as detrimental to the U.S. economy.

U.S. leverage over Beijing is limited, since China holds hundreds of billions of dollars of U.S. debt.

Still, the policy review, described by an official who recently left the Obama administration, is aimed at finding new ways of getting results on limits to U.S. market access, China's use of state-owned corporations, the valuation of its yuan currency, which U.S. officials see as artificially low, and related issues.

In his State of the Union address last month, Obama announced a new enforcement unit that will investigate unfair trade practices. China will likely be a major target.

Republicans do not see a lot that is working. Mitt Romney, the apparent front-runner in the race for the Republican presidential nomination, has said Obama is not being tough enough. He promised to label China a currency manipulator - something the Obama administration has declined to do.

In a speech to technology executives on Friday, Romney slammed China's "autocratic model" of capitalism, and said that China's rise could ultimately threaten U.S. freedom.

Such criticism has gained traction on the campaign trail.

"China is just a drop in the bucket in terms of things the Obama administration is doing wrong," said Chrystalline Lauryl, 35, who was attending a conservative conference in Washington where the Republican candidates were speaking.

"There's friendly and there's buttering up," she said with regard to China policy. Obama, she said, was doing the latter.

The president's political advisers are aware that Xi's visit could trigger more attacks on the president's record, and they are ready with a string of comebacks about Romney's own record on the subject.

They point out, for example, that in his book "No Apology" Romney criticized Obama for being protectionist after putting tariffs on Chinese tires, while as a presidential candidate Romney said he would apply tariffs to goods after declaring the country a currency manipulator.

"That just gives us another opportunity to talk about a flip flop," a senior Obama campaign official said.

CALCULUS

Obama may not address Romney's critiques directly while Xi is in Washington, but the pressure of the election will influence his positioning.

"The way that China's been broached in the Republican primaries has been one of the things that has contributed to Obama having to take a tougher public stance on some of the China economic issues in particular," said Andrew Small, a China expert at the German Marshall Fund, who said U.S. officials would still be cognizant of China's sensitivity to protocol.

"For this trip itself, the calculus will probably net out in favor of laying on a good show for him," he said.

#### Romney win crushes US-Russian relations – reverse causal evidence

**Larison 6-20-**12, citing Andrew Weiss director of the RAND Center for Russia and Eurasia and executive director of the RAND Business Leaders Forum, Daniel Larison is a reporter for the American Conservative, “The Presidential Election’s Effects on U.S.-Russian Relations” <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-presidential-elections-effects-on-u-s-russian-relations/>)

Andrew Weiss considers the reasons for U.S.-Russian tensions, and finds the presidential elections in both countries to be partly responsible: A third big drag on U.S.-Russian relations comes from the so-called silly season that accompanies presidential campaigns in both countries. Of course, 2012 was always supposed to be a dead year in U.S.-Russian relations. Back-to-back presidential campaigns have overshadowed just about everything on the bilateral agenda, and practically no one in Washington or Moscow had been predicting that significant progress could be made this year on the toughest issues. Take missile defense, for example. Putin has shown little interest in cutting deals on major arms control issues with a U.S. president who might not be around in just a few months time to implement them. Not only does Putin have no strong incentive to take risks in pursuing new deals with Obama before the election, but he has good reason to believe that a Romney administration would halt or reverse most or all of Obama’s initiatives related to Russia. If Romney wins in November, Putin has even less incentive to cooperate with the U.S., because he will assume (correctly) that the incoming administration is going to be much more antagonistic. Arms control isn’t likely to be a top priority in a Romney White House. To the extent that he has said anything about arms control, Romney is openly hostile to new agreements and unwilling to make even the smallest concessions on missile defense. The good news is that U.S.-Russian relations might start to recover once the election is over, but that depends on the outcome. Romney’s election would represent the confirmation of Russian hard-liners’ suspicions that the post-2008 thaw in relations was a fluke and couldn’t be sustained. Indeed, the Republican nominee seems to have crafted his Russia policy to maximize distrust and paranoia in Moscow. The 2008 and 2012 campaigns have been unusual in the post-Cold War era for the intensity of anti-Russian sentiment expressed by the Republican nominees in these cycles. If it had just been the 2008 cycle, it could have attributed to McCain’s longstanding anti-Russian attitudes and dismissed as such. The re-emergence of Russophobia as a major theme of Republican foreign policy makes that impossible. Weiss also points to the danger that Putin will contribute to wrecking the relationship for opportunistic domestic reasons: Still, Putin knows how to cater to the two-thirds of the Russian electorate that voted for him in March and reside primarily in Russia’s smaller cities and countryside. He may find it hard to resist the temptation to play upon their worst fears and anti-Western stereotypes. Sacrificing the past several years of dramatic improvement in the U.S.-Russian relationship may seem like a small price to pay if it breathes new life and legitimacy into his rule. If Romney is elected, his desire to scrap good relations with Russia would make it extremely easy for Putin to do just that.

#### **Relations key to solve accidental nuclear war – START is no substitute for relations**

Cohen 10—prof, Russian Studies and History, NYU. Prof emeritus, Princeton (Stephen, US-Russian Relations in an Age of American Triumphalism: An Interview with Stephen F. Cohen, 25 May 2010, http://www.thenation.com/article/us-russian-relations-age-american-triumphalism-interview-stephen-f-cohen, AMiles)

Cohen: The real concern I have with this "we won the Cold War" triumphalism is the mythology that we are safer today than we were when the Soviet Union existed. Though it is blasphemous to say so, we are not safer for several reasons, one being that the Soviet state kept the lid on very dangerous things. The Soviet Union was in control of its nuclear and related arsenals. Post-Soviet Russia is "sorta" in control, but "sorta" is not enough. There is no margin for error. Reagan's goal in the 1980s was not to end the Soviet Union, but to turn it into a permanent partner of the United States. He came very close to achieving that and deserves enormous credit. He did what had to be done by meeting Gorbachev half-way. But since 1991, the arrogance of American policymaking toward Russia has either kept the Cold War from being fully ended or started a new one. The greatest threats to our national security still reside in Russia. This is not because it's communist, but because it is laden with all these nuclear, chemical, and biological devices—that’s the threat. The reaction of the second Bush administration was to junk decades of safe-guarding agreements with Moscow. It was the first time in modern times that we have had no nuclear control reduction agreement with the Russians. What should worry us every day and night is the triumphalist notion that nuclear war is no longer possible. It is now possible in even more ways than before, especially accidental ones. Meanwhile, the former Soviet territories remain a Wal-Mart of dirty material and know-how. If terrorists ever explode a dirty device in the United States, even a small one, the material is likely to come from the former Soviet Union. The Nunn-Lugar Act (1992) was the best program Congress ever enacted to help Russia secure its nuclear material and know-how, a major contribution to American national security. But no one in Washington connects the dots. Take Senator Lugar himself. He seems not to understand that we need Russia's complete cooperation to make his own legislation fully successful, but he repeatedly speaks undiplomatically, even in ugly ways, about Russia’s leaders, thereby limiting their cooperation and undermining his own legacy. In other words, to have a nuclear relationship with Russia that will secure our national security, we must have a fully cooperative, trusting political relationship with Moscow. That’s why all the talk about a replacement for the expired START agreement, which Obama has been having trouble reaching with the Kremlin, is half-witted. Even if the two sides agree, and even if the Senate and Russian Duma ratify a new treaty, the agreement will be unstable because the political relationship is bad and growing worse. Evidently, no one in the Administration, Congress, or the mainstream media, or, I should add in the think tanks, can connect these dots.
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Solar energy mystifies existing consumption practices, greening them to remove guilt for our unsustainable ecological footprint

Byrne & Toly 6

(Josh, director of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and distinguished professor of energy and climate policy at the University of Delaware, Noah, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Politics & International Relations, Director of Urban Studies Program at Wheaton, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse”, pgs. 1-32 in Transforming Power: Energy, Environment, and Society in Conflict, eds. Josh Byrne, Noah Toly, and Leigh Glover)

In this regard, ironically, Small-is-Beautiful Solar shares with Big Wind the aspiration to re-order the energy regime without changing society. Despite modern society’s technological, economic, and political addiction to large-scale, cheap energy systems that solar energy cannot mimic, most PV proponents hope to revolutionize the technological foundation of modernity, without disturbing its social base. A new professional cadre of solar architects and engineers are exhorted to find innovative ways of embedding PV technology in the skin of buildings (Strong, 1999; Benemann, Chehab, and Schaar-Gabriel, 2001), while transportation engineers and urban planners are to coordinate in launching “smart growth” communities where vehicles are powered by hydrogen derived from PV-powered electrolysis to move about in communities optimized for “location efficiency” (Ogden, 1999; Holtzclaw et al., 2002). The wildly oversized ecological footprint of urban societies (Rees and Wackernagel, 1996) is unquestioned as PV decorates its structure. These tools for erecting a Solar Society intend to halt anthropogenic changes to the chemistry of the atmosphere, rain, and soil mantle while enabling unlimited economic growth. In the Solar Society of tomorrow, we will make what we want, in the amounts we desire, without worry, because all of its energy is derived from the benign, renewable radiation supplied by our galaxy’s sun. Compared to Big Wind, PV may cost more but it promises to deliver an equivalent social result (minus the avian and landscape threats of the former) and, just possibly, with a technical elegance that surpasses the clunky mechanicalness of turbines propelled by wind. In this respect, Solar Society makes its peace with modernity by leaving undisturbed the latter’s cornucopian dreams19 and, likewise, poses no serious challenge to the social and political structures of the modern era. At this precise point, inequality and conflict can only be conceived in Solar Society as the results of willful meanness and greed. While the solar variety of technological politics guiding society may be relatively minimalist—no towering new monuments or spectacular devices are planned—it would be no less committed to the ideals of technique in shaping social experience and its self-assessment. Similarly, its economics would warmly embrace a form of consumptive capitalism, although with cleaner inputs (and possibly throughputs) than before. While the discussion here of sustainable energy advocacy has concentrated on its wind- and solar-animated versions, we believe that strategies anticipating significant roles for geothermal, biomass, micro-hydro, and hydrogen harvested from factories fueled by renewables anticipate variants of the social narratives depicted for the two currently most prominent renewable energy options. The aim of producing more with advancing ecological efficiency in order to consume more with equally advancing consumerist satisfaction underpins the sustainable energy future in a way that would seamlessly tie it to the modernization project.20

