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### Plan

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should remove its tariffs on solar panels produced in the People’s Republic of China.

### 1AC – Trade War

**Contention 1 is Trade War**

**Trade tensions with China are growing due to the solar tariff- an olive branch is key to avoid trade war**

**Ikenson 12**

[ Daniel Ikenson- director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, 3/5/12, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war>]

Indeed, it is beyond doubt that certain Chinese policies have been provocative, discriminatory, protectionist, and, in some cases, violative of the agreed rules of international trade. But there is more to the story than that**. U.S. policies, politics, and attitudes have contributed to rising tensions, as have rabble-rousing politicians and a confrontation-thirsty media**. If the public's passions are going to be inflamed with talk of a trade war, prudence demands that the war's nature be properly characterized and its causes identified and accurately depicted. Those agitating for tough policy actions should put down their battle bugles and consider that **trade wars are never won**. Instead, such wars claim victims indiscriminately and leave significant damage in their wake. Even if one concludes that China's list of offenses is collectively more egregious than that of the United States, **the most sensible course of action** — for the American public (if not campaigning politicians) — is one that avoids mutually destructive actions and finds measures **to reduce frictions with China**. Nature of the U.S.-China Trade War It should not be surprising that the increasing number of commercial exchanges between entities in the world's largest and second largest economies produce frictions on occasion. But the U.S.-China economic relationship has not descended into an existential call to arms. Rather, both governments have taken protectionist actions that are legally defensible or plausibly justifiable within the rules of global trade. That is not to say that those measures have been advisable or that they would withstand closer legal scrutiny, but to make the distinction that, unlike the free-for-all that erupted in the 1930s, these trade "skirmishes" have been prosecuted in a manner that speaks to a mutual recognition of the primacy of — if not respect for — the rules-based system of trade. And that suggests that the kerfuffle is containable and the recent trend reversible.1 Still that relatively benign characterization does not mean there is no cause for concern. Protectionist actions — whether part of a series of events dubbed a trade war or not; whether within the rules of trade or not — impinge on our freedoms, increase costs of living, drive up production costs for businesses, reduce employment, retard more efficient resource allocations, and produce economic losses in both countries (and beyond). This is a fact dangerously obscured by gung-ho media pundits and politicians who hoist their flags and cast trade disputes in a terribly misleading "us-versus-them" context, implying along the way that domestic costs are borne only of inaction. Ratcheting up Tensions The year 2009 brought a change in tenor to the U.S.-China relationship. The rhetoric became more strident, historically minor tiffs became flashpoints, and the public's angst became more palpable. What was going on in 2009 that might provide some insights? First, the U.S. economy was immersed in a deep recession, while the Chinese economy was continuing its near-double-digit annualized growth. That juxtaposition sparked some public soul-searching among pundits and policymakers, many of whom questioned whether America's best days were behind her, with some concluding that U.S. policy had been too permissive of China's rise. In the United States that discussion begat calls for greater trade enforcement (which to some meant tighter restrictions regardless of the rules) and emulation of China's allegedly successful industrial policies. In China, meanwhile, the emerging perceptions emboldened leaders to dig in their heels over issues where they might have relented in the past. Sentiment clearly had been agitated by economic conditions and the perceptions they bore.2 Second, and more substantively, the U.S. business community in China, which had long counseled against U.S. policies that might frustrate its access to the Chinese market, began to air grievances about proliferating Chinese protectionism and issued warnings that China's market liberalization — evident through the early part of the last decade — had stopped and was beginning to reverse. An annual white paper published by the American Chamber of Commerce in China identified rising protectionism, lack of regulatory transparency and consistency, and favoritism toward local firms as big and growing problems in 2009.3 Meanwhile, another report published by AmCham-China exposed "a web of industrial policies" in China, such as indigenous innovation policies and elaborate plans to build national champions by borrowing Western technology.4 Publication of those reports and reaction to them inspired a change in sentiment within the U.S. multinational community, which shifted the balance of interests that shape U.S.Ã¢ï¿½ï¿½China policy in the direction of those traditionally more inclined toward trade restrictions and tougher enforcement, giving greater cover to U.S. policymakers to take a more strident tack with Beijing. And third, in September 2009, President Obama authorized the imposition of duties on imports of certain Chinese tires pursuant to Section 421 of the Trade Act of 1974.5 The president's decision crossed a line for the Chinese, since that statute had never before resulted in the imposition of duties. Section 421 (or the "China-specific safeguard") became U.S. law as a term of China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) in December 2001. Among many other concessions made by China to overcome special interest opposition to its joining the WTO was China's consent to allow the United States (and other WTO members) recourse to a so-called safeguard mechanism. Imposition of duties was conditioned upon there being an increase in imports in such increased quantities as -to be a cause or threat of "market disruption" to domestic producers. But given this low evidentiary threshold — when does credible competition not cause market disruption? — the president was granted discretion to reject duties if "provision of such relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States or, in extraordinary cases, that the taking of action ... would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States." On the four occasions when the U.S. International Trade Commission recommended to former president George W. Bush that he impose duties under Section 421, he rejected the recommendations on the grounds that duties were not in the national economic interest. Thus, precedent had been established that presidential discretion, exercised with the national interest in mind, could prevent the imposition of duties in these cases. So, when President Obama authorized the duties on tires (his first and only bite at the 421 apple), it was the first time a U.S. president personally signed off on a protectionist measure against China.6 That his decision came after months of deliberating the costs and benefits and ramifications for the bilateral relationship, and was characterized by the president as "enforcement" of U.S. trade laws, was perceived as an insult — even a provocation — in Beijing. Section 421 is clearly not about enforcement. Duties imposed under that statute are about industry winning a temporary reprieve from foreign competition so that it can catch its breath and, perhaps, compete more effectively in the future. Foreign behavior — whether pricing practices, subsidies, or some other castigated practice — is not at issue in 421 cases. Consideration of any wrongdoing is entirely absent from the proceedings. Rather than "enforce," the U.S. government "exercised its conditional right" to a special time out, akin to a "mulligan" in golf. One business day after the duties were announced, the Chinese government filed a formal complaint in the WTO, alleging that evidentiary thresholds in the U.S. law were inconsistent with U.S. obligations under China's WTO accession protocol and that the law, as such, violated China's rights as a WTO member. A dispute panel rejected China's claims and the WTO Appellate Body later affirmed the panel's findings. Tit for Tat Did imposition of the tire tariffs violate U.S. law? No. Did it violate U.S. WTO obligations? No. Was it protectionist? Yes. Was it provocative? Yes. As China's WTO case on tires was pending, the Chinese government launched its own antidumping (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) investigations into certain U.S. chicken and automobile exports to China. After losing the tires case at the WTO, China imposed AD and CVD measures on U.S. chicken broilers, raising suspicions in Washington that the measures were retaliatory. Even if they were retaliatory, they were not ad hoc. The chicken duties were the product of Chinese AD and CVD investigations, which are permissible as long as domestic law and its administration comport with the WTO agreements. Alleging that Chinese administration of the laws violated those WTO agreements, the U.S. government launched a formal WTO challenge in the chicken case in September 2011. A formal panel decision is probably more than one year away, but a similar U.S. challenge of Chinese antidumping and countervailing duty practices in a case involving "grain-oriented electrical steel" is expected in May. At about the same time as the U.S. WTO complaint over chicken broilers was filed, U.S. producers of solar panels brought AD and CVD cases against Chinese producers, further ratcheting up tensions. It is important to keep in mind that these cases are brought by industry — not government — so one should resist the temptation to read too much into policy with each new case filing. Nevertheless, this particular industry — **the solar industry** — has been a darling of the Obama administration, and the implication that Chinese producers benefit from Chinese government largesse, while U.S. producers get no such consideration from their government — though completely beside the matters of law and fact considered in trade remedies proceedings — **has been an important cause of rising frictions recently**. Indeed, just after the U.S. International Trade Commission issued its decision to proceed with the solar panels case, the Chinese government imposed antidumping and countervailing duty measures on certain U.S. automobiles. The timing raised new questions about whether the Chinese were engaging in retaliation because the measures stemmed from the investigations that began in the wake of the tire tariffs in 2009 but were never made official until just after the solar panel decision in late 2011. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the automobile duties were retaliatory, but plausible deniability exists in the facts that the duties were issued pursuant to Chinese laws, which do not require duties to be imposed immediately following completion of an investigation, as is the case under U.S. law. The U.S. Trade Representative's office has not filed a formal WTO challenge of China's automobile restrictions but may be waiting to see the rulings from the steel or chicken cases before bringing a new case along similar lines. Enforcement, Protectionism, and Provocation There are important distinctions to draw between enforcement efforts geared toward opening closed markets and protectionist measures designed to close opened markets. But media tend to conflate them and, in the process, obscure important nuances about the U.S.-China economic relationship. U.S. WTO challenges of discriminatory Chinese policies are not equivalent — economically or morally — to U.S. antidumping, countervailing duty, or safeguard measures imposed on Chinese products. The first is about opening markets; the second is about closing them. The first is about holding China accountable to its commitments; the second is about claiming exceptions to our own commitments. The first is about enforcement; the second is about bestowing favors on some domestic industries at great cost to others. The United States has filed 12 formal complaints against China, and China has filed 6 formal cases against the United States in the WTO. Those measures have all been about opening markets. Meanwhile, the United States has in place 113 trade remedy measures restricting access of Chinese goods to the U.S. market, and China has in place 20 such measures against the United States. Those measures are all about closing markets. There is little doubt that certain other Chinese policies would not pass muster at the WTO. China's so-called indigenous innovation policies, forced technology transfer requirements, porous intellectual property enforcement regime, and rare earth mineral export restrictions are some of many legitimate concerns that might justify formal WTO challenges. China's list of protectionist policies may be longer than the U.S. list. But that does not immunize American interests from the consequences of a trade war, **which is made more likely by U.S. reactions and characterizations of those Chinese policies**. U.S. policymakers — with the help of a sympathetic media — scapegoat China for a host of homegrown policy shortcomings and assume the inevitability of a bitter rivalry that forecloses the possibility of a mutually beneficial bilateral relationship. The president frequently refers to the imperative of beating China or "winning the future" as a justification for subsidies and industrial policy. The recent establishment of an interagency task force devoted to trade enforcement is so transparently targeted at China as to be provocative. Likewise, the ongoing Trans-Pacific Partnership trade negotiations have been pitched by the administration as a component of its "pivot" toward Asia to counterbalance China's rise. The administration touts its security and foreign policy aspects more frequently than its economic benefits. Defending U.S. interests in the realm of international trade rules is a legitimate obligation of U.S. officials, but failure to avert a trade war would constitute perhaps the worst dereliction of that duty. So rather than saber rattle over arguably discriminatory Chinese trade policies, **U.S. officials should look for actions, gestures, or even changes in tone that could help reduce bilateral frictions**.

