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### 2NC REM Impact – Toxicity

#### Rare earth minerals produce massive toxic waste and environmental destruction – increased demand motivates poor environmental accounting and encourages global ecological violence for short-term profit

Ives 13

(Mike, writer based in Hanoi, Vietnam whose work has appeared in the Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, Smithsonian Online, and other publications. In Vietnam he reports for the Associated Press. In earlier articles for Yale Environment 360, he reported on efforts to reintroduce native tree species to Vietnam’s war-scarred landscape and how melting glaciers are exacerbating water shortages in northwestern China, “Boom in Mining Rare Earths Poses Mounting Toxic Risks”, January 28, 2013, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/boom\_in\_mining\_rare\_earths\_poses\_mounting\_toxic\_risks/2614/)

All of these projects, however, must come to grips with the toxic and radioactive legacy of rare earth mining. Scientists say under-regulated rare earths projects can produce wastewater and tailings ponds that leak acids, heavy metals and radioactive elements into groundwater, and they point out that market pressures for cheap and reliable rare earths may lead project managers to skimp on environmental protections. In Malaysia, Mitsubishi Chemical is now engaged in a $100 million cleanup of its Bukit Merah rare earths processing site, which it closed in 1992 amid opposition from local residents and Japanese politicians and environmentalists. It is one of Asia’s largest radioactive waste cleanup sites, and local physicians said the thorium contamination from the plant has led to an increase in leukemia and other ailments. The legacy of that project has led many Malaysians to be wary of rare earths mines. Few independent studies chart the industry’s global ecological fallout. But no country has as many rare earths processing plants, and their attendant environmental problems, as China. Last year, China’s State Council reported that the country’s rare earths operations are causing “increasingly significant” environmental problems. A half century of rare earths mining and processing has “severely damaged surface vegetation, caused soil erosion, pollution, and acidification, and reduced or even eliminated food crop output,” the council reported, adding that Chinese rare earths plants typically produce wastewater with a “high concentration” of radioactive residues. Bayan-Obo, China’s largest rare earths project, has been operating for more than four decades. According to the Germany-based Institute for Applied Ecology, the site now has an 11-square-kilometer waste pond — about three times the size of New York City’s Central Park — with toxic sludge that contains elevated concentrations of thorium. China’s lax environmental standards have enabled it to produce rare earths at roughly a third the price of its international competitors, according to a 2010 report on the country’s rare earths industry by the Washington-based Institute for the Analysis of Global Security. The report noted that China “has never actually worked out pollutant discharge standards for the rare earth industry.” Like nuclear power plants, rare earths projects require strict independent auditing in order to prevent environmental damage, according to Peter Karamoskos, a nuclear radiologist and the public’s representative at Australia’s Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency. But as the rare earths industry expands to developing countries like Malaysia and Vietnam, such oversight will be unlikely. “A regulator will either be in the pocket of the industry or a government,” he says. According to Gavin Mudd, an environmental engineer at Australia’s Monash University, rare earths mining provides a wide range of economic and social benefits and can be exploited in a responsible way. However, he says no company — including Mitsubishi and Lynas — has managed to set a good example. Mudd says Lynas decided to process its rare earths in Malaysia rather than Australia, where they are mined, because it received tax incentives. But he says that Lynas hasn’t meaningfully engaged Malaysian communities to hear their concerns. A key problem with the company’s proposals, he adds, is that it never took a baseline sample of the environment before it began operations, making it difficult to gauge the future environmental impacts. “Their approach to solid waste management has been very haphazard,” says Mudd, who has offered unpaid advice to both the company and the activists who oppose its plans.

#### Toxification causes extinction

Ehrlich & Ehrlich 13

(Paul, Professor of Biology and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology, Sydney, Anne, Senior Research Scientist in Biology at Stanford, “Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?”, January 9, 2013, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Biological Sciences*)

Another possible threat to the continuation of civilization is global toxification. Adverse symptoms of exposure to synthetic chemicals are making some scientists increasingly nervous about effects on the human population [77–79]. Should a global threat materialize, however, no planned mitigating responses (analogous to the ecologically and politically risky ‘geoengineering’ projects often proposed to ameliorate climate disruption [80]) are waiting in the wings ready for deployment.

### AT: Plan Reduces Consumption

#### **The rebound effect means that technological gains in efficiency ultimately cause more consumption – renewables don’t displace fossil fuels but in fact supplement them**

Foster et al 10

(John Bellamy, prof of sociology @ U of Oregon, Brett Clark, asst prof of sociology @ NC-State, Richard York, associate prof of sociology @ U of Oregon, The Ecological Rift, pgs. 183-191)

Eco-Efficiency of National Economies Stephen Bunker, an environmental sociologist, found that over a long stretch of recent history, the world economy as a whole showed substantial improvements in resource efficiency (economic output per unit of natural resource), but that the total resource consumption of the global economy continually escalated. Similarly, recent research has shown that at the national level, high levels of affluence are, counter intuitively, associated with both greater eco-efficiency—GDP output per unit of ecological footprint—of the economy as a whole and with a higher per capita ecological footprint, suggesting that empirical conditions characteristic of the Jevons Paradox often may be applicable to the generalized aggregate level. Indeed, this type of pattern appears to be quite common. Statistical analyses using elasticity models of the effect of economic development (GDP per capita) on environmental impacts, such as carbon dioxide emissions, have shed light on the relationship between efficiency and total environmental impact. With such a model, an elasticity coefficient for GDP per capita (which indicates the percentage increase in the environmental impact of nations for a 1 percent increase in GDP per capita) of between 0 and 1 (indicating a positive inelastic relationship) implies a condition where the aggregate eco-efficiency of the economy improves with development but the expansion of the economy exceeds improvements in efficiency, leading to a net increase in environmental impact. This type of research does not establish a causal link between efficiency and total environmental impact or resource consumption, but it does empirically demonstrate that an association between rising efficiency and rising environmental impacts may be common, at least at the national level. These findings also suggest that improving eco-efficiency in a nation is not necessarily, or even typically, indicative of a decline in resource consumption. Fuel Efficiency of Automobiles The fuel efficiency of automobiles is obviously an issue of substantial importance, since motor vehicles consume a large share of the world’s oil. It would seem reasonable to expect that improvements in the efficiency of engines and refinements in the aerodynamics of automobiles would help to curb motor fuel consumption. However, and examination of recent trends in the fuel consumption of motor vehicles suggests a paradoxical situation where improvements in efficiency are associated with increases in fuel consumption. For example, in the United States an examination of a reasonable indicator of fuel efficiency of automobiles stemming from overall engineering techniques, pound-miles per gallon (or kilogram-kilometers per liter) of fuel, supports the contention that the efficiency of the light-duty fleet (which includes passenger cars and light trucks) improved substantially between 1984 and 2001, whereas the total and average fuel consumption of the fleet *increased*. For the purposes of calculating CAFE (corporate average fuel economy) performance of the nation’s automobile fleet, the light-duty fleet is divided into two categories, passenger cars and light trucks (which includes sports utility vehicles), each of which has a different legally enforced CAFE standard. In 1984 the total light-truck fleet CAFÉ miles per gallon (MPG) was 20.6 (~8.8 kilometers per liter; KPL) and the average equivalent test weight was 3,804 pounds (~1,725 kilograms), indicating that the average pound-miles per gallon was 78,362 (20.6 x 3,804) (~15,100 kilogram-KPL). By 2001, the total light truck fleet CAFÉ MPG had improved slightly to 21.0 (~8.9 KPL), while the average vehicle weight had increased substantially, to 4,501 pounds (~2,040 kilograms). Therefore the pound-miles per gallon had increased to 94,521 (21.0 x 4,501) (~18,200 kilogram-KPL), a 20.6 percent improvement in efficiency from 1984. A similar trend happened in passenger cars over this same period . In 1984 the total passenger car fleet CAFÉ was 29.6 MPG (~11.4 KPL) and the average equivalent test weight was 3,170 pounds (~1,440 kilograms), indicating that the pound-miles per gallon was 85,273 (26.9 x 3,170)(~16,400 kilogram-KPL). By 2001, the total passenger car fleet CAFÉ MPG had improved to 28.7 (~12.2 KPL) while the average vehicle weight had increased to 3,446 pounds (~1,560 kilograms), making the average fleet pound-miles per gallon 98,900 (28.7 x 2,446) (~19,070 kilogram-KPL)—a 16 percent improvement since 1984. Clearly engineering advances had substantially improved the efficiency of both light trucks and passenger cars in terms of pound-MPG (or kilogram-KPL) between 1984 and 2001. The observation of this fact in isolation might lead tone to expect that these improvements in efficiency were associated with a reduction in the fuel consumption of the total light-duty fleet. However, this is not what happened. Over this period, light; trucks, which on average are heavier and consume more fuel than passenger cars, grew from 24.4 percent of the light truck duty fleet to 46.6 percent. Because of this shift in composition, the CAFÉ MPG for the combined light-duty fleet declined from 25.0 to 24.5 (~10.6 to ~10.4 KPL), a 2 percent decrease. Clearly, engineering advances had improved the efficiency of engines and other aspects of automobiles, but this did not lead to a less-fuel thirsty fleet since the size of vehicles increased substantially, particularly due to a shift from passenger cars to light trucks among a large segment of drivers. It is worth noting that even if the total fleet MPG had improved, a reduction in fuel consumption would have been unlikely to follow, since over this period the distance traveled by drivers per year increased from little more than 15,000 km (~9,300 miles) per car, on average, to over 19,000 km (~11,800 miles). And, finally, an increase in the number of drivers and cars on the road drove up fuel consumption even further. For example, between 1990 and 1999, the number of motor vehicles in the United States increased from 189 million to 217 million due to both population growth and a 2.8 percent increase in the number of motor vehicles per 1,000 people (from 758 to 779). It appears that technological advances that improved the engineering of cars were in large part implemented, at least in the United States, in expanding the size of vehicles, rather than reducing the fuel the average vehicle consumed. The causal explanations for this are likely complex, but the fact that, despite engineering improvements, the U.S. light-duty fleet increased its total and average fuel consumption over the past two decades does suggest that technological refinements are unlikely in and of themselves to lead to the conservation of natural resources. Furthermore, it is possible that improvements in efficiency may actually contribute to the expansion of resource consumption, since it is at least plausible that success at improving the MPG/KPL of a nation’s automobile fleet may encourage drivers to travel more frequently by car, due to the reduction in fuel consumption per mile/kilometer—a situation directly analogous to the one Jevons observed regarding coal use by industry. The Paperless Office Paradox Paper is typically made from wood fiber, so paper consumption puts substantial pressure on the world’s forest ecosystems. It would seem on the face of it that the rise of the computer and the capacity for the storage of documents in electronic form would lead to a decline in paper consumption, and eventually, the emergence of the “paperless office”—which would be decidedly good news for forests. This, however, has not been the case, as Abigail J. Sellen and Richard H.R. Harper clearly document in their aptly titled book *The Myth of the Paperless Office*. Contrary to the expectations of some, computers, email, and the World Wide Web are associated with an increase in paper consumption. For example consumption of the most common type of office paper (uncoated free-sheet) increased by 14.7 percent in the United States between the years 1995 and 2000, embarrassing those who predicted the emergence of the paperless office. Sellen and Harper also point to research indicating that “the introduction of e-mail into an organization caused, on average, a 40% increase in paper consumption.” This observation suggests that there may be a direct causal link between the rise of electronic mediums of data storage and paper consumption, although further research is necessary to firmly establish the validity of this causal link. The failure of computers and electronic storage mediums to bring about the paperless office points to an interesting paradox, which we label the Paperless Office Paradox: the development of a substitute for a natural resource is sometimes associated with an increase in consumption of that resource. This paradox has potentially profound implications for efforts to conserve natural resources. One prominent method advocated for reducing consumption of a particular resource is to develop substitutes for it. For example, the development of renewable energy resources, such as wind and solar power, are commonly identified as a way to reduce dependence on fossil fuel, based on the assumption that the development of alternative sources of energy will displace, at least to some extent, fossil fuel consumption. However, just as the Jevons Paradox points to the fact that efficiency not lead to a reduction in resource consumption, the Paperless Office Paradox points to the fact that the development of substitutes may not lead to a reduction in resource consumption. The reasons that computers led to a rise in paper consumption are not particularly surprising. Although computers allow for the electronic storage of documents, they also allow for ready access to innumerable documents that can be easily printed using increasingly ubiquitous printers, which explains in large part the reason for escalating office paper consumption. Due to the particularistic reasons for the association between electronic storage mediums and paper consumption, the Paperless Office Paradox may not represent a generality about the development of substitutes and resource consumption. However, this paradox does emphasize the point that one should *not* assume that the development of substitutes for a natural resource will lead to a reduction in consumption of that resource. For example, over the past two centuries we have seen the rise of fossil fuel technologies and the development of nuclear power, so that whereas in the eighteenth century biomass was the principal source of energy in the world, biomass now only provides a small proportion of global energy production. However, it is worth noting that even though substitutes for biomass—such as fossil fuel and nuclear power—have expanded dramatically, the absolute quantity of biomass consumed for energy in the world has *increased* since the nineteenth century. This is likely due, at least in part, to the fact that new energy sources fostered economic and population growth, which in turn expanded the demand for energy sources of all types, including biomass. This observation raises the prospect that the expansion of renewable energy production technologies, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, may not displace fossil fuel or other energy sources, but merely add a new source on top of them, and potentially foster conditions that expand the demand for energy. Clearly, further theoretical development and empirical research aimed at assessing the extent to which substitutes actually lead to reductions in resource consumption is called for, and faith that technological developments will solve our natural resource challenges should at least be called into question. Coda Here, we have drawn attention to two ecological paradoxes in economics, the Jevons Paradox and the Paperless Office Paradox. The Jevons Paradox is a classical one, based on the Jevons observation that rising efficiency in the utilization of coal led to an escalation of coal consumption. We presented two examples, which suggest that the Jevons Paradox may have general applicability to a variety of circumstances. The Paperless Office Paradox is a new one, and draws attention to the fact that the development of computers and electronic storage mediums has not led to a decline in paper consumption, as some predicted, but rather to more paper consumption. It is important to note that these are empirically established paradoxes—they point to the correlation between efficiency or substitutes and resource consumption. Each paradox may actually house phenomenon that have a diversity of theoretical explanations. Therefore, underlying these two paradoxes may be many forces that need to be theorized. Together, these paradoxes suggest that improvements in the efficiency of use of a natural resource may not lead to reductions in consumption of that resource—in some circumstances they may even lead to an escalation of consumption of that resource. Although improvements in efficiency and utilization of substitutes will reduce consumption of a resource *all else being equal* (if the scale of production remains constant), economies are complex and dynamic systems with innumerable interactions among factors. Changes in the type and efficiency of resource utilization will likely influence many other conditions, thus ensuring that all else will rarely be equal. Relying on technological advances alone to solve our environmental problems may have disastrous consequences. The two paradoxes we present here suggest that social and economic systems need to be modified if technological advances are to be translated into natural resource conservation.

### AT: Reduces Carbon

#### Their framing of global warming as a techno-fix blocks broader efforts to transform society’s relationship to the Earth, and displaces concern for other environmental issues – their depictions *actively produce* biodiversity loss, topsoil erosion, deforestation, and ocean acidification

Crist 7

(Eileen, has been teaching at Virginia Tech in the Department of Science and Technology in Society since 1997, where she is advisor for the undergraduate program Humanities, Science, and Environment, “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse”, *Telos*, 141 (Winter 2007): 29–55.)