#### Consumption practices ensure extinction – cause overshoot and collapse of the environment, only re-organizing society can solve

Smith 11

(Gar, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, “NUCLEAR¶ ROULETTE¶ THE CASE AGAINST A¶ “NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE” Pgs. 46)

Even if all of the world’s current energy output could be produced by renewables, this level of¶ energy consumption would still inflict terrible harm on Earth’s damaged ecosystems. In order to¶ survive, we need to relearn how to use less. It is critical that we adopt a Conservation Imperative.¶ Faced with the inevitable disappearance of the stockpiles of cheap energy we have used to move and¶ transform matter, we need to identify society’s fundamental needs and invest our limited energy resources¶ in those key areas. A Post-Oil/Post Coal/Post-Nuclear world can no longer sustain the one-time extravagances¶ of luxury goods, designed-to-be-disposable products, and brain-numbing entertainment devices.¶ The long-distance transport of raw materials, food and manufactured goods will need to decline in favor¶ of local production geared to match local resources and needs. Warfare—the most capital-, resource- and¶ pollution-intensive human activity—must also be diminished. Neither the costly inventory of nuclear¶ arms nor the Pentagon’s imperial network of 700-plus foreign bases is sustainable. There will doubtless¶ still be wars but, in the Post-oil World, they will be either be waged with solar-powered tanks or fought¶ on horseback.¶ Modern economies insist on powering ahead like competing steamboats in an upstream race. We have¶ become addicted to over-consumption on a planet that was not designed for limitless exploitation. As¶ the late environmental leader David Brower noted: “In the years since the Industrial Revolution, we¶ humans have been partying pretty hard. We’ve ransacked most of the Earth for resources….We are living¶ off the natural capital of the planet—the principal, and not the interest. The soil, the seas, the forests, the¶ rivers, and the protective atmospheric cover—all are being depleted. It was a grand binge, but the hangover¶ is now upon us, and it will soon be throbbing.” 224¶ On the eve of India’s independence, Mahatma Gandhi was asked whether his new nation could expect¶ to attain Britain’s level of industrial development. Noting that “it took Britain half the resources of this¶ planet to achieve its prosperity,” Gandhi famously estimated that raising the rest of the world to British¶ levels of consumption would require “two more planets.” The United Nations Development Program¶ recently reconsidered Gandhi’s equation as it applies towards “a world edging towards the brink of¶ dangerous climate change.”¶ Working from the assumed “sustainable” ceiling of climate-warming gases (14.5 Gt CO2 per year),¶ UNEP confirmed that “if emissions were frozen at the current level of 29 Gt CO2, we would need two¶ planets.” Unfortunately, UNEP noted, some countries are producing more CO2 than others. Fifteen¶ percent of the world’s richest residents are using 90 percent of the planet’s sustainable budget of shared¶ resources. According to UNEP’s calculations, just sustaining the current lifestyle of Canada and the U.S.¶ would require the resources of 16 planets—eight planets each. 225

Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production

Rather than focusing on production of technology, we should embrace our ability to shape and transform our subjectivity as consumers, embracing voluntary simplicity – this debate offers a crucial moment to produce alternative knowledge about everyday living practices

Alexander ‘11

(Samuel, University of Melbourne; Office for Environmental Programs/Simplicity Institute, “

Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence”, Social Sciences Research Network, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1941087)

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western--‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western--‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption--‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self enfgaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

### CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should incentivize and foster collaboration between U.S. and Chinese solar manufacturers to create jointly owned factories in the U.S. The USFG should create a “Buy American” provision for these incentives. The US should grant an exception to the tariffs if deployed in US-assembled modules.

#### The CP solves the case and boosts the US solar industry.

Kenedi, ’12 (Ron, Contributing Editor, “A "Third Way" Approach for U.S.-China Solar Trade,” July 30, 2012, <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/07/a-third-way-approach-for-u-s-china-solar-trade?cmpid=rss>)

Threat of unresolved tariff amounts (that might change in the future) also has caused uncertainty among buyers which creates insecurity in the market and damages the efforts of U.S. sellers. The reputations of both SolarWorld and the Chinese manufacturers have been tarnished, and profits, which are in short supply throughout the global solar industry, have been further squeezed by this action. But let’s be realistic. Yes, the U.S. manufacturers have a difficult time competing pricewise with Chinese makers because the cost of doing business in China is less than in the U.S. for many reasons — including cost of labor, taxes, insurance, property, and the steadfast support of an exceedingly generous government. But also, the Chinese solar industry has been willing to take risks to establish scale which lowers solar’s total cost, and the Chinese makers have learned to refine silicon, make wafers and cells and build modules as well as or better than any other group of manufacturers. I believe there is a “third way” of moving forward for the benefit of the solar power customer and industry participant: Foster collaboration between U.S. and Chinese entities that lead to jointly owned factories in the U.S. that service the domestic market. The Chinese makers want access to the U.S. market and the U.S. market needs investment and the ability to create more jobs. Let the Chinese use Chinese-made cells — without penalty tariffs — if deployed in U.S.-assembled modules. Encourage the Chinese solar industry to invest in U.S. factories that produce solar products “made in the USA.” Of course this simple suggestion is not so simple. The complication lies in keeping the cost low for normally more expensive U.S. labor and non-silicon expenses. However, I believe U.S. manufacturing could benefit from the challenge. The same ingenuity that created commercially produced photovoltaics in the first place can be used to develop new, low cost manufacturing procedures and practices. Also, for this idea to become a reality a “Buy American” provision needs to be put in place where taxpayer-funded incentives (including tax incentives would be tied to mandatory American content. This idea is not loved by all, but my view is that if the taxpayers are funding the programs then taxpayers should be given some of the jobs thus making incentivizing solar power twice as valuable.

#### China says yes – it’s economically desirable and past precedent proves.

Castelazo, ’12 (Molly, Director of ChinaGlobalTrade.com, “China’s Solar Industry and the U.S. Anti-Dumping/Anti-Subsidy Trade Case,” A Kearny Alliance Project ChinaGlobalTrade.com May 2012, The Kearny Alliance is a non-profit 501 (c) (3). It supports innovative programs in trade, business education, training and applied research.)-mikee

This has been called by some experts a “once-in-a-generation” case, akin to the 1970s and 1980s trade cases against Japanese automakers.136 Those trade cases pushed Japanese auto makers to build their factories in the U.S. Chinese solar manufacturer Canadian Solar already said that would be one possible response to countervailing duties and anti-dumping duties in this case too.137 There is a case to be made for locating at least module assembly facilities in or very close to the end market. And many Chinese cell and module manufacturers have or plan to do just that. Suntech in Arizona is just one example. According to analysis by the Peterson Institute, the three most important solar PV markets in terms of annual added installation capacity (Spain, Germany, and the U.S.) were also the leading destinations for cross-border greenfield investment in manufacturing facilities between 2003 and 2007.138 But while that may be a growing trend driven by economic rationale (when low cost is paramount, cutting transportation costs by locating in or near the end market makes sense), it would not be a way for Chinese manufacturers to circumvent tariffs. The trade case applies to Chinese-made cells as well as modules comprised of Chinese-made cells, no matter where those modules are assembled (see Section 1.1). So to avoid the tariffs, Chinese manufacturers would have to locate not just module assembly plants but cell production facilities in the United States as well. The trade case “will only accelerate the setting up of solar module and solar cell manufacturing in the United States,” said the president of Grape Solar, a company based in Eugene, Ore., that is a big importer of solar panels from China, Korea and Taiwan, as quoted in the New York Times. “Grape Solar has already been in discussions with big Chinese panel makers on ways to move more manufacturing to the United States.139 If the trade case causes Chinese solar manufacturers to set up shop in the U.S., that’s not an outcome that would bother SolarWorld President Gordon Brinser. “If a company wants to set up manufacturing in the U.S., we welcome that. This is about growing an industry in the U.S. that brings jobs, brings innovation, brings supply chain, brings installation; it brings a lot to the communities.” But to achieve the kind of scale and vertical integration that allow them to keep costs low, Chinese manufacturers would have to invest huge sums of money in the United States – to essentially recreate the Chinese solar supply chain here. It’s not clear that the United States is a large enough market – not yet at least – to warrant that kind of capital investment.

