Climate K

1AC Archambeau evidence says that warming has become a

“polarizing social issue” – proves our arguments that communication is necessary

Warming

This advantage relies on tech diffusion – cross-x showed why this internal link is stupid – three arguments take out this and all the other advantages –

1. Countries have already committed billions to constructing other types of reactors – it shows a lack of hubris to think that the U.S. declaring – no guys you should really build this one will cause them to dismantle plutonium breeders and other IFR designs now.

2. Basic economics – China, India, and other developing countries are focused on sustaining economic growth and will do so in the cheapest way possible. Gutcheck.

Morse 12 (Richard K. Morse is Director of Research on Coal and Carbon Markets at Stanford University's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development.)

(Jul/August 12. Foreign Affairs. 102-112. “Cleaning Up Coal: From Climate Culprit to Solution” Proquest)

As the developing world keeps growing, coal will remain its fuel of choice. The iea expects coal demand in non-oecd countries to nearly double by 2035 if current policies continue, with Chinese and Indian demand alone accounting for more than 80 percent of that growth. Indonesia, Vietnam, and much of the rest of Asia are also rapidly building new coal plants. The coal markets of Asia are thus at the heart of the global-warming problem.

The case of China, the world's biggest carbon emitter, demonstrates just how hard it is to give up the fuel. The country's reliance on coal is becoming increasingly costly. Over the last five years, as demand for coal has risen while supply has struggled to keep up, Chinese coal prices have skyrocketed. Meanwhile, tightly regulated electricity prices have not been allowed to rise in parallel. Pricing has become so distorted that at many points, a ton of coal has cost more than the value of the electricity it could create. China's dependence on coal is not only an expensive habit but also an environmental hazard. In addition to emitting carbon dioxide and sulfur dioxide, coal combustion creates mountains of toxic ash that are swept up in storms and blanket cities with particulate poison. That pollution is increasingly drawing the ire of the Chinese public and has even sparked protests.

Beijing is making every effort to kick its coal habit. The government has set a target of deriving 15 percent of the country's energy from nonfossil fuels by 2020 (the current figure is eight percent), with nuclear and hydroelectric power likely to make up most of the difference in the electricity sector. It has given generous subsidies to wind and solar power, industries that have made strong gains in recent years. Beijing is also focusing on improving the efficiency of coal-fired power generation by funding state-of-the-art engineering research and shutting down older, dirtier coal plants. As a result, the average Chinese coal plant is already far more efficient than the average American one.

These policies have started to curb China's coal addiction, but they are fighting an uphill battle against ever-increasing energy demand. Coal's share of new electricity capacity in China dropped from 81 percent in 2007 to 64 percent in 2010, but the figure rose to 65 percent in 2011, proving that the march toward alternative sources of energy will not be linear. Last year, droughts reduced hydroelectric output and caused severe power shortages. China's central planners no doubt see coal plants as the only available way to maintain the stability of the electrical grid, especially as the country relies more on wind and solar power, the outputs of which are intermittent.

Moreover, new technologies that can convert coal into more valuable liquid fuels, natural gas, and chemicals could stymie progress toward a coal-free future. When oil prices have been high, China has flirted with large-scale investments in these technologies. Although the resulting fuels can be less environmentally friendly than gasoline, in a world of $100-a-barrel crude oil, the economics get more tempting every year.

If China keeps up its efforts at diversifying its energy supply, coal's share of total electricity capacity there might drop one to three percent each year before 2020. After that, it could fall faster as nuclear power and natural gas gain a stronger foothold. But even then, it will be diffcult for China to get less than 50 percent of its electricity from coal by 2030. Like it or not, coal will remain the dominant fuel in China and the other emerging Asian economies for quite some time.

3. There’s no tech diffusion given their conflictual framing – if we can’t trust countries now about how they’ll build nuclear arsenals, why the hell would we export our most valuable, newest, untested technologies to Pakistanis who we think can’t keep their shit straight.

Eisen (Professor of Law, University of Richmond School of Law) 11

(JOEL B, THE NEW ENERGY GEOPOLITICS?: CHINA, RENEWABLE ENERGY, AND THE “GREENTECH RACE”, CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW Vol 86:1, SSRN)

