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#### No nuclear renaissance – no new reactor construction, alternatives are cheaper and economics not favorable.

Wald, reporter at The New York Times, where he has been writing about energy topics for 30 years, 8-31

[Matthew, “Unraveling the Nuclear Renaissance”, 8-31-12, The New York Times,

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/31/unraveling-the-nuclear-renaissance/>, RSR]

Power plants are a bit like insect eggs. At the start, there are huge numbers, but few of them make it to adulthood. The last few days may have seen the demise of two reactor projects that had looked promising a few years ago, when the economy was strong and people worried about the high price of natural gas and the possibility of a price on carbon emissions. But natural gas is at historic lows, carbon charges seem unlikely, and lately neither reactor project has looked likely. On Wednesday, Exelon Corporation, the nation’s largest nuclear operator, threw in the towel on a planned twin-reactor project in Victoria County in Texas. Texas is short of generating capacity, but it has vast amounts of natural gas and a highly competitive electric market, both of which make it hard to build a reactor. Exelon had not said exactly when it would build, but it took advantage of a provision in a reformed nuclear licensing system to seek early approval of a 11,500-acre site southeast of the city of Victoria. The licensing system now allows companies to get “early site permits” and “bank” the sites, and later match the preapproved site with a preapproved reactor design, potentially shortening the time between deciding to build a reactor and getting it into operation. Exelon was one of the first to try it out. The company faced opposition from people who said there was not enough water in the area and that the ground was subject to subsidence that could wreck a cooling pond. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission might well have approved the site over these objections, but the company said the economics were not favorable.

#### SMRs hold the key to the entire renaissance – revives the nuclear industry.

Harrington, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Kent, “Study Finds Small Modular Reactors Could Revive US Nuclear Industry”, Chenected, 1-5-12

<http://chenected.aiche.org/energy/study-finds-small-modular-reactors-could-revive-us-nuclear-industry/>, RSR]

Now, a newly released study from the Energy Policy Institute at the University of Chicago finds that small modular reactors (SMR) may hold the key to an actual renaissance of U.S. nuclear power (read whole study): “Clearly, a robust commercial SMR industry is highly advantageous to many sectors in the United States,” concluded the study, led by Robert Rosner, director of the Energy Policy Institute at the University of Chicago. Through his work as the former director of Argonne National Laboratory, Rosner became involved in nuclear and renewable energy technology development. “It would be a huge stimulus for high-value job growth, restore U.S. leadership in nuclear reactor technology and, most importantly, strengthen U.S. leadership in a post-Fukushima world, on matters of nuclear safety, nuclear security, nonproliferation, and nuclear waste.” This represents a huge shift from last century’s large-reactor build-out, which eventually petered out and stagnated. Before construction stopped, new reactors had grown larger and larger as utilities tried to reduce costs through economies of scale. But now the trend may be toward what SMR proponents call economies of “small scale.” Creating value through standardized, mass produced, small modular reactors.

#### Meltdowns inevitable – reactors have shut down in the past and the NRC has failed at regulation

Gronlund 2007 (Nuclear power in a Warming world: Assessing the Risks, Addressing the Challenges, Lisbeth Gronlund; David Lochbaum; Edwin Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear_power/nuclear-power-in-a-warming-world.pdf>) JD

Safety problems remain despite a lack of serious accidents. A serious nuclear power accident has not occurred in the United States since 1979, when the Three Mile Island reactor in Pennsylvania experienced a partial core meltdown. However, the absence of serious accidents does not necessarily indicate that safety measures and oversight are adequate. Since 1979, there have been 35 instances in which individual reactors have shut down to restore safety standards, and the owner has taken a year or more to address dozens or even hundreds of equipment impairments that had accumulated over a period of years. The most recent such shutdown occurred in 2002. These year-plus closures indicate that the NRC has been doing a poor job of regulating the safety of power reactors. An effective regulator would be neither unaware nor passively tolerant of safety problems so extensive that a year or more is needed to fix them.

#### Meltdowns cause extinction – reactors contain radiation 100x that of nuclear bombs.

Lendman 11

[Stephen, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, 03/ 13, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,”, The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>, accessed 8-2-12, RSR]

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, **under a worst case** core **meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination**, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. **Emissions from** this **one reactor** exceeded a hundred**-fold the radioactive contamination of** the bombs dropped on **Hiroshima and Nagasaki.**" "**No** citizen of any **country** can be assured that he or she **can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.** Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. **If the cooling system fails** (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated **radioactive fuel rods will melt**, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, **massive radiation releases may follow**, impacting the entire region. "**It could be**, literally, **an apocalyptic event.**

## DA

#### 1. Obama winning – swing state polls and voters like his policies so far

Bowen 9/20 (Robert Bowen¶ Economic Policy writer for the Examiner¶ Currently a businessman, Robert Bowen served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980s as a moderate Democrat. He was also appointed by three different governors to serve on various boards and commissions, “New Fox News poll released Thursday shows Obama winning 3 key swing states” 2012, http://www.examiner.com/article/new-fox-news-poll-released-thursday-shows-obama-winning-3-key-swing-states)

Despite two re-set buttons, Mitt Romney’s campaign continues to back slide. The latest bad news comes from the Fox News poll for the crucial states of Ohio, Florida, and Virginia. The poll was released Thursday, and it is not good news for Romney. The results were confirmed by 3 other polls this week.¶ According to Fox News, Obama tops Romney by seven percentage points among likely voters in both Ohio (49-42 percent) and Virginia (50-43 percent). In Florida, the president holds a five-point edge (49-44 percent). Obama’s lead is just outside the poll’s margin of sampling error in Ohio and Virginia, and within the margin of sampling error in Florida.¶ .¶ The poll shows that majorities of voters are unhappy with how things are going in the country, yet in all three states more say they trust Obama than Romney to improve the economy. It was not asked in this poll, but in others, more voters still blame Bush and Republicans for the bad economy than Obama.¶ Likewise, in each state more voters believe the Obama administration’s policies have helped rather than hurt the economy although the margins are small. They favor Obama by two points in Florida, three points in Ohio, and five points in Virginia.

#### 2. Massive public opposition to nuclear power – viewed as too risky

Ramana 11 (Princeton University Program on Science and Global Security Physicist, 11, M.V. August 3, “Nuclear power and the public,” <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/nuclear-power-and-the-public>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

Japan is by no means alone. Around the world, nuclear energy has declined in popularity. In the United States, for example, a Washington Post-ABC poll conducted in April 2011 found that 64 percent of Americans opposed the construction of new reactors. Another poll, conducted by CBS News in March 2011, soon after the Fukushima crisis began, found that only 43 percent of those polled would approve of building new reactors, down from a 57 percent approval rating in 2008. Support for nuclear power was similar or lower in countries as varied as Chile (12 percent), Thailand (16.6 percent), Australia (34 percent), and the United Kingdom (35 percent). Even in France, which relies on nuclear power for about three-quarters of its electricity, one poll found that a majority (57 percent) were in favor of abandoning nuclear energy. These approval ratings are not strictly comparable because the polls were conducted by different agencies, asking different questions and providing different kinds of information prior to asking the questions. Nevertheless, there is little doubt among those who study public opinion on nuclear power that, by and large, it does not command much support. Nuclear power wasn't always so unpopular. For example, in the United States in 1977, when CBS News conducted its first poll on nuclear power, 69 percent of those surveyed expressed support for building more nuclear plants. Just two years later, after the Three Mile Island accident, public support had plummeted to 46 percent, and it dropped further to 34 percent after the 1986 Chernobyl accident. Since the 1980s, a majority of the US population has consistently opposed the construction of new nuclear reactors. Not coincidentally, there has been practically no nuclear construction in the United States since Three Mile Island. The public perceives nuclear power as a very risky technology. In some cases, association with nuclear facilities is even subject to stigma. The nuclear industry has tried a variety of strategies to break down public resistance to nuclear power, but they haven't worked well. With growing public concern about global warming, the industry is experimenting with a new strategy -- playing up the climate mitigation potential of nuclear power. While this has increased the benefit side of the equation for nuclear power, it hasn't decreased the risk perception associated with the technology, and nuclear power remains a reluctant choice at best. Renewable energy technologies offer the same benefits, making it unlikely that a large-scale "nuclear renaissance" will materialize.

#### 3. Approval ratings are key to the election

Cook 11 (The National Journal Political Analyst, Charlie, October 27, “Underwater,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-underwater-20111027>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

The best barometer of how a president is going to fare is his approval rating, which starts taking on predictive value about a year out. As each month goes by, the rating becomes a better indicator of the eventual results. Presidents with approval numbers above 48 to 50 percent in the Gallup Poll win reelection. Those with approval ratings below that level usually lose. If voters don’t approve of the job you are doing after four years in office, they usually don’t vote for you. Of course, a candidate can win the popular vote and still lose the [Electoral College](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-underwater-20111027). It happened to Samuel Tilden in 1876, Grover Cleveland in 1888, and Al Gore in 2000. But the popular votes and the Electoral College numbers usually come down on the same side.