### Trade Adv

#### Solar trade tariffs key to economy – rule of law and US manufacturing

Gordon, ’12 (Kate, vice president for energy policy at the Center for American Progress. “China’s Solar Industry Should Be Held Accountable For Breaking Trade Laws” 5-16-2012, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/16/484892/chinas-solar-industry-should-be-held-accountable-for-breaking-trade-laws/)

A simmering trade dispute between the U.S. and China will likely come to a head tomorrow when the U.S. Department of Commerce issues its determination on alleged trade violations by Chinese solar manufacturers. Surprisingly, the U.S. solar industry is not in agreement on the need to hold the Chinese accountable. It should be. On one side are those who claim China has been illegally subsidizing and dumping its solar products in the U.S. market, forcing many American manufacturers into bankruptcy. These companies, mostly manufacturers of solar panels and related products, claim Chinese solar companies have benefited from government largesse in the form of free land and facilities, electricity and water, and low- or no-cost loans that keep prices for Chinese-made solar products artificially low. In addition, they claim these Chinese companies are illegally “dumping” their cheap solar panels into the American market, making it nearly impossible for U.S. manufacturers to compete. On the other side are those, mostly solar installers, who have benefited from the ability to buy low-cost solar panels, which they claim has allowed them to do solar installations at a lower cost and therefore expand the use of solar power in America. This group of U.S. companies argues that U.S. manufacturers can’t compete with the Chinese when it comes to solar panel production, because the Chinese are simply more efficient and can do production at a lower cost. They also worry that pursuing a trade case will incite a “trade war” with China, which will erode their profit margins, slow U.S. industry growth across the value chain, and make it even harder for solar energy to compete with traditional fossil fuels. Both sides have compelling arguments. So who’s right? One way to answer that question is to say that we’ll find out who’s right when the Department of Commerce issues its findings. Commerce has already found that China is unfairly subsidizing its solar industry, and has imposed tariffs on Chinese solar manufacturers as a result. The upcoming decision, on whether China is also illegally dumping those panels into the U.S. market, may bring larger tariffs if China is found to be in violation of our mutually-agreed-upon, and heavily negotiated, trade agreements. The entire point of the trade enforcement regime is to figure out whether a country is in fact breaking the rules, and if so, to issue sanctions. It’s a system based on the rule of law, something we Americans hold dear, and for good reason. But would a decision against China undermine America’s emerging solar energy industry? There is no question that solar energy faces an uphill battle in the U.S. The combination of century-old subsidies to fossil fuel companies and the lack of any real national commitment to renewable energy makes it difficult for emerging energy technologies to compete here. But that doesn’t mean that the United States needs cheap Chinese solar panels so badly that we should just roll over and let a foreign government break enforceable international trade rules. If Commerce finds that the Chinese government has acted illegally, then the Chinese government and the industry it is subsidizing should pay a price for that behavior. Our faith in the rule of law is too important for us to abandon our international trade obligations in favor of cheap imported solar panels. So, too, is our need to support the U.S. manufacturing sector by protecting it from unlawful trade practices. Manufacturing is a crucial piece of the U.S. economy. Our ability to stay innovative and competitive in a time of intense global pressures relies on manufacturing companies, which contribute fully 70 percent of all the private research and development spending in America. And these companies are major job creators: a recent report by SEMI found that manufacturing jobs had the highest job multiplier of any segment of the American economy. That’s why we should be supporting clean energy manufacturers in their efforts to compete with China, through programs like the Clean Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit program that President Obama recently urged Congress to extend, or through Senator Sherrod Brown’s “Security and Energy in Manufacturing Act,” rather than punishing them for trying to compete on a level playing field. Because that’s the crucial point: every American company should be able to compete on a level playing field in the international marketplace. That’s good for solar manufacturers in the current case, but it’s good for all American companies – and for our economy as a whole – in the long run.

#### No risk of a trade war – china is rational and will just focus domestically.

Haley, ’12 (George T. (PhD, UT at Austin) is Professor of Marketing at the U. of New Haven Director of the Center for International Industry Competitiveness (CIIC). “The Case for U.S. Tariffs on Chinese Solar Panels,” 06/19/2012,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/usha-haley/the-case-for-us-tariffs-o_b_1605087.html>)-mikee

With the U.S. Commerce Department's preliminary decision in May to impose 31-percent anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese photovoltaic (PV) solar panels, some commentators have warned that this is the first shot in a job-killing trade war with China. Professed fears of a trade war are as predictable as night after day. Fortunately, the hand wringing is largely unnecessary. Prediction of a trade war is largely a dangerous myth. Historically, U.S.-China trade disputes follow a different pattern. In fact, China, while complaining loudly, tends to comply with trade-case findings rather than retaliating in response. Why? Because Chinese trade-policy makers are rational political players. They make decisions based on political and economic interests, including jobs and growth. They rarely suffer self-inflicted wounds (or even self-inflicted paper cuts). A trade war with China would hurt the U.S. but would mortally wound China. The U.S. market remains central to China's export-led development. In 2011 exports to the U.S. represented 21 percent of China's total exports and 8.3 percent of China's GDP. Conversely, exports to China represented 3.7 percent of the U.S.'s total exports and less than 0.5 percent of U.S. GDP. With European markets collapsing, China's dependence on the United States is increasing. China's solar-manufacturing industry relies especially heavily on foreign markets, including the US. Currently, Chinese solar-panel manufacturing capacity is 32 times greater than domestic consumption. As a result, China exports 95 percent of its production. U.S. anti-dumping tariffs will encourage domestic consumption in China, thereby reducing the growth in China's carbon footprint. China's need to export has led to the recent solar-trade dispute. Over the past seven years China has gone from a non-factor to the world's biggest player in the solar sector. Thanks to Chinese overproduction, prices for solar panels have plummeted. In an industry where prices dropped an average of 10 percent a year, prices suddenly fell 50 percent as Chinese firms jockeyed to grab market share. However, Chinese solar panels may not remain cheap for long. Our research, along with Chinese CEOs' statements, shows that Chinese solar manufacturers will raise prices after driving out U.S. manufacturers. As China's market position grew, American manufacturers suffered. Twelve American manufacturers have had significant layoffs or have shuttered completely. These manufacturing jobs that the U.S. is losing to China pay better and have three times greater ripple effects than installation jobs. Between 2010 and 2011 the U.S. went from a $540-million trade surplus with China in solar products to a $1.6-billion deficit. Chinese solar-panel exports rose nearly 1,000 percent. Simultaneously, Chinese imports of U.S. polysilicon dropped 20 percent as China ramped up domestic production. Under threat, SolarWorld, the largest U.S. solar manufacturer, filed a trade case alleging that the Chinese manufacturers received World-Trade-Organization-illegal subsidies and have sold their cells and panels below cost. Through Commerce's investigation and the U.S. debate, three interesting facts became apparent.

#### Write your plan better –

#### a. There are two tariffs and you only remove one

Jonathan Stearns – Bloomberg – 9/6/12,

Chinese Solar-Panel Exporters Face the Threat of EU Tariffs, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/09/chinese-solar-panel-exporters-face-the-threat-of-eu-tariffs

In addition to anti-dumping duties, the U.S. introduced anti-subsidy levies against China’s solar industry earlier this year.

#### b. That pisses China off just as much

Leslie Pietersen - 9/3/12, China’s List of Solar Trade Rows Grows, http://www.engerati.com/article/china%E2%80%99s-list-solar-trade-rows-grows

#### In 2012 alone, China’s solar industry has pitted itself against that of the US, the EU, Japan and South Korea. Allegations center on anti-subsidy and anti-dumping violations. The latest of these, dated August 2012, follows a request by four of the country’s major polysilicon producers to launch an anti-dumping investigation into imports from the EU.

#### China is still pissed about it

Bloomberg – 9/28/12, Jennifer M. Freedman, WTO to Probe U.S. Anti-Subsidy Duties on Chinese Imports, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-28/wto-to-probe-u-s-anti-subsidy-duties-on-chinese-imports.html

The World Trade Organization will decide whether U.S. anti-subsidy duties affecting $7.3 billion of Chinese products such as solar panels, thermal paper, wind towers and steel wire violate global commerce rules.¶ The Geneva-based trade arbiter agreed yesterday to set up a panel of judges to investigate China’s allegation that the U.S. acted “inconsistently with WTO rules and rulings in many aspects” during probes to determine whether Chinese companies received illegal government aid.¶ The two governments have stepped up WTO complaints and rhetoric over access to the others’ markets this year as the global economic crisis crimps trade. The Obama administration says China keeps its currency undervalued and engages in unfair tactics that have led to chronic U.S. trade deficits and the loss of millions of American jobs.¶ Cracking down on China has emerged as a key campaign issue in the U.S. presidential race, with Republican candidate Mitt Romney blaming President Barack Obama for the loss of U.S manufacturing jobs and criticizing him for not declaring China a currency manipulator. Obama has said his administration has lodged trade complaints against China at almost twice the rate of his Republican predecessor, George W. Bush.¶ China’s Complaint¶ China lodged its complaint on May 25, just eight days after the U.S. Commerce Department imposed duties of as much as 250 percent on Chinese solar imports, siding with companies including SolarWorld AG (SWV) that said the goods were sold below the cost of production, a practice known as dumping.¶ The Commerce Department also made a preliminary finding in March that China illegally subsidizes exporters of crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells and solar panels. The U.S. applied tariffs on Chinese producers and exporters including Suntech Power Holdings Co. (STP) and Trina Solar Ltd. (TSL)¶ The European Union has also threatened to impose duties on solar panels from China by starting an inquiry into whether Chinese manufacturers of the products are dumping them in the EU. The probe covers 21 billion euros ($27 billion) of imports of crystalline silicon photovoltaic modules or panels and cells and wafers used in them.

#### Antidumping is not an official restriction yet – effect has still to be determined

Cardwell, ’12 (Diane, “A Tug of War Over Solar Tariffs,” October 3, 2012

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/03/a-tug-of-war-over-solar-tariffs/>)

The Commerce Department found earlier this year that Chinese companies, which dominate the global panel business, were benefiting from unfair government subsidies and were selling their products below the cost of production on the American market. In March, the department imposed anti-subsidy tariffs of 2.9 percent to 4.73 percent, and in May, it added anti-dumping duties of at least 31 percent. Those rulings were preliminary, and the department is due to announce its final decision on both on Oct. 10. But for any tariffs to go into effect, the trade commission must find that the Chinese pricing practices have actually harmed or threatened to harm the American industry, a determination that is not expected until November.