Rather than creating the scorched earth of a “greentech war,” 216 both nations can benefit from collaboration that takes advantages of the respec- tive strengths of each.217 The urgency to do this is compelling. No nation has ever grown so rapidly as China is growing now, and no nation has had to address such daunting environmental challenges at the same time as it has pursued such rapid growth.218 This poses major hurdles to tackling climate change that must be surmounted by nations working together. And there are not just two nations involved, but the whole world.219 The planet is in peril if we do not all act together with concerted, targeted efforts. Ra- ther than creating a two-nation race, we should encourage China’s domestic policies and the climate change collaborations of the “BRIC” developing economies (Brazil, Russia, and India, in addition to China).220 Nationalistic rhetoric on climate change (as best embodied in the USTR investigation) will have high costs. Creating near-term tension would be especially unfortunate for the U.S.-China relationship on climate matters, which is complex, but not marked by the same animosity as Amer- ica’s relationship with the U.S.S.R. in the 1950s. The two nations have occasionally criticized each other’s progress toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and China is not reticent about highlighting its stronger pro- grams (greentech promotion) and downplaying weaker ones (lack of bind- ing nationwide emissions limits).221 The two nations have ongoing tensions on a whole host of sensitive topics,222 but have worked productively with each other to address climate change.223 Some note that collaboration on climate issues could have a positive impact on the entire U.S.-China dialo- gue,224 although the USTR investigation threatens that optimistic out- look.225 In the two-year period of international negotiations between the prom- ulgation of the Bali Action Plan and the December 2009 Copenhagen summit, there were numerous cooperative activities between the two na- tions. The highest level of talks took place under the auspices of the U.S.- China Strategic and Economic Dialogue.226 Discussions also took place during 2009 with other world leaders at the Pittsburgh G-20 summit227 and the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate.228 There was even talk during 2009 of the two nations forming a sort of “G-2” to cooperate on financial and climate matters, though that never materialized.229 The two nations have pledged several times to take mutual action to address climate change,230 and while the promises are often hortatory, the ongoing discus- sion does have important value in strengthening the bilateral relation- ship.231 Continued antagonistic rhetoric about a clean energy race will make it difficult to conduct cooperative efforts in energy and environmental mat- ters. Unlike the near-complete scientific secrecy that marked the Cold War era, advocating a strategy of competition with the Chinese undercuts these activities. 232 China and the United States are working to develop technology together. Under the China-U.S. Science and Technology Agreement, the Department of Energy has twelve ongoing initiatives with China,233 includ- ing electric vehicle234 and carbon capture and storage development initia- tives.235 The Clean Energy Ministerial Forum in July 2010, hosted by U.S. Secretary of Energy Steven Chu and attended by his Chinese counterpart and ministers from twenty-two other nations, outlined a multi-part agenda in specific areas of cooperation.236 Similar to Norway, which saw coopera- tion in fishing matters cut off by an aggrieved China after the award of a Nobel Prize to a Chinese dissident,237 Some even argue (in obvious counterpoint to the USTR investiga- tion) that China’s subsidies and other programs to promote renewables can be good for the United States’ economy. the United States could find itself shunned by China in these highly symbolic areas instead of cooperating with it. 238 The Council on Foreign Rela- tions’ Michael Levi, examining the study cited earlier in this Article that the United States retains leadership at the high value end of the solar devel- opment and manufacturing chain,239 argues that “it’s quite possible for the United States and China both to win, with China lowering the cost of rela- tively low-tech parts of the value chain, in turn growing the market for the higher-tech parts that are still handled by the United States.”240 Levi com- pares this to other situations in which China manufactures products devel- oped in the United States. Some might find that overstated, and others cite feedback loops like the one described earlier in this Article (in which Chi- nese firms eventually find their way up the value chain).241 On the other hand, warring with China can only hurt the prospects for American firms to do business in China.242 At the international level, greentech warring makes it even more diffi- cult to reach a global climate agreement. Many have chastised China for taking insufficient steps toward an agreement limiting greenhouse gas emissions. According to some accounts, China’s foot-dragging and re- fusal to adopt binding reduction targets was at least in part responsible for the failure of the Copenhagen Accord to incorporate global binding lim- its,244 although the United States shares some blame for putting forth a weak negotiating position. As China’s economy continues its rapid growth, there will be even greater demand for it to agree to limit emissions.245 Cas- tigating it for its greentech policies could foster a climate of distrust and delay further progress on a post-Kyoto agreement. For example, it would not take much for Senators who oppose international climate agreements to blame the Chinese as a reason for refusing to agree to any such agreement (a prerequisite for it to go into effect in the United States),246 as they al- ready have done once before with a resolution opposing ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.247 The rhetoric of a green energy race could give cover for this regrettable posturing.

Warming’s inevitable – clean tech can’t solve unsustainable deforestation and ag practices. Our Nordhaus ev says even if they remove greenhouse emissions by 70 percent, loss of forests like the Amazon as carbon storage banks means that the global climate system would still be destabilized.

Our Mead evidence cites UN reports that say cattle-rearing is a more signicant internal link to emissions – also produces nitrous oxide and methane which are magntitudes time more important than CO2 in contributing to warming – rising global meat and dairy consumption means it’s inevitable and outweighs their internal link.

No runaway warming impact - the Earth’s had much higher CO2 in the past (and the temperature were correspondingly much higher), and the Earth did not turn into Venus. That’s Revkin.

Can’t solve warming fast enough – recent World Energy Council and MIT studies conclude that 1000 reactors minimum are needed to just curb warming. Average construction time is now 10 years because of complex reactor designs

Can’t solve transportation sector – that’s key to warming.

Carr and Fernandes 8 [Jessie Carr and Dulce Fernande, staff of Nuclear information and resource center, http://www.nirs.org/falsepromises.pdf]

The nuclear industry claims that nuclear power is the only energy source that can effectively replace fossil fuels. But, building new nuclear facilities does nothing to address the transportation sector, which is responsible for a large part of GHG emissions. For example, electricity generation in the US is responsible for only 40 percent of the country’s total CO2 emissions.25 Likewise, transportation is the primary sector responsible for global oil consumption (corresponding to more than half of the oil consumed worldwide everyday), generating a full 40 percent of global CO2 emissions. As oil accounts for only seven percent of worldwide electricity generation, the transportation sector is a major source of GHGs and would not be affected by any changes in nuclear power generating capacity.26