#### 4. Romney would repeal the ACA

Friedman 12 Jun 28, 2012 EMILY FRIEDMAN ABC producer and digital reporter covering Gov. Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign “Romney Calls for Obamacare Repeal as ‘Bad Law’”

http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/06/romney-calls-for-obamacare-repeal-as-bad-law/

Mitt Romney today renewed his vow to repeal the health care law that the United States Supreme Court today upheld, referring to the plan as “bad law” and “bad policy.”¶ “As you might imagine I disagree with the Supreme Court’s decision and I agree with the dissent,” said Romney, with the Capitol building as his backdrop. “What the Court did not do on its last day in session I will do on my first day if elected President of the United States and that is I will act to repeal Obamacare.”

#### 5. Repealing the ACA would drive up health care costs – that kills jobs, destroys innovation and slows wage growth and consumer spending

Cutler 11 (David M. Cutler is Otto Eckstein Professor of Applied Economics, Harvard University, and a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress., January 7th, Repealing Health Care Is a Job Killer¶ It Would Slow Job Growth by 250,000 to 400,000 Annually, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/healthcare/report/2011/01/07/8887/repealing-health-care-is-a-job-killer/)

A successful repeal of health care reform would revert us back to the old system for financing and delivering health care and lead to substantial increases in total medical spending. The consequences of this spending increase would be far reaching. It would hurt family incomes, jobs, and economic growth.¶ Repealing health reform would:¶ Increase medical spending by $125 billion by the end of this decade and add nearly $2,000 annually to family insurance premiums¶ Destroy 250,000 to 400,000 jobs annually over the next decade¶ Reduce the share of workers who start new businesses, move to new jobs, or otherwise invest in themselves and the economy¶ This memo will review these effects in more detail with a particular focus on jobs.¶ High medical spending harms employment and economic growth¶ Before getting to the effects of repeal let’s look at how health costs affect the economy. Health insurance costs are a major issue for Americans. Family health insurance premiums have increased 80 percent in the past decade after adjusting for inflation, while median income has fallen by 5 percent. This is among the reasons why American families are increasingly uneasy about the economy. Businesses are worried as well. Small businesses have consistently ranked the cost of health insurance as their number one problem since 1986. Finally, rising medical costs are the major contributor to the long-run federal deficit, and they hamper state and local governments, too.¶ These costs affect four aspects of economic activity. First, increasing costs reduce net income for workers. The increase in the premiums that employees pay for coverage is most noticeable, but family income is affected in other ways as well. The first response of employers to rising health insurance costs is to reduce salary increases. Salaries for high-income workers have grown less rapidly than productivity as health insurance costs have accounted for a growing share of total compensation.¶ Less rapid growth of wages is not possible for all workers—many of whom have already experienced stagnant or declining take-home pay. For those workers the only viable response to rising medical costs is reduced employment—both involuntary part-time work and layoffs. Several studies show that health insurance costs and employment are negatively related.¶ Neeraj Sood, Arkadipta Ghosh, and José Escarce recently compared employment growth across industries in the United States that differ in how likely they are to provide health insurance. They compared employment in the same industries in the United States and Canada, where medical costs are lower and not paid for by businesses. The study found that every 10 percent increase in excess health care cost growth (cost growth above GDP growth) led to 120,000 fewer jobs. In other words, the high and growing cost of health care means that American firms that offer health coverage create fewer jobs than Canadian firms who need not offer these benefits. These results are consistent with a recent study by Katherine Baicker and Amitabh Chandra, as well as estimates from the president’s Council of Economic Advisers.¶ Beyond the impact on employment, high health insurance costs discourage long-term investments in economic growth. Fear of losing health insurance deters people from moving to new entrepreneurial jobs, from retiring when their health deteriorates, or from switching to part-time work as family needs arise. In the public sector, high medical spending crowds out investment in education, transportation, and electronic infrastructure, which translates into slower growth over time.¶ Health care reform aims to bring rising health costs down, but repealing it would do the opposite and make the above problems worse. The alternative proposals conservatives are offering would lead to continued cost increases as well. I focus primarily on how employment would be affected by health care repeal in this analysis. But the other effects of repeal on the economy are certainly important.¶ Medical spending is rapidly increasing¶ Health care analysts are virtually united in their view that medical spending is higher than it should be. They also agree that the approach taken in the Affordable Care Act is the right one to reduce this excessive spending.¶ Excessive medical spending is seen in several areas. A large literature shows that spending on acute and post-acute care exceeds appropriate levels. To take just a few examples, rehospitalization rates in the nation as a whole average twice what they are in the areas with the best care. Imaging has increased rapidly with little sense of whether prior rates were too low or that current rates are right. And care at the end of life is far more intensive than people and their families desire. Estimates suggest that about 30 percent of acute and post-acute care could be eliminated with no adverse health impact, and in many cases health improvements.¶ Prevention is also limited. Medications to control hypertension, high cholesterol, diabetes, depression, and other chronic conditions have been available for decades. Yet no more than one in three people with chronic disease are successfully treated. Lack of access to care, high out-of-pocket costs, and an excessive focus on acute illness over prevention are all factors in this poor performance. The result is too many people becoming sick and needing the expensive armamentarium of the medical system.¶ Finally, administrative costs eat up significant resources that would better be directed elsewhere. Insurance companies’ administrative expenses are widely noted. But they are only the tip of the iceberg. Providers incur costs verifying enrollment, adjudicating claims, and ensuring appropriate reimbursement. Estimates suggest that such costs account for as much as 15 percent of overall medical spending.¶ The Affordable Care Act takes steps to bring costs down¶ The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act takes steps to address each of these cost drivers. On the administrative end, the legislation establishes insurance exchanges, mandates minimum loss ratios for insurance companies, and streamlines transactions between medical care providers and insurers. Together, these provisions will significantly reduce the administrative costs of medical care.¶ By far the most changes are in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The philosophy underlying the Affordable Care Act is to make Medicare and Medicaid smarter purchasers of medical care so that providers are rewarded for creating value—not just for providing additional services.¶ The specific changes that promote this philosophical viewpoint include:¶ Payment innovations including greater reimbursement for preventive care services and patient-centered primary care; bundled payments for hospital, physician, and other services provided for a single episode of care; shared savings approaches or capitation payments that reward accountable provider groups that assume responsibility for the continuum of a patient’s care; and pay-for-performance incentives for Medicare providers¶ An Independent Payment Advisory Board with the authority to make recommendations that reduce cost growth and improve quality in both the Medicare program and the health system as a whole¶ A new Innovation Center within the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, charged with streamlining the testing of demonstration and pilot projects in Medicare and rapidly expanding successful models across the program¶ Profiling medical care providers on the basis of cost and quality and making that data available to consumers and insurance plans, and providing relatively low-quality, high-cost providers with financial incentives to improve their care¶ Increased funding for comparative effectiveness research¶ Increased emphasis on wellness and prevention¶ The exact amount that will be saved from these provisions is uncertain. Partly as a result of this uncertainty, the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, and the Office of the Actuary at CMS assume only minor savings. CBO, for example, estimated that the major parts of the law including these provisions will cost $10 billion over the 2010–2019 period, while the Office of the Actuary determined savings of only $2 billion.¶ Other studies suggest much larger changes. Melinda Beeuwkes- Buntin and I estimate a 1.5 percentage point reduction in cost increases annually from significant health care reform.9 Similarly, Peter S. Hussey, Christine Eibner, and M. Susan Ridgely in the New England Journal of Medicine estimate that savings of more than 10 percent are possible largely from payment reforms like bundled-payment systems. Realizing these savings over a decade implies cost reductions of nearly 1.5 percentage points annually. Finally, a Commonwealth Fund report indicates that provisions like these will slow annual growth in national health expenditures from 6.5 percent to 5.6 percent over the 2010–2020 period.¶ Taking all these studies into consideration, Karen Davis, Kristof Stremikis, and I estimate that the Affordable Care Act will reduce medical spending by 1.0 percentage points annually, beginning in 2014.¶ Repealing the law would increase medical spending¶ Accordingly, repealing health reform would increase spending by the same amount. I also consider a scenario where repeal would increase cost growth by 1.5 percentage points annually to account for the higher estimates in some studies.¶ National health spending would continue to balloon¶ The implications of repealing health care for national medical spending (public and private) are shown in Figure 1. Repealing health reform would add $25 billion to spending in 2014 and $185 billion to spending in 2019. The impact on family premiums will be equally large (see Figure 2). Repealing health reform would add 9 percent or nearly $2,000 annually to family health insurance premiums in 2019.¶ Families would continue to pay more for health insurance¶ How health reform repeal would affect jobs¶ Any proposal that adds $200 billion to our medical spending after a decade will have enormous economic implications. The employment impacts of health care repeal will be particularly severe because many of these costs will fall on businesses. As we’ve already seen, employers facing higher health costs will hire fewer people, lay workers off, and pay lower wages.¶ A total of 250,000 jobs will be lost annually if health reform is repealed¶ To estimate these employment impacts, I followed the methodology of myself and Neeraj Sood. That paper took estimates of the medical spending change associated with health reform and combined that with the econometric model of Sood, Arkadipta Ghosh, and José Escarce that estimated the employment impacts of changes in medical costs. I use the model to estimate the employment impact of repealing reform.¶ Figure 3 shows the net impact of repealing health reform on total employment. The baseline estimates show that 250,000 jobs will be lost annually if health reform is repealed. Annual job losses would average 400,000 using the greater estimate of 1.5 percentage point cost increases annually resulting from repeal. Figure 4 shows the estimated employment change by industry in 2016 (omitting health care, which will have more employment). More than 200,000 jobs will be lost in manufacturing and nearly 900,000 jobs will be lost in nonhealth care services.¶ Repeal will lead to more than 200,000 jobs lost in manufacturing and nearly 900,000 jobs lost in nonhealth care services¶ These job losses are not the only impact of repealing health reform, however. Family incomes would fall by as much as $2,000 annually as medical costs increase beyond forecasted levels. Federal deficits also would rise. The Congressional Budget Office has predicted that repealing health reform would add $230 billion to federal deficits in the next decade because provisions in the law intended to bring down costs would be repealed.¶ Job transitions would also be affected. Millions of people are “locked” into their current job because they fear becoming uninsured or underinsured if they were to change. Repealing health reform would thus stifle job transitions, new business startups, and movements into and out of the labor force. Millions more workers would be affected.¶ Conclusion¶ Medical care accounts for one-sixth of the economy, which means that any health reform that improves the efficiency of medical care will boost economic performance. Conversely, legislation that raises medical spending will be a job killer.¶