While the dangers of climate change are real, I argue that there are even greater dangers in representing it as the most urgent problem we face. Framing climate change in such a manner deserves to be challenged for two reasons: it encourages the restriction of proposed solutions to the technical realm, by powerfully insinuating that the needed approaches are those that directly address the problem; and it detracts attention from the planet’s ecological predicament as a whole, by virtue of claiming the limelight for the one issue that trumps all others. Identifying climate change as the biggest threat to civilization, and ushering it into center stage as the highest priority problem, has bolstered the proliferation of technical proposals that address the specific challenge. The race is on for figuring out what technologies, or portfolio thereof, will solve “the problem.” Whether the call is for reviving nuclear power, boosting the installation of wind turbines, using a variety of renewable energy sources, increasing the efficiency of fossil-fuel use, developing carbon-sequestering technologies, or placing mirrors in space to deflect the sun’s rays, the narrow character of such proposals is evident: confront the problem of greenhouse gas emissions by technologically phasing them out, superseding them, capturing them, or mitigating their heating effects. In his The Revenge of Gaia, for example, Lovelock briefly mentions the need to face climate change by “changing our whole style of living.”16 But the thrust of this work, what readers and policy-makers come away with, is his repeated and strident call for investing in nuclear energy as, in his words, “the one lifeline we can use immediately.”17 In the policy realm, the first step toward the technological fix for global warming is often identified with implementing the Kyoto protocol. Biologist Tim Flannery agitates for the treaty, comparing the need for its successful endorsement to that of the Montreal protocol that phased out the ozone-depleting CFCs. “The Montreal protocol,” he submits, “marks a signal moment in human societal development, representing the first ever victory by humanity over a global pollution problem.”18 He hopes for a similar victory for the global climate-change problem. Yet the deepening realization of the threat of climate change, virtually in the wake of stratospheric ozone depletion, also suggests that dealing with global problems treaty-by-treaty is no solution to the planet’s predicament. Just as the risks of unanticipated ozone depletion have been followed by the dangers of a long underappreciated climate crisis, so it would be naïve not to anticipate another (perhaps even entirely unforeseeable) catastrophe arising after the (hoped-for) resolution of the above two. Furthermore, if greenhouse gases were restricted successfully by means of technological shifts and innovations, the root cause of the ecological crisis as a whole would remain unaddressed. The destructive patterns of production, trade, extraction, land-use, waste proliferation, and consumption, coupled with population growth, would go unchallenged, continuing to run down the integrity, beauty, and biological richness of the Earth. Industrial-consumer civilization has entrenched a form of life that admits virtually no limits to its expansiveness within, and perceived entitlement to, the entire planet.19 But questioning this civilization is by and large sidestepped in climate-change discourse, with its single-minded quest for a global-warming techno-fix.20 Instead of confronting the forms of social organization that are causing the climate crisis—among numerous other catastrophes—climate-change literature often focuses on how global warming is endangering the culprit, and agonizes over what technological means can save it from impending tipping points.21 The dominant frame of climate change funnels cognitive and pragmatic work toward specifically addressing global warming, while muting a host of equally monumental issues. Climate change looms so huge on the environmental and political agenda today that it has contributed to downplaying other facets of the ecological crisis: mass extinction of species, the devastation of the oceans by industrial fishing, continued old-growth deforestation, topsoil losses and desertification, endocrine disruption, incessant development, and so on, are made to appear secondary and more forgiving by comparison with “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. In what follows, I will focus specifically on how climate-change discourse encourages the continued marginalization of the biodiversity crisis—a crisis that has been soberly described as a holocaust,22 and which despite decades of scientific and environmentalist pleas remains a virtual non-topic in society, the mass media, and humanistic and other academic literatures. Several works on climate change (though by no means all) extensively examine the consequences of global warming for biodiversity, 23 but rarely is it mentioned that biodepletion predates dangerous greenhouse-gas buildup by decades, centuries, or longer, and will not be stopped by a technological resolution of global warming. Climate change is poised to exacerbate species and ecosystem losses—indeed, is doing so already. But while technologically preempting the worst of climate change may temporarily avert some of those losses, such a resolution of the climate quandary will not put an end to—will barely address—the ongoing destruction of life on Earth.

### AT: Makes Inequality Worse

#### **You should use this debate to endorse voluntary simplicity as a new practice of the self – this asks individuals to embrace the principle that less is more and encourages creative use of existing resources, rather than expansion of the resource base as a whole**

#### **This requires a prior, epistemological shift in how you calculate impacts and alt solvency – first, you should not ask what others are “likely to do” – obsessive externalization of environmental ethics onto others is the medium for overconsumption, because it produces a lack of responsibility for our everyday economic practices since others will “do it anyway”**

#### **If you believe the affirmative replicates overconsumption than you should vote negative to refuse it, regardless of the likelihood of transition – only this approach to formation of subjectivity can cope with the imminent threat of extinction posed by multiple, interlocking systems of ecological destruction**

#### **Secondly – you should use a longer time horizon to calculate impacts – there is a historical bias toward privileging shorter horizons that we have to consciously correct for humanity to survive**

* This is alt solvency – can use this debate to encourage people to think differently which is a starting point to solving these problems
	+ Simultaneously saying doing what we’re saying will help people transform themselves and we should do it within this debate – the function within the debate is to focus on structural impacts, be suspicious about arguments that rely on other people’s behavior
	+ Teaches the k how to use your framework to judge the particular debate you’re in and the process that you’re asking the judge to carry out is a performance of the alternative
	+ “our process of engaging in a new evaluative criterion is itself a performance of cultural change away from the way we see things now” – a problem and its solution only exist in respect to its framework of evaluation

Ehrlich & Ehrlich 13

(Paul, Professor of Biology and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology, Sydney, Anne, Senior Research Scientist in Biology at Stanford, “Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?”, January 9, 2013, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Biological Sciences*)

Until very recently, our ancestors had no reason to respond genetically or culturally to long-term issues. If the global climate were changing rapidly for Australopithecus or even ancient Romans, then they were not causing it and could do nothing about it. The forces of genetic and cultural selection were not creating brains or institutions capable of looking generations ahead; there would have been no selection pressures in that direction. Indeed, quite the opposite, selection probably favoured mechanisms to keep perception of the environmental background steady so that rapid changes (e.g. leopard approaching) would be obvious [132, pp. 135–136]. But now slow changes in that background are the most lethal threats. Societies have a long history of mobilizing efforts, making sacrifices and changes, to defeat an enemy at the gates, or even just to compete more successfully with a rival. But there is not much evidence of societies mobilizing and making sacrifices to meet gradually worsening conditions that threaten real disaster for future generations. Yet that is exactly the sort of mobilization that we believe is required to avoid a collapse. Perhaps the biggest challenge in avoiding collapse is convincing people, especially politicians and economists, to break this ancient mould and alter their behaviour relative to the basic population-consumption drivers of environmental deterioration. We know that simply informing people of the scientific consensus on a serious problem does not ordinarily produce rapid changes in institutional or individual behaviour. That was amply demonstrated in the case of cigarettes [68], air pollution and other environmental problems [69] and is now being demonstrated in the obesity epidemic [133] as well as climate disruption. Obvious parallels exist regarding reproduction and overconsumption, which are especially visible in what amounts to a cultural addiction to continued economic growth among the already well-off [134]. One might think that the mathematics of compound interest would have convinced everyone long ago that growth of an industrialized economy at 3.5 per cent annually cannot long continue. Unfortunately, most ‘educated’ people are immersed in a culture that does not recognize that, in the real world, a short history (a few centuries) of exponential growth does not imply a long future of such growth. Besides focusing their research on ways to avoid collapse, there is a need for natural scientists to collaborate with social scientists, especially those who study the dynamics of social movements. Such collaborations could develop ways to stimulate a significant increase in popular support for decisive and immediate action on the predicament. Unfortunately, awareness among scientists that humanity is in deep trouble has not been accompanied by popular awareness and pressure to counter the political and economic influences implicated in the current crisis. Without significant pressure from the public demanding action, we fear there is little chance of changing course fast enough to forestall disaster. The needed pressure, however, might be generated by a popular movement based in academia and civil society to help guide humanity towards developing a new multiple intelligence [135], ‘foresight intelligence’ to provide the long-term analysis and planning that markets cannot supply. Foresight intelligence could not only systematically look ahead but also guide cultural changes towards desirable outcomes such as increased socio-economic resilience. Helping develop such a movement and foresight intelligence are major challenges facing scientists today, a cutting edge for research that must slice fast if the chances of averting a collapse are to be improved. If foresight intelligence became established, many more scientists and policy planners (and society) might, for example, understand the demographic contributions to the predicament [136], stop treating population growth as a ‘given’ and consider the nutritional, health and social benefits of humanely ending growth well below nine billion and starting a slow decline. This would be a monumental task, considering the momentum of population growth. Monumental, but not impossible if the political will could be generated globally to give full rights, education and opportunities to women, and provide all sexually active human beings with modern contraception and backup abortion. The degree to which those steps would reduce fertility rates is controversial [137–139], but they are a likely win-win for societies [140]. Obviously, especially with the growing endarkenment, there are huge cultural and institutional barriers to establishing such policies in some parts of the world. After all, there is not a single nation where women are truly treated as equal to men. Despite that, the population driver should not be ignored simply because limiting overconsumption can, at least in theory, be achieved more rapidly. The difficulties of changing demographic trajectories mean that the problem should have been addressed sooner, rather than later. That halting population growth inevitably leads to changes in age structure is no excuse for bemoaning drops in fertility rates, as is common in European government circles [141]. Reduction of population size in those over-consuming nations is a very positive trend, and sensible planning can deal with the problems of population aging [142]. While rapid policy change to head off collapse is essential, fundamental institutional change to keep things on track is necessary as well. This is especially true of educational systems, which today fail to inform most people of how the world works and thus perpetuate a vast culture gap [54]. The academic challenge is especially great for economists, who could help set the background for avoiding collapse by designing steady-state economic systems [107,134,143], and along the way destroying fables such as ‘growth can continue forever if it's in service industries’, or ‘technological innovation will save us’. Issues such as the importance of comparative advantage under current global circumstances [144], the development of new models that better reflect the irrational behaviour of individuals and groups [145], reduction of the worship of ‘free’ markets that infests the discipline, and tasks such as making information more symmetrical, moving towards sustainability and enhancing equity (including redistribution) all require re-examination. In that re-examination, they would be following the lead of distinguished economists [146–148] in dealing with the real world of biophysical constraints and human well-being. At the global level, the loose network of agreements that now tie countries together [149,150], developed in a relatively recent stage of cultural evolution since modern nation states appeared, is utterly inadequate to grapple with the human predicament. Strengthening global environmental governance [151] and addressing the related problem of avoiding failed statehood [152] are tasks humanity has so far refused to tackle comprehensively even as cultural evolution in technology has rendered the present international system (as it has educational systems) obsolete. Serious global environmental problems can only be solved and a collapse avoided with an unprecedented level of international cooperation [122]. Regardless of one's estimate of civilization's potential longevity, the time to start restructuring the international system is right now. If people do not do that, nature will restructure civilization for us. Similarly, widely based cultural change is required to reduce humanely both population size and overconsumption by the rich. Both go against cultural norms, and, as long feared [153], the overconsumption norm has understandably been adopted by the increasingly rich subpopulations of developing nations, notably India and China. One can be thrilled by the numbers of people raised from poverty while being apprehensive about the enormous and possibly lethal environmental and social costs that may eventually result [154,155]. The industrial revolution set civilization on the road to collapse, spurring population growth, which contributed slightly more than overconsumption to environmental degradation [136]. Now population combined with affluence growth may finish the job. Needless to say, dealing with economic and racial inequities will be critically important in getting large numbers of people from culturally diverse groups [156] to focus their minds on solving the human predicament, something globalization should help [157]. These tasks will be pursued, along with an emphasis on developing ‘foresight intelligence’, by the nascent Millennium Alliance for Humanity and the Biosphere (the MAHB; http://mahb.stanford.edu). One of its central goals is to try to accelerate change towards sustainability. Since simply giving the scientific facts to the public will not do it, among other things, this means finding frames and narratives to convince the public of the need to make changes. We know that societies can evolve fundamentally and unexpectedly [158, p. 334], as was dramatically demonstrated by the collapse of communist regimes in Europe in 1989 [159]. Rather than tinkering around the edges and making feeble or empty gestures towards one or another of the interdependent problems we face, we need a powerful and comprehensive approach. In addressing climate change, for instance, developing nations need to be convinced that they (along with the rest of the world) cannot afford (and do not need) to delay action while they ‘catch up’ in development. Indeed, development on the old model is counterproductive; they have a great opportunity to pioneer new approaches and technologies. All nations need to stop waiting for others to act and be willing to do everything they can to mitigate emissions and hasten the energy transition, regardless of what others are doing. With climate and many other global environmental problems, polycentric solutions may be more readily found than global ones. Complex, multi-level systems may be better able to cope with complex, multi-level problems [160], and institutional change is required at many levels in many polities. What scientists understand about cultural evolution suggests that, while improbable, it may be possible to move cultures in such directions [161,162]. Whether solutions will be global or polycentric, international negotiations will be needed, existing international agencies that deal with them will need strengthening, and new institutions will need to be formed.

## CCS DA

### NG Prices Rising

#### Increasing demand driving up natural gas prices

Weber, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin, 12

(May, THE LOOMING NATURAL GAS TRANSITION IN THE UNITED STATES, [www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf](http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf))

While natural gas is enjoying a period of relatively stable and low prices at the time of this writing in 2012, there are several prospects that might put upward pressure on the long-term prices. These key drivers are: 1) increasing demand, and 2) re-coupling with global markets. As discussed above, there are several key forcing functions for higher demand. Namely, because natural gas is relatively cleaner, less carbon-intensive, and less water-intensive than coal, it might continue its trend of taking away market share from coal in the power sector to meet increasingly stringent environmental standards. While this trend is primarily driven by environmental constraints, its effect will be amplified as long as natural gas prices remain low. While fuel-switching in the power sector will likely have the biggest overall impact on new natural gas demand, the same environmental and economic drivers might also induce fuel-switching in the transportation sector (from diesel to natural gas), and residential and commercial sectors (from fuel oil to natural gas for boilers, and from electric heating to natural gas heating). If cumulative demand increases significantly from these different factors, but supply does not grow in a commensurate fashion, then prices will move upwards.The other factor is the potential for re-coupling U.S. and global gas markets. While they are mostly empty today, many LNG import terminals are seeking to reverse their orientation, with an expectation that they will be ready for export beginning in 2014. Once they are able to export gas to EU and Japanese markets, then domestic gas producers will have additional markets for their product. If those external markets maintain their much higher prevailing prices (similar to what is illustrated in Figure 5), re-coupling will push prices upwards.

### CCS Good – Warming

#### Coal inevitable internationally – just a question of transition to CCS

LA Times 2012 (July 27, “Dirty but essential -- that's coal” <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jul/27/opinion/la-oe-adv-bryce-coal-epa-climate-20120727>)

But the EPA and the Obama administration know their attack on coal is little more than a token gesture. The rest of the world will continue to burn coal, and lots of it. Reducing the use of coal in the U.S. may force Americans to pay higher prices for electricity, but it will have nearly no effect on climate change. There's no denying that coal has earned its reputation as a relatively dirty fuel. On one particularly nasty day in London in 1812, a combination of coal smoke and fog became so dense that, according to one report, "for the greater part of the day it was impossible to read or write at a window without artificial light." About 200 years later, the New York Times reported that in Datong, China, known as the City of Coal, the air pollution on some winter days is so bad that "even during the daytime, people drive with their lights on." Air pollution is only part of the coal industry's toll. It damages the Earth's surface with strip mines, mountaintop removal and ash ponds at power plants. In addition, thousands of workers die each year in coal mines. But U.S. policymakers are mostly focused on carbon dioxide. The proposed EPA rule would cap the amount of CO2 that new fossil-fuel electricity generation units could emit at 1,000 pounds per megawatt-hour. Absent "carbon capture and storage," a process that isn't commercially viable, that standard will rule out coal-fired units, which emit about 1,800 pounds of CO2 per megawatt-hour. (Natural gas units emit about 800 pounds per megawatt-hour.) Prohibiting new coal-fired power plants may please President Obama's domestic supporters, but it would leave global coal demand and CO2 emissions almost unchanged. Indeed, over the last decade, even if CO2 emissions in the U.S. had fallen to zero, global emissions still would have increased. Consider Vietnam, where electricity use increased by 227% from 2001 to 2010. Its coal demand jumped by 175% during the same period, and it had the world's fastest percentage growth in CO2 emissions. Meanwhile, China has about 650,000 megawatts of coal-fired electricity generation capacity (more than twice the capacity in the U.S.), and it plans to build an additional 273,000 megawatts of coal-fired capacity. Those numbers help explain this fact: Over the last decade, global coal consumption has increased by more than the growth in oil, natural gas and hydro and nuclear power combined. We needn't look only at developing countries to see the essential role of coal. After the disaster at Japan'sFukushima nuclear power plant, Germany is rushing to shutter its reactors. Although renewable-energy projects are the darling of European politicians, nearly 14,000 of the 36,000 megawatts of new electricity generation capacity that will be built in Germany over the next few years probably will be coal-fired facilities. Coal is helping meet the world's electricity demands for a simple reason: It's cheap, thanks to the fact that deposits are abundant, widely dispersed, easily mined and not controlled by any OPEC-like cartels. According to theU.S. Department of Energy, from 1999 through 2010, coal cost about half as much per BTU as the next cheapest fuel, natural gas. And coal will continue to be a low-cost option. ExxonMobil predicts that in 2030, the cheapest form of electricity production will remain coal-fired generation units, with a total cost of about $0.06 per kilowatt-hour, less than the cost of electricity produced by natural gas, nuclear, wind or solar photovoltaic panels.