#### Solar tariff causes an escalating trade war

Doom et al 12 -- reporters @ Bloomberg (Justin, Ehren Goosens, William McQuillen, 5/25/12, "Trade War Looming as China Rebukes U.S. Support for Solar," http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-05-24/trade-war-seen-looming-as-china-rebukes-u-dot-s-dot-support-for-solar)

China’s allegation that renewable- energy subsidies in five U.S. states violate free-trade rules ratchets up a potentially costly trade war between the world’s two largest economies. “It’s a long, slow escalation of trade and currency wars as we race to the bottom,” said Theodore O’Neill, an analyst with Wunderlich Securities Inc. of New York. Programs supporting renewable power, including wind and solar, in Washington state, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio and California, violate World Trade Organization policies and trade treaties, according to a preliminary finding of an investigation posted yesterday on the website of China’s Ministry of Commerce. China filed a complaint today at the WTO over U.S. procedures for calculating anti-subsidy duties on imports. Those announcements followed a preliminary decision by the U.S. Commerce Department last week to impose tariffs of as much as 250 percent on imports of Chinese solar cells. The agency said the units were being sold for less than the cost of production in an attempt to drive out domestic competition. Both countries have identified renewable energy as a strategically important industry that could provide both jobs and clean power. As a candidate, President Barack Obama campaigned in support of a “green” economy that would replace jobs lost in declining sectors. Chinese Complaints At least four U.S. solar manufacturers filed for bankruptcy in the past year even as federal subsidies helped build a $8.4 billion U.S. solar market. “China has been engaged in a trade war against the U.S. interests for a number of years and only now are we calling them to the carpet for their illegal and predatory trade practices,” said Mike Wessel, a member of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission that reports to Congress. Chinese solar companies criticized Commerce’s preliminary decision May 18 that they improperly benefit from government subsidies and sell solar cells below cost. High tariffs may raise costs, slowing demand for polysilicon that’s used to make solar panels, hurting U.S. companies that reported $2.6 billion in exports in 2011, including about $700 million to China, according to a Bloomberg Government report released last week. ‘Prohibited Subsidies’ China initiated the investigation into U.S. subsidies in November, a month after seven U.S. solar manufacturers filed their complaint with the U.S. International Trade Commission and Commerce. In announcing the preliminary findings yesterday, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce said some U.S. actions “constitute prohibited subsidies.” During the U.S. investigation into whether Chinese companies received illegal government aid, the U.S. acted “inconsistently with WTO rules and rulings in many aspects,” China’s mission to the WTO in Geneva said today in an e-mailed statement. The U.S. “repeated its wrongful practice” during its recent anti-subsidy investigation on Chinese solar cells. China’s official Xinhua News Agency reported yesterday that 14 of China’s solar-panel companies have formed an alliance in response to the trade issues with the U.S. Nkenge Harmon, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Trade Representative’s office, defended the U.S. procedures for so- called countervailing duties today, and said the government is committed to defending those remedies. ‘Strongly Supports’ “The Obama administration strongly supports the trade remedy laws, and was the first administration ever to apply” a China-specific safeguard on imports from that nation, she said in an e-mail. The U.S. is also jousting with China over access for products including steel pipes, poultry, tires and music. Along with the European Union and Japan, the U.S. filed a complaint in March with the World Trade Organization challenging the Asian nation’s export limits on rare-earth minerals. “China’s recent investigation of U.S. practices demonstrates the dangers of imposing unilateral trade barriers and how political tension can quickly lead to a full blown trade war,” Jigar Shah, president of the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy, which opposes the U.S. tariffs, said in an e-mail. Additionally, the Commerce Department is scheduled to announce on May 30 how much in tariffs Chinese companies should pay over allegations their wind-tower exports receive unfair government subsidies. The U.S. imports $103.6 million in wind tower parts annually from China, according to papers filed with the International Trade Commission. ‘Slap Back’ As U.S. politicians complain of the trade deficit with China, the country may take further actions in an effort to narrow the gap before the November election, said Robert Kapp, 1994-2004 president of the U.S.-China Business Council. That will result in China “looking for opportunities to slap back,” he said. All countries offer subsidies to certain industries, Hari Chandra Polavarapu, an analyst at Auriga USA LLC in New York, said in a telephone interview. “The absurdity is the scope and depth of the subsidies in China,” Polavarapu said. “You’re competing against a sovereign when you’re talking about the Chinese solar industry. It’s economic warfare.” The U.S. unit of SolarWorld AG (SWV), which brought the complaint, said it was responding to thousands of job losses due to Chinese trade practices. The company shouldn’t be blamed for any trade war, SolarWorld said in a statement. “China’s tactic of retaliation rather than following the rule of law is extremely disturbing and is yet another example of the Chinese inappropriately attempting to influence U.S. investigations,” Timothy Brightbill, an attorney for SolarWorld said in an e-mailed statement. The Commerce Department is scheduled to make its final determination on the solar tariffs in early October. With the election weeks later, the U.S. and China may continue to antagonize each other, said Kelly Dougherty, an analyst with New York-based Macquarie Capital USA Inc. “The louder the U.S. or SolarWorld is, the louder China is going to be,” she said.