#### 6. Economic crisis causes war–strong statistical support

Royal 10(Jedediah, director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives, pg 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, **on the systemic level**, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power **and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next**. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises **could usher in a redistribution of relative power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) **that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, **even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, althou gh he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “**future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states**. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict**, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. **Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other**. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) **Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

## CP

#### Text – the United States federal government should establish a national renewable portfolio standard requiring 20% of a utilities’ electricity be produced by renewable sources by 2025, and should establish and maintain a renewable energy credits market for utilities.

#### (for nuke power aff, check vs. plan text) The United States federal government should establish purchasing power agreements for renewable energy.

#### Counterplan would solve all of the case – it boosts renewables which solves dependence, competitiveness and greenhouse gases

Sovacool & Cooper 2008

(Benjamin, Senior Research Fellow at the Network for New Energy Choices & Christopher, the Executive Director of the Network for New Energy Choices Environment and Energy Law and Policy Journal “Congress Got it Wrong: The Case for a National Renewable Portfolio Standard and Implications for Policy”)

VI. CONCLUSIONS Politicians and real estate moguls are fond of referring to things as “win-win” situations. The truth is that most important policy decisions involve winners and losers and benefits that accrue to one group often come at the expense of another. Every so often, constituencies align as if the stars and policymakers are faced with a true “win-win” situation. A properly designed national RPS is one of those rare choices. When compared to conflicting state-based RPS policies and their impact on energy markets and electricity pricing, a federal mandate could benefit ratepayers and regulated utilities in several unique ways that most policy advocates have not even considered. For example, a national RPS would decrease consumer electricity prices by: (1) depressing the cost of fossil fuels used to generate electricity; (2) lowering the cost of natural gas used to heat and power homes; (3) minimizing the cost of transmission congestion; (4) protecting against rate hikes to recover infrastructure investments and stranded costs; and (5) preventing predatory trade-offs that require some ratepayers to subsidize others. Yet a national RPS would also achieve further objectives, such as: (1) decreasing regulatory compliance costs by reducing the need for costly litigation to clarify vague and competing state regulations; (2) lowering the administrative costs associated with inconsistent state standards; (3) making regulations more predictable to ease planning of resource investments; (4) creating economies of scale that decrease the cost of renewable energy technologies; (5) giving utilities greater flexibility in meeting RPS mandates by expanding the market of eligible renewable resources; (6) decreasing the cost of RECs by creating a uniform national market; and (7) encouraging the tracking of GHG emissions reductions before the implementation of a national carbon cap-and-trade program. A national RPS would even benefit utility profits by: (1) maximizing the “hedge” benefits of renewable energy investments; (2) decreasing construction cost overruns and encouraging more modular generation; (3) displacing transportation costs associated with fossil fuel supply chains; (4) overcoming public opposition to new transmission infrastructure; (5) speeding cost recovery of transmission investments; (6) reducing the need for expensive reserve capacity; and (7) creating a level playing field that rewards strategic investment rather than location. By producing thousands of new manufacturing, installation and maintenance companies, and by encouraging thousands of existing companies to expand into the burgeoning renewable technology manufacturing sector, a national RPS would help American companies by creating more new jobs for American workers in the same states that have lost the most manufacturing jobs. Furthermore, a national RPS would also produce other benefits, such as: (1) decreasing the number of sick days workers take because of illnesses related to power plant air pollution and accidents related to the mining, transportation and processing of fossil fuels and uranium; (2) increasing total consumer income by up to $8.2 billion by 2020; and (3) enhancing U.S. Gross Domestic Product (“GDP”) by up to $10.2 billion by 2020. Finally, as if the aforementioned benefits were not enough, a national RPS would provide secondary environmental and social benefits in the following ways: (1) conserving substantial amounts of water in drought-prone areas; (2) decreasing the number of premature deaths and illnesses related to power plant air pollution and transportation and storage accidents; (3) offsetting millions of tons of GHGs that contribute to global warming; and (4) reducing the amount of America’s wilderness that is consumed to generate electricity using fossil fuels and nuclear power. Given such obvious and overwhelming advantages, it is hard to believe that many utilities and policymakers diligently oppose a federal RPS mandate, repeating myths that have long since been debunked. Largely, the remaining objections to federal intervention constitute a diminishing series of canards that mischaracterize a national RPS policy as an unnecessary federal intervention in a relatively free market. A majority of states are well on their way to imposing their own clunky, overlapping, inconsistent, competing, and sometimes irrational mess of mandates. In contrast to the national distribution of fossil fuels, all states possess renewable resources that they can affordably develop. However, under the current system of state mandates, some RPS states are “losers” by subsidizing the cheap, polluting electricity in non-RPS states. Other RPS states are victims of inconsistencies from state mandates that produce perverse predatory trade-offs and require them to export their cheap instate renewable electricity to other states in exchange for more expensive electricity or renewable energy credits. A national mandate would level the playing field by creating consistent, uniform rules and by allowing utilities to purchase RECs or develop renewable resources anywhere they are cost competitive. Experience § Marked 09:42 § from existing state RPS programs proves that mandates with broad eligibility actually have led to the development of many different renewable resources. Utilities have already demonstrated that they can meet state RPS requirements by deploying a diverse portfolio of renewable resources that best match their service areas. By expanding—geographically and monetarily—the market for renewable resources, a national RPS is likely to diversify the deployment of renewable energy technologies even further. In Nevada, geothermal energy may be cheaper to develop than wind. In the Pacific Northwest, incremental hydropower may be cheaper than solar power. In the Southeast, biomass may be the most affordable. A national RPS mandate with a fuel-based definition of eligible renewable resources ensures that free market principles—rather than regulatory set-asides or political patronage—determine which technologies will be most cost competitive in certain areas of the country. An added bonus is that a uniform national RPS decreases compliance costs for regulated utilities, because a technology-neutral mandate allows utilities to meet RPS obligations using the technology that is most cost competitive for the fuels available. It is time that federal policymakers engage in an informed, comprehensive and rational debate about the few remaining objections to a federal RPS mandate. America faces serious and mounting energy problems, including: (1) continued dependence on dwindling foreign sources of fossil fuels and uranium; (2) an undiversified electricity fuel mixture that leaves the nation vulnerable to serious national security threats; (3) reliance on an ancient and overwhelmed transmission grid that risks more common, pronounced, and expensive catastrophic system failures; (4) an impending climate crisis that will require massive and expensive emissions controls costing billions of dollars and substantially reducing U.S. GDP; and (5) loss of American economic competitiveness as Europe and Japan become the major manufacturing center for new renewable energy technologies. By establishing a consistent, national mandate and uniform trading rules, a national RPS can create a more just and predictable regulatory environment for utilities while jumpstarting a robust national renewable energy technology sector. Through offsetting electricity that utilities would otherwise generate with conventional and nuclear power, a national RPS would decrease electricity prices for American consumers while protecting human health and the environment. There is a time for accepting the quirks and foibles of state experimentation in national energy policy, and there is a time to look to the states as laboratories for policy innovation. Now is the time to model the best state RPS policies and craft a coherent national policy that protects the interests of regulated utilities and American consumers.

