**Aff Frontlines**

**UQ**

**F2: BRI isn’t clean – Top level**

READ THIS ONE RESPONSE WITH ONE LOWER DEPENDING ON HOW THEY READ IT

1. I would rather have China who cares a little about green energy than a developing country do it. The dev country would have 100% coal plants where as china would do green energy
2. Worse even is that the developing country may not even burn FF they would burn biomass which produces 150% more emissions.

**F2: China isn’t clean --- coal**

**Roberts in 2017** notes that China is waging a massive campaign to clean up coal before eventually phasing it out with their own renewables. They make plants something called ultra-supercritical, which burn at higher degrees, which makes the process cleaner and yielding more energy and less pollution. This is also happening in existing plants. So A) AFF means that China would phase out fossil fuels soon, O/W on timeframe and B) the coal plants that are occurring now would be cleaner than in a world without the EU in the BRI.

**Roberts,** David. “By 2020, Every Chinese Coal Plant Will Be More Efficient than Every US Coal Plant.” Vox, **Vox,** 16 May **2017,** www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2017/5/15/15634538/china-coal-cleaner.

The result is [a report](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/reports/2017/05/15/432141/everything-think-know-coal-china-wrong/) — authored by Melanie Hart, Luke Bassett, and Blaine Johnson — that offers the clearest picture yet of the big picture on coal in China. And a closer look, it turns out, utterly destroys the conservative argument. Far from sitting back and coasting while the US acts, **China is waging an aggressive, multi-front campaign to clean up coal before eventually phasing it out — reducing emissions from existing plants,** [**mothballing older plants**](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2017/1/17/14294906/china-cancels-coal-plants)**, and raising standards for new plants.** Unlike the US, it is on track to exceed its Paris carbon reduction commitments. In short, while the US dithers along in a cosmically stupid dispute over whether science is real, China is tackling climate change with all guns blazing. The US, not China, is the laggard in this relationship. The results are pretty dramatic. The CAP team pulled together a list of the top 100 most efficient coal plants in China and the US respectively. The differences are striking. The top US plants are older, built between 1967 to 2012, while China’s were built between 2006 and 2015. **Of China’s 100 top plants, 90 are ultra-supercritical; the US, by contrast, boasts exactly one ultra-supercritical plant.** There are three basic categories of coal plants. All of them burn coal to boil water to generate steam to spin a turbine. They are distinguished by how much heat and pressure they put the steam under. Subcritical plants do not reach water’s [critical point](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_point_(thermodynamics)), which is 705 degrees Fahrenheit and 3,208 pounds per square inch. Supercritical plants do — they get up over 1,000 degrees. **Ultra-supercritical plants** get even hotter — **[burn coal at] up to 1,400 degrees and 5,000 pounds of pressure per square inch. With each boost in temperature and pressure, the process gets cleaner, yielding more energy and less pollution per unit of coal. (Cleaner plants are also, as you’d expect, more expensive.) The Chinese government has been cranking up standards for new plants. Most new plants built today are ultra-supercritical.**

**Link 1: EU Works with China**

F2: Ur fucked no rems = GG

1 case makes up for the difference if they fund means theres more money so more expensive GT doesn’t matter, 2 REMs will be mined China wants resources that’s what its done everywhere else in the globe means on net we can achieve more GT

F2: REMs bad for environment

1. O/w long term

# Neg Frontlines

## **F2: Junker Plan**

### **F2: Junker Too Small**

1. Junker is large enough and already working in Europe. The [**EU Commission**](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_19_5649) finds in 2019 that over 250 billion invested into Italy through the Junker plan has invested into clean fusion energy. This project is expected to create 2 billion worth of economic growth and 1500 new jobs.
2. In the long term, [**EU Commission**](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/jobs-growth-and-investment/investment-plan-europe-juncker-plan_en) expected a further 650 billion dollars worth of funding.

### **F2: Junker Failing**

1. Not true. In the long term, [**EU Commission**](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/jobs-growth-and-investment/investment-plan-europe-juncker-plan_en) expected a further 650 billion dollars worth of funding to the junker plan in the next 20 years

### **F2: Joint cooperation**

1. European Union cannot fund both at the same time. There is a clear trade-off -- [**EU Commission**](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/jobs-growth-and-investment/investment-plan-europe-juncker-plan_en) expected a further 650 billion dollars worth of funding to the junker plan in the next 20 years; this can not go to Junker AND BRI especially with decreasing domestic demand.

## **UQ: BRI Green**

### **F2: “Think 2030” plan / China is trying to be green**

1. This argument is rhetoric, not reality. China has consistently shown to be the nonrenewable leader as Hilton 19 in case finds 80% of their foreign energy investment is in FF.
2. Even if China becomes green by 2030, it will be too late because Zadek in case explains there is a generational, decade-long, lockin effect in emissions from pre-existing built coal plants happening within the next 2 years.