**Trade war kills relations, free trade, and escalates to a shooting war**

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may formally label China as a "currency manipulator," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead one step closer to a trade war between China and the U.S. Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "They are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: **if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt** and. If this happens, says Barker, "all bets are off." He adds, "The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be **catastrophic**, and what could prove to be a mild long wave [economic] winter season this time around could plunge into a global depression." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "If trade wars are allowed to get under way in these final years of a long wave winter, this decline will be far deeper and darker than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire **world will suffer**," writes Barker.

#### Nationalism magnifies the impact- confrontational policies cause conflict

Gries 12 (Peter Hays Gries is a professor of international and area studies at the University of Oklahoma and the director of its Institute for U.S.-China Issues, “Why China Resents Japan, and Us,” 8-23-12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/24/opinion/why-china-resents-japan-and-us.html>)

And although Chinese nationalist rage is primarily aimed at Japan, it is also directed toward the United States. As Chinese nationalists see it, America is the cause of China’s continuing problems with both Taiwan and Japan. If it were not for the “American imperialists” inserting the United States Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait during the Korean War, they say, Taiwan would long ago have been reunified with mainland China, erasing that “national humiliation.” And Japan’s continuing impertinence is also America’s fault: the United States’ alliance with Japan gives Japanese nationalists the gumption to defy a rising China. The statements of American politicians further stoke Chinese anger at the United States. Speaking in Ohio late last week, the presumptive Republican vice-presidential nominee, Paul D. Ryan, accused China of stealing intellectual property, blocking access to its markets and manipulating the exchange rate. “President Obama promised he would stop these practices,” Mr. Ryan declared. “He said he’d go to the mat with China. Instead, they’re treating him like a doormat. We’re not going to let that happen.” Mr. Ryan’s views echo those of Mitt Romney, who has promised if elected to declare China a “currency manipulator.” This could lead to punitive tariffs on Chinese imports and a possible trade war. There is a long history of challengers using China to attack incumbents during presidential elections. Most famously, in 1992, Bill Clinton accused President George Bush of coddling the “butchers of Beijing” following the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989. While there is some antipathy toward China in the Democratic Party, particularly among labor unions and human rights activists, anti-Chinese sentiment these days comes mostly from the right. Economic conservatives don’t like the income redistribution and government regulation they associate with socialism; the Christian right fears the atheism of “Godless” Communism; and libertarians don’t like any government at all, let alone the authoritarian government of China. China-bashing will therefore be good election year politics for the Romney-Ryan ticket. But it will be bad for America’s relations with China and could undermine our national security. Many Chinese are already suspicious of American intentions, and ideologically driven rhetoric from across the Pacific will only confirm their worst fears. Worse, the Communist Party is currently undergoing its own leadership transition, and it is happening at a time when popular nationalism is bringing people into the streets. Because the party bases its legitimacy in large part on its nationalist credentials, no party leader is likely to quiet the nationalists until the new leadership is finalized. Lacking a secure foundation of mutual trust, American-Chinese relations today remain susceptible to the random accidents of history that have plagued them in the past. In 1999, the mistaken NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, Serbia, killed three and led to huge anti-American protests across China. And in 2001, the collision between a Chinese jet and an American surveillance plane led to a Chinese pilot’s death and an American crew’s being detained for two weeks. If comparable accidents occur during this fall’s leadership transitions in both countries, popular pressure for more confrontational policies in both China and the United States will be more difficult to contain — and will increase the likelihood of conflict in Asia.

**US-Sino war will go nuclear**

**Kugler 06** – Professor of world politics @ Claremont Graduate University [Jacek Kugler (Consultant to the IMF, the World Bank, State Department, and Department of Defense. His publications on the causes and consequences of war use formal modeling and empirical analysis), “The Asian Ascent: Opportunity for Peace or Precondition for War?,” [International Studies Perspectives](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118516737/home), [Volume 7, Issue 1](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/journal/118606983/issue), Pages 36-42