## Case

### Warming

#### Newest statistical data goes negative—Warming isn’t happening, it’s not anthropogenic, their science is flawed, and their impacts are exaggerated

Happer 3/27 (William, Professor of Physics at Princeton University, Wall Street Journal, “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again,” 2012, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>, NP)

During a fundraiser in Atlanta earlier this month, President Obama is reported to have said: "It gets you a little nervous about what is happening to global temperatures. When it is 75 degrees in Chicago in the beginning of March, you start thinking. On the other hand, I really have enjoyed nice weather." What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979. The lack of any statistically significant warming for over a decade has made it more difficult for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its supporters to demonize the atmospheric gas CO2 which is released when fossil fuels are burned. The burning of fossil fuels has been one reason for an increase of CO2 levels in the atmosphere to around 395 ppm (or parts per million), up from preindustrial levels of about 280 ppm. Getty Images CO2 is not a pollutant. Life on earth flourished for hundreds of millions of years at much higher CO2 levels than we see today. Increasing CO2 levels will be a net benefit because cultivated plants grow better and are more resistant to drought at higher CO2 levels, and because warming and other supposedly harmful effects of CO2 have been greatly exaggerated. Nations with affordable energy from fossil fuels are more prosperous and healthy than those without. The direct warming due to doubling CO2 levels in the atmosphere can be calculated to cause a warming of about one degree Celsius. The IPCC computer models predict a much larger warming, three degrees Celsius or even more, because they assume changes in water vapor or clouds that supposedly amplify the direct warming from CO2. Many lines of observational evidence suggest that this "positive feedback" also has been greatly exaggerated. There has indeed been some warming, perhaps about 0.8 degrees Celsius, since the end of the so-called Little Ice Age in the early 1800s. Some of that warming has probably come from increased amounts of CO2, but the timing of the warming—much of it before CO2 levels had increased appreciably—suggests that a substantial fraction of the warming is from natural causes that have nothing to do with mankind. Frustrated by the lack of computer-predicted warming over the past decade, some IPCC supporters have been claiming that "extreme weather" has become more common because of more CO2. But there is no hard evidence this is true. After an unusually cold winter in 2011 (December 2010-February 2011) the winter of 2012 was unusually warm in the continental United States. But the winter of 2012 was bitter in Europe, Asia and Alaska. Weather conditions similar to 2012 occurred in the winter of 1942, when the U.S. Midwest was unusually warm, and when the Wehrmacht encountered the formidable forces of "General Frost" in a Russian winter not unlike the one Russians just had. Large fluctuations from warm to cold winters have been the rule for the U.S., as one can see from records kept by the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA. For example, the winters of 1932 and 1934 were as warm as or warmer than the 2011-2012 one and the winter of 1936 was much colder. Nightly television pictures of the tragic destruction from tornadoes over the past months might make one wonder if the frequency of tornadoes is increasing, perhaps due to the increasing levels of CO2 in the atmosphere. But as one can read at Andrew Revkin's New York Times blog, dotearth, "There is no evidence of any trend in the number of potent tornadoes (category F2 and up) over the past 50 years in the United States, even as global temperatures have risen markedly." Like winter temperatures, the numbers, severity and geographical locations of tornadoes fluctuate from year-to-year in ways that are correlated with the complicated fluid flow patterns of the oceans and atmosphere, the location of the jet stream, El Niño or La Niña conditions of the tropical Pacific Oceans, etc. As long as the laws of nature exist, we will have tornadoes. But we can save many more lives by addressing the threat of tornadoes directly—for example, with improved and more widely dispersed weather radars, and with better means for warning the people of endangered areas—than by credulous support of schemes to reduce "carbon footprints," or by funding even more computer centers to predict global warming. It is easy to be confused about climate, because we are constantly being warned about the horrible things that will happen or are already happening as a result of mankind's use of fossil fuels. But these ominous predictions are based on computer models. It is important to distinguish between what the climate is actually doing and what computer models predict. The observed response of the climate to more CO2 is not in good agreement with model predictions. We need high-quality climate science because of the importance of climate to mankind. But we should also remember the description of how science works by the late, great physicist, Richard Feynman: "In general we look for a new law by the following process. First we guess it. Then we compute the consequences of the guess to see what would be implied if this law that we guessed is right. Then we compare the result of the computation to nature, with experiment or experience; compare it directly with observation, to see if it works. If it disagrees with experiment it is wrong." The most important component of climate science is careful, long-term observations of climate-related phenomena, from space, from land, and in the oceans. If observations do not support code predictions—like more extreme weather, or rapidly rising global temperatures—Feynman has told us what conclusions to draw about the theory.

#### Turn: Cutting pollutants causes warming, current atmospheric reactions negate climate change – there’s only a risk the aff makes it worse

Castro 1/12 (Joseph, LiveScience Staff Writer, “How Mysterious Molecules May Help Cool the Planet,” 1/12/2012, http://www.livescience.com/17883-mysterious-molecule-cools-earth.html AD: 1/12/12) Nisarg

Elusive molecules in the Earth’s atmosphere may be helping to cool the planet more efficiently than scientists previously thought, a new study suggests. They are called Criegee intermediates, or Criegee biradicals (named after the German chemist Rudolf Criegee), and are short-lived molecules that form in the Earth’s atmosphere when ozone reacts with alkenes (a family of organic compounds). While scientists have known about the intermediates for decades, they haven't been able to directly measure how the molecules react with other atmospheric compounds, such as the pollutants nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide, until now. Researchers used a new method to create Criegee intermediates in the lab, and then reacted them with several atmospheric compounds. They found that the reactions with the pollutants could produce aerosols, tiny particles that reflect solar radiation back into space, much more quickly than previously assumed. Given that 90 percent of the alkenes in the atmosphere that produce these intermediates come from Earth's ecosystems, the results suggest that "the ecosystem is negating climate change more efficiently than we thought it was," said study co-author Carl Percival, an atmospheric chemist at the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom. "The most important message here is that we need to protect the ecosystems we have left." Percival noted that scientists aren't close to being ready to use the intermediates in geoengineering to generate more aerosols and proactively cool Earth's climate. The main point, he said, is that we need to preserve the ecosystem so that it can naturally produce more Criegee intermediates. Measuring the biradicals In 1949, the chemist Criegee proposed that biradicals — reactive molecules missing two chemical bonds — could form when ozone reacts with hydrocarbons like alkenes. These biradicals would presumably play a substantial role in both removing pollutants from the lower atmosphere (a process called oxidation) and producing secondary organic aerosols (primary aerosols come from such sources as sea spray and wind-blown dust, whereas secondary aerosols form from the reactions of atmospheric gases).

#### No catastrophic warming and its not human caused- past temperatures were hotter and we didn’t cause them nor die from them

Idso, Carter and Singer 2011 [Craig D. Ph.D Chairman for the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Robert M. Ph.D Adjunct Research Fellow James Cook University, S. Fred Ph.D President of Science and Environmental Policy Project, Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

Evidence of a Medieval Warm Period (MWP) approximately 1,000 years ago, when there was about 28 percent less CO2 in the atmosphere than there is currently, would show there is nothing unusual, unnatural, or unprecedented about recent temperatures. Such evidence is now overwhelming.  New evidence not reported in NIPCC-1 finds the Medieval Warm Period occurred in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Antarctica, and the Northern Hemisphere. Despite this evidence, Mann et al. (2009) continue to understate the true level of warming during the MWP by cherry-picking proxy and instrumental records.  Research from locations around the world reveals a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period.  Recent reconstructions of climate history find the human influence does not stand out relative to other, natural causes of climate change. While global warming theory and models predict polar areas would warm most rapidly, the warming of Greenland was 33 percent greater in magnitude in 1919–1932 than it was in 1994–2007, and Antarctica cooled during the second half of the twentieth century.  Perlwitz et al. (2009) reported ―a decade-long decline (1998–2007) in globally averaged temperatures from the record heat of 1998‖ and noted U.S. temperatures in 2008 ―not only declined from near-record warmth of prior years, but were in fact colder than the official 30-year reference climatology … and further were the coldest since at least 1996.‖  New research disputes IPCC‘s claim that it has ferreted out all significant influences of the world‘s many and diverse urban heat islands from the temperature databases they use to portray the supposedly unprecedented warming of the past few decades.