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

#### No impact – Tensions don’t affect growth or trade.

Gross, ’12 (Daniel, “U.S.-China Economies Ties Deepen as Tensions Rise,” Sep 20, 2012, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/09/20/u-s-china-economies-ties-deepen-as-tensions-rise.html>)-mikee

China-U.S. trade tensions are mounting. The two presidential candidates are falling over themselves to bash China. GOP nominee Mitt Romney routinely chastises President Obama for being soft on China, and promises that, if elected, he will deem China a currency manipulator. President Obama is using more than his bully pulpit to express anger at China. This week, his administration filed a case with the World Trade Organization seeking to limit imports of car parts from China. China is returning the lack of affection. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was snubbed by heir-apparent Xi Jinping on her recent visit. And on Tuesday, protesters surrounded the car of U.S. Ambassador Gary Locke. But a funny thing has been happening as economic tensions between the two countries rise: the financial ties that bind them are getting thicker and stronger. The data, the actions of policymakers, and the decisions by Chinese and American firms all show that the level of trade and investment between the two countries is growing. One veteran observer isn’t surprised. Despite the noise, “the relationship has become broader and deeper,” notes Tung Chee Hwa, the Hong Kong shipping magnate who served as governor of Hong Kong from 1997 to 2005, during the period in which control of Hong Kong passed from the U.K. to China. Tung is now chief executive of the China-United States Exchange Foundation (CUSEF) in Hong Kong, and a member of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference, a sort of council of elders in Beijing. (Disclosure: in the past I’ve participated in CUSEF programs). And Tung believes the made-for-media clashes mask a profound change that is offering long-term opportunities for the U.S. economy: the continuing shift of China from an export-oriented economy to one driven by domestic consumption. The numbers back him up. The latest trade data show that the U.S. still has a huge trade deficit with China—$174 billion so far this year. But U.S. exports to China, which were negligible just a few years ago, totaled $61.4 billion through July 2011, up from $57.7 billion in the first seven months of 2012. China is now the third-largest destination for U.S. exports, behind only Canada and Mexico. Imports from China were $235.8 billion through July 2012, up from $218 billion in the first seven months of 2011. So far this year, the total volume of trade between the two countries is up 7.8 percent. That’s all the more impressive given the slowdown in the rest of the world. And it means more work for all the people involved in trade: producers, importers, exporters, dockworkers, cargo shippers, railroads, truckers. The nature of the trade is changing. Yes, China still sends the U.S. a lot of cheap manufactured goods, and America sells China a lot of government bonds. But there’s much more going on, including direct investment in the U.S. by Chinese firms. Chinese company Wanda in May agreed to pay $2.6 billion for the AMC movie chain. That’s the largest Chinese corporate acquisition of a U.S. company. Earlier this year, oil company Sinopec struck a $2.5 billion joint venture with Devon Energy to exploit shale oil resources in the U.S. Chinese buyers are becoming significant purchasers of real estate in New York and Miami. United States and Chinese Trade Relations Indeed, the rising power of Chinese people to spend—abroad, and at home—is one of the big themes in the global economy. In the first five months of 2012, 523,000 Chinese tourists came to the U.S.—up 42 percent from the first five months of 2011. Over time, Tung notes, “consumption will become the main driver in the economy, like in other countries.” In the first five months of 2012, 523,000 Chinese tourists came to the U.S.—up 42 percent from the first five months of 2011. Now, some U.S. companies have struggled in China’s domestic market. Home Depot recently announced it would close several stores. In a nation of very small homes, Home Depot big boxes may not have been a great idea. But Tung notes several other successes. In February, when Xi Jinping visited the U.S., China agreed to open up its film market so that more American movies can be shown there. “You can see Procter & Gamble doing $5 billion of business in China, and it is one of the largest consumer-product companies in China,” Tung notes. Walmart has successfully married American logistics and supply-chain techniques to Chinese consumer needs. And General Motors sells more cars in China than it does in the U.S. Just as China has been meeting America’s need for cheap manufactured goods, the U.S. is meeting China’s need for affordable supplies of food. In a nation of 1.3 billion people, only 30 years removed from desperate poverty, food security is a major issue. “China is importing 50 million tons of corn from America this year,” notes Tung. “They use it for animal feed.” As China grows wealthier, its citizens will consume more beef, chicken, and protein, which will only boost Chinese demand for U.S. products like soybeans and corn. All of which is not to downplay or minimize any of the serious differences the U.S. and China have over economic and other policies. But even as politicians in Washington and Beijing trade barbs, pick fights, and imagine snubs, the ports of Los Angeles and Shanghai are growing more busy with U.S.-China trade.

#### Impacts inev – even if we could get to zero emissions, temperatures rise until the year 3000

Solomon et al, Chairwoman, IPCC, ‘9 (Susan- member of the US National Academy of Sciences, the European Academy of Sciences, and the Academy of Sciences of France, Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Chairman of the IPCC, February 10, “Irreversible climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions” PNAS, Vol 106, http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2009/01/28/0812721106.full.pdf)