#### US CCS is key to mitigate warming – solves globally

Der 2010 - Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy @ U.S. Department of Energy Dr. Victor K. Der (Former Director of the Office of Clean Energy Systems where he directed large-scale demonstration programs, including the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program, the Power Plant Improvement Initiative, the Clean Coal Power Initiative, and FutureGen, a program for near-zero coal emissions. PhD in Mechanical Engineering from University of Maryland), “ARTICLE: CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE: AN OPTION FOR HELPING TO MEET GROWING GLOBAL ENERGY DEMAND WHILE COUNTERING CLIMATE CHANGE,” University of Richmond Law Review, March 2010, 44 U. Rich. L. Rev. 937

Top coal producing nations, including the United States, China, and India, hold domestic coal reserves so abundant that exploration for the resource appears neglected. [n12](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n12)These nations are also [\*939] vested in an often extensive, dependent infrastructure. [n13](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n13) Included in this infrastructure are coal-based generating plants with useful lives measured in decades, for which large investments have been made in response to long-term market signals. [n14](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n14) A combination of considerations, including the length of plant service, investment requirements, significant lead-times needed to build energy infrastructure and gain cost improvements, and coal's relative abundance as an energy resource, make it unlikely that any country currently depending on this default fuel option will completely replace its reliance in the short and intermediate term. [n16](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n16) Even nations earnestly striving to move to more efficient or greener technologies in response to long-range market trends will need time to do so. Additionally, an estimated 1.5 billion people or more currently live without electricity. If those nations create and utilize a fossil-fuel-powered grid [n18](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n18) without the prospect of a scalable means for capturing CO(2), the global atmospheric buildup of this GHG would be direly exacerbated. For the past several decades, the international research community, of which the U.S. Department of Energy's ("DOE") Office of Fossil Energy is an important part, has traveled a road of growing discovery regarding global climate change. During this period, policy and scientific debates about the role played by anthropogenic (i.e., human-induced) GHG emissions in warming the Earth's climate have continued. [n19](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n19) Meanwhile, researchers [\*940] have progressively built a body of knowledge based on experiments, observations, modeling, theory testing, the study of ancient ice cores, and examination of historical and current weather data. [n20](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n20) The consensus among the scientific community emanating from this gradual accumulation of evidence and analysis is that rising fossil fuel CO(2) emissions are contributing significantly to more extreme temperature swings and could permanently and adversely impact the Earth's climate. [n21](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n21) Complicating matters, the formidable challenge of reducing GHG emissions is coming at a time when significantly more energy will be needed to meet expected future demand, much of which will come from developing countries. [n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n22) While alternative sources of energy exist, short-and intermediate-term forecasts demonstrate there are barriers to global substitution, including expense, intermittency, adjustability, geographic concentration, and long development lead-times. [n23](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n23) The practical challenge facing the United States and other developed nations is how to continue to depend on coal as a primary electricity source while assuring this reliance is both economically and environmentally sustainable. Of equal importance in resolving this issue, however, is an associated philosophical challenge: in an increasingly carbon-constrained world, what workable solution can we provide for coal-producing and consuming nations, whose participation in the effort to resolve atmospheric CO(2) buildup is critical to success? Underlying all of these issues is the fact that climate change is a complex and challenging problem with many variables and no all-encompassing answer. As a result, many think developing a portfolio or range of options is the most suitable, potentially effective, and sustainable response. [n24](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n24) While energy efficiency improvements, increased use of renewables, and greater utilization [\*941] of nuclear power are important components of this portfolio, among the most promising potential solutions for countries reliant on large fossil fuel reserves is CO(2) capture and storage ("CCS"), also known as sequestration. [n25](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n25) This procedure can reduce CO(2) output from present stationary emitting sources and help avoid future atmospheric emissions. [n26](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n26) For a number of years, DOE has been at the forefront of domestic and international research and development ("R&D") efforts to actively pursue the capture and storage of CO(2) emissions from fossil fuel power and industrial plants. [n27](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n27) For example, over thirty years ago, DOE improved enhanced oil recovery ("EOR") with low temperature CO(2) flooding, as disclosed in the Comberiati patent application from 1979. [n28](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n28) Because of CCS research and other worldwide R&D initiatives, [n29](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n29) if there is a sufficient price placed on emitting CO(2) within the decade, CCS could transition from experimental and demonstration levels to global commercial deployment. While substantial progress has been made, CCS is at a critical stage of development: there are still several significant technical and non-technical hurdles [n30](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n30) that must be overcome before this transition can occur and the technology is firmly established as an effective option for reducing CO(2) emissions. Many of these challenges are being addressed directly and indirectly through both the DOE R&D program and international partnerships. Although significant and complex, none of these hurdles [\*942] appear insurmountable, [n31](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n31) yet failure to deal with them in a timely and effective fashion could delay - or even prevent - expedited and comprehensive CCS deployment. The atmosphere of international urgency for dealing with the climate change issue is further driving an accelerated deployment of CCS. Some experts suggest cost-competitive CCS must be deployed in a majority of countries and situations by 2020. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n32) Many also believe this action is necessary to reduce energy-related CO(2) emissions enough to begin the process of stabilizing atmospheric GHG concentrations to help avoid possibly catastrophic warming later in the century. [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1359961931260&returnToKey=20_T16600385760&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.699260.3443241271#n33) The crux of the matter is this: the manner in which these issues are resolved will likely impact not only the effectiveness of CCS as part of a portfolio solution, but also global energy supply, use, and cost, as well as the growth of economies primarily dependent on coal for electricity. Cumulatively, these issues add up to a daunting challenge that the international community recognizes it must address with alacrity.

### 2NC Flaring Impact

#### Low prices cause flaring

Weber, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin, 12

(May, THE LOOMING NATURAL GAS TRANSITION IN THE UNITED STATES, [www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf](http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf))

These attractive market opportunities are offset in some respects by the negative environmental impacts that are occurring from production in the Bakken and Eagle Ford shale plays in North Dakota and Texas. At those locations, significant volumes of gases are flared because the gas is too inexpensive to justify rapid construction of the pricey distribution systems that would be necessary to move the fuel to markets. Consequently, for many operators it ends up being cheaper in many cases to flare the gas rather than to harness and distribute it.

#### Flaring depletes the ozone layer - extinction

Osai, Professor of Social Sciences at The Rivers State College of Arts and Science, 02

(SHELL AS AGAMA LIZARD, www.waado.org/Environment/OilCompanies/Shell-Communities/ShellsFalsePR.html)

Talking of the impact of gas flaring on the environment, in 1984/85, I was part of a team of professors and graduate students from the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Port Harcourt that undertook a field trip to what is now called the Orashi Region. I guided the team to the gas flare site at Obagi, Obrikom, Ebocha, Ukwugba and Izombe. From one site to another, we took sample of cassava and other crops; we observed the plantains, palm trees and the general vegetation within a certain radius of the gas flared racks and we noted that though the cassava stems and leaves looked unaffected, their tubers were rotten. We also observed a pathetic degeneration from the lush vegetation with giant trees that used to be a rustic meadow; giant racks, spewing roaring flames into the sky had taken the place of the giant trees. These findings were published in Newswatch. It is, therefore, an insult on the collective intellect of the peoples of the Niger Delta for Shell to aver that "gas flaring is not detrimental to the immediate environment." Matter-of-factly, the statement is an insult on the collective intellect of humanity, which is facing imminent extinction as a result of the depletion of the ozone layer - a phenomenon that gas flaring contributes immensely to. Incidentally, I did my administrative internship in 1977 at the Cleveland Division of Air Pollution Control, Cleveland, Ohio, USA and I think I learned quite a bit about pollution and its negative impact on the environment - immediate or otherwise.

### 2NC Exports Impact

#### Low prices key to gas exports

Slutz, President and Managing Director of Global Energy Strategies LLC, 12

(9/4, The Shale Gas Revolution Implications for U.S. and Canadian Energy Policy and Asian Energy Security, www.nbr.org/downloads/pdfs/ETA/Slutz\_interview\_09042012.pdf

It is important to appreciate that before natural gas exports can occur, industry must spend several billion dollars for each export terminal to build the liquefaction facility. To make this decision, companies must believe that U.S. natural gas prices will remain low enough and Asia prices high enough to make money on exports to Asia for the entire term of a 20-year contract. While the differentials between Asia and North America currently support trade, the cost of liquefaction and shipping will account for a significant amount of that differential. Asia’s LNG contracts are based on oil prices. At oil prices below $80 per barrel, importing LNG from North America is less attractive to Asian buyers. As oil prices rise, the economics of importing gas from North America become more attractive. The United States does have a very large resource base, which will support production of more natural gas than will be consumed domestically. The market, not government, will be the best mechanism to determine the extent of exports. Most projections, including from the EIA, anticipate some level of North American gas exports in the next four to eight years. The level of exports will be determined by the cost of gas and the cost of converting it to LNG, as well as the cost of transporting the gas to market. The United States has huge gas resources, but the cost of production varies between different areas. While there is plenty of gas for domestic use and exports, as we move into areas that cost more to develop, there is less incentive to export gas. The other important issue to remember is that significant gas resources exist around the world. Gas exports from the United States directly compete with other supplies and the least costly supplies will be the ones that go to market. Economics will ultimately determine how much gas is exported.

**US gas exports collapse the Russian economy**

Mead, Professor of Foreign Affairs at Bard, 12

(North American Shale Gas Gives Russia Serious Headache, blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/04/25/north-american-shale-gas-gives-russia-serious-headache/)

North America’s shale gas boom is chipping away at the market for gas producers like Russia. What’s more, if the United States becomes a gas exporter, Russia’s customers (especially in Europe) could decide to cancel expensive contracts with Gazprom in favor of cheaper American natural gas. “If the US starts exporting LNG to Europe and Asia, it gives [customers there] an argument to renegotiate their prices with Gazprom and Qatar, and they will do it,” says Jean Abiteboul, head of Cheniere supply & marketing. Gazprom supplied 27 percent of Europe’s natural gas in 2011. While American gas is trading below $2 per MMBTU (million British thermal units), Gazprom’s prices are tied to crude oil markets, and its long-term contracts charge customers roughly $13 per MMBTU, says the FT. European customers would love to reduce their dependence on Gazprom and start to import American gas. Already Gazprom has had to make concessions to its three biggest customers, and others are increasingly dissatisfied with their contracts. Worse, from Russia’s point of view: evidence that western and central Europe contain substantial shale gas reserves of their own. Fracking is unpopular in thickly populated, eco-friendly Europe, but so are high gas prices. All this ought to give Russia serious heartburn. Eroding Gazprom’s dominance of the European energy market would be a major check on Russian economic growth and political influence.

#### Extinction

Filger, columnist and founder of GlobalEconomicCrisis.com, 09

(Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction, www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html)

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## Case

### 2NC Movements Fail

#### Intellectual resistance to globalization fails

O’Callaghan, Professor International Studies U of South Australia, ‘2 (International Relations and the "third debate:" Postmodernism and its critics, Darryl S. L. Jarvis, pg. 73)

There are also a host of technological and logistical questions that plague George’s scheme and make problematic his recommendations. For example, through what medium are those on the fringes of the international system going to speak to the world? Although it may be true that the third world has now been integrated into the global polity via the advent of technological innovations in communications, allowing for remote access to information sources and the Internet, it also remains true that the majority of those on the fringes continue to be disenfranchised from such mediums, whether as a result of a lack of economic resources, the prevalence of illiteracy, or social, cultural and political circumstances that systemically exclude women (among others) from economic resources and certain political and social freedoms. Need we remind George that social, political, and individual autonomy is at a minimum in these parts of the world, and an intellectual approach as controversial as postmodernism is not likely to achieve the sorts of goals that George optimistically foreshadows. Indeed, on practical questions such as these, matters otherwise central to the success of postmodern visions, George prefers to be vague, suggesting instead that the intricacies of such details will somehow work themselves out in a manner satisfactory to all. Such a position reveals George’s latent idealism and underscores how George’s schema is an intellectual one: a theory of international politics written for other theorists of international politics. George’s audience is thus a very limited and elite audience and begs the question of whether a senior, middle-class scholar in the intellectual heartland of Australia can do anything of real substance to aid the truly marginalized and oppressed. How is it possible to put oneself in the shoes of the “other,” to advocate on his or her behalf, when such is done from a position of affluence, unrelated to and far removed from the experiences of those whom George otherwise champions? Ideals are all good and well, but it is hard to imagine that the computer keyboard is mightier than the sword, and hard to see how a small, elite, affluent assortment of intellectuals is going to generate the type of political momentum necessary to allow those on the fringes to speak and be heard! Moreover, why should we assume that states and individuals want to listen and will listen to what the marginalized and the oppressed have to say? There is precious little evidence to suggest that “listening” is something the advanced capitalist countries do very well at all. Indeed, one of the allegations so forcefully alleged by Muslim fundamentalists as justification for the terrorist attacks of September 11 is precisely that the West, and America in particular, are deaf to the disenfranchised and impoverished in the world. Certainly, there are agencies and individuals who are sensitive to the needs of the “marginalized” and who champion institutional forums where indigenous voices can be heard. But on even the most optimistic reckoning, such forums and institutions represent the exception, not the rule, and remain in the minority if not dwarfed by those institutions that represent Western, first world interests. To be sure, this is a realist power-political image of the current configuration of the global polity, but one apparently, and ironically, endorsed by George if only because it speaks to the realities of the marginalized, the imposed silences, and the multitude of oppressions on which George founds his call for a postmodern ethic. Recognizing such realities, however, does not explain George’s penchant for ignoring them entirely, especially in terms of the structural rigidities they pose for meaningful reform. Indeed, George’s desire to move to a new “space beyond International Relations” smacks of wishful idealism, ignoring the current configuration of global political relations and power distribution; of the incessant ideological power of hyperindividualism, consumerism, advertising, Hollywood images, and fashion icons; and of the innate power bestowed on the (institutional) barons of global finance, trade, and transnational production. George seems to have little appreciation of the structural impediments such institutions pose for radical change of the type he so fiercely advocates. Revolutionary change of the kind desired by George ignores that fact that many individuals are not disposed to concerns beyond their family, friends, and daily work lives. And institutional, structural transformation requires organized effort, mass popular support, and dogged single-mindedness if societal norms are to be challenged, institutional reform enacted, consumer tastes altered, and political sensibilities reformed. Convincing Nike that there is something intrinsically wrong with paying Indonesian workers a few dollars a week to manufacture shoes for the global market requires considerably more effort than postmodern platitudes and/or moral indignation. The cycle of wealth creation and distribution that sees Michael Jordan receive multimillion dollar contracts to inspire consumer demand for Nike products, while the foot soldiers in the factory eke out a meager existence producing these same products is not easily, or realistically, challenged by pronouncements of moving beyond International Relations to a new, nicer, gentler nirvana.

### Community Engagement High

#### Community engagement high – youth participation

Common Dreams 2006 (“America's Youth Becoming Engaged in Community, Political Activity” <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines06/1004-04.htm>)

Turns out, seminal rock band The Who was correct: Gloomy stereotypes to the contrary, the kids are alright. While the majority of young people aren't engaged in their communities, a study released Tuesday found what researchers called a higher than expected level of political and community engagement among Americans ages 15 to 25. In many civic activities, there were only small differences in the rates of participation between young people and older people, the report's authors said. More than 36 percent of young people volunteered in their communities, 30 percent had boycotted a product in protest and almost a quarter had raised money for charities, according to the report. The survey, by the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement, a nonpartisan group funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, was of 1,700 youths nationwide and was done from April to June. "This is a generation that's just screaming to be paid attention to," said Heather Smith, director of Young Voter Strategies, a nonprofit group that works with young voters. "They are engaged. They are paying attention. When issues are relevant, they are willing to flex their political muscle."