#### No impact – newest data says we’re more likely to suffer from an ice age than global warming

Rose 1/29 (David, Daily Mail Online, “Forget global warming - it's Cycle 25 we need to worry about (and if NASA scientists are right the Thames will be freezing over again)”, 2012, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2093264/Forget-global-warming--Cycle-25-need-worry-NASA-scientists-right-Thames-freezing-again.html?ito=feeds-newsxml) Nisarg

The supposed ‘consensus’ on man-made global warming is facing an inconvenient challenge after the release of new temperature data showing the planet has not warmed for the past 15 years. The figures suggest that we could even be heading for a mini ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists yesterday told The Mail on Sunday that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830. In this period, named after the meteorologist John Dalton, average temperatures in parts of Europe fell by 2C. However, it is also possible that the new solar energy slump could be as deep as the ‘Maunder minimum’ (after astronomer Edward Maunder), between 1645 and 1715 in the coldest part of the ‘Little Ice Age’ when, as well as the Thames frost fairs, the canals of Holland froze solid.

#### Nuclear power produces heat emissions which exacerbate global warming

Science Daily 9 (July 13th, Trapping Carbon Dioxide Or Switching To Nuclear Power Not Enough To Solve Global Warming Problem, Experts Say, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm)

Attempting to tackle climate change by trapping carbon dioxide or switching to nuclear power will not solve the problem of global warming, according to energy calculations published in the July issue of the International Journal of Global Warming. Bo Nordell and Bruno Gervet of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Sweden have calculated the total energy emissions from the start of the industrial revolution in the 1880s to the modern day. They have worked out that using the increase in average global air temperature as a measure of global warming is an inadequate measure of climate change. They suggest that scientists must also take into account the total energy of the ground, ice masses and the seas if they are to model climate change accurately. The researchers have calculated that the heat energy accumulated in the atmosphere corresponds to a mere 6.6% of global warming, while the remaining heat is stored in the ground (31.5%), melting ice (33.4%) and sea water (28.5%). They point out that net heat emissions between the industrial revolution circa 1880 and the modern era at 2000 correspond to almost three quarters of the accumulated heat, i.e., global warming, during that period. Their calculations suggest that most measures to combat global warming, such as reducing our reliance on burning fossil fuels and switching to renewables like wind power and solar energy, will ultimately help in preventing catastrophic climate change in the long term. But the same calculations also show that trapping carbon dioxide, so-called carbon dioxide sequestration, and storing it deep underground or on the sea floor will have very little effect on global warming. "Since net heat emissions accounts for most of the global warming there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell explains, "The increasing carbon dioxide emissions merely show how most net heat is produced. The "missing" heat, 26%, is due to the greenhouse effect, natural variations in climate and/or an underestimation of net heat emissions, the researchers say. These calculations are actually rather conservative, the researchers say, and the missing heat may be much less. The researchers also point out a flaw in the nuclear energy argument. Although nuclear power does not produce carbon dioxide emissions in the same way as burning fossil fuels it does produce heat emissions equivalent to three times the energy of the electricity it generates and so contributes to global warming significantly, Nordell adds.

### Agriculture

#### CO2 increases crop yields

Idso, Carter and Singer 2011 [Craig D. Ph.D Chairman for the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Robert M. Ph.D Adjunct Research Fellow James Cook University, S. Fred Ph.D President of Science and Environmental Policy Project, Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

Rising temperatures and atmospheric CO2 concentrations, by increasing crop yields, will play a major role in averting hunger without the taking of new land and water from nature. For a nominal doubling of the air‘s CO2 concentration, for example, the productivity of Earth‘s herbaceous plants rises by 30 to 50 percent and the productivity of its woody plants rises by 50 to 80 percent or more. In addition, atmospheric CO2 enrichment typically increases plant nutrient and water use efficiency.

#### Even if we tripled the amount of CO2 in the air it wouldn’t cause runaway warming- it actually has created ecological benefits

Idso and Idso 2011 Craig D. (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) Sherwood B. (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf.

As presently constituted, earth's atmosphere contains just slightly less than 400 ppm of the colorless and odorless gas we call carbon dioxide or CO2. That's only four-hundredths of one percent. Consequently, even if the air's CO2 concentration was tripled, carbon dioxide would still comprise only a little over one tenth of one percent of the air we breathe, which is far less than what wafted through earth's atmosphere eons ago, when the planet was a virtual garden place. Nevertheless, a small increase in this minuscule amount of CO2 is frequently predicted to produce a suite of dire environmental consequences, including dangerous global warming, catastrophic sea level rise, reduced agricultural output, and the destruction of many natural ecosystems, as well as dramatic increases in extreme weather phenomena, such as droughts, floods and hurricanes. As strange as it may seem, these frightening future scenarios are derived from a single source of information: the ever-evolving computer-driven climate models that presume to reduce the important physical, chemical and biological processes that combine to determine the state of earth's climate into a set of mathematical equations out of which their forecasts are produced. But do we really know what all of those complex and interacting processes are? And even if we did -- which we don't -- could we correctly reduce them into manageable computer code so as to produce reliable forecasts 50 or 100 years into the future? Some people answer these questions in the affirmative. However, as may be seen in the body of this report, real-world observations fail to confirm essentially all of the alarming predictions of significant increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, floods and hurricanes that climate models suggest should occur in response to a global warming of the magnitude that was experienced by the earth over the past two centuries as it gradually recovered from the much-lower-than-present temperatures characteristic of the depths of the Little Ice Age. And other observations have shown that the rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations associated with the development of the Industrial Revolution have actually been good for the planet, as they have significantly enhanced the plant productivity and vegetative water use efficiency of earth's natural and agro-ecosystems, leading to a significant "greening of the earth."

### Biodiversity

#### Warming increases Biodiversity- allows animals to adapt to the other things we do

Idso and Idso 2011 Craig D. (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) Sherwood B. (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf.

"Given the strong positive correlation between diversity and temperature," the six scientists went on to say that "local copepod diversity, especially in extra-tropical regions, is likely to increase with climate change as their large-scale distributions respond to climate warming." This state of affairs is much the same as what has typically been found on land for birds, butterflies and several other terrestrial lifeforms, as their ranges expand and overlap in response to global warming. And with more territory thus available to them, their "foothold" on the planet becomes ever stronger, fortifying them against forces (many of them human-induced) that might otherwise lead to their extinction.

#### No impact to loss of biodiversity – empirically proven.

**Lomborg**, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, **‘1**

[Bjorn, “The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World”,

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/lomborg2.htm>]

Third, that threat of biodiversity loss is real, but exaggerated. Most early estimates used simple island models that linked a loss in habitat with a loss of biodiversity. A rule-of-thumb indicated that loss of 90% of forest meant a 50% loss of species. As rainforests seemed to be cut at alarming rates, estimates of annual species loss of 20,000-100,000 abounded. Many people expected the number of species to fall by half globally within a generation or two. However, the data simply does not bear out these predictions. In the eastern United States, forests were reduced over two centuries to fragments totalling just 1-2% of their original area, yet this resulted in the extinction of only one forest bird. In Puerto Rico, the primary forest area has been reduced over the past 400 years by 99%, yet “only” seven of 60 species of bird has become extinct. All but 12% of the Brazilian Atlantic rainforest was cleared in the 19th century, leaving only scattered fragments. According to the rule-of-thumb, half of all its species should have become extinct. Yet, when the World Conservation Union and the Brazilian Society of Zoology analysed all 291 known Atlantic forest animals, none could be declared extinct. Species, therefore, seem more resilient than expected. And tropical forests are not lost at annual rates of 2-4%, as many environmentalists have claimed: the latest UN figures indicate a loss of less than 0.5%.

### Emissions

#### CO2 doesn’t cause warming- its colder now with more of it

Idso and Idso 2011 Craig D. (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) Sherwood B. (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf.

But could the higher temperatures of the past four interglacials have been caused by higher CO2 concentrations due to some non-human influence? Absolutely not, for atmospheric CO2 concentrations during all four prior interglacials never rose above approximately 290 ppm, whereas the air's CO2 concentration today stands at nearly 390 ppm. Combining these two observations, we have a situation where, compared with the mean conditions of the preceding four interglacials, there is currently 100 ppm more CO2 in the air than there was then, and it is currently more than 2°C colder than it was then, which adds up to one huge discrepancy for the world's climate alarmists and their claim that high atmospheric CO2 concentrations lead to high temperatures. The situation is unprecedented, all right, but not in the way the public is being led to believe.