Over the 20th century, the atmospheric concentrations of key greenhouse gases increased due to human activities. The stated objective (Article 2) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is to achieve stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a low enough level to prevent ‘‘dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.’’ Many studies have focused on projections of possible 21st century dangers (1–3). However, the principles (Article 3) of the UNFCCC specifically emphasize ‘‘threats of serious or irreversible damage,’’ underscoring the importance of the longer term. While some irreversible climate changes such as ice sheet collapse are possible but highly uncertain (1, 4), others can now be identified with greater confidence, and examples among the latter are presented in this paper. It is not generally appreciated that the atmospheric temperature increases caused by rising carbon dioxide concentrations are not expected to decrease significantly even if carbon emissions were to completely cease (5–7) (see Fig. 1). Future carbon dioxide emissions in the 21st century will hence lead to adverse climate changes on both short and long time scales that would be essentially irreversible (where irreversible is defined here as a time scale exceeding the end of the millennium in year 3000; note that we do not consider geo-engineering measures that might be able to remove gases already in the atmosphere or to introduce active cooling to counteract warming). For the same reason, the physical climate changes that are due to anthropogenic carbon dioxide already in the atmosphere today are expected to be largely irreversible. Such climate changes will lead to a range of damaging impacts in different regions and sectors, some of which occur promptly in association with warming, while others build up under sustained warming because of the time lags of the processes involved. Here we illustrate 2 such aspects of the irreversibly altered world that should be expected. These aspects are among reasons for concern but are not comprehensive; other possible climate impacts include Arctic sea ice retreat, increases in heavy rainfall and flooding, permafrost melt, loss of glaciers and snowpack with attendant changes in water supply, increased intensity of hurricanes, etc. A complete climate impacts review is presented elsewhere (8) and is beyond the scope of this paper. We focus on illustrative adverse and irreversible climate impacts for which 3 criteria are met: (i) observed changes are already occurring and there is evidence for anthropogenic contributions to these changes, (ii) the phenomenon is based upon physical principles thought to be well understood, and (iii) projections are available and are broadly robust across models. Advances in modeling have led not only to improvements in complex Atmosphere–Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCMs) for projecting 21st century climate, but also to the implementation of Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICs) for millennial time scales. These 2 types of models are used in this paper to show how different peak carbon dioxide concentrations that could be attained in the 21st century are expected to lead to substantial and irreversible decreases in dry-season rainfall in a number of already-dry subtropical areas and lower limits to eventual sea level rise of the order of meters, implying unavoidable inundation of many small islands and low-lying coastal areas. Results Longevity of an Atmospheric CO2 Perturbation. As has long been known, the removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere involves multiple processes including rapid exchange with the land biosphere and the surface layer of the ocean through air–sea exchange and much slower penetration to the ocean interior that is dependent upon the buffering effect of ocean chemistry along with vertical transport (9–12). On the time scale of a millennium addressed here, the CO2 equilibrates largely between the atmosphere and the ocean and, depending on associated increases in acidity and in ocean warming (i.e., an increase in the Revelle or ‘‘buffer’’ factor, see below), typically 20% of the added tonnes of CO2 remain in the atmosphere while 80% are mixed into the ocean. Carbon isotope studies provide important observational constraints on these processes and time constants. On multimil- lenium and longer time scales, geochemical and geological processes could restore atmospheric carbon dioxide to its pre- industrial values (10, 11), but are not included here. Fig. 1 illustrates how the concentrations of carbon dioxide would be expected to fall off through the coming millennium if manmade emissions were to cease immediately following an illustrative future rate of emission increase of 2% per year [comparable to observations over the past decade (ref. 13)] up to peak concentrations of 450, 550, 650, 750, 850, or 1,200 ppmv; similar results were obtained across a range of EMICs that were assessed in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (5, 7). This is not intended to be a realistic scenario but rather to represent a test case whose purpose is to probe physical climate system changes. A more gradual reduction of carbon dioxide emission (as is more likely), or a faster or slower adopted rate of emissions in the growth period, would lead to long-term behavior qualitatively similar to that illustrated in Fig. 1 (see also Fig. S1). The example of a sudden cessation of emissions provides an upper bound to how much reversibility is possible, if, for example, unexpectedly damaging climate changes were to be observed. Carbon dioxide is the only greenhouse gas whose falloff displays multiple rather than single time constants (see Fig. S2). Current emissions of major non-CO2 greenhouse gases such as methane or nitrous oxide are significant for climate change in the next few decades or century, but these gases do not persist over time in the same way as carbon dioxide (14). Fig. 1 shows that a quasi-equilibrium amount of CO2 is expected to be retained in the atmosphere by the end of the millennium that is surprisingly large: typically 40% of the peak concentration enhancement over preindustrial values ( 280 ppmv). This can be easily understood on the basis of the observed instantaneous airborne fraction (AFpeak) of 50% of anthropogenic carbon emissions retained during their buildup in the atmosphere, together with well-established ocean chemistry and physics that require 20% of the emitted carbon to remain in the atmosphere on thousand-year timescales [quasi- equilibrium airborne fraction (AFequi), determined largely by the Revelle factor governing the long-term partitioning of carbon between the ocean and atmosphere/biosphere system] (9–11). Assuming given cumulative emissions, EMI, the peak concen- tration, CO2peak (increase over the preindustrial value CO20), and the resulting 1,000-year quasi-equilibrium concentration, CO2equi can be expressed as COpeak 2 = CO02 + AFpeak EMI [1] COequi 2 = CO02 + AFequi EMI [2] so that COequi2 – CO0 2 = AFequi/AFpeak (COpeak 2 – CO02) [3] Given an instantaneous airborne fraction (AFpeak) of 50% during the period of rising CO2, and a quasi-equilbrium airborne factor (AFequi) of 20%, it follows that the quasi-equilibrium enhancement of CO2 concentration above its preindustrial value is 40% of the peak enhancement. For example, if the CO2 concentration were to peak at 800 ppmv followed by zero emissions, the quasi-equilibrium CO2 concentration would still be far above the preindustrial value at 500 ppmv. Additional carbon cycle feedbacks could reduce the efficiency of the ocean and biosphere to remove the anthropogenic CO2 and thereby increase these CO2 values (15, 16). Further, a longer decay time and increased CO2 concentrations at year 1000 are expected for large total carbon emissions (17). Irreversible Climate Change: Atmospheric Warming. Global average temperatures increase while CO2 is increasing and then remain approximately constant (within 0.5 °C) until the end of the millennium despite zero further emissions in all of the test cases shown in Fig. 1. This important result is due to a near balance between the long-term decrease of radiative forcing due to CO2 concentration decay and reduced cooling through heat loss to the oceans. It arises because long-term carbon dioxide removal and ocean heat uptake are both dependent on the same physics of deep-ocean mixing. Sea level rise due to thermal expansion accompanies mixing of heat into the ocean long after carbon dioxide emissions have stopped. For larger carbon dioxide concentrations, warming and thermal sea level rise show greater increases and display transient changes that can be very rapid (i.e., the rapid changes in Fig. 1 Middle), mainly because of changes in ocean circulation (18). Paleoclimatic evidence suggests that additional contributions from melting of glaciers and ice sheets may be comparable to or greater than thermal expansion (discussed further below), but these are not included in Fig. 1. Fig. 2 explores how close the modeled temperature changes are to thermal equilibrium with respect to the changing carbon dioxide concentration over time, sometimes called the realized warming fraction (19) (shown for the different peak CO2 cases). Fig. 2 Left shows how the calculated warmings compare to those expected if temperatures were in equilibrium with the carbon dioxide concentrations vs. time, while Fig. 2 Right shows the ratio of these calculated time-dependent and equilibrium tempera- tures. During the period when carbon dioxide is increasing, the realized global warming fraction is 50–60% of the equilibrium warming, close to values obtained in other models (5, 19). After emissions cease, the temperature change approaches equilib- rium with respect to the slowly decreasing carbon dioxide concentrations (cyan lines in Fig. 2 Right). The continuing warming through year 3000 is maintained at 40–60% of the equilibrium warming corresponding to the peak CO2 concentration (magenta lines in Fig. 2 Right). Related changes in fast-responding atmospheric climate variables such as precipitation, water vapor, heat waves, cloudiness, etc., are expected to occur largely simultaneously with the temperature changes. Irreversible Climate Change: Precipitation Changes. Warming is expected to be linked to changes in rainfall (20), which can adversely affect the supply of water for humans, agriculture, and ecosystems. Precipitation is highly variable but long-term rainfall decreases have been observed in some large regions including, e.g., the Mediterranean, southern Africa, and parts of south- western North America (21–25). Confident projection of future changes remains elusive over many parts of the globe and at small scales. However, well-known physics (the Clausius–Clapeyron law) implies that increased temperature causes increased atmospheric water vapor concentrations, and changes in water vapor transport and the hydrologic cycle can hence be expected (26–28). Further, advances in modeling show that a robust characteristic of anthropogenic climate change is poleward expansion of the Hadley cell and shifting of the pattern of precipitation minus evaporation (P–E) and the storm tracks (22, 26), and hence a pattern of drying over much of the already-dry subtropics in a warmer world ( 15°-40° latitude in each hemi- sphere) (5, 26). Attribution studies suggest that such a drying pattern is already occurring in a manner consistent with models including anthropogenic forcing (23), particularly in the south- western United States (22) and Mediterranean basin (24, 25). We use a suite of 22 available AOGCM projections based upon the evaluation in the IPCC 2007 report (5, 29) to characterize precipitation changes. Changes in precipitation are expected (5, 20, 30) to scale approximately linearly with increasing warming (see Fig. S3). The equilibrium relationship between precipitation and temperature may be slightly smaller (by 15%) than the transient values, due to changes in the land/ ocean thermal contrast (31). On the other hand, the observed 20th century changes follow a similar latitudinal pattern but presently exceed those calculated by AOGCMs (23). Models that include more complex representations of the land surface, soil, and vegetation interactively are likely to display additional feedbacks so that larger precipitation responses are possible. Here we evaluate the relationship between temperature and precipitation averaged for each month and over a decade at each grid point. One ensemble member is used for each model so that all AOGCMs are equally weighted in the multimodel ensemble; results are nearly identical if all available model ensemble members are used. Fig. 3 presents a map of the expected dry-season (3 driest consecutive months at each grid point) precipitation trends per degree of global warming. Fig. 3 shows that large uncertainties remain in the projections for many regions (white areas). How- ever, it also shows that there are some subtropical locations on every inhabited continent where dry seasons are expected to become drier in the decadal average by up to 10% per degree of warming. Some of these grid points occur in desert regions that are already very dry, but many occur in currently more temperate and semiarid locations. We find that model results are more robust over land across the available models over wider areas for drying of the dry season than for the annual mean or wet season (see Fig. S4). The Insets in Fig. 3 show the monthly mean projected precipitation changes averaged over several large regions as delineated on the map. Increased drying of respective dry seasons is projected by 90% of the models averaged over the indicated regions of southern Europe, northern Africa, southern Africa, and southwestern North America and by 80% of the models for eastern South America and western Australia (see Fig. S3). Although given particular years would show exceptions, the long-term irreversible warming and mean rainfall changes as suggested by Figs. 1 and 3 would have important consequences in many regions. While some relief can be expected in the wet season for some regions (Fig. S4), changes in dry-season precipitation in northern Africa, southern Europe, and western Australia are expected to be near 20% for 2 °C warming, and those of southwestern North America, eastern South America, and southern Africa would be 10% for 2 °C of global mean warming. For comparison, the American ‘‘dust bowl’’ was associated with averaged rainfall decreases of 10% over 10–20 years, similar to major droughts in Europe and western Australia in the 1940s and 1950s (22, 32). The spatial changes in precipitation as shown in Fig. 3 imply greater challenges in the distribution of food and water supplies than those with which the world has had difficulty coping in the past. Such changes occurring not just for a few decades but over centuries are expected to have a range of impacts that differ by region. These include, e.g., human water supplies (25), effects on dry-season wheat and maize agriculture in certain regions of rain-fed farming such as Africa (33, 34), increased fire frequency, ecosystem change, and desertification (24, 35–38). Fig. 4 Upper relates the expected irreversible changes in regional dry-season precipitation shown in Fig. 3 to best estimates of the corresponding peak and long-term CO2 concentrations. We use 3 °C as the best estimate of climate sensitivity across the suite of AOGCMs for a doubling of carbon dioxide from preindustrial values (5) along with the regional drying values depicted in Fig. 3 and assuming that 40% of the carbon dioxide peak concentration is retained after 1000 years. Fig. 4 shows that if carbon dioxide were to peak at levels of 450 ppmv, irreversible decreases of 8–10% in dry-season precipitation would be expected on average over each of the indicated large regions of southern Europe, western Australia, and northern Africa, while a carbon dioxide peak value near 600 ppmv would be expected to lead to sustained rainfall decreases of 13–16% in the dry seasons in these areas; smaller but statistically significant irreversible changes would also be expected for southwestern North America, eastern South America, and Southern Africa. Irreversible Climate Change: Sea Level Rise. Anthropogenic carbon dioxide will cause irrevocable sea level rise. There are 2 relatively well-understood processes that contribute to this and a third that may be much more important but is also very uncertain. Warm- ing causes the ocean to expand and sea levels to rise as shown in Fig. 1; this has been the dominant source of sea level rise in the past decade at least (39). Loss of land ice also makes important contributions to sea level rise as the world warms. Mountain glaciers in many locations are observed to be retreating due to warming, and this contribution to sea level rise is also relatively well understood. Warming may also lead to large losses of the Greenland and/or Antarctic ice sheets. Additional rapid ice losses from particular parts of the ice sheets of Greenland and Antarctica have recently been observed (40–42). One recent study uses current ice discharge data to suggest ice sheet contributions of up to 1–2 m to sea level rise by 2100 (42), but other studies suggest that changes in winds rather than warming may account for currently observed rapid ice sheet flow (43), rendering quantitative extrapolation into the future uncertain. In addition to rapid ice flow, slow ice sheet mass balance processes are another mechanism for potential large sea level rise. Paleoclimatic data demonstrate large contributions of ice sheet loss to sea level rise (1, 4) but provide limited constraints on the rate of such processes. Some recent studies suggest that ice sheet surface mass balance loss for peak CO2 concentrations of 400–800 ppmv may be even slower than the removal of manmade carbon dioxide following cessation of emis- sions, so that this loss could contribute less than a meter to irreversible sea level rise even after many thousands of years (44, 45). It is evident that the contribution from the ice sheets could be large in the future, but the dependence upon carbon dioxide levels is extremely uncertain not only over the coming century but also in the millennial time scale. An assessed range of models suggests that the eventual contribution to sea level rise from thermal expansion of the ocean is expected to be 0.2–0.6 m per degree of global warming (5). Fig. 4 uses this range together with a best estimate for climate sensitivity of 3 °C (5) to estimate lower limits to eventual sea level rise due to thermal expansion alone. Fig. 4 shows that even with zero emissions after reaching a peak concentration, irreversible global average sea level rise of at least 0.4–1.0 m is expected if 21st century CO2 concentrations exceed 600 ppmv and as much as 1.9 m for a peak CO2 concentration exceeding 1,000 ppmv. Loss of glaciers and small ice caps is relatively well understood and is expected to be largely complete under sustained warming of, for example, 4 °C within 500 years (46). For lower values of warming, partial remnants of glaciers might be retained, but this has not been examined in detail for realistic representations of glacier shrinkage and is not quantified here. Complete losses of glaciers and small ice caps have the potential to raise future sea level by 0.2–0.7 m (46, 47) in addition to thermal expansion. Further contributions due to partial loss of the great ice sheets of Antarctica and/or Greenland could add several meters or more to these values but for what warming levels and on what time scales are still poorly characterized. Sea level rise can be expected to affect many coastal regions (48). While sea walls and other adaptation measures might combat some of this sea level rise, Fig. 4 shows that carbon dioxide peak concentrations that could be reached in the future for the conservative lower limit defined by thermal expansion alone can be expected to be associated with substantial irreversible commitments to future changes in the geography of the Earth because many coastal and island features would ultimately become submerged. Discussion: Some Policy Implications It is sometimes imagined **that** slow processes such as climate changes pose small risks, on the basis of the assumption that a choice can always be made to quickly reduce emissions and thereby reverse any harm within a few years or decades. We have shown that this assumption is incorrect for carbon dioxide emissions, because of the longevity of the atmospheric CO2 perturbation and ocean warming. Irreversible climate changes due to carbon dioxide emissions have already taken place, and future carbon dioxide emissions would imply further irreversible effects on the planet, with attendant long legacies for choices made by contemporary society. Discount rates used in some estimates of economic trade-offs assume that more efficient climate mitigation can occur in a future richer world, but neglect the irreversibility shown here. Similarly, understanding of irreversibility reveals limitations in trading of greenhouse gases on the basis of 100-year estimated climate changes (global warming potentials, GWPs), because this metric neglects carbon dioxide’s unique long-term effects. In this paper we have quantified how societal decisions regarding carbon dioxide concentrations that have already occurred or could occur in the coming century imply irreversible dangers relating to climate change for some illustrative populations and regions. These and other dangers pose substantial challenges to humanity and nature, with a magnitude that is directly linked to the peak level of carbon dioxide reached.