### Transhumanism

#### **Speciesism is key to Transhumanism**

CALVERLY ‘6 (David; Center for the Study of Law, Science and Technology – Arizona State University, “Android Science and Animal Rights, Does an Analogy Exist?” Connection Science, 18:4, December)

Even more fundamentally, there are concerns that arise at the earliest stages of development of a machine consciousness. The endeavour itself is replete with moral and ethical pitfalls. If the same logic as urged for animal rights, or for the rights of foetuses, is applied to a machine consciousness, some of these issues could have the potential to curtail radically the development of a conscious entity. If part of the process of developing a machine consciousness is an emergent learning process (Lindblom and Ziemke 2006), or even a process of creating various modules that add attributes of consciousness such as sentience, nociception, or language, in a cumulative fashion, some could argue that this is immoral. As posed by LaChat (1986: 75–76), the question becomes ‘Is the AI experiment then immoral from its inception, assuming, that is, that the end (telos) of the experiment is the production of a person? . . . An AI experiment that aims at producing a self-reflexively conscious and communicative “person” is prima facie immoral’. Must designers of a machine consciousness be aware that as they come closer to their goal, they may have to consider such concerns in their experimentation? Arguably yes, if human equivalence is the ultimate goal. Failure to treat a machine consciousness in a moral way could be viewed as a form of speciesism (Ryder 1975). The utilitarian philosopher J. J. C. Smart (1973: 67) has observed ‘if it became possible to control our evolution in such a way as to develop a superior species, then the difference between species morality and a morality of all sentient beings would become much more of a live issue’.

#### **Transhuman focus means we address existential risks – those outweigh**

Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy Oxford University, The Transhumanist FAQ- A General Introduction, Version 2.1 (2003), google.

Yes, and this implies an urgent need to analyze the risks before they materialize and to take steps to reduce them. Biotechnology, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence pose especially serious risks of accidents and abuse. [See also “ If these technologies are so dangerous, should they be banned? What can be done to reduce the risks?” ] One can distinguish between, on the one hand, endurable or limited hazards, such as car crashes, nuclear reactor meltdowns, carcinogenic pollutants in the atmosphere, floods, volcano eruptions, and so forth, and, on the other hand, existential risks – events that would cause the extinction of intelligent life or permanently and drastically ~~cripple~~ [halt] its potential. While endurable or limited risks can be serious – and may indeed be fatal to the people immediately exposed – they are recoverable; they do not destroy the long-term prospects of humanity as a whole. Humanity has long experience with endurable risks and a variety of institutional and technological mechanisms have been employed to reduce their incidence. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. For most of human history, there were no significant existential risks, or at least none that our ancestors could do anything about. By definition, of course, no existential disaster has yet happened. As a species we may therefore be less well prepared to understand and manage this new kind of risk. Furthermore, the reduction of existential risk is a global public good (everybody by necessity benefits from such safety measures, whether or not they contribute to their development), creating a potential free-rider problem, i.e. a lack of sufficient selfish incentives for people to make sacrifices to reduce an existential risk. Transhumanists therefore recognize a moral duty to promote efforts to reduce existential risks.

### Aliens Turn

#### The rules of anthropocentrism would be justifiably applicable to extra-terrestrial life

Huebert and Block ‘7 (J.H. and Walter , 2007, J.D. - University of Chicago and Harold E. Wirth Eminent Scholar Endowed Chair in Econmics - College of Business Administration - Loyola University, "Space Environmentalism, Property Rights, and the Law" 37 U. Mem. L. Rev. 281, Winter, ln

Some observers, such as Roberts, believe that bodies "with the potential for harboring biotic or prebiotic activity" present a special case for which different rules must apply. Roberts states that where life exists or even potentially exists, we must apply the "precautionary principle," which would place the burden of proof on those engaged in a "challenged activity" and prohibit development that threatens evidence of past life or the existence of present or "potential" life. [n96](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n96" \t "_blank) We disagree. First, we note that there is no evidence that life exists or has ever existed anywhere in the **solar** System except Earth. [n97](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n97" \t "_blank) Further, there is a strong consensus that to the extent that life might exist or have ever existed elsewhere, such as on Mars or Europa, it is limited to extremely simple microscopic organisms. [n98](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n98" \t "_blank) The likelihood of sentient or even plant life existing elsewhere in the solar System appears to be zero, and the question of life on planets outside the solar System is very hypothetical, even for an article on space law. [n99](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n99" \t "_blank) Therefore, a presumption against the existence of actual life where no evidence to the contrary exists seems proper. Further, space environmentalists have failed to make the case that environmental regulations are necessary to protect whatever extraterrestrial life (or evidence thereof) may exist. Humans are fascinated by the prospect of the existence of any kind of extraterrestrial life. Anyone who bothers to go to space for any purpose is likely to be interested in checking for signs of past or present life on his property (or prospective property) before acting in a way that might destroy it. For the intellectually uncurious, there would still be financial incentives. For example, scientific or environmental organizations could offer prize money for discovery of evidence [\*303] of extraterrestrial life; a property owner who discovers evidence of life could sell scientists, journalists, and others rights to access, study, and publicize information about the discovery. Only governmental intervention (e.g., stripping individuals of property rights when something of scientific interest is found on their property) is likely to cause incentives to run in any other direction. [n100](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n100" \t "_blank) Suppose there were the proverbial "little green creatures" discovered on Mars or on any other planet humans colonized. What rights would they have? What obligations would we have to respect these rights? If they were smarter/stronger than we, the shoe of course would be on the other foot. There are several options. If they had the intelligence/ability of dogs or cats, then we would treat them as we now do those animals. But suppose they were an intermediate between us and the smartest of earth animals (chimps, porpoises), or had human qualities but looked like a cross between an octopus and a giraffe. According to Rothbard, [n101](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.678837.5771811252&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1234148840673&returnToKey=20_T5728010935&parent=docview" \l "n101" \t "_blank) if they could communicate with us, promise to respect our personal and property rights, and adhere to such undertakings, then and only then would we be obligated to treat them as we do each other (well, better, hopefully).

#### Embracing aliens leads to extinction

Leake, Writer for the Sunday Times, 10

[Jonathon, The Sunday Times, “Don’t talk to aliens, warns Stephen Hawking” 4/25/10 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/space/article7107207.ece ,accessed 6/21/11,HK]

THE aliens are out there and Earth had better watch out, at least according to Stephen Hawking. He has suggested that extraterrestrials are almost certain to exist — but that instead of seeking them out, humanity should be doing all it that can to avoid any contact. The suggestions come in a new documentary series in which Hawking, one of the world’s leading scientists, will set out his latest thinking on some of the universe’s greatest mysteries. Alien life, he will suggest, is almost certain to exist in many other parts of the universe: not just in planets, but perhaps in the centre of stars or even floating in interplanetary space. Hawking’s logic on aliens is, for him, unusually simple. The universe, he points out, has 100 billion galaxies, each containing hundreds of millions of stars. In such a big place, Earth is unlikely to be the only planet where life has evolved. “To my mathematical brain, the numbers alone make thinking about aliens perfectly rational,” he said. “The real challenge is to work out what aliens might actually be like.” The answer, he suggests, is that most of it will be the equivalent of microbes or simple animals — the sort of life that has dominated Earth for most of its history. One scene in his documentary for the Discovery Channel shows herds of two-legged herbivores browsing on an alien cliff-face where they are picked off by flying, yellow lizard-like predators. Another shows glowing fluorescent aquatic animals forming vast shoals in the oceans thought to underlie the thick ice coating Europa, one of the moons of Jupiter. Such scenes are speculative, but Hawking uses them to lead on to a serious point: that a few life forms could be intelligent and pose a threat. Hawking believes that contact with such a species could be devastating for humanity. He suggests that aliens might simply raid Earth for its resources and then move on: “We only have to look at ourselves to see how intelligent life might develop into something we wouldn’t want to meet. I imagine they might exist in massive ships, having used up all the resources from their home planet. Such advanced aliens would perhaps become nomads, looking to conquer and colonise whatever planets they can reach.” He concludes that trying to make contact with alien races is “a little too risky”. He said: “If aliens ever visit us, I think the outcome would be much as when Christopher Columbus first landed in America, which didn’t turn out very well for the Native Americans.” The completion of the documentary marks a triumph for Hawking, now 68, who is paralysed by motor neurone disease and has very limited powers of communication. The project took him and his producers three years, during which he insisted on rewriting large chunks of the script and checking the filming. John Smithson, executive producer for Discovery, said: “He wanted to make a programme that was entertaining for a general audience as well as scientific and that’s a tough job, given the complexity of the ideas involved.” Hawking has suggested the possibility of alien life before but his views have been clarified by a series of scientific breakthroughs, such as the discovery, since 1995, of more than 450 planets orbiting distant stars, showing that planets are a common phenomenon. So far, all the new planets found have been far larger than Earth, but only because the telescopes used to detect them are not sensitive enough to detect Earth-sized bodies at such distances. Another breakthrough is the discovery that life on Earth has proven able to colonise its most extreme environments. If life can survive and evolve there, scientists reason, then perhaps nowhere is out of bounds. Hawking’s belief in aliens places him in good scientific company. In his recent Wonders of the Solar System BBC series, Professor Brian Cox backed the idea, too, suggesting Mars, Europa and Titan, a moon of Saturn, as likely places to look. Similarly, Lord Rees, the astronomer royal, warned in a lecture earlier this year that aliens might prove to be beyond human understanding. “I suspect there could be life and intelligence out there in forms we can’t conceive,” he said. “Just as a chimpanzee can’t understand quantum theory, it could be there are aspects of reality that are beyond the capacity of our brains.”

### AT: Anthropocentrism

#### Human-centeredness is key to environmental sustainability

Schmidtz 2k – Professor of Philosophy @ Arizona

David Schmidtz, 2k. Philosophy, University of Arizona, Environmental Ethics, p. 379-408

Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about equilibria and perturbations that keep systems from converging on equilibria. Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about competition and unintended consequences, and the internal logic of systems, a logic that dictates how a system responds to attempts to manipulate it. Environmental activism and regulation do not automatically improve the environment. It is a truism in ecology, as in economics, that well-intentioned interventions do not necessarily translate into good results. Ecology (human and nonhuman) is complicated, our knowledge is limited, and environmentalists are themselves only human. Intervention that works with the system’s logic rather than against it can have good consequences. Even in a centrally planned economy, the shape taken by the economy mainly is a function not of the central plan but of how people respond to it, and people respond to central plans in ways that best serve their purposes, not the central planner’s. Therefore, even a dictator is in no position simply to decide how things are going to go. Ecologists understand that this same point applies in their own discipline. They understand that an ecology’s internal logic limits the directions in which it can be taken by would-be ecological engineers. Within environmental philosophy, most of us have come around to something like Aldo Leopold’s view of humans as plain citizens of the biotic community.[[21]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn22) As Bryan Norton notes, the contrast between anthropocentrism and biocentrism obscures the fact that we increasingly need to be nature-centered to be properly human-centered; we need to focus on "saving the ecological systems that are the context of human cultural and economic activities." [[22]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn23) If we do not tend to what is good for nature, we will not be tending to what is good for people either. As Gary Varner recently put it, on purely anthropocentric grounds we have reason to think biocentrically.[[23]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn24) I completely agree. What I wish to add is that the converse is also true: on purely biocentric grounds, we have reason to think anthropocentrically. We need to be human-centered to be properly nature-centered, for if we do not tend to what is good for people, we will not be tending to what is good for nature either. From a biocentric perspective, preservationists sometimes are not anthropocentric enough. They sometimes advocate policies and regulations with no concern for values and priorities that differ from their own. Even from a purely biocentric perspective, such slights are illegitimate. Policy makers who ignore human values and human priorities that differ from their own will, in effect, be committed to mismanaging the ecology of which those ignored values and priorities are an integral part.

#### Their ethic is biologically impossible

Duckler 8 – PhD in Biology

Geordie, ARTICLE: TWO MAJOR FLAWS OF THE ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT, PhD in Biology, JD from Northwestern, 14 Animal L. 179

**Those of us at the heart of the animal law movement envision a world** in which the lives and interests of all sentient beings are respected within the legal system, where companion animals have good, loving homes for a lifetime, where wild animals can live out their natural lives according to their instincts in an environment that supports their needs - a world **in which animals are not exploited, terrorized, tortured or controlled to serve frivolous or greedy human purposes**. This vision guides in working toward a far more just and truly humane society. [n83](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n83)   A workable definition of "sentience" or "sentient beings" notwithstanding, **one would have to ignore the last hundred and fifty years of accumulated rigorous scientific study of how evolution by natural selection actually works in the natural world to sincerely make such a  [\*197]  plea**. [n84](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n84) **A world "in which animals are not exploited, terrorized, tortured or controlled to serve frivolous or greedy human purposes"** [n85](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n85) **is an unobtainable, inherently biologically impossible world.** Moreover, **the world of nature** to which Tischler fervently hopes to return animals already is a world in which **animals are "exploited, terrorized, tortured or controlled"** [n86](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n86) **to serve the frivolous or greedy purposes of other animals, including conspecifics and kin.**

#### Morality fails to apply across animalia – other animals won’t respect morality

Duckler 8 – PhD in Biology

Geordie, ARTICLE: TWO MAJOR FLAWS OF THE ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT, PhD in Biology, JD from Northwestern, 14 Animal L. 179

**Another example of ethical conflict created by the animal rights position is that the entire animal world must be seen to be inherently immoral because the new "rights" will never be respected between and among animals other than humans**. [n89](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n89) **God help the activist who tries valiantly to hold long onto the argument that it is morality that demands legal rights for animals: A basic biology text would stop them absolutely cold at the early chapter describing the major division of all  [\*198]  life into prokaryotes and eukaryotes**. [n90](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n90) If activists gleaned their information from a college science lesson instead of from a religious tome, they would find that prokaryotes engage in immoral acts: **Throughout earth history, prokaryotes have created immense global "crises of starvation, pollution, and extinction**" [n91](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n91) **that make human parallels appear trivial in comparison. Prokaryotes destroy other organisms by the great multitude, routinely transfer genetic material freely from individual to individual, fool around with genetic engineering, create "chimeras" at a level that our most ill-advised laboratory technicians could only dream about, and fundamentally alter the biotic and abiotic world in doing so**. [n92](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.997959.0518058672&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220848443484&returnToKey=20_T4504110919&parent=docview#n92)

#### Human separation from nature is inevitable and good- the transition to small ag leads to poverty and environmental destruction

Bailey 6 – Economic Philosopher

Ronald, Economic Philosopher and Science Editor for Reason Magazine, The Lingering Stench of Malthus, <http://www.reason.com/news/show/117481.html>

The further good news is that the movement of humanity's burgeoning population into the thousand of megacities foreseen that Rifkin is part of a process that ultimately will leave more land for nature. Today cities occupy just 2 percent of the earth's surface, but that will likely double to 4 percent over the next half century. In order to avoid this ostensibly terrible fate Rifkin proclaims, "In the next phase of human history, we will need to find a way to reintegrate ourselves into the rest of the living Earth if we are to preserve our own species and conserve the planet for our fellow creatures." Actually, he's got it completely backwards. Humanity must not reintegrate into nature-that way lays disaster for humanity and nature. Instead we must make ourselves even more autonomous than we already are from her. Since nothing is more destructive of nature than poverty stricken subsistence farmers, boosting agricultural productivity is the key to the human retreat from wild nature. As Jesse Ausubel, the director for the Program for the Human Environment at Rockefeller University, points out: "If the world farmer reaches the average yield of today's US corn grower during the next 70 years, ten billion people eating as people now on average do will need only half of today's cropland. The land spared exceeds Amazonia." Similarly all of the world's industrial wood could be produced on an area that is less than 10 percent of the world's forested area today leaving 90 percent of the world's forests for Nature.

#### No such thing as root cause

Holland 6 (Joshua, “About those real reasons for the invasion of Iraq …” March 20, 2006, Alternet, <http://www.alternet.org/blogs/echochamber/33790/>)

That's because there is almost never one "real" cause of any foreign policy action. Look seriously at foreign policy formation and you'll see that FoPo is an extension of domestic politics, with all its varied constituents and interest groups. That's why all of the reasons thrown about for this war are correct, except the ones that the administration that started it have peddled. So, yes, the guys at Lockheed and Boeing and Northrop Grumman and Raytheon and General Dynamics wanted this war because all wars are good for business. And, yes, Bush's oil buddies wanted access to a big chunk of the world's petroleum reserves. (Because I like accuracy, I replaced my 'No Blood For Oil' bumper sticker with a bumper-length banner reading: 'No blood for assuring a stable energy supply-chain to a global economy in which we're heavily invested.') Yes, there were various stripes of Neo-cons and democratic imperialists and other PNAC-type ideologues who wanted to enforce a global 'rule set' centered around American hegemony. And, yes, there were the boys from Halliburton and Bechtel and Dyncorp and Caci and Titan who wanted fat contracts to rebuild Iraq (which they've totally fucked up). No doubt that there were good ole' boys from the Chamber of Commerce and AEI who George saw on the links or in the clubhouse and who told him how marvelous it would be to see what a fully privatized neo-liberal laboratory would look like in action. I'm sure, too, that there were various Fundie Christian extremists who thought a big conflagration in the Middle East would set off the rapture.