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

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

Coral reefs around the world are suffering badly from overfishing and various forms of pollution. Yet many experts argue that the greatest threat to them is the acidification of the oceans from the dissolving of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. The effect of acidification, according to J.E.N. Veron, an Australian coral scientist, will be "nothing less than catastrophic.... What were once thriving coral gardens that supported the greatest biodiversity of the marine realm will become red-black bacterial slime, and they will stay that way." This is a common view. The Natural Resources Defense Council has called ocean acidification "the scariest environmental problem you've never heard of." Sigourney Weaver, who narrated a film about the issue, said that "the scientists are freaked out." The head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration calls it global warming's "equally evil twin." But do the scientific data support such alarm? Last month scientists at San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography and other authors published a study showing how much the pH level (measuring alkalinity versus acidity) varies naturally between parts of the ocean and at different times of the day, month and year. "On both a monthly and annual scale, even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification," say the authors of the study, adding that because good instruments to measure ocean pH have only recently been deployed, "this variation has been under-appreciated." Over coral reefs, the pH decline between dusk and dawn is almost half as much as the decrease in average pH expected over the next 100 years. The noise is greater than the signal. Another recent study, by scientists from the U.K., Hawaii and Massachusetts, concluded that "marine and freshwater assemblages have always experienced variable pH conditions," and that "in many freshwater lakes, pH changes that are orders of magnitude greater than those projected for the 22nd-century oceans can occur over periods of hours." This adds to other hints that the ocean-acidification problem may have been exaggerated. For a start, the ocean is alkaline and in no danger of becoming acid (despite headlines like that from Reuters in 2009: "Climate Change Turning Seas Acid"). If the average pH of the ocean drops to 7.8 from 8.1 by 2100 as predicted, it will still be well above seven, the neutral point where alkalinity becomes acidity. The central concern is that lower pH will make it harder for corals, clams and other "calcifier" creatures to make calcium carbonate skeletons and shells. Yet this concern also may be overstated. Off Papua New Guinea and the Italian island of Ischia, where natural carbon-dioxide bubbles from volcanic vents make the sea less alkaline, and off the Yucatan, where underwater springs make seawater actually acidic, studies have shown that at least some kinds of calcifiers still thrive—at least as far down as pH 7.8. In a recent experiment in the Mediterranean, reported in Nature Climate Change, corals and mollusks were transplanted to lower pH sites, where they proved "able to calcify and grow at even faster than normal rates when exposed to the high [carbon-dioxide] levels projected for the next 300 years." In any case, freshwater mussels thrive in Scottish rivers, where the pH is as low as five. Laboratory experiments find that more marine creatures thrive than suffer when carbon dioxide lowers the pH level to 7.8. This is because the carbon dioxide dissolves mainly as bicarbonate, which many calcifiers use as raw material for carbonate. Human beings have indeed placed marine ecosystems under terrible pressure, but the chief culprits are overfishing and pollution. By comparison, a very slow reduction in the alkalinity of the oceans, well within the range of natural variation, is a modest threat, and it certainly does not merit apocalyptic headlines.

### Solvency

#### SMRs are not a solution for global warming

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

 Efficiency and most renewable technologies are already cheaper than new large reactors. The long time—a decade or more—that it will take to certify SMRs will do little or nothing to help with the global warming problem and will actually complicate current efforts underway. For example, the current schedule for commercializing the above-ground sodium cooled reactor in Japan extends to 2050, making it irrelevant to addressing the climate problem. Relying on assurances that SMRs will be cheap is contrary to the experience about economies of scale and is likely to waste time and money, while creating new safety and proliferation risks, as well as new waste disposal problems.

#### NP is too little too late for climate change, renewable energy like solar and wind will be efficient and cost-competitive by the time the first reactor could be built.

Mariotte 7 (Michael, executive director, Nuclear Info and Resource Service, Nov 6 http://www.cfr.org/publication/14718/nuclear\_power\_in\_response\_to\_climate\_change.html)

Environmental advocates considering “reconsidering” nuclear power in light of climate change are too late. The accelerating pace of the climate crisis and the dawning realization that we no longer have the luxury of a few decades to address the crisis already have made nuclear power an irrelevant technology in terms of climate. Even if the nuclear industry had solved the safety, radioactive waste, proliferation, cost, and other issues that ended its first generation—and it hasn’t solved any of those problems—it wouldn’t matter. What nuclear power can offer for climate is simply too little, too late. The major studies that have looked at the issue—[MIT](http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/), the National Commission on [Energy Policy](http://www.energycommission.org/site/page.php?index), etc.—generally agree that for nuclear to make a meaningful contribution to carbon emissions reduction would require reactor construction on a massive scale: 1,200 to 2,000 new reactors worldwide, 200 to 400 in the United States alone. And that would have to be done over the next f40 to 50 years. Pity poor Japan Steel Works, the world’s major facility for forging reactor pressure vessels (there is one other, small-capacity facility in Russia): working overtime it can produce twleve pressure vessels per year. Do the math: That’s less than half of what is needed. Even if someone put in the billions of dollars and years necessary to build a new forging facility, it’s still not enough, not fast enough. There are 104 operable reactors in the United States today. In November 2017, no matter how much taxpayer money is thrown at the nuclear industry, there will be 104—or fewer. Even with streamlined licensing procedures and certified reactor designs, it will take ten, twelve years or more to license, build and bring a single new reactor online. And since most of the reactor designs being considered are first or second of a kind, count on them taking even longer. Our energy future ultimately will be carbon-free and nuclear-free, based primarily on solar and wind power, energy efficiency, and distributed generation. What is perhaps less obvious is that the future is now. In the years we’d be waiting for that first new reactor to come online, we can install ten times or more solar and wind capacity, and save twenty times or more that much power through increased efficiency while building the mass production that reduces costs, especially for photovoltaics. By the time that first reactor could come online, solar could already be cost-competitive, while wind and efficiency already are cheaper than nuclear. We no longer have ten years to begin reducing carbon emissions. Waiting around for a few new reactors won’t help our climate, but it would waste the funds needed to implement our real energy future.

#### Smaller is more expensive – no adoption.

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

SMR proponents claim that small size will enable mass manufacture in a factory, enabling considerable savings relative to field construction and assembly that is typical of large reactors. In other words, modular reactors will be cheaper because they will be more like assembly line cars than hand-made Lamborghinis. In the case of reactors, however, several offsetting factors will tend to neutralize this advantage and make the costs per kilowatt of small reactors higher than large reactors. First, in contrast to cars or smart phones or similar widgets, the materials cost per kilowatt of a reactor goes up as the size goes down. This is because the surface area per kilowatt of capacity, which dominates materials cost, goes up as reactor size is decreased. Similarly, the cost per kilowatt of secondary containment, as well as independent systems for control, instrumentation, and emergency management, increases as size decreases. Cost per kilowatt also increases if each reactor has dedicated and independent systems for control, instrumentation, and emergency management. For these reasons, the nuclear industry has been building larger and larger reactors in an effort to try to achieve economies of scale and make nuclear power economically competitive.

#### Government subsidies fail to motivate policy – the free-market solves.

Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, ‘12

[Sterling, “Energy Loserville: U.S. DOE Picks in an Artificial Industry”, MasterResource, A Free Market Energy Blog, 7-9-12,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2012/07/losing-us-green-subsidies/>, RSR]