#### No China/Taiwan war – other countries counterbalance

Nye, ’10

[Joseph S. Nye, Jr., University Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University, “The Future of American Power,” Foreign Affairs, November/December 2010, Volume 89, Issue 6] AP

Some have argued that China aims to challenge the United States' position in East Asia and, eventually, the world. Even if this were an accurate assessment of China's current intentions (and even the Chinese themselves cannot know the views of future generations), it is doubtful that China will have the military capability to make this possible anytime soon. Moreover, Chinese leaders will have to contend with the reactions of other countries and the constraints created by China's need for external markets and resources. Too aggressive a Chinese military posture could produce a countervailing coalition among China's neighbors that would weaken both its hard and its soft power. The rise of Chinese power in Asia is contested by both India and Japan (as well as other states), and that provides a major power advantage to the United States. The U.S.-Japanese alliance and the improvement in U.S.-Indian relations mean that China cannot easily expel the Americans from Asia. From that position of strength, the United States, Japan, India, Australia, and others can engage China and provide incentives for it to play a responsible role, while hedging against the possibility of aggressive behavior as China's power grows.

#### Wind farm restrictions will undermine trade relations with China

CSM 10/3

(Obama blocks Chinese wind farm ownership in Oregon, www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2012/1003/Obama-blocks-Chinese-wind-farm-ownership-in-Oregon

President Barack Obama has blocked a Chinese company from owning interests in four northern Oregon wind farms, citing national security risks given their close proximity to a United States military base where unmanned drones and electronic-warfare planes are tested. The decision marks the first time in more than 22 years that an American president has vetoed a foreign business deal in the interest of American security. While every American president has the power to void foreign transactions involving United States-based businesses under the Defense Production Act, the ability has not been exercised since President George H.W. Bush preempted the sale of Mamco Manufacturing to a Chinese-owned agency in 1990. (See more: Wind Power Layoffs Abound as Industry Threatened by Tax Credit Expiration) Owned by Chinese nationals, Rall Corp. purchased interest in the wind farms, located only miles away from the Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility in Boardman, Oregon, earlier this year. With this turn of events, the company will have to divest its interests in the wind farms immediately. The company has already filed suit against the Obama Administration, alleging that the president had “acted in an unlawful and unauthorized manner”. “By failing to provide Ralls with sufficient notice and opportunity to be heard prior to prohibiting its acquisition of the wind farms and imposing extraordinary restrictions on the use and enjoyment of its property interests, CFIUS and the president have unconstitutionally deprived Ralls of its property absent due process,” the complaint reads. The news of President Obama’s decision comes during an election campaign that has seen his opponents accuse him of being soft with China, helping the president to combat such claims, but the call is likely to further irritate already tense economic relations with China. With this risk obviously in mind, the Treasury Department statement attempted to play down the political gravity of the decision.

### Solar Adv

#### Tariff key to US solar & sustained growth –

#### a. China will dominate in the long run, crushing US manufacturers.

Castelazo, ’12 (Molly, Director of ChinaGlobalTrade.com, “China’s Solar Industry and the U.S. Anti-Dumping/Anti-Subsidy Trade Case,” A Kearny Alliance Project ChinaGlobalTrade.com May 2012, The Kearny Alliance is a non-profit 501 (c) (3). It supports innovative programs in trade, business education, training and applied research.)-mikee

Yet there are some who argue that refraining from assessing tariffs on subsidized and dumped Chinese imports just because China might retaliate and cause losses in the U.S. polysilicon and PV capital equipment industries would be short-sighted. They argue that China will seek to dominate the polysilicon and capital equipment industries just as they have cell and module manufacturing. Indeed, China has already rapidly increased its share of world polysilicon production – now at 17 percent. And the 12th Five Year Plan requires China's leading polysilicon manufacturers to reach a 50,000-ton annual production capacity (per company) by 2015. A number of those leading polysilicon producers are at least partially state-owned or state-controlled. For example, Yichang CSG Polysilicon Co., Ltd is a subsidiary of the China Southern Power Grid Company Limited (“CSG”), a state-owned enterprise, or SOE (see here). The China Investment Corporation, a wholly state-owned company, holds an interest in CGL-Poly Energy Holdings Limited (see here). There are, broadly, two problems with China’s rise in the polysilicon industry. If China’s rise takes away production from the U.S. (which is not inevitable) that would represent a further deterioration of the solar manufacturing industry in the U.S. And that would send ripple effects across the economy. “Many economists believe there is a strong link between manufacturing and R&D: lose manufacturing and you lose the high-paying jobs in R&D, design and other areas. Lose manufacturing and you lose the entire industry to foreign companies. This is particularly true for process engineering dependent industries like solar PV where continuous improvements in manufacturing processes play a major role in cost reduction and product improvement. In the Harvard Business Review, Harvard professors Pisano and Shih wrote, ‘the decline of manufacturing in a region sets off a chain reaction. Once manufacturing is outsourced, process-engineering expertise can’t be maintained, since it depends on daily interactions with manufacturing. Without process-engineering capabilities, companies find it increasingly difficult to conduct advanced research on next-generation process technologies. Without the ability to develop such new processes, they find they can no longer develop new products. In the long term, then, an economy that lacks an infrastructure for advanced process engineering and manufacturing will lose its ability to innovate.’”150 And it is innovation that drives productivity – which drives growth – in the American economy.

#### b. A future monopoly will drive up prices.

Castelazo, ’12 (Molly, Director of ChinaGlobalTrade.com, “China’s Solar Industry and the U.S. Anti-Dumping/Anti-Subsidy Trade Case,” A Kearny Alliance Project ChinaGlobalTrade.com May 2012, The Kearny Alliance is a non-profit 501 (c) (3). It supports innovative programs in trade, business education, training and applied research.)-mikee

And that’s the second potential problem with China’s rise in the polysilicon industry. Today, China’s leading solar cell and module manufacturers are equally as innovative as U.S. manufacturers. But if China develops a monopoly across the solar supply chain, that could drive out innovation. According to Melanie Hart, Policy Analyst for Chinese Energy and Climate Policy at the Center for American Progress, “Governments don’t subsidize forever. Once the foreign competitors are driven out of the industry, then the Chinese government will stop subsidizing Chinese manufacturers and the price will increase. But the supply will be limited. And when you limit the number of suppliers, then there’s less competitions, and it is competition that drives innovation.” That is essentially what happened in the rare-earth market; Chinese producers of rare-earth drove costs so low that producers in the U.S. and elsewhere couldn’t compete, and were forced to close up shop. That gave Chinese producers a virtual monopoly over rare-earth production, which they have recently leveraged to withhold supply and drive prices back up. (Now, U.S. producers are getting back into the market.)151

#### Tariff prevents a bubble bust – SQ oversupply will collapse the finance market sustaining solar.

Bradsher, ’12 (Keith, Hong Kong bureau chief of The New York Times. “Glut of Solar Panels Poses a New Threat to China,” October 4, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/business/global/glut-of-solar-panels-is-a-new-test-for-china.html?pagewanted=all>)-mikee