Given the fundamental importance of demographic and economic forces in establishing the roster of states capable of fundamentally affecting the structure of world politics, whatever resolution there might be to the Global War on Terror will not alter the major challenge faced by the United States. In the long run, China’s demographic and hence economic power cannot be denied. By the same reasoning, the Middle East has no long-run demographic or economic power. The U.S. **courts long-term peril** by being obsessively distracted by short-term objectives. **To ensure real peace, the U.S. would be much better advised to** preserve strong links with the EU, maintain and improve cordial relations with Russia, and most importantly, **open a sincere dialogue** with India and **China designed to maximize their support for the existing status quo**. To be sure, positive, but limited, steps have been taken by the United States. American support for China’s entry into the World Trade Organization was important because it helps integrate China’s growing economy more fully into the capitalist world economy. Similar recognition for India, not to mention support for Indian membership on the United Nations Security Council, would also be beneficial. Because Taiwan and Korea have replaced the Cold War’s Berlin as focal points for potential **Great Power conflict**, finding an accommodation that meets the desires of the main parties with respect to them is central to the preservation of long-term peace. The economic, demographic, and political science research summarized above suggests that American foreign policy attention must center on China and India as the major future contenders for global leadership. Although China retains a political ideology inconsistent with democracy, there are good reasons to expect and thus to work toward change to a participatory system based on increasing prosperity (Feng 2003; Feng and Zak 2003). India is the largest democracy in the world, but like China it is still not a major partner of the Western world. While these relationships may develop and prosper on their own, the relative amount of attention paid to these rising giants compared with the Global War on Terror is simply insupportable.Neither convergence arguments nor power transition theory suggests that future Great Power war between Asia and the West is inevitable. The research described here offers evidence about probabilistic relationships between parity and status quo evaluations on the one hand, and war on the other. Thus, while China's overtaking of the U.S. may be relatively certain, the result of that overtaking is not. Power transition research supports claims that **overtakings are dangerous** when policy makers fail to accommodate them. A conflict between China or India and the United States as the Asian giants emerge from the shadows of underdevelopment is not inevitable. Rather, the political negotiations among contenders determine whether potential challengers can be made satisfied with the rules and norms governing world politics. If the declining dominant state is able to engineer a satisfactory compromise between the demands of the rising state and its own requirements (as Britain and the U.S. did when peacefully passing the mantle of international leadership), war is not expected. If the two sides remain intransigent, war is expected. It is clear that such a war in the twenty-first century would have a **very high probability of involving nuclear weapons.** A clear counter expectation can be drawn from classical nuclear deterrence arguments. They involve a fundamental assumption that as the costs of war increase, the probability of war decreases. Nuclear weapons are then alleged to alter calculations substantially because they raise the expected costs of war so high that war becomes unthinkable. According to this logic, a global war between a newly predominant China and a declining U.S. will never occur thanks to the pacifying influence of the balance of terror. A new Cold War is anticipated by this nuclear deterrence argument. Consistent with this theory, various scholars have advocated the proliferation of nuclear weapons as one method to prevent wars ([Intriligator and Brito 1981; Waltz 1981; Bueno de Mesquita and Riker 1982](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b5)). An odd paradox is raised by the fact that many world leaders accept nuclear deterrence claims, such as that about the stability of mutual assured destruction (MAD), while rejecting the logical concomitant that proliferation of nuclear weapons to more and more states is desirable. What follows logically has stubbornly resisted practical implementation. Thus, using some other logic, leaders of nuclear nations seem to agree that deterrence is stable under MAD but nevertheless also agree that nuclear proliferation must be prevented in order to preserve peace. If decision makers really believed MAD is stable, it is impossible to understand why they would oppose nuclear proliferation to Iran, thereby creating stable nuclear parity in the Middle East. This inconsistency was noted years ago by [Rosen (1977)](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs#b13), but subsequently conveniently overlooked. Theory and policy may frequently be at odds, but seldom when the costs of such logical inconsistency are so high. Power transition theorists are inherently suspicious of MAD arguments about nuclear stability because they essentially resurrect traditional balance of power arguments. Rather than focusing on conventional balance as a pacifying influence, nuclear deterrence proponents of MAD suggest that a nuclear balance will maintain the peace. Given a fortuitous absence of wars among nuclear states thus far, it is impossible to test arguments such as that about MAD. But what we can observe is not promising. It is not only policy makers who doubt the veracity of MAD when they deny the logical consequence of "beneficial" proliferation. Recent formal presentations of deterrence arguments strongly suggest that a preponderance of nuclear capabilities—specifically in the possession of satisfied states—is more amenable to peace than is MAD ([Zagare and Kilgour 2000](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/cgi-bin/fulltext/118606987/main.html,ftx_abs" \l "b19)). Power transition theorists, informed by their own as well as by **decades of demographic and economic research**, strongly doubt that nuclear parity between the U.S. and a risen but dissatisfied China could preserve the peace. Conclusions It is entirely reasonable to anticipate that Asia will dominate world politics by the end of the century. The most important issue facing American decision makers is how to handle the anticipated overtaking. The research summarized here indicates that the one element of Asia's ascent that Western decision makers can manipulate is Asia's relative acceptance of the international system's existing norms and values. War is not an inevitable certainty. The opportunity for peace is at hand. If Western decision makers can persuade Chinese and Indian leaders through word and deed to join with the current global status quo, peace and prosperity should endure. **If,** on the other hand, China and India can**not** be persuaded to join the existing structure of relations, then **the chances for conflict increase** around mid-century. The research summarized here suggests this is true even in the face of the enormous costs that reasonably would be anticipated from a **nuclear war.**

#### Specifically, the tariff causes global trade competition

Beebe 12

[Andrew Beebe, chief commercial officer of Suntech, the world's largest producer of solar panels. 3/28/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303404704577309583348171396.html>]

Doing so would be a mistake. Trade barriers—large or small, at any point in the global solar value chain—are harmful to both America and China. The tariffs arise because a German company with operations in the U.S., SolarWorld, spearheaded a petition claiming that Chinese solar companies are successful because of unfair Chinese subsidies, and also that we sell our products in the U.S. at unfairly low prices. Suntech's success is not based on extraordinary subsidies but on industry-leading technology, quality products and efficient, large-scale manufacturing. Two weeks ago, Suntech set a world record for solar-cell conversion efficiency using standard commercial silicon wafers. To the extent that Chinese firms do receive any subsidies, such subsidies are hardly unique to China. SolarWorld itself has received more than $100 million in support from governments around the world, according to news reports. Many other energy-related firms also enjoy various forms of largess, including ethanol producers and oil companies. Unfortunately, for some in Washington China-bashing has taken priority over the global imperative to rapidly develop more cost-effective and large-scale clean energy. **Even if China doesn't retaliate**, solar tariffs will be costly for the U.S. economy by pushing up the price of solar energy, reducing demand, threatening millions of dollars in new power projects, and cutting jobs. Only a small proportion of the American solar industry is involved in the kind of manufacturing SolarWorld does, which the antidumping duties are supposed to help save. About 95,000 of the 100,000 solar-industry jobs in the U.S. are either with upstream producers of capital equipment, polysilicon and the like; manufacturers of complementary components such as racks; or downstream services surrounding solar-project construction, installation and engineering **.All of those jobs are heavily integrated in the global economy** and benefit from global free trade, including with China. For example, over the last decade, Suntech has been primarily a net consumer of solar products in the U.S., as we spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year with U.S.-based producers of machine equipment and material inputs. In 2010, we also opened a solar-panel manufacturing facility in Goodyear, Ariz., which has already doubled employment to more than 100 jobs. The (questionable) benefits of any antidumping tariff for the fewer than 5,000 workers at companies that directly compete with Suntech and our peers need to be weighed against the potential harm to all the other Americans employed by us, our suppliers and customers. That's why many large and small U.S. solar industry leaders—including AES Solar, Dow Corning, Grape Solar, GroSolar, GT Advanced Technologies, MEMC/SunEdison, REC Silicon, Rosendin Electric, SolarCity, Swinerton and Verengo Solar—have banded together in the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy to oppose tariffs and defend free trade. They not only represent American consumers; they represent thousands of American manufacturing jobs and 95% of all American solar-industry jobs. Unfortunately, by law, Commerce Department antidumping investigations don't consider this bigger picture. Commerce also isn't allowed to account for the danger of retaliation by a trading partner targeted by antidumping duties, though some in China now are calling for trade barriers to block U.S. competition. The consequences could be serious. China is the largest customer for many of America's solar products. According to a Brattle Group analysis commissioned by the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy, America could lose 11,000 jobs if Beijing were to impose tariffs on American polysilicon. Trade battles between these two governments could encourage other countries to raise protectionist barriers. The rapid growth of the global solar industry is made possible by competition driving down the price of solar products and therefore solar electricity to parity with fossil fuels. **The world's two largest producers and consumers of energy, China and the U.S., must work together to facilitate solar-industry growth and to solve our planet's energy and environmental crisis.**

#### Protectionism causes extinction

Pazner 8 (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### Independently – the tariff kills the global economy, resiliency doesn’t apply

Tucker 12

[William, Nuclear Town Hall, 8/27/12, <http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-let%E2%80%99s-just-admit-solar-needs-help-and-avoid-trade-war/>]