### AT: VTL

#### There is an infinite value to life- your framework causes extinction

Kateb, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, ‘92 (George, The Inner Ocean, pg. 144)

To sum up the lines of thought that Nietzsche starts, I suggest first that it is epistemologically impossible for humanity to arrive at an estimation of the worth of itself or of the rest of nature: it cannot pretend to see itself from the outside or to see the rest, as it were, from the inside. Second, after allowance is made for this quandary, which is occasioned by the death of God and the birth of truth, humanity, placed in a position in which it is able to extinguish human life and natural life on earth, must simply affirm existence as such. Existence must go on but not because of any particular feature or group of features. The affirmation of existence refuses to say what worth existence has, even from just a human perspective, from any human perspective whatever. It cannot say, because existence is indefinite; it is beyond evaluating; being undesigned it is unencompassable by a defined and definite judgment. (The philosopher Frederick A. Olafson speaks of "the stubbornly unconceptualizable fact of existence.") The worth of the existence passed on to the unborn is not measurable but indefinite. The judgment is minimal: no human purpose or value within existence is worth more than existence and can ever be used to justify the risk of extinction. Third, from the moral point of view, existence seems unjustifiable because of the pain and ugliness in it, and therefore the moral point of view must be chastened if it is not to block attachment to existence as such. The other minimal judgment is that whatever existence is, it is better than nothing. For the first time, in the nuclear age, humanity can fully perceive existence from the perspective of nothing, which in part is the perspective of extinction.

#### Any existence is better than nothing

Kateb, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, ‘92 (George, The Inner Ocean, pg. 141)

But neither of these responses will do in the nuclear situation. To affirm existence as such is to go beyond good and evil; it is to will its perpetual prolongation for no particular reason. To affirm existence is not to praise it or love it or find it good. These responses are no more defensible than their contraries—no more defensible than calling exis­tence absurd, or meaningless, or worthless. All such responses are appro­priate only for particulars. Existence does not have systemic attributes amenable to univocal judgments. At least some of us cannot accept the validity of revelation, or play on ourselves the trick of regarding existence as if it were the designed work of a personal God, or presume to call it good, and bless it as if it were the existence we would have created if we had the power, and think that it therefore deserves to exist and is justifia­ble just as it is. No: these argumentative moves are bad moves; they are hopeless stratagems. The hope is to go beyond the need for reasons, to go beyond the need for justifying existence, and in doing so to strengthen, not weaken, one's attachment. Earthly existence must be preserved whatever we are able or unable to say about it. There is no other human and natural existence. The alternative is earthly nothingness. Things are better than nothing; anything is better than nothing.

### Solar Society 1NC

#### **The plan romanticizes Western participatory democracy and ignores its modern roots in capitalism**

Chaput ‘4

(Catherine, PhD Student in Rhetoric @ Arizona, “Review of Carl Boggs's *The End of Politics: Corporate Power and the Decline of the Public Sphere*”, *Workplace*, Issue 7, http://louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue7/chaput.html)

12. While this book calls attention to the limited nature of many current political and cultural movements, it does so with more than a trace of nostalgia for the history of Western participatory democracy. Certainly Boggs is cognizant of the problems of constructing an overly nostalgic and romantic past. Indeed, he sees nostalgic trends as dangerously close to the isolationism he critiques in this text: he states that alienation from the public sphere "often gives rise not only to privatized retreat but to romanticized journeys into nostalgia" (37). While this knowledge fails to keep Boggs from falling victim to his own romanticized historical narrative, perhaps the most glaring omission from his text might have prevented this nostalgia. Boggs never mentions Jürgen Habermas nor his important text, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. According to Habermas, the term "public sphere" originated sometime in the eighteenth century as part of the emerging civil society of wage labor and commodity exchange. The public sphere, then, is a term historically embedded in the development of capitalism. Of course, the idea of the public, or the polis, has a much longer history dating back to the Greeks. However, since Boggs chose to interrogate the public sphere in decline because of capitalism, Habermas's argument that the public sphere acts in complicity with the needs of capitalism seems to be seriously under question in this text. The significantly different understanding of the public sphere that operates in this book deserves further attention, justification, and historical grounding. Contextualizing against Habermas seems the natural place to start.

#### **Romanticizing Western democracy makes it dogmatic and leads to Eurocentric violence- attempts to export it create us/them exclusions- also links to the aff**

Radhakrishnan ‘6

(R., Prof. of English & Comparative Lit @ UC-Irvine, “When Is Democracy Political?”, *boundary 2* 33:3 (2006))

Profound as Wolin’s symptomatic reading is, does he have an answer and a remedy? Is democracy redeemable from the megastate? Is the political redeemable from democratic citizenship? Are politics separable from the stranglehold of the nation-state? What, ultimately, is stultifying about Wolin’s analysis is the fact that his focus is inexorably on the West and on Western democracies.8 Even as he takes the American megastate to task for its ideologically crafted amnesia and its megastate-like behavior toward the rest of the world, he does not (1) problematize democracy and democratic citizenship as such, even if it had not been hijacked by a media-driven mega-state; (2) interrogate the axiomatics of the nationalist horizon that eventually accommodates all democratic flows and energies (I am reminded here of the hysterical manner in which Islamic Americans are attempting to prove that their Islam can be harmoniously subsumed by an overarching American identity); (3) factor into his critical reading the macropolitical valence of colonial modernity and its ongoing participation in a world structured in dominance (here I must say that Wolin remains a provincial American theorist); or (4) acknowledge the ideology that subtends his very quarrel with a democracy run amok, that is, a Western/Eurocentric ideology that refuses to learn anything at all from the non-West and insists that the only way to actualize a West–non-West relationship is by way of a modular export to the non-West of the nation form and a democratic process already canonized into its ideal manifestation in the West.9 As I conclude this essay, I would like to consider briefly some of Wolin’s prescriptions within the larger world- historical context of the West versus the Rest.10 In our own times, nationalism and the nation-state have been the most effective, rigorous, and ruthless gatekeepers of people and populism. One cannot be part of the Mexican people and claim peoplehood within the populism of the United States. Peoples of the world do not and cannot not unite, for the simple reason that there is no taxonomic space or rubric under which they can consolidate such a solidarity. ‘‘Your’’ people and ‘‘my’’ people can of course negotiate with one another, but only on the strict basis of what makes me ‘‘me,’’ and you ‘‘you.’’ Even within the space of the intranational, a declaration like ‘‘We are all American people’’ is constrained to work within the inequalities, the asymmetries, and the unevenness of the American condition at that particular juncture in history. By this logic, at a particular moment of history, slaves had to be slaves, and women had to be nonvoters, so that the American people could celebrate their populism. In other words, a nation can legitimately call itself democratic even when the demos it works with is exclusionary: racist, casteist, homophobic, Orientalist, ethnocentric. By this definition of democracy, a slaveholding nation and a casteist nation can call itself a democracy merely on the procedural claim that its government is based on the will of the people, that is, racist people, homophobic people, xenophobic people. There is nothing democracy can do, on the basis of its procedural rationale, to prevent, say, hate crimes. Democracy by definition remains incapable of any ideological intervention in the status quo. The play of democracy is a highly centered play with no authority to problematize its ideological nature. The reason for this constitutive and constitutional debacle of democracy is something more complex than what Wolin perceives in the context of American democracy: the unresolved tension between the Jeffersonian-Madisonian model and the Hamiltonian model of constitutional power. The deeper reason I submit is fourfold: (1) democracy as a pragmatic mode does not allow a Foucauldian genealogical inquiry into its own historicity; (2) democracy pretends to function as a postideological instrument of collective will and sovereignty; (3) even the most benign and inclusive practice of democracy still remains a mechanism that has to produce an ‘‘other’’ so that the demos can be realized as a form of the Us/Them;11 and (4) democracy remains a prisoner to the regime of representation and is therefore incapable of the rigorous skepticism that representation itself could be the ultimate form of epistemic violence.12 Based on this, I would ask Wolin the following questions: What kind of a place or topos is democracy? Is it a place or a nonplace, a homotopia or a heterotopia? Is democracy what is common and shareable among the nations of the world? Is democracy shareable because the national form has already been generalized as the only possible currency of collectivity? In the glocality of the global, where does democracy locate itself? Is its potential ubiquity initially local or global? Assuming that democracy is capable of radical self-reflexivity and autocritique in any one place understood territorially as a nation space, how would transformations in one place affect the goings- on in another location? What are the insides and outsides of any location, and who or what force does the gatekeeping?13 If, shall we say, a democratic revolution or a revolution of democracy does take place within the United States as a result of which the megastate is cut to size and even abandoned as the sovereign body of power, what would the implications be elsewhere? I ask this both as a political question driven by a concern for coeval- ness among different cultures, societies, and nations, and as a philosophical question regarding the Self-Other problematic.

#### No shift to solar – not competitive

Empirics –billions of subsidies in squo haven’t spurred

RPS’s mean no collapse

Can’t compete w/ nat gas

Fed/state investment increasing now

Europe proves

Unconcentrated energy content = too much land

Siting constraints

High cost of transmission

Low capacity factors/intermittency = need backup which = expensive

Not an infant industry, cost evidence proves

Zycher**,** **Adjunct professor of Economics,** 12 Benjamin Zycher, Adjunct professor of Economics and Business at CSU-Channel Islands, associate of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and research in the US department of State. Ph.D in economics from UCLA, senior fellow at pacific Research Institute, “Wind and solar power, part III: chasing the green tail”, 1-17-2012, http://www.aei.org/outlook/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/wind-and-solar-power-part-iii-chasing-the-green-tail/)

Key points in this Outlook: Between billions of dollars worth of subsidies and support at the federal level and guaranteed market shares in thirty states, government aid for solar and wind power is substantial. Yet renewables remain marginal players, with poor prospects for gaining traction. Recent advances in the production of natural gas mean greater supply and lower prices for this competitive source of electrical generation, further weakening the competitive positions of solar and wind. Official projections are for slow growth at best. For many years, the bright future of renewable electricity generally, and wind and solar power in particular, has been a given in the public discussion. Many believed that some public support might be needed at initial adoption to get renewable power up to speed in the competition with gas- and coal-fired power. But then technological advances, scale economies, and learning efficiencies would make the new technologies competitive, and the benefits in environmental improvement, employment, and other parameters would justify the initial public investments.1 This general argument has become familiar over many years. As we learned in the previous two Outlooks (No. 1 and No. 2, January 2012), the competitive performance of wind and solar power is less than impressive, to put it mildly; the greater the competitive difficulties faced by wind and solar generation, seemingly ever-louder have become the official arguments promoting them. And amid this utter disconnect between the rhetoric and the reality of renewable electricity, lower costs for renewables’ competitors—in particular, natural gas prices, both current and prospective—have worsened this competitive environment. Wind and solar technologies must compete with conventional electric generation—coal and natural gas technologies in particular—so that long-run price dynamics for those conventional fuels have a significant effect on the competitiveness of renewables. As I will explain here, recent technological advances in the production of natural gas from shale formations and coal beds have created enormous new problems for the competitiveness of renewable electricity. Public Support for Renewable Electricity It is useful, therefore, to review briefly the public support given renewable electricity, because the substantial magnitude of the rhetorical support and the direct and indirect subsidies bestowed upon it contrasts sharply with the stubbornly small market shares of renewable technologies. This condition is likely to be exacerbated by the increasingly harsh competitive environment in which wind and solar power will have to compete. President George W. Bush argued in 2007, “It’s in our vital interest to diversify America’s energy supply, and the way forward is through technology. We must continue changing the way America generates electric power by even greater use of clean-coal technology; solar and wind energy; and clean, safe nuclear power.”2 This argument is broadly bipartisan, as reflected in this statement from President Barack Obama in 2010: “Each of us has a part to play in a new future that will benefit all of us. As we recover from this recession, the transition to clean energy has the potential to grow our economy and create millions of jobs—but only if we accelerate that transition. Only if we seize the moment. And only if we rally together and act as one nation—workers and entrepreneurs; scientists and citizens; the public and private sectors.”3 This political support is reflected in current legal and regulatory requirements—mandates or renewable portfolio standards (RPS)—in many states for the use of renewable energy sources for given percentages of the respective states’ electricity generation, consumption, or sales. Moreover, at both the federal and state levels, investment in and production of renewable electricity receive important subsidies in the form of direct payments to producers and the federal production tax credit for power generated by wind and other renewable technologies. For the federal government, the US Energy Information Administration (EIA) has estimated that the total cost of subsidies and support (in 2010 dollars) for all energy forms was about $9 billion in 1999, growing to almost $18 billion in 2007 and to more than $37 billion in 2010. For renewable energy, the respective figures were about $1.5 billion, $5 billion, and $14.7 billion.4 Moreover, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (the stimulus bill of 2009) included over $80 billion for various “clean energy,” energy efficiency, and technology programs and projects, of which $23 billion was to be directed toward renewable energy development.5 At the state level, policies in support of renewable energy investment and production vary widely; examples are production tax credits, property and sales tax exemptions, and subsidized loans. An important indirect subsidy results from standard regulatory rate making: higher-cost power—wind and solar electricity is a prime example—is combined (or “bundled”) with lower-cost power in regulated rates, which reflect average costs across different electricity generation technologies and across peak and off-peak periods. Even more important are the current legal and regulatory RPS requirements in many states for the use of renewable energy sources for given percentages of the respective state’s generation, consumption, or sales of electricity in the context of some timetable. Table 1 shows the thirty states (including the District of Columbia) with RPS requirements and the seven states where RPS goals are not yet mandatory. As table 1 shows, a typical requirement is a 20 percent market share (measured in various ways) by, say, 2020. In nearly every state with such requirements or goals, wind and solar power qualify as renewable generation counting toward satisfaction of the RPS standards. Table 2 presents recent data on actual power generation for the various electric generation technologies and on the market share of renewables. The recent slow growth in the market share of nonhydroelectric renewable technologies, coupled with the formidable problems faced by such technologies discussed in the first part of this Outlook series, suggests that achievement of the RPS goals summarized in table 1 will be difficult and costly. These problems are very likely to be exacerbated by ongoing developments in the market for natural gas, to which we now turn. Outlook for Natural Gas Supplies and Prices Recent technological advances in the production of natural gas from shale formations and from coal beds have increased estimated natural gas reserves sharply.6 Figure 1 illustrates the resulting sharp increase over the last two years in projected gas reserves. Between the 2010 and 2011 EIA estimates, projected natural gas reserves through 2025 have increased about 15 percent. The 2011 projection is about 17 percent higher for 2030 and for 2035. As a result, the EIA has reduced its projections of future prices for natural gas delivered for electric generation. Between the two sets of projections (2010 and 2011), prices fall by about 15–23 percent over the period 2015–35. As we would expect, the 2010 and 2011 EIA projections of combined cycle gas capacity remain roughly the same until 2035, when the 2011 projection is about 6 percent higher than that made a year earlier. But the projections for nonhydroelectric renewable capacity in 2030–35 fall by 16–21 percent over the course of only one year. These EIA projections of capacity investment in substantial part reflect the fact that gas and renewable generation technologies are substitutes, and the projected decline in delivered gas prices exacerbates the inherent competitive disadvantages borne by renewable technologies, as I discussed in my first Outlook. Conclusion This poor competitive performance of wind and solar energy is not limited to the United States. As a crude generalization, Europe’s experience with renewable electricity also can be summarized as high costs combined with low reliability.7 That is the unavoidable outcome given the basic economic realities afflicting wind and solar electricity generating technologies. Accordingly, renewable power generation has achieved only a small market share in the United States, and official projections are for slow growth at best, notwithstanding large subsidies and other policy support. This market resistance to investment in renewable generation capacity can be explained by the problems intrinsic to renewable power—that is, the inherent limitations on its competitiveness—that public policies can circumvent or neutralize only at very substantial cost. Those problems can be summarized as: unconcentrated energy content; siting constraints and resulting high costs for transmission; and the costs created by low capacity factors, the intermittent nature of wind flows and sunlight, and the resulting need for backup capacity. Moreover, the five central analytic arguments that dominate the political and policy support for renewables are highly problematic: The infant industry argument is inconsistent with the cost evidence on renewables. The subsidies enjoyed by renewables far outweigh those bestowed upon conventional generation technologies. The costs of backup capacity necessary for renewable power—an externality that renewable power imposes upon the electric system writ large—are greater than any negative environmental externalities created by conventional generation that current policies may not have corrected. And the sustainability and green employment rationales are exceedingly weak. These realities suggest that the purported social benefits of policy support for renewables are illusory. Moreover, ongoing supply and price developments in the market for natural gas are likely to weaken further the competitive position of renewable power generation. At the same time, the subsidies and mandates implemented in support of renewable electricity impose nontrivial costs upon the taxpayers and consumers in electricity markets. The upshot is the imposition of substantial net costs upon the US economy as a whole even as the policies bestow important benefits upon particular groups and industries, thus yielding enhanced incentives for innumerable interests to seek favors from government. As has proven true in most contexts, the outcomes of market competition, even as constrained and distorted by tax and regulatory policies, are the best guides for achievement of the most productive allocation of resources. As federal and state policymakers address the ongoing issues and problems afflicting renewable electricity generation, the realities of this recent history provide a useful guide for policy reform.