But now China’s strategy is in disarray. Though worldwide demand for solar panels and wind turbines has grown rapidly over the last five years, China’s manufacturing capacity has soared even faster, creating enormous oversupply and a ferocious price war. The result is a looming financial disaster, not only for manufacturers but for state-owned banks that financed factories with approximately $18 billion in low-rate loans and for municipal and provincial governments that provided loan guarantees and sold manufacturers valuable land at deeply discounted prices. China’s biggest solar panel makers are suffering losses of up to $1 for every $3 of sales this year, as panel prices have fallen by three-fourths since 2008. Even though the cost of solar power has fallen, it still remains triple the price of coal-generated power in China, requiring substantial subsidies through a tax imposed on industrial users of electricity to cover the higher cost of renewable energy. The outcome has left even the architects of China’s renewable energy strategy feeling frustrated and eager to see many businesses shut down, so the most efficient companies may be salvageable financially. In the solar panel sector, “If one-third of them survive, that’s good, and two-thirds of them die, but we don’t know how that happens,” said Li Junfeng, a longtime director general for energy and climate policy at the National Development and Reform Commission, the country’s top economic planning agency. Mr. Li said in an interview that he wanted banks to cut off loans to all but the strongest solar panel companies and let the rest go bankrupt. But banks — which were encouraged by Beijing to make the loans — are not eager to acknowledge that the loans are bad and take large write-offs, preferring to lend more money to allow the repayment of previous loans. Many local and provincial governments also are determined to keep their hometown favorites afloat to avoid job losses and to avoid making payments on loan guarantees, he said. Mr. Li’s worries appear to be broadly shared in Beijing. “For the leading companies in the sector, if they’re not careful, the whole sector will disappear,” said Chen Huiqing, the deputy director for solar products at the China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Machinery and Electronic Products. The Chinese government also wants to see the country’s more than 20 wind turbine manufacturers, many of which are losing money, consolidate to five or six. “Wind does not need so many manufacturers,” said Mr. Li, who in addition to drafting renewable energy policies is the president of the Chinese Renewable Energy Industries Association. Chinese solar company executives blame their difficulties partly on the United States’s decisions last spring to impose antidumping and anti-subsidy tariffs on solar panel imports, and on the European Union’s recent decision to start its own antidumping investigation of imports from China. “It is not a Chinese industry problem, it is a global solar industry problem,” said Rory Macpherson, a spokesman for Suntech Power, one of the largest Chinese solar panel manufacturers. “It is primarily the result of an imbalance between supply and demand, and the U.S. and E.U. trade investigations.” Mr. Li said the solar industry’s problems were the result of overcapacity in China, and not the fault of trade restrictions. Yet he insisted that if the Chinese government could turn back the clock and revisit past renewable energy decisions, it would not do anything differently. The problem lies in the eagerness of Chinese businesses to rush into any new industry that looks attractive and swamp it with investments, he said. Chinese companies and their bankers are then far more reluctant than Western companies to admit defeat for investments that prove unprofitable. Mr. Li added that banking regulators had not yet decided what to do about banks’ exposure to the solar sector. The central government tried without success to learn from local and provincial government agencies how much of the solar industry’s bank debt they have guaranteed, Mr. Li said. Chinese solar power companies are making some cutbacks. Suntech, based in Wuxi, is temporarily closing a quarter of its solar cell capacity. It will transfer a majority of the 1,500 affected workers to other operations and provide severance payments to the rest. Jiangsu province, where Suntech has its headquarters and most of its factories, issued an unusual appeal to state-owned banks several weeks ago to continue lending money to the company, a step that Mr. Li criticized as inappropriate. Mr. Macpherson of Suntech wrote in an e-mail that the Jiangsu government had not guaranteed any of the company’s debt, which totaled $2.26 billion at the end of the first quarter, including some convertible bonds in addition to bank loans. Trina Solar, one of its biggest rivals, also has said it will “streamline its operations” and shrink its work force, but did not provide details. Trina shares have dropped 85 percent in the last three years and Suntech shares have fallen more than 98 percent in the last five years. Both trade on the New York Stock Exchange. The modest cutbacks in production barely put a dent in China’s overcapacity problem. GTM Research, a renewable energy consulting firm in Boston, estimates that Chinese companies have the ability to manufacture 50 gigawatts of solar panels this year, while the Chinese domestic market is on track to absorb only 4 to 5 gigawatts. Exports will take another 18 or 19 gigawatts. The enormously expensive equipment in solar panel factories needs to be run around the clock, seven days a week, to cover costs. “You want to be up at 80 percent, so they’re half of what they need,” said Shayle Kann, the head of GTM Research, which is a unit of Greentech Media. Chinese companies have struggled even though a dozen solar companies in the United States and another dozen in Europe have gone bankrupt or closed factories since the start of last year. The bankruptcies and closures have done little to ease the global glut and price war because China by itself represents more than two-thirds of the world’s capacity.

#### Installations rising despite tariff – utility companies.

Chakravorty, ’12 (Swagato, “U.S. Solar Installations Double in Q2,” September 11th, 2012, <http://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/us-solar-installations-double-in-q2/2559)->mikee

The second quarter of this year saw U.S. domestic solar panel installations more than double compared to the same period in 2011, the Solar Energy Industries Association revealed in a report. Over the quarter, installations hit a peak of 742 megawatts, which is a rise of 45 percent from the first quarter, and it’s possible we could see 3.2 gigawatts by the end of 2012. California saw the most of it, with 217 megawatts, while Arizona ran a close second with 173 megawatts. The nation now boasts a total of 5.7 gigawatts of installed solar power capacity, according to Bloomberg, which is sufficient to power around 1 million households. The increase was driven in large part by big projects selling power to individual utilities companies. Residential installations didn’t go up by much, and non-residential installations actually went down.

#### Alt cause to installation – net-metering caps.

Martin, ’12 (Christopher, Bloomberg News, “U.S. Solar Industry Bracing for Utility Backlash Over Metering,” Sep 12, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-12/u-s-solar-industry-bracing-for-utility-backlash-over-metering.html>)-mikee

Growing installations of rooftop solar panels are increasing concern that U.S. utilities may refuse to buy power generated by the systems, according to the Solar Energy Industries Association. Utilities are required to purchase electricity generated by solar panels installed on consumers’ homes under so-called net- metering policies, an arrangement that may become less viable as solar systems become more common, said Rhone Resch, chief executive officer of the Washington-based trade group. California, the largest solar market, capped the amount of panels utilities are required to connect to their grids and other states are considering similar policies. Some utilities see the requirement to buy solar power from every rooftop system as a threat to their profitability, Resch said. “Net metering works for us now, but we’re going to see a backlash from utilities as solar penetration increases over the next few years,” Resch said today in an interview at the Solar Power International conference in Orlando, Florida. California regulators capped the amount of rooftop solar that may be connected to the grid at 5 percent of a a utility’s power needs, and is studying the long-term impact upon their profits. Other states may consider similar actions, said Tony Clifford, chief executive officer of Standard Solar Inc., a closely held developer based in Rockville, Maryland. “I’m really concerned about a utility pushback on net- metering,” Clifford said in an interview. “What we need is an honest assessment of the true costs and benefits of managing distributed generation and I don’t think we’ve seen that yet.” Utilities are considering ways to offset the cost of buying solar, including Sempra Energy (SRE)’s San Diego Gas & Electric, which proposed a fee for residential solar customers, said Aaron Hall, president of the San Diego-based developer Borrego Solar Systems Inc. Regulars blocked the proposal in January. “That would have made almost every installation lose money and prevent new projects from getting financing,” Hall said.

#### Market forces resilient – no risk solar industry collapse.

Wang, ’12 (Ucilia, “What the solar trade dispute against China has accomplished: nada,” Oct 4, 2012, <http://gigaom.com/cleantech/what-the-solar-trade-dispute-against-china-has-accomplished-nada/>)-mikee

Doomsday prediction When a group of manufactures, led by SolarWorld, filed the complaint against Chinese silicon solar cell makers last October, predictions about the positive or dire impact of the case began to fly. SolarWorld, which is based in Germany and runs a factory in Oregon, said tariffs are necessary to help American manufactures stay competitive and in business. The other side, which includes not only Chinese manufacturers but also project developers and equipment retailers that have benefited from cheaper solar panels, warned of rising installation costs and severe job losses. So far, the gloomy picture of rising solar panel prices and project costs hasn’t materialized. As we pointed out back in May, when the commerce department issued the tariffs for the anti-dumping claim, other market forces and clever strategies to side-step the tariffs (or the willingness by manufactures to absorb tariffs without raising prices) meant consumers weren’t likely going to feel the pinch. The U.S. market for solar panel installations is forecast to grow 71 percent in 2012 from the previous year. Leases have become a popular way for homeowners to go solar. Solar panel prices have continued to fall since those preliminary tariffs went into effect.

#### China solar tariffs good – key to US manufacturing and entire solar industry

Hart and Gordon 12, Melanie Hart is a Policy Analyst on China Energy and Climate Policy at the Center for American Progress. Kate Gordon is Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center, “The U.S. Decision on Chinese Solar Panel Imports: Why Tariffs Are Only A Partial Solution” 3-15-2012, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/15/445193/us-decision-chinese-solar-panel-imports-tariffs-partial-solution/)