Although the newspapers haven’t been paying much attention lately, the United States and China seem to be on the verge of a trade war that could have huge implications for the world economy. Let’s not scoff at trade wars. Although they’re easy to initiate, they’re awfully difficult to halt once they get started. People still remember the Stock Market Crash of 1929 as the start of the Great Depression but a couple of years ago, the late Bob Bartley, the great editorial page editor of The Wall Street Journal, ran a series of columns showing clearly that it was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Bill of 1930 that turned what might have been just a cyclical downturn into a decade-long horror. How did Smoot-Hawley get started? A couple of Western Congressman wanted to protect the agricultural crops in their home states. President Herbert Hoover called a special session of Congress and before anybody knew it, every Senator and Representative from every state in the union had added something to the Christmas tree. The stock market nosedived, knowing where all this was leading, and before it was over the Great Depression had begun. Every economist in the world knows right now that we are teetering on the edge of such another conflagration. The world economy is in a slump and threatening to get worse. Japan has been in the doldrums for twenty years. Europe is suffering a meltdown. The U.S. is in a four-year funk. China and India have been the locomotive of the world economy but now China is showing serious signs of slowing down. Will everybody stay calm and try to ride out the storm? Or will the recriminations begin and countries start rocking the boat so that the whole world economy may go under? Well, the rocking has already begun and the boat is being tipped by – wouldn’t you know it – good old solar energy. Ah yes, solar energy, the wave of the future that is sure to arrive soon except that it’s still not economical and so our government has to subsidize it right now because it’s eventually going to be the wave of the future and then we’ll become the solar capital of the world. What government hasn’t fallen for that line? Europe has been practicing “feed-in tariffs” – which is just a fancy name for price supports – for more than a decade. Spain almost bankrupted itself trying to nurture an infant solar industry. Germany thinks it’s going to get rid of nuclear power and run itself on that country’s notoriously weak sunshine. Portugal, Italy, Greece – they all think exporting solar panels will be the cure for their ailing economies. Here in the United States, of course, we have the Production Tax Credit, Renewable Portfolio Mandates, government loan guarantees (a la Solyndra) and all sorts of other gimmicks for trying to promote solar. President Obama recently decided to utilize about 100 square miles of the Mojave Desert for a great solar experiment because “We Can’t Wait” for the market to tell us that solar is practical. And in China? Well, everything in China is pretty much run by the government, so you can imagine how much the industry is being supported there. And so the first shots have been fired. Six months ago President Obama yielded to the solar industry and placed a 31 percent tariff on solar panels from China. The charge was that China was “overproducing” and “dumping” panels on the US. China immediately retaliated by pointing out the many solar subsidies in this country and filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization saying we are dumping polysilicon on them. China too has its domestic industries that want protection.

**Econ decline causes war**

**ROYAL 10** Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense

[Jedediah Royal, 2010, Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215]

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent stales. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level. Pollins (20081 advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 19SJ) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fcaron. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately. Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level. Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states arc likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Mom berg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write. The linkage, between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict lends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other (Hlomhen? & Hess. 2(102. p. X9> Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blombcrg. Hess. & Wee ra pan a, 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DcRoucn (1995), and Blombcrg. Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force arc at least indirecti) correlated. Gelpi (1997). Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that Ihe tendency towards diversionary tactics arc greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked lo an increase in the use of force. In summary, rcccni economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict al systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### **The tariff kills broader energy and economic cooperation- undermines relations across the board**

Barbier 12

[Edward B. Barbier is the John S. Bugas Professor of Economics, University of Wyoming, 5/28/12, <http://chinausfocus.com/energy-environment/can-the-us-and-china-cooperate-over-climate-and-clean-energy/>]

One of the few bright spots in recent international negotiations to replace the expiring 1997 Kyoto Protocol on curbing global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions has been the framework agreement concluded at the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP17) that took place in Durban, South Africa in December 2011. In addition to extending the Kyoto Protocol, COP17 produced the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action as the foundation for a prospective and comprehensive climate change agreement in 2015. However, the Durban Platform is most notable for securing the tentative inclusion of the United States and China – the world's two biggest GHG emitters – who were not signatories to the Kyoto Protocol. The Durban Platform may indicate that closer bilateral trade and economic ties between China and the US is fostering their cooperation on **a number of global issues**, including climate change. International trade and capital relationships between the two countries certainly reflect their increasing close economic ties. Around 17% of imports to the US, totalling $323 billion, are from its largest trading partner China. US foreign direct investment in China is $50 billion annually, whereas China investment in the US is $790 million per year. As the world's two largest economies, China and the US are also impacting the global environment, especially climate. Since 1950, the US has been responsible for approximately 29% of energy-related carbon dioxide emissions, and China for about 8%. However, in 2007 China surpassed the US as the world’s top annual emitter of GHGs. The two countries are now responsible for 40% of global annual GHG emissions. Thus, it is possible that closer economic ties between the US and China are also fostering bilateral cooperation on climate change and other global environmental problems. Increased cooperation between the US and China could in turn contribute to the success of multilateral negotiations. As a result, the Durban Platform may signal that it is in the mutual interests of China and the US to take the lead in global cooperation over controlling climate change. However, cooperation between the US and China is less evident in the case the promotion of clean energy. Here, more parochial national economic interests seem to dominate the incentives arising from bilateral economic ties. For example, the Obama Administration recently announced tariffs of 31% and higher on solar panels imported from China. These tariffs are in addition to the existing US duties of 2.9% to 4.7% on Chinese solar panels, which were imposed in March 2012 due to Chinese subsidies to their panel industry. The reasons cited for the new tariffs is that Chinese solar panels are accused of being "dumped" – i.e. sold at below fair-market value – in the United States. Certainly, Chinese solar panel imports have had a huge impact on the US market. The US solar industry, which includes manufacturing, installation and services, employs around 100,000 people. But it is panel manufacturing that cannot compete with Chinese imports, which last year amounted to $3.1 billion and now accounts for half of the US market. In addition, some US solar panel manufacturers have transferred their operations to China, to take advantage of the lower costs and subsidies there. This current confrontation over trade in solar panels arises from major differences in the Chinese and US approaches to clean energy development. China views expansion of clean energy as a sound long-term industrial and export promotion policy. It aims to be the world market leader in solar panels, water heating and batteries, wind turbines, fuel-efficient cars, high-speed rail, biofuels, and other clean energy industries. For a number of years, China has targeted development of these industries through combining pricing incentives, research and development subsidies, advanced production technology and economies of scale. This strategy is based on first supplying China's huge domestic market for clean energy as a springboard for exporting cheap manufactures to the rest of the world. For example, China is both the global leader in cumulative installed capacity and in exports of solar water heating. In 2010, China surpassed the US in terms of cumulative installed capacity of wind power, and is pushing hard to be a leading exporter to the rest of the world. Solar panel manufacturing is now following a similar pattern. In contrast, the US takes, at best, a piecemeal approach to promoting clean energy. There is no long-term US strategy for energy, let alone for clean energy development. The 2008-9 stimulus package enacted by the Obama Administration included a number of short-lived incentives to spur energy efficiency and renewable energy expansion, some of which are still in place. But a long-term industrial policy for promoting clean energy through R&D subsidies and price incentives remains politically controversial. Instead, state and even local governments enact a variety of regulations and incentives, and private industry is left to respond to market forces. Given this policy climate, restricting Chinese solar panel imports that compete with US manufactures is seen as both politically popular and economically expedient. However, protecting domestic clean energy manufacturing is no substitute for a long-term clean energy policy for the United States. For one, it may be counter-productive. By raising substantially the costs of solar panels, the US tariffs on Chinese imports could increase dramatically the expense of installing solar energy nationally and curtail employment. But most importantly, the solar panel trade dispute could lead to similar confrontations with China over other clean energy imports, such as wind turbines, solar batteries and biofuels. If clean energy trade disputes lead to worsening bilateral economic relations, then China and the US may have less incentive to pursue other mutual interests, such as reducing GHG emissions. It would be highly ironic, if not tragic, if a trade disagreement over clean energy undermines the fragile beginnings of US and China cooperation over global climate change.