### Solar Society 2NC

#### Solar trades off with energy efficiency measures, tanks warming solvency

Bergeron, president of SunDanzer Development, a solar energy company, 2011

[10/12/11, David, president of SunDanzer Development, Inc., a solar energy company, 21 years of experience working in the refrigeration and aerospace industries, technical lead for NASA’s Advanced Technology Refrigeration project, BS in Mechanical Engineering from Texas A&M, Masters in Finance from University of Houston CLC, “Solar Power Cost: Don’t Forget Intermittency (energy economics 101),” response to another author on the website’s comment, http://www.masterresource.org/2011/10/solar-power-cost-intermittency-too/]

I understand the externality argument. Let’s say for argument sake, CO2 cost our economy/environment $200/ton. Also assume we muster the political will to impose such a tax. The question is “will solar now make sense in the high carbon tax world?” I think the answer is “No, it will not”. I say this because there are a lot of direct and indirect energy inputs used to make and use on-grid PV. But beyond the energy inputs are the energy opportunity cost of the non-energy inputs. By this I mean, when we waste aluminum on PV frames and mounting structures, it crowds out better application, such as lightening vehicle or using more aluminum in transmission lines to reduce I2R losses. When both the direct, indirect, and energy opportunity cost of on-grid PV is calculated, I think one can demonstrate that on-grid PV is a net energy loser and therefore net CO2 producer.

#### Can’t solve the environment – land usage requirements

Ken Zweibel, James Mason and Vasilis Fthenakis – 2007

Solar Grand Plan, Scientific American, (Zweibel is president of PrimeStar Solar in Golden, Colo.; Mason is director of the Solar Energy Campaign and the Hydrogen Research Institute in Farmingdale, N.Y. Fthenakis is head of the Photovoltaic Environmental Research Center at Brookhaven National Laboratory and is a professor in and director of Columbia University’s Center for Life Cycle Analysis), http://people.bu.edu/sobieraj/articles/SolarGrandPlan\_Jan08\_SciAm.pdf

To convert the country to solar power, huge tracts of land would have to be covered with photovoltaic panels and solar heating troughs. A direct-current (DC) transmission backbone would also have to be erected to send that energy efficiently across the nation. The technology is ready. On the following pages we present a grand plan that could provide 69 percent of the U.S.’s electricity and 35 percent of its total energy (which includes transportation) with solar power by 2050. We project that this energy could be sold to consumers at rates equivalent to today’s rates for conventional power sources, about five cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh). If wind, biomass and geothermal sources were also developed, renewable energy could provide 100 percent of the nation’s electricity and 90 percent of its energy by 2100. The federal government would have to invest more than $400 billion over the next 40 years to complete the 2050 plan. That investment is substantial, but the payoff is greater. Solar plants consume little or no fuel, saving billions of dollars year after year. The infrastructure would displace 300 large coal-fired power plants and 300 more large natural gas plants and all the fuels they consume. The plan would effectively eliminate all imported oil, fundamentally cutting U.S. trade deficits and easing political tension in the Middle East and elsewhere. Because solar technologies are almost pollution-free, the plan would also reduce greenhouse gas emissions from power plants by 1.7 billion tons a year, and another 1.9 billion tons from gasoline vehicles would be displaced by plug-in hybrids refueled by the solar power grid. In 2050 U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would be 62 percent below 2005 levels, putting a major brake on global warming.

####  No impact – empirics

Willis et. al, ’10 [Kathy J. Willis, Keith D. Bennett, Shonil A. Bhagwat & H. John B. Birks (2010): 4 °C and beyond: what did this mean for biodiversity in the past?, Systematics and Biodiversity, 8:1, 3-9, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14772000903495833>, ]

The most recent climate models and fossil evidence for the early Eocene Climatic Optimum (53–51 million years ago) indicate that during this time interval atmospheric CO2 would have exceeded 1200 ppmv and tropical temperatures were between 5–10 ◦ C warmer than modern values (Zachos et al., 2008). There is also evidence for relatively rapid intervals of extreme global warmth and massive carbon addition when global temperatures increased by 5 ◦ C in less than 10 000 years (Zachos et al., 2001). So what was the response of biota to these ‘climate extremes’ and do we see the large-scale extinctions (especially in the Neotropics) predicted by some of the most recent models associated with future climate changes (Huntingford et al., 2008)? In fact the fossil record for the early Eocene Climatic Optimum demonstrates the very opposite. All the evidence from low-latitude records indicates that, at least in the plant fossil record, this was one of the most biodiverse intervals of time in the Neotropics (Jaramillo et al., 2006). It was also a time when the tropical forest biome was the most extensive in Earth’s history, extending to mid-latitudes in both the northern and southern hemispheres – and there was also no ice at the Poles and Antarctica was covered by needle-leaved forest (Morley, 2007). There were certainly novel ecosystems, and an increase in community turnover with a mixture of tropical and temperate species in mid latitudes and plants persisting in areas that are currently polar deserts. [It should be noted; however, that at the earlier Palaeocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum (PETM) at 55.8 million years ago in the US Gulf Coast, there was a rapid vegetation response to climate change. There was major compositional turnover, palynological richness decreased, and regional extinctions occurred (Harrington & Jaramillo, 2007). Reasons for these changes are unclear, but they may have resulted from continental drying, negative feedbacks on vegetation to changing CO2 (assuming that CO2 changed during the PETM), rapid cooling immediately after the PETM, or subtle changes in plant–animal interactions (Harrington & Jaramillo, 2007).]
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### 1NC Econ Impact

#### AG k2 Econ

Cupp, 4 – Assistant Professor, Department of Logistics and Resource Operations, United States Army Command and General Staff College (O. Shawn Cupp, Agroterrorism in the US: Key Security Challenges for the 21st Century, http://bcbsma.medscape.com/viewarticle/482308)

Agriculture is one of the easiest sectors of the U.S. economy to disrupt, and its disruption could have catastrophic consequences for the U.S. and world economies. Agriculture in the U.S. accounts for 13% of the current Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and provides employment for 15% of the population. It produces high-quality, cheap, plentiful food for domestic consumption and accounts for more than $50 billion in exports. The likelihood of terrorist acts interrupting the production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products is high: A number of different possible plant or animal pathogens could cause harm or loss of production, and even an act of agroterrorism that did not result in the destruction of foodstuffs or interruptions in the food supply could have a psychological impact. A number of recent unintentional events and epidemics have prompted the U.S. and other countries to provide resources to counteract contagious diseases and contain their impact, including increased funding to federal agencies that are responsible for protecting domestic agriculture. This article presents recommendations to protect agriculture, including changing the way agriculture is viewed on the federal level and increasing the resources to protect agriculture from terrorist attack.

#### Social instability causes otherization and authoritarianism

Stenner, 5 – Professor of Politics, Princeton (Karen, The Authoritarian Dynamic, p 27, AG)

In any case, the general idea that societal threat is in some way implicated in the generation of authoritarian attitudes and behaviors accords with some long-standing arguments as well as with some rudimentary evidence suggesting that these attitudes and behaviors respond powerfully to conditions such as social disorder, "moral decay," national decline, and political dissent and instability. An early expression of this idea was offered by Fromm (194 1), who proposed that the appeal to German workers of fascism was the "escape from freedom" it offered, that is, the release it promised from the uncertainty, insecurity, and lack of direction of modern capitalist society. Likewise, Reich (1970) argued that feelings of national humiliation and loss of security and identity prevalent in the pre- Nazi Weimar Republic laid the groundwork for public support of Hitler's fascist regime. The theme has reappeared in the literature many times since, with the most notable recent contribution provided by Staub (1989), who pondered the origins of genocide and group violence in light of historical case studies of Nazi Germany, Turkey, Cambodia, and Argentina. He argued that "difficult life conditions" – political instability, economic decline, social disorder and change – can lower group esteem, frighten or frustrate individuals, and threaten their values, worldview, or way of life. This is said to create a powerful drive to restore psychological security and a positive self-concept. The restoration is apparently accomplished by cleaving to the in-group, positively differentiating the in-group, and devaluing out-groups. Staub argued that given the right cultural–societal characteristics – an authoritarian culture, a history of devaluation of out-groups, authoritative support for their mistreatment – individuals could move from derogating out-groups in the interests of restoring in-group esteem along a "continuum of destruction" toward mass violence and genocide.

#### 9/11 proves

Helly- PhD in Anthropolgy 4 (Denise, Doctorat 3 e cycle Anthropology, La Sorbonne, Paris

Licence de sociologie, Faculté des Sciences économiques et sociales, La Sorbonne, Paris Degree in Sociology, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, La Sorbonne, Paris

Diplôme de langue et civilisation chinoises, École nationale des langues orientales, Paris Diploma in Chinese Language and Culture, National School of Oriental Languages, Paris

Diplôme de langue et civilisation indonésienne, École nationale des langues orientales, Paris Diploma of Indonesian Language and Culture, National School of Oriental Languages, Paris

Diplôme de Sciences Politiques, Institut d'études Politiques, Lyon, France Diplôme de Sciences Politiques, Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Lyon, France Are muslims discriminated against in Canada since September 2001?, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/summary\_0199-3053262\_ITM, AG)

Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC) figures indicate a 1,600 percent increase in hate crimes against Muslim individuals or places between September 2001 and September 2002 (Media release, March 10 2003). The Congress received 11 complaints related to such crimes the year preceding the September 2001 attacks, but this figure increased to 173 the following year. In the United States, a 2001 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) report indicates the same 1,600 percent increase in hate crimes against people perceived as Muslims: 28 in 2000, and 481 in 2001, including 3 murders and 35 cases of arson (Abdelkarim 2003:51).

### 1NC Warming/Innovation !

#### Immigration reform key to retain scientists, engineers and tech experts --- critical to innovation

Deruy, 1/15 (Emily, 1/15/2013, “Tech Experts: Immigration Reform Needs To Happen,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/tech-experts-immigration-reform-happen/story?id=18220248>)

The United States needs more high-level scientists and engineers, according to technology experts. That's why they're pushing for immigration reform as a way to educate and retain the most talented workers in the world. But how that reform should happen -- in one big piece of legislation or in a series of small bills -- is fueling debate on Capitol Hill. While lawmakers in Congress agree that reform should be a priority, the comprehensive package that the White House and top Democrats are pushing has House Republicans worried that it will turn into "amnesty" -- a dirty word in their playbook -- and provide a mass legalization for undocumented immigrants. See Also: Immigration Group Bashes Deferred Action "Comprehensive has become a code word for amnesty," Representative Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) said during a Tuesday morning panel on immigration and technology hosted by Politico. Chaffetz, joined by Republican Representative Raúl Labrador of Idaho, said he prefers the "piecemeal" approach to reform. "I don't think it should be comprehensive," Labrador added, because "every member [of Congress] will find something flawed" in one wide-ranging bill. Labrador supports a series of immigration bills that tackle specific, narrow issues, such as how to handle visas for experts in science, technology, engineering and math, what are called STEM visas. He said he wants the House of Representatives to vote on all immigration proposals, as many as five or six of them, together. But Zoe Lofgren (D-California), who also attended the Politico event, thinks one comprehensive bill makes more sense. She says Democrats are waiting "for a signal" from House Speaker John Boehner that he's open to the comprehensive immigration reform he mentioned in a speech shortly after President Obama's reelection. If Republicans such as Lamar Smith (R-Texas) continue to set the GOP immigration agenda, she said, "we're going nowhere fast." Smith favors tighter enforcement of current immigration laws and opposes programs such as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which grants two-year deportation reprieves to some undocumented young people. He joined other restrictionists in blasting DACA at a panel hosted by the Center for Immigration Studies, a D.C.-based think tank, on Monday. A group of technology industry leaders at the event said they want immigration reforms that will allow them to retain highly skilled foreign workers. As it stands, they said, too many workers currently obtain advanced degrees in the United States and then return to their home countries to start businesses that compete with companies here. Gary Shapiro, president and chief executive officer of the Consumer Electronics Association, said that for business owners, the debate over what type of immigration reform to pass is "like asking someone dying in the desert what type of water they want." "We need [reform] desperately," he said, adding that he has no problem with a path to citizenship being included in a reform bill if the reforms allow businesses to retain highly skilled workers. "Immigrants create economic activity," Shapiro said, "highly skilled or not." John Engler, current president of the Business Roundtable and former Republican governor of Michigan, pointed out that bringing foreign students into the country does not limit the number of U.S. students who can enroll in advanced STEM degree programs. "Programs would simply close" if they had to depend on American students, he said. STEM jobs pay better, the employment rate is higher, and there are a number of federal grants available for students that choose that career path, but not enough American students opt to go in that direction. It's a problem with broad consequences and a challenge that concerns leaders in immigration and education alike."There's something in our culture," Labrador said, that causes kids to opt for non-STEM degrees. Without a clear solution, technology experts say they want reforms that allow the country to educate and keep the best workers in the world, to help bolster the economy and spur innovation.

#### Immigration reform is key to reinvigorate all innovation

McCraw, 12 --- professor emeritus at Harvard Business School (11/1/2012, Thomas K., “Innovative Immigrants,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/02/opinion/immigrants-as-entrepreneurs.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>)

SOME 70 million immigrants have come to America since the first colonists arrived. The role their labor has played in economic development is widely understood. Much less familiar is the extent to which their remarkable innovations have driven American prosperity. Indeed, while both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney have lauded entrepreneurship, innovation and “job creation,” neither candidate has made comprehensive immigration reform an issue, despite immigrants’ crucial role in those fields. Yet understanding how immigrants have fueled innovation through history is critical to making sure they continue to drive prosperity in the future. At the country’s beginning, the three most important architects of its financial system were immigrants: Alexander Hamilton, from St. Croix, then part of the Danish West Indies; Robert Morris, born in Liverpool, England; and Albert Gallatin of Geneva. Morris was superintendent of finance during the Revolutionary War, using every resource at his command to support the army in the field. Hamilton, as the first secretary of the Treasury, rescued the country from bankruptcy and designed its basic financial system. Gallatin paid down much of the national debt, engineered the financing of the Louisiana Purchase and remains the longest-serving Treasury secretary ever. Immigrants’ financial innovations continued through the 19th century. In 1808 Alexander Brown, from Ireland, founded the nation’s first investment bank, and his immigrant sons set up Brown Brothers. The Lehman brothers, from Germany, began as dry-goods merchants and cotton brokers in Alabama, then moved to New York just before the Civil War and eventually founded a bank. Many other immigrants, including Marcus Goldman of Goldman Sachs, followed similar paths, starting very small, traveling to new cities and establishing banks. Meanwhile, “Yankee” firms like Kidder, Peabody and Drexel, Morgan — whose partners were native-born — remained less mobile, tied by family and high society to Boston and New York. Immigrant innovators were pioneers in many other industries after the Civil War. Three examples were Andrew Carnegie (Scotland, steel), Joseph Pulitzer (Hungary, newspapers) and David Sarnoff (Russia, electronics). Each came to America young, poor and full of energy. Carnegie’s mother brought the family to Pittsburgh in 1848, when Andrew was 12. He became a bobbin-boy in a textile mill, a telegram messenger, a telegraph-key operator, a low-level manager at the Pennsylvania Railroad, a division superintendent for the same railroad and a bond salesman for the railroad in Europe. Recognizing the limitless market for the rails that carried trains, Carnegie jumped to steel. His most important innovation was “hard driving” blast furnaces, wearing them out quickly. This violated the accepted practice of “coddling” furnaces, but he calculated that his vastly increased output cut the price of steel far more than replacing the furnaces cost his company. In turn, an immense quantity of cheap steel found its way into lucrative new uses: structural steel for skyscrapers, sheet steel for automobiles. Pulitzer was the home-tutored son of a prosperous Hungarian family that lost its fortune. He came to the United States in 1864 at age 17, recruited by a Massachusetts Civil War regiment. Penniless after the war ended, he went to St. Louis, a center for German immigrants, whose language he spoke fluently. He worked as a waiter, a railroad clerk, a lawyer and a reporter for a local German newspaper, part of which he eventually purchased. In 1879, he acquired two English-language papers and merged them into The St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In 1883, he moved to New York, where he bought The New York World and began a fierce competition with other New York papers, mainly the Sun and, later, William Randolph Hearst’s New York Journal. The New York World was pro-labor, pro-immigration and, remarkably, both serious and sensationalist. It achieved a huge circulation. Sarnoff was just 9 years old when he arrived from Russia in 1901. He earned money selling Yiddish newspapers on the street and singing at a synagogue, and then worked as an office clerk, a messenger and, like Carnegie, a telegraph operator. From there he became part of the fledgling radio firm RCA and rose rapidly within its ranks. Sarnoff was among the first to see radio’s potential as “point-to-mass” entertainment, i.e., broadcasting. He devoted a huge percentage of profits to research and development, and won an epic battle with CBS over industry standards for color TV. For decades, RCA and electronics were practically synonymous. As these men show, one of the key traits of immigrant innovators is geographic mobility, both from the home country and within the United States. Consider the striking roster of 20th-century immigrants who led the development of fields like movies and information technology: the Hollywood studios MGM, Warner Brothers, United Artists, Paramount and Universal; the Silicon Valley companies Intel, eBay, Google, Yahoo and Sun Microsystems. The economist Joseph Schumpeter — yet another immigrant, and the most perceptive early analyst of innovation — considered it to be the fundamental component of entrepreneurship: “The typical entrepreneur is more self-centered than other types, because he relies less than they do on tradition and connection” and because his efforts consist “precisely in breaking up old, and creating new, tradition.” For that reason, innovators always encounter resistance from people whose economic and social interests are threatened by new products and methods. Compared with the native-born, who have extended families and lifelong social and commercial relationships, immigrants without such ties — without businesses to inherit or family property to protect — are in some ways better prepared to play the innovator’s role. A hundred academic monographs could not prove that immigrants are more innovative than native-born Americans, because each spurs the other on. Innovations by the blended population were, and still are, integral to the economic growth of the United States. But our overly complex immigration law hampers even the most obvious innovators’ efforts to become citizens. It endangers our tradition of entrepreneurship, and it must be repaired — soon.