To keep the solar-panel market growing, the best thing the U.S. government can do is create a good environment for technology innovation, and that will require a combination of demand-side policies and protection from adverse price incentives. Photo: AP. By Melanie Hart and Kate Gordon The U.S. Department of Commerce early next week will issue a preliminary verdict on a trade petition filed by SolarWorld Industries America, Inc. That petition alleges that the Chinese government unfairly subsidizes crystalline silicon photovoltaic solar cells and modules by providing cash grants, tax rebates, cheap loans, and other benefits designed to artificially suppress Chinese export prices and drive U.S. competitors out of the market. As a remedy SolarWorld wants the Commerce Department to levy import tariffs to alleviate damage from these artificially cheap panels on solar-panel manufacturers in the United States. At first glance this would seem to be a reasonable solution. A sustained look yields the same conclusion. But it is important to understand the dynamics of the U.S. solar-panel market—where our labor skills and ability to innovate are strong but where demand for solar panels is low due to the lack of any national commitment to lower carbon emissions or to diversify our sources of energy—to comprehend why import tariffs are not the only solution. Indeed, this petition, along with a second action brought by SolarWorld accusing China of “dumping” its cheap solar panels into the U.S. market, has generated major controversy in the fledgling U.S. solar industry. Just about everyone seems to believe that Chinese officials are probably violating trade rules in this sector but there is substantial disagreement over what, if anything, the United States should actually do about it. Our current trade institutions address illegal subsidies by levying import tariffs on imported subsidized goods. In theory when trade partners artificially suppress prices and export those underpriced goods to the United States, import tariffs should level the playing field by raising prices back up to natural market levels. In theory these tariffs are lowered over time and finally eliminated as the trade partner phases out its subsidies. In the current case SolarWorld alleges that the Chinese government uses dumping and a variety of subsidies to artificially suppress solar panel export prices by a margin of at least 100 percent. SolarWorld has asked the Commerce Department to levy a comparable tariff to eliminate that price discrepancy. Everyone agrees that imposing import tariffs on Chinese solar panels should benefit the U.S. solar module manufacturing industry. Solar-panel prices fell 50 percent in 2011, and that unusually steep price drop has eroded profit margins worldwide. Cheap Chinese manufacturing appears to have contributed to the price drop, so reducing the impact of Chinese prices on the U.S. market should slow the price decrease to a more sustainable rate and increase profit margins for U.S. manufacturers. U.S. tariffs on Chinese solar panels would also help manufacturers in other countries that do not provide these subsidies, such as some in the European Union, because those manufacturers also export to the United States and compete for U.S. market share. What is less clear is how tariffs would affect the demand side in the United States. Many U.S. solar-installation companies, which purchase solar panels and therefore benefit from low Chinese prices, fear that import tariffs will erode their profit margins, slow industry growth across the value chain, and make it even harder for solar energy to compete with traditional fossil fuels. Some of these solar-installation firms are so concerned that they have formed an opposition group to push back against SolarWorld’s trade petitions. That group—the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy—claims that imposing high import tariffs on Chinese-manufactured solar panels would decimate the U.S. solar installation industry and eliminate thousands of jobs in that sector. Solar energy already faces an uphill battle in the United States. The combination of heavyfossil-fuel subsidies and weak national-level political support for policies to spur demand for renewable energy can make it hard for emerging energy technologies to compete in our country. Some politicians have even attacked the few solar-industry development policies we do have in an attempt to reduce federal government spending on clean energy across the board. The clean energy advocates who have supported solar-industry development throughout these political battles certainly do not want to throw more obstacles in the path of the solar-installation industry. But that does not mean that the United States needs cheap Chinese solar panels so badly that we should just roll over and let a foreign government break enforceable international trade rules. If the U.S. Department of Commerce finds that the Chinese government has acted illegally, then the Chinese government and the industry it is subsidizing should pay a price for that behavior. Under the current trade system that price is tariffs. If the U.S. Commerce Department finds that Chinese government dumping and subsidies artificially suppressed prices by a significant amount and that the price decreases harmed the U.S. manufacturing industry, then it is possible that the resultant tariffs could be 100 percent or above. Contrary to what the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy is claiming, that is not a reason to panic. For one thing, many different factors are contributing to declining global solar prices. Chinese manufacturing certainly plays a role, but innovation is also important. Solar panels are becoming increasingly efficient (generating more energy per module), and manufacturers are steadily improving production processes to bring down costs. The U.S. solar manufacturing market is already fiercely competitive, so even without discounted Chinese imports other U.S. manufacturers—and other solar-panel exporters to the United States—should still have strong incentives to keep innovating to bring down costs. It is possible that imposing import tariffs may slow the price decline or even create a temporary price bump in the U.S. market if U.S. customers shift orders from Chinese to non-Chinese manufacturers and the latter cannot keep up with demand. It is important to note, however, that one of the biggest problems facing solar-module markets worldwide is oversupply, so it should not be difficult to fill any gaps produced by a shift away from Chinese solar panels. Furthermore, Chinese manufacturers would likely respond to import tariffs by shifting production to the United States or other overseas markets where the tariffs would no longer apply, so they would not be out of the game for long. They would, though, be investing in the United States or at least in countries, such as in the European Union, where trade standards are more comparable. If Chinese companies do begin manufacturing here, they will find that the United States is in a strong competitive position to manufacture solar panels because of our skilled labor force, domestic supply of silicon, and strong manufacturing infrastructure. It certainly helps that China’s own labor costs are increasing: Boston Consulting Group recently estimatedthat within five years China’s manufacturing wages will be within 25 percent of those in the lowest-wage U.S. states (South Carolina, Alabama, and Tennessee). The solar-panel industry is one in which labor costs play a smaller role than they do in less advanced, lower-tech manufacturing sectors. Labor accounts for only 3 percent to 4 percentof the cost of producing solar panels, meaning that higher labor-cost countries such as the United States should be in a strong position to increase solar-manufacturing capacity. Given the volatility of global oil prices, the cost of transportation is currently much more important to most advanced manufacturers. High transportation costs mean that many manufacturers are looking to locate as close as possible to both their suppliers and their customers, so that they can keep costs down and maintain “just-in-time” manufacturing standards. And here is where the United States has a problem in solar. We have inconsistent demand for these products, making it difficult for manufacturers to take the risk in spending the upfront capital to build new plants or expand existing ones. Demand-side policies have spurred solar growth in the past. In 2010, for example, the seven states with the strongest development policies accounted for 82 percent of new U.S. solar installations. In third-quarter 2011 that share increased to 89 percent. But political attacks on state-level renewable energy standards, the expiration of many federal clean energy support programs, and the lack of federal policies that would create sustained demand for renewable energy in the United States all play a part in making demand for solar far less stable than it is in the European Union countries or even in China itself. Whether the U.S. solar market continues to grow, therefore, may depend much more on demand-side policies than on access to cheap Chinese imports. Overall, then, it is not clear that import tariffs would harm solar-market growth in the United States over the long term. What is clear, however, is that long-term U.S. market exposure to illegal subsidization certainly would not only harm solar-panel manufacturers but possibly also slow growth across the value chain. Chinese leaders look at the United States and want what we have. They want to become a global research and development powerhouse that creates and exports cutting edge technologies with big profit margins. China’s traditional command-and-control economic system was not good at creating those innovation incentives, so they are working to reform that system, but reform takes time. In the meantime they are trying to fill the gap with heavy government subsidies. Problem is, that approach can actually reduce innovation, not only in China, but also in the United States. Bureaucrats are not adept at picking winning companies and winning technology standards. When Chinese officials heavily subsidize their favorite domestic solar manufacturers, those subsidies can reduce prices to levels that other firms cannot match, thus driving competitors out of the market and reducing incentives for innovation. When China exports those products to the United States, the same dynamic can play out here. The long-term result is that a small number of heavily subsidized Chinese manufacturers could dominate the global solar market. That may make Chinese leaders happy, but if those firms are not producing the best solar technologies—for example, if their solar panels are not as efficient as they need to be to compete with traditional fossil fuels—that can slow solar-market development worldwide. To keep this market growing, the best thing the U.S. government can do is to create a good environment for technology innovation, and that will require a combination of demand-side policies and protection from adverse price incentives.

#### No impact – China will side step.

Crooks, ’12 (Ed, Financial Times, “China looks to sidestep solar tariffs” 5-20-2012, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/2a1da18a-a29d-11e1-a605-00144feabdc0.html#axzz26yoiAz5e>)

Chinese solar panel manufacturers are making plans to source components from Taiwan in order to get around US anti-dumping tariffs of at least 31 per cent announced by the department of commerce last week. Industry executives and analysts expect the largest Chinese solar power companies such as Suntech Power, Trina Solar and Yingli Green Energy to use components from Taiwan, Korea and other countries to maintain their position in the fast-growing US market. The US imposed anti-dumping duties on Chinese polysilicon solar cells, the components that are used to make panels, following a complaint from SolarWorld, a German company that employs 1,100 people in Oregon and California, and six other companies with US solar manufacturing operations. The 61 larger Chinese companies that co-operated with the commerce department’s investigation, including Suntech, Trina and Yingli, face tariffs of about 31 per cent on import price of their cells, while other Chinese cells will be charged a tariff of about 250 per cent. The move brought an angry reaction on Friday from the Chinese ministry of commerce, which attacked the duties as “unfair” and said they were evidence of the US tendency towards protectionism. Chinese manufacturers and American solar power generators and installers, which benefit from cheap Chinese panels, will try to overturn the preliminary decision when the US commerce department makes its final ruling in October. The duties apply only to solar cells, not to the modules that they are assembled into, enabling Chinese module manufacturers to serve the US market with cells from alternative sources. With the global solar cell market heavily oversupplied, there will be plenty of countries able to provide those cells. Taiwan has capacity to manufacture solar cells this year capable of generating 7,300 megawatts, twice the expected size of the US market, which is on course to be about 3,000MW this year. There is a further 2,000MW of cell production capacity in South Korea. The move could benefit Taiwanese cell manufacturers including Motech and Neo Solar Power. Although the Taiwanese and Korean cells are likely to be more expensive than Chinese production, the existence of substantial global excess capacity is likely to prevent large increases in prices. As a result, analysts expect some increase in the price of solar cells and modules in the US, but not by as much as the 31 per cent duty rate. The relatively modest impact on prices may also limit the effectiveness of the tariffs in helping US manufacturers, who generally have higher costs than Asian producers.

#### Humans resilient to disease- no extinction

Posner, former professor of law @ Chicago, 5 ([Richard A Posner](javascript:void(0);). [Skeptic](http://proquest.umi.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/pqdweb?RQT=318&pmid=38988&TS=1237848127&clientId=42567&VInst=PROD&VName=PQD&VType=PQD). Altadena: [2005](http://proquest.umi.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/pqdweb?RQT=572&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD&pmid=38988&pcid=15068061&SrchMode=3). Vol. 11, Iss. 3; pg. 42, Proquest)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destaictive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race.