#### Signal of the plan is key --- protectionist measures convince Xi that the U.S. does not want to cooperate.

**Bader**, 2/14/**2012** (Jeffrey – John C. Whitehead senior fellow in international diplomacy at the Brookings Institution, Rooting for Xi, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/14/rooting\_for\_xi\_jinping?page=full)

Xi's visit does not signal new breakthroughs in Washington's relationship with Beijing. He is only the heir apparent, not yet the man in charge, and he will not take bold steps that would upset his colleagues back home. But during his visit the administration can take his measure and communicate that it wants to work with him to create an international environment that doesn't threaten China or the United States and that it seeks to establish a framework for trade and investment that is fair and pro-growth in both countries. Particularly in the wake of rhetoric about a U.S. "pivot" to the Western Pacific accompanying Obama's visit to Asia in November and overexcited Chinese reactions, the Chinese should be told that a strengthened U.S. overall presence in the region will be structured to facilitate, not prevent, China's peaceful rise. In the overheated atmosphere of an election year, it will be important to communicate to Xi that the United States **will not take protectionist steps** that would be popular for a moment but counterproductive in the long run. At the same time, Xi should be made to understand that U.S. frustrations over trade issues are not a mere election-year ploy, but reflect deep-seated irritation and will be dangerous to the relationship if unaddressed. That will require a recommitment of China's leaders to systemic reform. If on the other hand the United States goes for quick victories and headlines, it will only persuade the man expected to rule China for the next decade to distrust America, rather than want to work with it.

#### Increasing pressure on China collapses relations – causes multiple scenarios for extinction

Stokes and Hachigian 12

[Jacob Stokes, policy analyst – National Security Network, and Nina Hachigian, senior fellow – Center for American Progress, 3/13/12, <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/03/pdf/us_china_relations.pdf>]

In contrast, the Obama administration’s approach is steady, clear-eyed, and focused on results. The administration has pushed back on China multiple times—taking China to task on unfair trade, forming a united front to get China to back down from aggressive actions in the South China Sea, and selling arms to Taiwan over furious protests from Beijing. President Obama’s Asia strategy, which is deepening partnerships and engagement in the region, is designed to ensure that as China grows it contributes to peace and stability and follows the rules of the international system. At the same time the administration does not let differences prevent the United States from working with Beijing on important joint challenges such as North Korea’s nuclear program and clean energy. This progressive approach offers the best tactic for dealing with China because for the foreseeable future China will be both a rival and a partner. Our policymakers have to play the long game, ensuring our strategies for China make sense not just during campaign seasons but for this year, this decade, and beyond. Fostering successful policies toward China requires a steady hand and a concerted effort to refrain from overheated tirades and knee-jerk responses. But reflexive belligerence toward China plays well on the conservative campaign trail. Already the election has seen the two top candidates for the Republican nomination fighting over who could be more confrontational toward China “on Day 1,” and a conservative candidate for the U.S. Senate using racially tinged advertisements to stoke fears about Chinese ownership of U.S. debt. In *The Wall Street Journal*, Mitt Romney offered a plainly zero-sum view of the U.S.-China relationship. China policy via short-term political point scoring may help campaigns but it does not help the United States. In fact, a fair and mature relationship with China will serve U.S. interests in creating jobs and sustainable economic growth. Steady U.S.- China relations will promote stability in the Asia-Pacific region and security for the global commons. And it will enable both nations to help address transnational problems such as climate change, pandemic disease, energy security, and terrorism.

### 1AC – China Pollution

**Contention 2 is Chinese Pollution**

**Chinese solar industry collapse is imminent- the tariffs put the industry over the brink**

**AP 12**

[Associated Press, 8/22/12, <http://business.time.com/2012/08/22/chinese-solar-industry-faces-weak-sales-price-war/>]

Chinese solar panel makers that grew fast over the past decade are suffering big losses due to slumping global sales and a price war that threaten an industry seen by communist leaders as a role model for hopes to transform China into a technology leader. Another looming challenge: Moves by the United States and Europe toward imposing possible anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese-made solar panels that might **further depress sales**. Financial problems are likely to force painful changes in the Chinese industry including possible mergers, bankruptcies, factory closures or layoffs, industry analysts say. “The next 1½ years will be very challenging,” said Frank Haugwitz, a renewable energy consultant in Beijing. Companies have been hurt by weak sales, especially in debt-crippled Europe, the leading global solar market, but also by Chinese government policies that encouraged hundreds of small companies to rush into the industry. They flooded the market and depressed prices. Five major Chinese manufacturers, including industry leaders Suntech Power Holdings Ltd. and Yingli Green Energy Ltd., reported total losses of nearly $250 million in the latest quarter. One of them, LDK Solar Co., also reported an eye-popping loss of $588.7 million the previous quarter. Pioneers such as Suntech, Yingli and Trina Solar Ltd. that were founded before 2005 grew to become some of their industries biggest competitors as Germany, Spain and other European countries promoted solar power with subsidies and low-cost loans. Suntech’s founder, Shi Zhengrong, a Chinese-born Australian scientist, was lauded by the communist government as a leading entrepreneur. Industry profits soared in 2007-09 as the United States and other new markets stepped up installations. That success encouraged communist authorities who saw solar, wind and other renewable energy as a way both to curb China’s growing reliance on imported oil and gas and to take the lead in an emerging industry without established competitors. Solar power, along with such fields as biotechnology and aerospace, was declared a “strategic emerging industry” targeted for development as part of efforts to transform China from a low-wage country of farmers and factory workers into a creator of technology. Beijing provided grants and low-cost loans. Local leaders encouraged companies to start producing solar panels or components to make them. The field promised higher-paying jobs and a political payoff for officials who would be seen to support a key national initiative. Producing the basic element of a solar panel — the hand-size black solar cell made of polysilicon that converts the sun’s light into electricity — is relatively simple using equipment that a new company can buy as a kit from European suppliers. That allowed novices to start production quickly, while bigger manufacturers also assemble the cells into power-generating modules. New companies still were springing up in 2011 even after Western countries that were hammered by the global crisis cut subsidies and other support. Supplies surged as sales growth stalled, forcing sellers to slash prices to unprofitable levels. Since 2010, the price of polysilicon wafers used to make solar cells has plunged by 73 percent, according to Aaron Chew and Francesco Citro, analysts for Maxim Group, a financial firm in New York City. The price of cells has fallen by 68 percent and that of modules by 57 percent. “The solar manufacturing industry has been wracked by a collapse in pricing,” said Chew and Citro in a report. The major Chinese manufacturers have accumulated a total of $17.5 billion in debt, leaving balance sheets “**at the breaking point**,” they said. Beijing is unlikely to allow major producers to go bankrupt but rescue measures might include capital injections that would dilute or wipe out the value of shares held by foreign investors who have put billions of dollars into the industry, Chew and Citro said. Haugwitz said people in the industry have told him at least 300 smaller manufacturers have suspended production and others are producing at below 50 percent of their capacity. The industry also faces the potential impact of U.S. and European anti-dumping measures in response to complaints Beijing improperly subsidizes companies. Foreign competitors complain that allows Chinese suppliers to sell abroad at unfairly low prices, wiping out American and European jobs abroad — an explosive issue at a time of high unemployment. In July, a group of 25 producers of solar gear including companies from Germany, Italy and Spain filed an anti-dumping complaint with the European Union. That alarmed Chinese companies, which warned Beijing would retaliate, possibly triggering a trade war. “Over 60 percent of products are exported to Europe,” said Wang Shuai, a spokeswoman for Yingli. “If the anti-dumping measures really take effect in Europe, that would be a **fatal blow** to the industry) southwest of Beijing that promotes itself as a center for renewable energy. The local government has attracted 170 companies that produce solar, wind and other clean power equipment. In a reflection of Chinese leaders’ hopes for the industry, Baoding’s city government says its clean energy industry had 45 billion yuan ($7 billion) in revenue in 2010 and that figure is forecast to grow by 30 percent a year through 2016. The city works closely with companies, organizing job fairs, providing training and helping to recruit employees through local schools. In the United States, the Commerce Department issued a preliminary ruling in May that Chinese producers sold solar cells and panels below fair price and hurt American producers. If that is upheld, tariffs averaging 31 percent could be imposed on Chinese solar-panel imports. On Tuesday, Trina Solar Ltd. reported its loss widened to $92.1 million in the second quarter from $29.8 million in the previous quarter. CEO Jifan Gao blamed industry overcapacity and pressure to cut prices. He said the possible anti-dumping measures contributed to “uncertain market conditions.”