#### Clean tech development key to solve warming

Norris & Jenkins, 9 --- leaders in the youth climate movement and work at the Breakthrough Institute (3/10/2009, Teryn and Jesse, “Want to Save the World? Make Clean Energy Cheap,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/teryn-norris/want-to-save-the-world-ma\_b\_173482.html)

Over 12,000 young adults attended the recent Power Shift 2009 summit in Washington, DC. Their goal? Building the largest youth movement in decades to save the world from global warming. Largely missing from Power Shift, however, was a critical group: young scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs. Maybe it was mid-terms. Perhaps the event seemed too political. Or maybe the summit recruited too many traditionally-defined "activists." Whatever the cause, we have very little chance of overcoming climate change without enlisting young innovators at a drastically greater scale. Simply put, they represent one of the most important catalysts for creating a clean energy economy and achieving long-term prosperity. The reason is this: at its core, climate change is a challenge of technology innovation. Over the next four decades, global energy demand will approximately double. Most of this growth will happen in developing nations as they continue lifting their citizens out of poverty and building modern societies. But over the same period, global greenhouse gas emissions must fall dramatically to avert the worst consequences of climate change. Shortly before his untimely death in 2005, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Richard Smalley coined this the "Terawatt Challenge": increasing global energy production from roughly 15 terawatts in 2005 to 60 terawatts annually by 2100 in a way that simultaneously confronts the challenges of global warming, poverty alleviation, and resource depletion. The single greatest obstacle to meeting the Terawatt Challenge is the "technology gap" between dirty and clean energy sources. Low-carbon energy technologies remain significantly more expensive than fossil fuels. For example, solar photovoltaic electricity costs up to three to five times that of coal electricity, and plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles can be twice as expensive as their gasoline-fueled competitors. Unless this technology gap is bridged and clean energy technologies become affordable and scalable, poor and rich nations alike will continue opposing significant prices on their carbon emissions and will continue relying primarily upon coal and other fossil fuels to power their development. This will virtually assure massive climate destabilization. So the task is clear: to avoid climate catastrophe and create a new energy economy, we must unleash our forces of innovation - namely, scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs- to invent a new portfolio of truly scalable clean energy technologies, chart new paths to bring these technologies to market, and ensure they are affordable enough to deploy throughout the world. In short, to save the world we must make clean energy cheap.

#### No impact – empirics

Willis et. al, ’10 [Kathy J. Willis, Keith D. Bennett, Shonil A. Bhagwat & H. John B. Birks (2010): 4 °C and beyond: what did this mean for biodiversity in the past?, Systematics and Biodiversity, 8:1, 3-9, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14772000903495833>, ]

The most recent climate models and fossil evidence for the early Eocene Climatic Optimum (53–51 million years ago) indicate that during this time interval atmospheric CO2 would have exceeded 1200 ppmv and tropical temperatures were between 5–10 ◦ C warmer than modern values (Zachos et al., 2008). There is also evidence for relatively rapid intervals of extreme global warmth and massive carbon addition when global temperatures increased by 5 ◦ C in less than 10 000 years (Zachos et al., 2001). So what was the response of biota to these ‘climate extremes’ and do we see the large-scale extinctions (especially in the Neotropics) predicted by some of the most recent models associated with future climate changes (Huntingford et al., 2008)? In fact the fossil record for the early Eocene Climatic Optimum demonstrates the very opposite. All the evidence from low-latitude records indicates that, at least in the plant fossil record, this was one of the most biodiverse intervals of time in the Neotropics (Jaramillo et al., 2006). It was also a time when the tropical forest biome was the most extensive in Earth’s history, extending to mid-latitudes in both the northern and southern hemispheres – and there was also no ice at the Poles and Antarctica was covered by needle-leaved forest (Morley, 2007). There were certainly novel ecosystems, and an increase in community turnover with a mixture of tropical and temperate species in mid latitudes and plants persisting in areas that are currently polar deserts. [It should be noted; however, that at the earlier Palaeocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum (PETM) at 55.8 million years ago in the US Gulf Coast, there was a rapid vegetation response to climate change. There was major compositional turnover, palynological richness decreased, and regional extinctions occurred (Harrington & Jaramillo, 2007). Reasons for these changes are unclear, but they may have resulted from continental drying, negative feedbacks on vegetation to changing CO2 (assuming that CO2 changed during the PETM), rapid cooling immediately after the PETM, or subtle changes in plant–animal interactions (Harrington & Jaramillo, 2007).]

### 1NR U/Q

#### \

#### Obama is providing leadership to get comprehensive reform passed

Cassidy & Remal, 2/18 (Chris Cassidy and Gary J. Remal, 2/18/2013, “Obama pressures GOP with own immigration plan,” http://bostonherald.com/news\_opinion/us\_politics/2013/02/obama\_pressures\_gop\_with\_own\_immigration\_plan)

President Obama upped the ante on the immigration reform showdown with Republicans, vowing to present his own bill to Congress if the GOP refuses to compromise — a move hailed by political pundits and reform advocates as a savvy maneuver to keep the backing of crucial Latino voters. “As the election showed, the Democrats have their boot on the neck of the Republicans,” said Maurice Cunningham of the University of Massachusetts Boston. “Why let up?” A bipartisan group of eight lawmakers has been working on an immigration plan for the past few weeks. Yesterday, White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough warned those lawmakers their time is limited. “We will be prepared with our own plan if these ongoing talks between Republicans and Democrats up on Capitol Hill break down,” McDonough said in one of several interviews on Sunday talk shows after news of the president’s alternative plan leaked. The administration’s proposal would create a visa for those in the country illegally and allow them to become legal permanent residents within eight years. The proposal also requires businesses to know the immigration status of their workers and adds more funding for border security. It drew immediate criticism from U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), one of the eight lawmakers on the immigration panel. “If actually proposed, the president’s bill would be dead on arrival in Congress,” Rubio said. Local activist groups yesterday praised Obama. “It’s a good day. It shows leadership and it shows he’s really trying to provide leadership,” said Eva A. Millona, head of the Massachusetts Immigration and Refugee Advocacy Coalition. “But we’re optimistic both parties are serious to get this done.”The president is seizing on a key moment, agreed Alejandra St. Guillen, executive director of Oiste, a Latino civic education organization. “I don’t know what other option he had,” St. Guillen said. “Right after the election we had Republicans talking about immigration reform. In a sense, the White House might have thought this was the right time.”

#### Immigration is top priority and Obama is putting pressure on Congress to complete reform

Hesson, 2/17 (Ted, 2/17/2013, “Leaked White House Immigration Bill Puts Pressure on Senate,” <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/leaked-white-house-immigration-bill-puts-pressure-senate/story?id=18524947>))

A draft of a White House immigration reform bill leaked to USA Today on Saturday puts pressure on the Senate to deliver with its own package of comprehensive legislation. See also: 3 Numbers Napolitano Needs on Immigration The draft features an earned path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, so long as they meet certain requirements. Qualifying immigrants would be able to apply for a green card within eight years, according to USA Today. The bill also contains provisions related to border security and a mandatory system to make sure businesses check the work eligibility of their employees, USA Today reported. On Saturday, a spokesperson for the Obama administration stressed that the administration bill was neither final nor an attempt to derail a reform effort by a group of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate. "We continue to work in support of a bipartisan effort, and while the president has made clear he will move forward if Congress fails to act, progress continues to be made and the administration has not prepared a final bill to submit," White House spokesman Clark Stevens told USA Today. Still, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a leading voice in the Senate group working on a bipartisan bill, said in a statement that it was a "mistake" for the White House to draft its own legislation without seeking GOP input. As a result, he said, President Barack Obama's bill would be "dead on arrival in Congress." "The President's bill repeats the failures of past legislation," Rubio said. "It fails to follow through on previously broken promises to secure our borders, creates a special pathway that puts those who broke our immigration laws at an advantage over those who chose to do things the right way and come here legally, and does nothing to address guest workers or future flow, which serious immigration experts agree is critical to preventing future influxes of illegal immigrants." The draft obtained by USA Today did not include what will likely be an important and contentious part of any immigration reform package -- how to alter the legal immigration system to better handle future flows of immigrants. Such changes could potentially include the addition of a guest worker program or an expansion of visas for certain workers. The exclusion of that section isn't necessarily surprising. The Senate working group, for its part, is hoping that labor unions and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce will be able to come to an agreement on how to handle future influxes of immigrants before drafting that part of the congressional bill. As of last week, the two groups said they were continuing to negotiate despite rumors that talks were collapsing. Since winning reelection in November, President Obama has made immigration reform a top priority, and has made it clear that he'll take the lead if Congress fails to act. He told Univision in late January that he believed Senate could have a bill ready by March, and last week, he met with Senate Democrats to check on the status of the legislative effort.Whether or not the White House leak was intentional, the administration is using the moment to send a reminder to Congress that the president could move forward on legislation in the coming months if a bill in the Senate fails to materialize. "He [Marco Rubio] says its 'dead on arrival' if its proposed. Well let's make sure that it doesn't have to be proposed," White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough said Sunday on ABC News' "This Week." "Let's make sure that that group up there, the gang of eight, makes the good progress on these efforts as much as they say they want to."

#### Progress now --- passage likely in Senate and House

Samay Live, 2/21 (“Obama is hoping to sign immigration reform bill,” 2/21/2013, Factiva))

US President Barack Obama is encouraged by the progress made in the US Congress on comprehensive immigration reform and hoped that a bill in this regard would soon land up on his table for signature. "As the (US) President has made clear, he is encouraged by and hopeful about the process underway in the Senate, the bipartisan process led by the so-called Gang of Eight (a group of eight Senators), towards achieving a comprehensive immigration reform bill that could pass the Senate -- and hopefully pass the House, and land on his desk for his signature," the White House Press Secretary Jay Carney told reporters here yesterday. "He (Obama) prefers that option to any other, and he is very encouraged by the progress that's been made so far. He thought his conversations with Senate Democrats involved in this process last week were very productive, and he felt the same about his conversations with Senate Republicans yesterday," Carney said referring to the telephonic conversations the US President had with top three Republican lawmakers, a day earlier. Responding to questions, Carney said there is not much disagreement among various parties when it comes to the need to pursue enhanced border security as part of comprehensive immigration reform. "That's part of why it's called comprehensive. So we look forward, to continuing to work with Congress, work with the Senate as they pursue bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform legislation," he said. Carney said that the prospects of success in this regard can be easily reflected from the comments of Republican Senator Mario Rubio."But we encourage the Senate to keep working because this is a significant priority. It's a priority that has in the past enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and that we believe is, once again, enjoying that kind of support," the White House Press Secretary said. He said the legislation that then-Senator Obama supported back in 2006 was co-authored by Senator (John) McCain, which also got the support of President George W. Bush "And that I think represents and reflects what should be the bipartisan consensus behind this very important policy goal," he said. Carney said that comprehensive immigration reform provides a clear path to citizenship that includes getting in the back of the line and paying taxes and the like, a view supported by both the Democratic and Republican parties.

#### I answered their Helderman argument in C-X – Rubio is already on board and is backing Obama now – our ev isnewer

#### Pace just says that Republicans could pose a problem not that they will

#### Obama reaching out to congressional leaders to get it passed

Strauss, 2/19 (Daniel, 2/19/2013, The Hill, “Obama 'commends' GOP senators on immigration reform,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/283857-obama-phones-gang-of-eight-republicans>)

President Obama reached out on Tuesday to the Republican members of the bipartisan group of senators that crafted a framework for passing immigration reform. Obama called Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) to discuss progress on passing immigration reform. The three senators are part of the so-called Gang of Eight, which unveiled a framework for passing immigration reform in late January. Obama recently sat down with the Democratic members of the group to discuss progress on passing immigration reform. "This afternoon, the President placed calls to Sen. Graham, Sen. McCain, and Sen. Rubio to discuss their shared commitment to bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform and to commend the Senators for the bipartisan progress that continues to be made by the Gang of Eight on this important issue," a statement from the White House said. Obama did not speak with Sen. Jeff Flake (Ariz.), the fourth Republican member of the group, who was traveling, according to the White House. The phone calls between the Republicans and Obama came a few hours after the White House and Rubio's office traded accusations about communication over immigration reform. Rubio's office said earlier on Tuesday that White House staffers had not been in contact with Rubio or his office about immigration reform, but the White House said its staffers had met with Rubio's office. "During the calls, which build on conversations that have taken place at the staff level, the President reiterated that he remains supportive of the effort underway in Congress, and that he hopes that they can produce a bill as soon as possible that reflects shared core principles on reform," the statement continued. On Saturday, Rubio criticized the Obama administration after USA Today published leaked details of the administration's proposal for an immigration reform law. Obama has said he would push his own immigration plan if Congress cannot come to an agreement on comprehensive immigration reform. "As the President made clear when he met with Democratic Senators involved in the process last week, that while he is pleased with the progress and supportive of the effort to date, he is prepared to submit his own legislation if Congress fails to act," the White House statement continued. "He thanked the senators for their leadership, and made clear that he and his staff look forward to continuing to work together with their teams to achieve needed reform." Graham's office described the conversation between the senator from South Carolina and Obama as "short" and "cordial." Obama called at around 2 p.m., according to Graham's office. "They discussed the need for immigration reform and why it is important we fix our broken immigration system," Graham spokesman Kevin Bishop said. Rubio was in Jerusalem when he talked to Obama on Tuesday. "Sen. Rubio appreciated receiving President Obama's phone call to discuss immigration reform late tonight in Jerusalem," according to Rubio spokesman Alex Conant. "The senator told the president that he feels good about the ongoing negotiations in the Senate, and is hopeful the final product is something that can pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support."

#### Growing number of Republicans coming on board --- increasing support for citizenship

Werner, 2/21 (Erica, 2/21/2013, Associated Press, “Seen as key to immigration bill, business and labor leaders agree on future worker principles,” Factiva))

Even so, Thursday's agreement represents a significant step in talks that some on Capitol Hill gave little chance of success.

"This is yet another sign of progress, of bipartisanship, and we are encouraged by it," White House press secretary Jay Carney said. Schumer called the announcement "a major step forward."

President Barack Obama has been criticized as caving in to organized labor for failing to include a temporary worker program in his own immigration blueprint. Carney would not say whether the White House supports a visa program for low-skill workers.

In a sign of the growing support for action on immigration, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R-Va., one of a number of Republicans who've recently softened their opposition to eventual citizenship for some illegal immigrants, issued a statement saying he was encouraged "that two groups often on opposite sides of the aisle are serious about putting politics aside and finding solutions."