“When government undertakes tasks for which it is ill equipped it squanders the authority necessary for carrying out its core responsibilities. Pervasive rent-seeking, bad for our economy and worse for our republic, should be discouraged instead of rewarded. If government becomes integral to securing every advantage and assuaging every grievance, then governance becomes impossible.” - Richard Voegeli, “Reclaiming Democratic Capitalism,” Claremont Review of Books, Spring 2012, p. 46. Governments around the world are having buyers’ remorse with their bets that solar and wind could effectively diminish oil, gas, coal, and nuclear. So much cost, so little energy. So much cost, so little reliability, and so much need for backup power. The story is the same for the U.S. Department of Energy. The Obama administration’s rocky road with green-energy boosterism is no secret. With big names like Solyndra and Solar Trust of America, it’s hard to lose sight of the administration’s funding failures. But what may come as a surprise is the overall amount of money being thrown away on these green companies that the administration has championed. Of the $10.7 billion in green-energy commitments, detailed below, approximately $3.2 billion is to companies that are in bankruptcy, and another $7.1 billion is committed to teetering firms. The good news is that private developers are postponing (and probably canceling) projects that even with government subsidies are uneconomic. General Electric Co. just last week halted construction of what would have been the largest solar-panel factory in the U.S. Some 335 workers can now find economic employment. Here’s the breakdown of the “green” energy carnage to date: Bankruptcies Abound Solar: Spent $70 million of its $400 million DOE loan. Beacon Power Corp: Received $43 million in federal loan guarantees in 2009 and also received $29 million in PA grants – Bankrupt in October 2011 Ener1 (parent company of EnerDel): Received $118.5 million in federal loan guarantees — Bankrupt in January 2012 – has since exited bankruptcy Evergreen Solar: Received $58 million in MA loan guarantees (an undisclosed portion sourced from federal ARRA block grant) — Bankrupt in August 2011 with $485.6 million in debt Solyndra: Received $535 million in federal loan guarantees in 2009 and $25.1 million in CA tax credit — Bankrupt in August 2011 SpectraWatt: Received $500,000 in federal loan guarantees in 2009 — Bankrupt in August 2011 Babcock and Brown: Received $178 million in federal grants in December 2009 (4 months after it went bust) – Bankrupt in early 2009 Mountain Plaza Inc.: Received $424,000 in federal grants through TN Department of Transportation in 2009 — Bankrupt in 2003 and again in June 2010 Solar Trust of America (parent company: Solar Millennium): Received $2.1 billion loan guarantee in April 2011 – Bankrupt in April 2012 Troubled ‘Green’ Energy Companies A123: Received $300 million in federal grants and $135 million in MI grants — Declining orders have forced multiple layoffs Amonix, Inc.: Received $5.9 million in federal tax credits in 2009 through ARRA — Laid off 2/3 of work force First Solar: Received $3 billion in federal loan guarantees — Biggest S&P loser in 2011, CEO fired Fisker Automotive: $529 million in federal loan guarantees — Multiple 2012 sales prediction downgrades for first car release, delivery and cash flow troubles; Assembling cars in Finland Johnson Controls: Received $299 million in federal grants in 2009 — Low demand caused cancellation of a new factory, operating at half capacity Nevada Geothermal: Received $98.5 million in federal loan guarantees in 2009 — Defaulting on long-term debt obligations, 85% drop in stock value Sun Power: Received $1.2 billion in federal loan guarantees — Debt exceeds assets; French oil company took over last fall BrightSource Energy: $1.6 billion federal loan approved in April 2012 – loan obtained through political connections with the administration; absent the loan, Brightsource’s solar power purchase would have fallen through. Here is the total green of federal “green” energy bets. In Bankruptcy: o $2,975,424,000 – federal grants and loan guarantees o $112,100,000 – state grants, loan guarantees, and tax credits o $3,087,524,000 total Dire Finances o $7,432,400,000 – federal grants, loan guarantees, and tax credits o $135,000,000 – state grants o $7,567,400,000 total Overall Commitments o $10,407,824,000 federal dollars o $247,100,000 state dollars o $10,654,924,000 total Backdoor Costs As high as the losses are, these numbers undoubtedly understate the problem. Accounting for the true, total costs of these programs is difficult given that government funding for “green” energy projects come from multiple, often unexpected and disparate departments and programs. For instance, In addition to the costs noted above, an additional $9 billion was sunk into solar and wind projects through the stimulus bill, according to a national renewable energy laboratory report, since fewer than 910 direct jobs and just 4,600 indirect jobs were created by that spending, the cost per job topped $1.63 million dollars each – and some of those jobs are temporary.[1] In addition, green energy programs routinely have both ancillary and/or hidden costs and they result in unintended consequences that also have costs. Why Hidden Costs? Leaving aside libertarian concerns about the very legitimacy of government spending on and regulation of energy development, there are a number of purely economic reasons for believing that federal and state agencies routinely overstate the benefits of green energy spending and understate the costs. First, the some of the justification regularly cites things like premature mortality or hospitalizations avoided as a significant benefit from subsidized green energy substitution for traditional fossil fuels. Yet, as I and others have pointed out, the harms attributed to various regulated pollutants (which supposedly justify replacing standard, reliable fossil-fuel-powered electrical plants with more costly, less reliable wind and solar plants) are routinely, grossly overstated. For instance, when the EPA recently updated its ozone regulations, most of the purported benefits were to come from avoided hospitalizations and deaths from asthma; however, claims that ozone is causing a rise in asthma are simply not plausible. While the prevalence of asthma has risen about 75 percent during the last 25 years — and nearly doubled for children – during the same time period, ozone levels have fallen. In addition, worldwide the lowest asthma rates are found in developing and ex-Soviet countries with substantial air pollution, while western countries with the world’s cleanest air have the highest asthma rates. And, emergency room visits and hospitalizations for asthma in the U.S. are lowest during July and August, when ozone levels are highest. Wealth is Health: The True Cost of Government Inefficiency By contrast, there is a well-established relationship between wealth and health. Lower household incomes associated with increased risk of premature death. By this measure, the health cost of tougher ozone standards is high. Using U.S. Office of Management and Budget estimates that every $7.5 million to $12 million dollars in regulatory costs imposed on the economy results in a life lost and the EPA’s cost estimate the new ozone regulations could result in 833 to 2,933 premature deaths. By the same token, replacing coal-fired power plants, with wind or solar plants, based purely on costs will result in thousands of premature deaths. Concerning non-health based economic benefits, I would argue that these are usually overstated by the government as well. There is no question that subsidies produce benefits as well as costs. Unfortunately the benefits are usually concentrated–going to politically favored industries and businesses–while the costs are dispersed among both the industry (in this case the electric power and transportation industries) and the public as a whole. Certainly subsidies that result in new domestic manufacturing and construction opportunities can create jobs – though many may be temporary jobs for those installing the equipment and those merchants who benefit secondarily from their commerce (restaurants, hotels, etc.). But if, as has proven the case in Europe (where the subsides have resulted in an overall net loss of jobs) and in the United States (where, as the few instances above demonstrate), job production has been underwhelming), then the subsides amount to a net loss to the economy. This loss only grows when one considers consumers, who will pay higher costs and/or suffer from unreliability of supply from the energy source replacing coal, will bear these costs for years to come — meaning that they collectively will have billions of dollars less each year in discretionary income which would have created jobs in industries chosen by consumers in the market place.

#### Every dollar in government-directed spending trades off with new, more competitive technologies

Burnett, senior fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, ‘12

[Sterling, “Energy Loserville: U.S. DOE Picks in an Artificial Industry”, MasterResource, A Free Market Energy Blog, 7-9-12,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2012/07/losing-us-green-subsidies/>, RSR]

This latter point is perhaps the greatest weakness of any benefit/cost analysis of any government subsidies. These subsidies substitute the government’s judgment about what the public should want for the public’s own judgment as express through their choices in the marketplace. There are huge opportunity costs to such government directed spending. The money spent developing and promoting a green energy industry (especially one that has subpar development results) is \*money not spent innovating, not available to entrepreneurs to discover the next big thing(whether it be energy source or entertainment device), \* jobs not created in other sectors of the economy(and maybe in some industries that haven’t been created yet), \*money not available for better education or health care,or \* money not available to reduce the annual deficit and overall debt. This, in my opinion, is the real economic loss. More Bad Bets? In the face of these multiple “successes,” the Obama administration wants to double down and throw more good money after bad. It’s never worked before, but hey, there’s always a first time, Right? Election season, and bad ideology, have put the sitting President at odds with reality.

#### Innovation in the energy sector is vital to overall U.S. competitiveness

Deutsch, Former undersecretary of DOE and Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, ‘8

[John, Issues in Science and Technology, "Ending the Inertia on Energy Policy," Winter 08, RSR]

There is only one solution to the challenge: The United States must begin the long process of transforming its economy from one that is dependent on petroleum and high-emission coal-fired electricity to one that uses energy much more efficiently, develops alternative fuels, and switches to electricity generation that is low-carbon or carbon-free. The benefits of such a transformation are indisputable: It would avoid unnecessary cost and disruption to the U.S. economy, protect the environment, and enhance national security. The United States has sought to adopt an effective and coherent energy policy since the first oil crisis of 1973, but it has failed to do so. The challenge for U.S. political leaders is to craft, fund, and diligently sustain a range of policy measures that will make this critical transition as certain, rapid, and cost-effective as possible. In order to meet this challenge, the United States must undergo an innovation revolution. The rate at which the United States is able to develop and deploy new energy technologies will, to a great extent, determine the ultimate speed and cost of the economic transformation. Large-scale carbon capture and sequestration, advanced batteries, plug-in hybrid vehicle technologies, next-generation biofuels for the transportation sector, and a number of other innovations will be vital to achieving a low-carbon economy, and the United States must not only develop but deploy these technologies. The benefits of such innovation will accrue to other countries as well, for U.S. technical assistance programs and trade will carry these advances abroad.

#### Competitiveness is vital to U.S. hegemony and the economy.

Segal, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, ‘4

[Adam, Foreign Affairs, "Is America Losing Its Edge?" November / December 2004, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html>, RSR]

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

#### Loss of heg results in extinction.

Barnett 11 (Thomas, Professor, Warfare Analysis and Research Dept – U.S. Naval War College, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7, 2011, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job.  It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II.  Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.  But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.