**U.S. China solar trade war destroys China’s solar industry- causes a shift back to coal**

**Bradsher 12**

[Keith, NYT, 8/21/12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/22/business/global/chinas-solar-panel-manufacturers-face-trade-and-finance-hurdles.html?_r=1>]

China’s solar panel manufacturers, who dominate global sales with a two-thirds market share, are confronting growing trade and financial problems, a Chinese industry official acknowledged Tuesday, shortly before one of the industry’s largest companies, Trina Solar, announced weak results for the second quarter. The Chinese manufacturers “face challenges of decreasing margins, decreasing exports, lack of capital, protectionism and an external environment that **continues to deteriorate**,” said the official, Chen Huiqing, the deputy director for solar products at the China Chamber of Commerce for Import and Export of Machinery and Electronic Products. The United States Commerce Department has already imposed preliminary antidumping and antisubsidy tariffs on Chinese solar panels totaling more than 33 percent, although the tariffs are subject to a review by the department this fall that could raise, lower or even repeal them. A coalition of solar manufacturers in Europe has asked the European Union to impose antidumping tariffs. Ms. Chen, who was the lead speaker Tuesday morning at the Guangzhou International Solar Photovoltaic Exhibition here in southeastern China, said that a team of representatives from the Chinese industry is in Brussels to try to persuade European officials not to start a trade investigation into Chinese solar panels in the coming weeks. Trina Solar, one of the largest Chinese solar manufacturers, announced Tuesday that it had lost $92.1 million on sales of $346.1 million in the second quarter. Price wars in the industry eroded **overall revenue**, even as the volume, measured by wattage of solar module shipments, continued to increase. Solar panel exports soared in the last five years to become one of the largest categories of China’s diverse exports, representing a little more than 1 percent of the total. The European Union, the leader in deploying solar panels through extensive government subsidies, buys five times as many panels from China as the United States, making the European Union’s trade decision crucial for Chinese manufacturers. But the value of Chinese solar panel exports has already fallen 30 percent in the first six months of 2012 from the comparable period last year, as prices have tumbled. Several bankruptcies of solar manufacturers in the United States and Germany have created political pressure for action against China, where the government has made it a national priority to expand manufacturing capacity for renewable energy. As new solar panel factories continue to open in China, the industry’s surplus capacity increases, with downward pressure on prices, said Yotam Ariel, the managing director of Bennu Solar, a research company in Shanghai. “Everyone talks about the struggle of the U.S. producers, but it seems like the **Chinese producers are in a struggle of their own,”** he said. The Chinese Commerce Ministry has complained repeatedly, most recently in a statement Monday, that renewable energy programs by five state governments in the United States discriminate against imports from China, but it has not said whether it might file a challenge with the World Trade Organization. The ministry is also investigating a complaint from Chinese industry that the United States is exporting polysilicon, the main ingredient for solar panels, at prices below manufacturing costs. American companies have contended that their polysilicon prices are low because they rely on very inexpensive hydroelectric power in Oregon, and energy is the biggest single cost in polysilicon production. Chinese polysilicon producers, who would be the main beneficiaries if China restricted imports from the United States, **rely heavily on coal-fired power** and have a history of **spills of toxic chemicals**.

#### Mounting debt means China will not bail out its solar industry

Min 12

[Eric, Morning Whistle, 7/31/12, <http://www.morningwhistle.com/html/2012/Company_Industry_0731/213306.html>]

Coup de Grace for a Chinese Tier One? With Balance Sheets at the Breaking Point, Shifting Political and Economic Winds Are Likely to Soon Give Way to a Wave of Recapitalizations and Take unders Amidst growing complacency that China Solar’s political support is perpetual, the source believe (1) a new national government and (2) gaping capital requirements will bring this dynamic to a tipping point. With cash draining and capex needs high, we believe the sectors’ balance sheets are cracking at the seams with equity at risk of succumbing to insolvencies, recapitalizations, and take unders. Bloated Balance Sheets on Verge of Boiling Over from Strain of Cash Burn: Despite a wave of insolvencies striking solar manufacturing in Europe and the U.S., China Solar has largely sidestepped a major failure to date, in our view, from deep support from the government and banks. However, after accumulating $4 billion in free cash flow losses and straining under $17.5 billion in debt, we believe the balance sheets of China Solar’s Top 10 are near the breaking point. Capital Needs and Change at Top May Undermine Provincial Support: In the face of a new government coming to power October 2012-March 2013 **and the capital hole facing the solar industry, we believe support at the provincial level—**where it has been most prevalent—is **at risk.** Historic support may have been underpinned by banks’ refusal to take losses, but we believe **the tables will turn as banks balk at new investment in an industry suffering from steady cash burn and the need for massive future capital investment**. Recapitalization Destroying Equity May Be More Viable than Insolvency: Even as bankruptcy law exists in China, we believe the dynamics of China’s command economy make this a less viable option. While the collapse in profits and cash flow may leave some with no other option than failure, we believe the most viable solution may be recapitalizations, in which banks swap debt for equity, enabling (1) banks to creatively avoid a write down, (2) companies to eliminate interest expenses, and (3) provinces to maintain employment. The trade-off, though, is equity dilution that destroys value for current shareholders. Despite Strong Support, LDK’s Cash Needs May Be Too Much to Bear: With debt of $3.4 billion translating into a bloated 7.4x net debt-to-equity, LDK might be considered insolvent by traditional measures at Western banks. While Jiangxi province’s support has held firm, a free cash flow drain of ($1.2 billion) in 2011 and the need for further capital investment long term to maintain share leave it with few ways out. Rather than demonstrate perpetual support, Xinyu city’s recent pay-down of $80m of LDK’s debt may mark the beginning of an orderly wind down of its liabilities. With only $137 million in unrestricted cash, a $380 million off balance sheet liability due June 2013 without an LDK Silicon IPO, and unsubsidized solar pricing pointing to normalized annual free cash flow losses of ($200 million), we believe LDK is on the cusp of failure or a major recapitalization. Even with a White Knight Savior, STP’s (Suntech’s ticker symbol)