### **F2: Biomass**

AT: Biomass

Biomass is small-scale

Narasimhan Santhanam, Cleantech, 8-16-2016 ["Can biomass be used for small scale power plants?", http://www.cleantech.guide/p/359/, 7-19-2019] mjw

But how can we run biomass power plants on a small scale if the Steam Rankine Cycle is not efficient too run a small power plant that is just a few 10s of kW? This is where the concept of biomass gasification comes in. Through gasifying biomass into a synthetic mixture of gases, it is possible to run small scale biomass power plants. The way it works is as follows: Using equipments called Biomass Gasifiers, biomass is converted into an organic mixture of gases called Producer Gas. This producer gas can then be used in a gas engine (not very different from a diesel generator) to generate electricity. As gas engines can operate on very small scales (even 10 kW or lower), we can this generate electricity from biomass on a small scale too. For this reason, biomass gasification is quite popular for rural electrification schemes in many developing and underdeveloped countries. In the past many years, I have had the opportunity to visit some of these small scale gasifiers installed in rural locations. Technically, they work fine, and I am convinced that these gasifiers constitute one of the feasible solutions in the overall renewable energy basket for rural electrification. The only challenge I observed had to do with the gasifier maintenance. You see, while the gasifier itself might not require much of maintenance, the gas engine that uses the producer gas to generate power requires maintenance. In many rural areas, such maintenance was difficult owing to lack of trained personnel, and this had resulting in their mal-functioning or shut down.

Biomass is used on a small-scale in rural areas.

This has 3 implications.

1. Even if 1 unit of biomass is worse than 1 unit of coal, biomass is used on a small-scale so 100,000 units of coal is worse than 10 units of biomass

2. Pollution from coal is always going to be worse because it affects a lot higher concetrations of people in urban areas

3. The same amount of Biomass will exist in either world because the two energy sources aren’t interchangeable=0-9

## **L: FDI**

### **F2: FDI Decreased Globally**

Not true. China pours most it’s FDI in the BRI as, **Zhou of Boston University** finds in 2019 that while average Chinese FDI output declined by 20%, BRI nations received an average increase of FDI by 31.5%.

### **F2: FDI tripled in EU (Brattberg)**

## **I Link: Fossil Fuel Lockin**

F2: Global warming - only AFF has risk of solvency

F2: Khan - Coordinated response from Chinese Government (4 bil spent)

## **I Link: M&A**

### **F2: M&A increases SB access to markets**

1. This argument is non-responsive to our own. We say that businesses decrease R&D spending after a merger, decreasing critical green tech innovation and harming the environment in the long term.
2. Innovation outweighs a marginal access to markets. If there is no new product/innovation, why does a greater market matter?
3. Decreases seed funding

## **Impact: Emissions**

### **F2: Green-tech unsustainable**

1. This makes no sense. Green tech, is by definition, a much smaller carbon-emitter.
2. Not empirically true, look to South Africa and their massive green eco. Furthermore ht's possible.

### **F2: Prices**

The lack of coal plants has led to an increase in coal prices. **Arezki 15 of the IMF** writes

*IMFBlog. “The Price of Oil and the Price of Carbon.” IMF Blog, IMF Blog, 2014, blogs.imf.org/2015/12/02/the-price-of-oil-and-the-price-of-carbon/. Accessed 28 Aug. 2019. // A&M SS*

Progress in the development of renewables could be fragile, however, if fossil fuel prices remain low for long. Renewables account for only a small share of global primary energy consumption, which is still dominated by fossil fuels—30 percent each for coal and oil, 25 percent for natural gas (see Table). But renewable energy will have to displace fossil fuels to a much greater extent in the future to avoid unacceptable climate risks. Unfortunately, the current **low prices for [Fossil Fuels]** oil, gas, and coal may provide scant **[destroys] incentive[s] for research to find** even **cheaper substitutes** for those fuels. **There is strong evidence that both innovation and adoption of clean**er **technology are strongly encouraged by higher fossil fuel prices.** The same is true for new technologies for mitigating fossil fuel emissions.The current **low fossil-fuel price** environment **will** thus certainly **delay the energy transition.** That transition—from fossil fuel to clean energy sources—is not the first one. Earlier transitions were those from wood/biomass to coal in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and from coal to petroleum in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One important lesson is that these transitions take a long time to complete. But this time we cannot wait. We owe to electric lighting the fact that there are still whales in the sea. Unless renewables become cheap enough that substantial carbon deposits are left underground for a very long time, if not forever, the planet will likely be exposed to potentially catastrophic climate risks.

### **F2: 1% inc trade decreases emissions**

1. No warrant -- why would something as devastating as building large concrete structures help the environment?
2. Not true -- Even the [**World Trade Organization**](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/envir_e/climate_impact_e.htm) finds that “increase in the scale of economic activity and energy use [from increased trade] will lead to higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions.

### **F2: Poverty puts pressure on the environment**

1. This simply doesn't make sense, people who are poor don't randomly drive around in maseratis and do emissions, it is non responsive
2. This is reverse casual because the main reason why people go into poverty in dev world is Emissions