### 2NC AT: Confrontation Good/Dickerson

#### Strategy of confrontation will backfire for Obama --- spoils cooperation necessary to pass immigration

Gergen, 1/18 --- professor of public service and director of the Center for Public Leadership at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government (1/18/2013, David, CNN Wire, “Obama 2.0: Smarter, tougher -- but wiser?” Factiva))

Strikingly, Obama has also been deft in the ways he has drawn upon Vice President Joe Biden. During much of the campaign, Biden appeared to be kept under wraps. But in the transition, he has been invaluable to Obama in negotiating a deal with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell on the fiscal cliff and in pulling together the gun package. Biden was also at his most eloquent at the ceremony announcing the gun measures. All of this has added up for Obama to one of the most effective transitions in modern times. And it is paying rich dividends: A CNN poll this past week pegged his approval rating at 55%, far above the doldrums he was in for much of the past two years. Many of his long-time supporters are rallying behind him. As the first Democrat since Franklin D. Roosevelt to score back-to-back election victories with more than 50% of the vote, Obama is in the strongest position since early in his first year. Smarter, tougher, bolder -- his new style is paying off politically. But in the long run, will it also pay off in better governance? Perhaps -- and for the country's sake, let's hope so. Yet, there are ample reasons to wonder, and worry. Ultimately, to resolve major issues like deficits, immigration, guns and energy, the president and Congress need to find ways to work together much better than they did in the first term. Over the past two years, Republicans were clearly more recalcitrant than Democrats, practically declaring war on Obama, and the White House has been right to adopt a tougher approach after the elections. But a growing number of Republicans concluded after they had their heads handed to them in November that they had to move away from extremism toward a more center-right position, more open to working out compromises with Obama. It's not that they suddenly wanted Obama to succeed; they didn't want their party to fail. House Speaker John Boehner led the way, offering the day after the election to raise taxes on the wealthy and giving up two decades of GOP orthodoxy. In a similar spirit, Rubio has been developing a mainstream plan on immigration, moving away from a ruinous GOP stance. One senses that the hope, small as it was, to take a brief timeout on hyperpartisanship in order to tackle the big issues is now slipping away. While a majority of Americans now approve of Obama's job performance, conservatives increasingly believe that in his new toughness, he is going overboard, trying to run over them. They don't see a president who wants to roll up his sleeves and negotiate; they see a president who wants to barnstorm the country to beat them up. News that Obama is converting his campaign apparatus into a nonprofit to support his second term will only deepen that sense. And it frustrates them that he is winning: At their retreat, House Republicans learned that their disapproval has risen to 64%. Conceivably, Obama's tactics could pressure Republicans into capitulation on several fronts. More likely, they will be spoiling for more fights. Chances for a "grand bargain" appear to be hanging by a thread.

#### Fiscal cliff proves Dickerson was wrong --- concessions and compromise are key

Crook, 1/20 --- senior editor of The Atlantic (1/20/2013, Clive, “The Tough New Obama Isn't So Tough—and That's Why He's Winning,” [http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/the-tough-new-obama-isnt-so-tough-and-thats-why-hes-winning/267355/)](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/the-tough-new-obama-isnt-so-tough-and-thats-why-hes-winning/267355/%29))

One thing puzzles me about the prevailing line of analysis on the new Obama. The Republicans are in full retreat, according to this view, and it goes to prove that Obama was right to get tough and refuse to compromise. So long as the president grows enough of a spine to confront the GOP, he'll win and keep winning. Even commentators who think Obama might overreach if he adopts this strategy too carelessly agree that the new-look Obama is all about being tough. Take David Gergen, for instance. It is clear that he is consciously changing his leadership style heading into the next four years. Weeks before the November elections, his top advisers were signaling that he intended to be a different kind of president in his second term. "Just watch," they said to me, in effect, "he will win re-election decisively and then he will throw down the gauntlet to the Republicans, insisting they raise taxes on the wealthy. Right on the edge of the fiscal cliff, he thinks Republicans will cave." What's your Plan B, I asked. "We don't need a Plan B," they answered. "After the president hangs tough -- no more Mr. Nice Guy -- the other side will buckle." Sure enough, Republicans caved on taxes. Encouraged, Obama has since made clear he won't compromise with Republicans on the debt ceiling, either. Or John Dickerson. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. That's the old way. He has abandoned that... Obama's only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray. What am I failing to understand here? Obama compromised during the fiscal-cliff fight, and the GOP didn't -- and that's why he's emerged with the upper hand. Instead of insisting on an income threshold of $250,000 for raising top marginal tax rates, he accepted a threshold of $450,000. Instead of going over the cliff rather than yield on anything, he behaved reasonably. Republicans refused to give an inch on their own hardline position and then allowed a sufficient number of their votes in the House to defect. Thus the GOP disowned the very compromise it had been forced to accept--defining itself as the loser (even though the deal entrenched almost all of the Bush tax cuts). This is a good kind of opponent to have. Republicans seem to know they screwed up and are reluctantly retreating from use of the debt ceiling as a way to advance their aims. For the economy's sake, that's very good news. But let's be clear that the winner in the fight for public opinion was the team that showed flexibility and made the concession, not the team that refused to budge. Obama did what Dickerson says won't work. He gave ground to a Republican demand then finessed the GOP votes he needed--not through schmoozing, admittedly, but through pressure of public opinion. (I note in passing that the White House is already signaling that it doesn't expect to get all of its supposedly ambitious gun-control legislation through Congress. Guess what. It's open to compromise--and I'm betting it's hoping that the GOP isn't. This would improve its chances of winning that fight too.) What's new here, it seems to me, is mostly cosmetics--though I'm not saying that's unimportant. Obama has toughened up his presentation, but he still preferred the deal to going over the cliff. Crucially, most of the country felt exactly the same way. What's comical to me is how easily many Democrats have taken up the tough-new-Obama line. They might have decided to care about that tax threshold. They could have said, "Obama promised not to give way on taxes, then he did. He had the winning hand, and folded. Another climbdown, another needless compromise." Instead, they went with, "See what happens when you refuse to deal? You win!" I urge the president to follow the same approach going forward. Be more pragmatic. Make tactical concessions on inessentials. Show the GOP, in contrast, to be rigid and dogmatic. That will get the public on your side and help you win. But just remember to keep saying how tough you've become, how it's new rules, you've learned from your first term, and the days of trying to compromise with extremists are over. The party will lap that up. Why didn't we think of this before?

## 1NR Case

### AT: Root Cause

#### Focus on proximate causes are key

#### Hindsight is blinding – claims of “inevitability” are over-determined and diminish our ability to isolate alternative pathways

Scott D. Sagan – Political Science, Stanford –2000, ACCIDENTAL WAR IN THEORY AND PRACTICE – available via: [www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc)

To make reasonable judgements in such matters it is essential, in my view, to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination." Looking backwards at historical events, it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war and argue that the likelihood of conflict was so high that the war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off. If taken too far, however, this tendency eliminates the role of contingency in history and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways that were present to historical actors. The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, a bizarre false warning incident in the U.S. radar systems facing Cuba led officers at the North American Air Defense Command to believe that the U.S. was under attack and that a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida. Now imagine the counterfactual event that this false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and resulted in a U.S. nuclear "retaliation" against the Russians. How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III? One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given the deep political hostility of the two superpowers, the conflicting ideology, the escalating arms race, nuclear war would have occurred eventually. If not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin, or the Middle East, or Korea. From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.

### Kurusawa

#### failure of preventative action and predictions drives structural violence and inequality, only actions that act to preserve future generations can resolve power relations

Kurasawa‘4,

(Fuyuki, Assistant Prof. of Sociology @ York University, Cautionary Tales, Constellations Vol. 11, No. 4, Blackwell Synergy)

In the previous section, I described how the capacity to produce, disseminate, and receive warning signals regarding disasters on the world stage has developed in global civil society. Yet the fact remains that audiences may let a recklessness or insouciance toward the future prevail, instead of listening to and acting upon such warnings. There is no doubt that the short-sightedness and presentism are strong dynamics in contemporary society, which is enveloped by a “temporal myopia” that encourages most individuals to live in a state of chronological self-referentiality whereby they screen out anything that is not of the moment.22 The commercial media, advertising, and entertainment industries are major contributors to this “tyranny of real time”23 that feeds a societal addiction to the ‘live’ and the immediate while eroding the principle of farsightedness. The infamous quip attributed to Madame de Pompadour, ‘après nous, le déluge,’ perfectly captures a sense of utter callousness about the future that represents one of presentism’s most acute manifestations. Two closely related notions underlie it: the belief that we should only concern ourselves with whether our actions, or lack thereof, have deleterious consequences visible to us in the short-to medium-term (temporally limited responsibility); and sheer indifference toward the plight of those who will come after us (generational self-centeredness). Substantively, the two are not much different because they shift the costs and risks of present-day decisions onto our descendants. “The crisis of the future is a measure of the deficiency of our societies, incapable as they are of assessing what is involved in relationships with others,” Bindé writes. “This temporal myopia brings into play the same processes of denial of others as social shortsightedness. The absence of solidarity in time between generations merely reproduces selfishness in space within the same generation.”24 Thus, to the NIMBY (‘not-in-my-back-yard’) politics of the last few decades can be added the ‘not-in-my-lifetime’ or ‘not-to-my-children’ lines of reasoning. For members of dominant groups in the North Atlantic region, disasters are something for others to worry about – that is, those who are socio-economically marginal, or geographically and temporally distant. The variations on these themes are numerous. One is the oft-stated belief that prevention is a luxury that we can scarcely afford, or even an unwarranted conceit. Accordingly, by minimizing the urgency or gravity of potential threats, procrastination appears legitimate. Why squander time, energy, and resources to anticipate and thwart what are, after all, only hypothetical dangers? Why act today when, in any case, others will do so in the future? Why not limit ourselves to reacting to cataclysms if and when they occur? A ‘bad faith’ version of this argument goes even further by seeking to discredit, reject, or deny evidence pointing to upcoming catastrophes. Here, we enter into the domain of deliberate negligence and “culpable ignorance,”25 as manifest in the apathy of US Republican administrations toward climate change or the Clinton White House’s disengenuous and belated responses to the genocides in ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda. At another level, instrumental-strategic forms of thought and action, so pervasive in modern societies because institutionally entrenched in the state and the market, are rarely compatible with the demands of farsightedness. The calculation of the most technically efficient means to attain a particular bureaucratic or corporate objective, and the subsequent relentless pursuit of it, intrinsically exclude broader questions of long-term prospects or negative side-effects. What matters is the maximization of profits or national self-interest with the least effort, and as rapidly as possible. Growing risks and perils are transferred to future generations through a series of trade-offs: economic growth versus environmental protection, innovation versus safety, instant gratification versus future well-being. What can be done in the face of short-sightedness? Cosmopolitanism provides some of the clues to an answer, thanks to its formulation of a universal duty of care for humankind that transcends all geographical and socio-cultural borders. I want to expand the notion of cosmopolitan universalism in a temporal direction, so that it can become applicable to future generations and thereby nourish a vibrant culture of prevention. Consequently, we need to begin thinking about a farsighted cosmopolitanism, a chrono-cosmopolitics that takes seriously a sense ¶ of “intergenerational solidarity” toward human beings who will live in our wake as much as those living amidst us today.26 But for a farsighted cosmopolitanism to take root in global civil society, the latter must adopt a thicker regulative principle of care for the future than the one currently in vogue (which amounts to little more than an afterthought of the non-descript ‘don’t forget later generations’ ilk). Hans Jonas’s “imperative of responsibility” is valuable precisely because it prescribes an ethico-political relationship to the future consonant with the work of farsightedness.27 Fully appreciating Jonas’s position requires that we grasp the rupture it establishes with the presentist assumptions imbedded in the intentionalist tradition of Western ethics. In brief, intentionalism can be explained by reference to its best-known formulation, the Kantian categorical imperative, according to which the moral worth of a deed depends upon whether the a priori “principle of the will” or “volition” of the person performing it – that is, his or her intention – should become a universal law.28 Ex post facto evaluation of an act’s outcomes, and of whether they correspond to the initial intention, is peripheral to moral judgment. A variant of this logic is found in Weber’s discussion of the “ethic of absolute ends,” the “passionate devotion to a cause” elevating the realization of a vision of the world above all other considerations; conviction without the restraint of caution and prudence is intensely presentist.29 By contrast, Jonas’s strong consequentialism takes a cue from Weber’s “ethic of responsibility,” which stipulates that we must carefully ponder the potential impacts of our actions and assume responsibility for them – even for the incidence of unexpected and unintended results. Neither the contingency of outcomes nor the retrospective nature of certain moral judgments exempts an act from normative evaluation. On the contrary, consequentialism reconnects what intentionalism prefers to keep distinct: the moral worth of ends partly depends upon the means selected to attain them (and vice versa), while the correspondence between intentions and results is crucial. At the same time, Jonas goes further than Weber in breaking with presentism by advocating an “ethic of long-range responsibility” that refuses to accept the future’s indeterminacy, gesturing instead toward a practice of farsighted preparation for crises that could occur.30 From a consequentialist perspective, then, intergenerational solidarity would consist of striving to prevent our endeavors from causing large-scale human suffering and damage to the natural world over time. Jonas reformulates the categorical imperative along these lines: “Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life,” or “Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such life.”31 What we find here, I would hold, is a substantive and future-oriented ethos on the basis of which civic associations can enact the work of preventive foresight.

#### Even if security and risk calculation are flawed, engaging in them creates discourse of social welfare and promotes a democratic civic culture that checks political exclusion and loss of value to life

Loader – Criminology Prof at Oxford – 7

(Civilizing Security, Pg. 5)

Faced with such inhospitable conditions, one can easily lapse into fatalistic despair, letting events simply come as they will, or else seek refuge in the consolations offered by the total critique of securitization practices – a path that some critical scholars in criminology and security studies have found all too seductive (e.g. Bigo 2002, 2006; Walters 2003). Or one can, as we have done, supplement social criticism with the hard, uphill, necessarily painstaking work of seeking to specify what it may mean for citizens to live together securely with risk; to think about the social and political arrangements capable of making this possibility more rather than less likely, and to do what one can to nurture practices of collective security shaped not by fugitive market power or by the unfettered actors of (un)civil society, but by an inclusive, democratic politics. Social analysts of crime and security have become highly attuned to, and warned repeatedly of, the illiberal, exclusionary effects of the association between security and political community (Dillon 1996; Hughes 2007). They have not, it should be said, done so without cause, for reasons we set out at some length as the book unfolds. But this sharp sensitivity to the risks of thinking about security through a communitarian lens has itself come at a price, namely, that of failing to address and theorize fully the virtues and social benefits that can flow from members of a political community being able to put and pursue security in common. This, it seems to us, is a failure to heed the implications of the stake that all citizens have in security; to appreciate the closer alignment of self-interest and altruism that can attend the acknowledgement that we are forced to live, as Kant put it, inescapably side-by-side and that individuals simultaneously constitute and threaten one another’s security; and to register the security-enhancing significance and value of the affective bonds of trust and abstract solidarity that political communities depend upon, express and sustain. All this, we think, offers reasons to believe that security offers a conduit, perhaps the best conduit there is, for giving practical meaning to the idea of the public good, for reinventing social democratic politics, even for renewing the activity of politics at all.

## 1NR CP

#### Expanding renewables requires political capital

NGI, 11/19 (Natural Gas Intelligence, 11/19/2012, “Obama Re-Election Puts Target on Energy, Say Execs,” Factiva)

**\*\*\*Barry Worthington is the USEA Executive Director**

President Obama "got some political capital" from the election, but "whether he's willing to spend it on renewable energy is very difficult to say," said Worthington. "I do think that the whole notion of tax credits is very, very suspect. One element says take away tax credits for renewables, others say take them all away. It's possible that it could happen."

#### No congressional support for expanding solar or wind energy

Reuters, 11/7 (“Harsher energy regulations coming in Obama's second term,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/07/us-usa-campaign-energy-companies-obama-idUSBRE8A60N920121107>)

Obama's team of energy advisers includes Energy Secretary Steven Chu, a Nobel prize-winning scientist who specializes in alternative and renewable energy technologies, but who regularly talks up the government's role in developing hydraulic fracturing technology. His top White House energy adviser is Heather Zichal, who has been an advocate for creating green jobs and tackling climate change by reducing dependence on oil.

Obama has pledged more support for development of renewable energy technologies like solar and wind, but he will need the support of Congress to extend or renew tax breaks that have underpinned the growth of those industries.

"Obama can love solar as much as he wants, but I don't know that a whole lot more is going to happen in terms of new, constructive policy," said Morningstar energy analyst Stephen Simko