### No War

#### Seriously, there will be wars: economics, security dilemma, nationalism

Mearsheimer, Distinguished Professor of Political Science, 1999.

(John Mearsheimer, “Is Major War Obsolete?” 1999, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/index.html)

A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that.  What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers.  Second reason: There is no question that in the twentieth century, certainly with nuclear weapons but even before nuclear weapons, the costs of going to war are very high. But that doesn’t mean that war is ruled out. The presence of nuclear weapons alone does not make war obsolescent. I will remind you that from 1945 to 1990, we lived in a world where there were thousands of nuclear weapons on both sides, and there was nobody running around saying, “ War is obsolescent.” So you can’t make the argument that the mere presence of nuclear weapons creates peace. India and Pakistan are both going down the nuclear road. You don’t hear many people running around saying, “ That’s going to produce peace.” And, furthermore, if you believe nuclear weapons were a great cause of peace, you ought to be in favor of nuclear proliferation. What we need is everybody to have a nuclear weapon in their back pocket. You don’t hear many people saying that’s going to produce peace, do you?

#### Institutions have positive effects, but they’re not strong enough to restrain war

Jervis, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics, Columbia University, 2002

(Robert, “Theories of War in an Era of Leading Power Peace”. American Political Science Review 96:1–14.)

International Organizations. Even those who argue for the pacifying effect of common memberships in international organizations aver that the magnitude of this effect is relatively slight, at least in the short run (Russett and Oneal 2001, Chap. 5), and so my discussion is brief. The causal mechanisms are believed to be several: enhanced information flows, greater ability to solve problems peacefully, an increased stake in cooperative behavior linked to the risk of being ex- cluded from the organization if the state behaves badly, and possibly a heightened sense of common identity (Keohane 1984; much of the literature is summarized by Martin and Simmons 1998). Harder to pin down but perhaps most important are processes by which joint membership alters states' conceptions of their interest, leading them to see it not only as calling for cooperative reciprocations, but also as extending over a longer time- horizon and including benefits to others (Jervis 1999, 2001; March and Olsen 1998). The obvious reasons to doubt the importance of shared institutional membership are that the incentives do not seem great enough to tame strong conflicts of interest and that membership may be endogenous to common interests and peaceful relations. States that expect war with each other are less likely to join the same international organizations and political conflicts that are the precursors to war may destroy the institutions or drive some members out, as Japan and Germany withdrew from the League of Nations during the 1930s. Even with a strong correlation and reasonable con- trol variables, the direction of causality is difficult to establish.

#### Nuclear war would create a dust-induced winter that causes extinction

Phillips, PhD, Physics, Cambridge, 2000

(Alan, , Nuclear Winter Revisited, Oct, www.peace.ca/nuclearwinterrevisited.htm)

Altogether, nuclear winter would be an ecological disaster of the same sort of magnitude as the major extinctions of species that  have occurred in the past, the most famous one being 65 million years ago at the cretaceous extinction.  Of all the species living at the time, about half became extinct.  The theory is that a large meteor made a great crater in the Gulf of California, putting a trillion tons of rock debris into the atmosphere.  That is a thousand times as much rock as is predicted for a nuclear war, but the soot from fires blocks sunlight more effectively than rock debris.  In nuclear winter there would also be radioactive contamination giving worldwide background radiation doses many times larger than has ever happened during the 3 billion years of evolution.  The radiation would notably worsen things for existing species, though it might, by increasing mutations, allow quicker evolution of new species (perhaps mainly insects and grasses) that could tolerate the post-war conditions.  (I should just mention that there is no way the radioactivity from a nuclear war could destroy "all life on earth".  People must stop saying that.  There will be plenty of evolution after a war, but it may not include us.)

#### Energy competition increases the risk of major power escalation

Klare, A professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2008

(Michael T.,"The End of the World as You Know It,", http://zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/17176)

Until very recently, the mature industrial powers of Europe, Asia, and North America consumed the lion's share of energy and left the dregs for the developing world. As recently as 1990, the members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the club of the world's richest nations, consumed approximately 57% of world energy; the Soviet Union/Warsaw Pact bloc, 14% percent; and only 29% was left to the developing world. But that ratio is changing: With strong economic growth in the developing countries, a greater proportion of the world's energy is being consumed by them. By 2010, the developing world's share of energy use is expected to reach 40% and, if current trends persist, 47% by 2030. China plays a critical role in all this. The Chinese alone are projected to consume 17% of world energy by 2015, and 20% by 2025 -- by which time, if trend lines continue, it will have overtaken the United States as the world's leading energy consumer. India, which, in 2004, accounted for 3.4% of world energy use, is projected to reach 4.4% percent by 2025, while consumption in other rapidly industrializing nations like Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey is expected to grow as well.**These rising economic dynamos will have to compete with the mature economic powers for access to remaining untapped reserves of exportable energy** -- in many cases, bought up long ago by the private energy firms of the mature powers like Exxon Mobil, Chevron, BP, Total of France, and Royal Dutch Shell. Of necessity, the new contenders have developed a potent strategy for competing with the Western "majors": they've created state-owned companies of their own and fashioned strategic alliances with the national oil companies that now control oil and gas reserves in many of the major energy-producing nations.

#### War does pay – industrial capacity, raw materials, security

Mearsheimer, Distinguished Professor of Political Science, 1999.

(John Mearsheimer, “Is Major War Obsolete?” 1999, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/index.html)

Let me make three quick points on that. One is, there’s a book by Peter Liberman, who actually teaches at Queens College, called Does Conquest Pay? which addresses this issue. And it shows very nicely that even though we live in the post-industrial age, conquest does pay, and that you can extract resources when you conquer countries in the modern age. Second point is, even if you don’t buy that argument, you can still make the raw-materials argument, which is the one that I went to because it’s the easier argument to make, involving things like the South China Sea and oil in the Persian Gulf. And my third and final point would be, even if you take the economic arguments off the table-let’s say that they just don’t hold any water-the security arguments remain alive and well. We knocked the Soviet Union down the toilet bowl during the Cold War. It produced no economic benefits for us, but what it did was it eliminated our principal competitor, which, from a realist’s perspective, is a wonderful thing. And I think most people in the audience think it was a wonderful thing. It had no economic benefits, but it had significant strategic benefits, because we wanted no peer competitors in the world because that’s the way we like it.

#### Nuclear weapons can’t build a security community

Jervis, Professor of International Politics, Columbia University, 02

 (Adlai E. Stevenson , Theories of War in an Era of Leading Power Peace”, American Political Science Review 96:1–14)

While there is a great deal to this argument, it is not without its problems. First, because this kind of deterrence rests on the perceived possibility of war, it may explain peace, but not a security community. Second, mutual deterrence can be used as a platform for hostility, coercion, and even limited wars. In what Glenn Snyder (1965; also see Jervis 1989, 19–23, 74–106) calls the stability–instability paradox, the common realization that all-out war would be irrational provides a license for threats and lower levels of violence. In some circumstances a state could use the shared fear of nuclear war to exploit others. If the state thinks that the other is preoccupied with the possibility of war and does not anticipate that the state will make the concessions needed to reduce this danger, it will expect the other to retreat and so can stand firm. In other words, the fact that war would be the worst possible outcome for both sides does not automatically lead to uncoerced peace, let alone to a security community

#### Deterrence theories rely on false assumptions of state rationality—Organizations are constrained by conflicting interests and calculation uncertainties

Clark, director of the national security studies program at California State University, 1997

(Mark T., “Deterrence in the Second Nuclear Age-book reviews: Neorealism versus Organizational Theory,” http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0365/is\_n1\_v41/ai\_19238111)

Perhaps even more important is Sagan's critique of Waltz's assumptions about rational deterrence logic. By using organizational theory, Sagan demonstrates problems with all three of the assumptions necessary for rational deterrence theory to work: There must not be a preventive war during the transition period when both states do not have nuclear weapons. Both states must develop an assured destruction potential (however defined) and a secure retaliatory capability. Nuclear arsenals must not be prone to accidental or unauthorized use (p. 51). In each case, the neorealist assumption is shown to be in error.Pure rationality is not possible, argues Sagan, for at least a couple of reasons: "First, large organizations function within a severely 'bounded,' or limited, form of rationality: they have inherent limits on calculation and coordination and use simplifying mechanisms to understand and respond to uncertainty in the outside world." Because of that, organizations develop rules and procedures to assist in making decisions. Rather than search for the most "rational" decision, then, organizations more often take the first option that is minimally satisfying. "Second, complex organizations commonly have multiple, conflicting goals, and the process by which objectives are chosen and pursued is intensely political" (pp. 52-53). As a result, rather than being completely subordinated to higher authorities, many organizations compete for preeminence in the policy process, often defying authority for long periods of time.