#### Tariff kills China shift to renewables- kills growth and causes pollution

Donald 12 – writer for Carbon Brief, MA in International Studies and Diplomacy from the School of Oriental and African Studies @ Cardiff University, specialized in global energy and climate policy (Ros, 8/14/12, "Is China the new green superpower?" http://www.carbonbrief.org/blog/2012/08/is-china-the-worlds-new-green-superpower)

China is certainly burning a lot of coal to fuel economic growth which is currently estimated at between seven and eight per cent. According to the International Energy Agency (IEA), China made the biggest contribution to the 6.1 per cent rise in carbon emissions outside OECD countries recorded in 2011. The IEA says China's emissions rose by "720 million tonnes, or 9.3%, primarily due to higher coal consumption". According to Chinese government figures, the country burned an extra 95 million tonnes of coal last year, compared to 2010. But while China's emissions are rising rapidly, it also has policies in place that are helping to limit the country's carbon footprint. The IEA says energy efficiency and clean energy deployment meant China's carbon intensity - the amount of carbon dioxide emitted per unit of GDP - fell by 15 per cent between 2005 and 2011, cutting China's overall emissions by 15 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide. China's government says the country currently gets 8.3 per cent of its energy from renewables - and it's led the world in terms of installed renewable energy capacity since 2010 with 103.36 gigawatts installed. For comparison, in 2011 renewables met 3.8% of UK energy consumption, with 12.3 gigawatts installed. Last year China tripled its solar energy generating capacity and increased wind and hydropower capacity. China's current five-year plan includes ambitions to increase the proportion of energy from non fossil fuels to 11.3 per cent by 2015. The country appears to have much bigger carbon-cutting ambitions and plans to cap coal consumption this year in order to "reduce pollution and curb reliance on the fuel", according to Bloomberg, with the National Development and Reform Commission vowing to take an "active part" in international efforts to mitigate emissions. Liu Tienan - the director of the country's National Energy Administration - called for energy use to be kept below 4.1 billion tonnes of coal equivalent per year by 2015, although a spokesman from a state coal body voiced concern that the cap would make it hard to fuel China's growth. So although China has resisted signing up to binding emissions cuts at international summits, it's undoubtedly got its own thing going on in terms of climate targets. It's a complex picture that suggests China doesn't want to be tied to coal forever - and that at least some parts of the government are keen to have a leading role in efforts to green the world's economy, including cutting emissions. China's export industries China's growth is based on the ability to export cheap products. Its export-led growth policy allowed China to become the world's biggest exporter in 2009, overtaking Germany. The country's main export products include electronic goods, agricultural goods and machinery. You can see these figures in more detail on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and Hong Kong Trade Development Council sites. Renewable energy technology is one of China's fastest-growing export industries, presumably because growth projections for the sector suggest there's a lot of money in it. The Energy Information Administration, for example, predicts that world consumption of renewable energy will almost double by 2035. Since the early 2000s, for example, 95 per cent of China's production of solar photovoltaic (PV) equipment has been destined for export markets, and China dominates the global market - accounting for half of world PV output, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance. Trade disputes with China With export growth has come a fair share of trade disputes. China is involved in just under half of all trade conflicts brought before the WTO from 2011 onward. The press is full of stories entertaining the possibility of an all out trade war with the US - which Lawson's interview is a nod towards. Republican presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, never one to pour oil on troubled international waters, has threatened to file a complaint with the WTO over alleged currency manipulation. He claims China is undervaluing the Yuan in order to flood the US market with under-priced products - a practice known as dumping. The US has failed so far to make any blanket complaints about Chinese goods, but allegations that the Chinese state is producing under-valued products are common. The country's renewables sector has taken centre stage in some of these tussles. Although many countries have created schemes to promote renewables exports, China's have been especially comprehensive, and that is causing friction. Last year, for example, the Chinese government revoked grants of between US $6.7 million and US $22.5 million to domestic wind turbine manufacturers following a US complaint to the WTO. The government gave the subsidies on condition that the turbine manufacturers purchased parts and materials in China, provoking a complaint from US steelmakers. China: the world's green competition The complaints about China's renewables export industries indicate just how worried other countries' domestic renewables industries are about competition from China. Last month, European solar companies asked the EU to investigate whether China is selling solar PVs at unfairly low prices, saying several of them now face bankruptcy due to competition from China. This follows a recent decision by the US to impose 31 per cent tariffs on Chinese PVs, after finding the Chinese government is subsidising panel exports. China has become more confident in filing its own complaints, too. This year it filed a complaint about the US's application of countervailing measures - tariffs designed to raise the price of subsidised goods - to a wide range of its products, eight days after the US solar tariffs were imposed. This willingness to file retaliatory cases has fuelled concerns that trade war with the globe's other powers looms, despite Chinese protestations to the contrary. Competition from China has its cheerleaders, too. The Worldwatch Institute, for example, finds in a recent report that Chinese products' downward pressure on prices - coupled with progress in Chinese research and development - is generally a good thing for cleantech deployment. The institute says: "As the country's skills in efficient, low-cost manufacturing are brought to clean energy industries, this could widen the energy options for the world as a whole." The new green superpower? In the West, many stories of China's economic rise tend to focus either on its carbon footprint or on accusations of mercantilism. This comes into focus especially in the world's renewable energy industries, which - especially in the West - must promise domestic jobs to counter political arguments that they are expensive and ineffective. Cheap exports from China, competing with these infant industries have increased pressure on governments to impose tariffs, possibly at the risk of hurting faster green rollout in the process. Though spooked by China's aggressive market tactics, it's possible these industries - and governments - could benefit from taking a look at China's policies. A recent study from the University of Pennsylvania argues that China's renewable energy experience could provide important lessons for other countries wishing to kick-start economic growth using new, low carbon technologies. By offering renewable energy industries consistent support combined with exposure to competitive markets, despite its dependence on coal, China now has one of the world's leading green industries.

#### China econ collapse goes nuclear

**Kaminski 7**

(Antoni Z., Professor – Institute of Political Studies, “World Order: The Mechanics of Threats (Central European Perspective)”, Polish Quarterly of International Affairs, 1, p. 58)

As already argued, the economic advance of China has taken place with relatively few corresponding changes in the political system, although the operation of political and economic institutions has seen some major changes. Still, tools are missing that would allow the establishment of political and legal foundations for the modem economy, or they are too weak. The tools are efficient public administration, the rule of law, clearly defined ownership rights, efficient banking system, etc. For these reasons, many experts fear an economic crisis in China. Considering the importance of the state for the development of the global economy, the crisis would have serious global repercussions. Its political ramifications could be no less dramatic owing to the special position the military occupies in the Chinese political system, and the existence of many potential vexed issues in East Asia (disputes over islands in the China Sea and the Pacific). A potential hotbed of conflict is also Taiwan's status. Economic recession and the related destabilization of internal policies could lead to a political, or even military crisis. The likelihood of the global escalation of the conflict is high, as the interests of Russia, China, Japan, Australia and, first and foremost, the US clash in the region.

**China fossil fuel dependence causes pollution and warming**

**Bradsher and Barboza 06**

[Keith and David, NYT, 6/11/06, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/11/business/worldbusiness/11chinacoal.html?pagewanted=all>]

One of China's lesser-known exports is a dangerous brew of soot, toxic chemicals and climate-changing gases from the smokestacks of coal-burning power plants. In early April, a dense cloud of pollutants over Northern China sailed to nearby Seoul, sweeping along dust and desert sand before wafting across the Pacific. An American satellite spotted the cloud as it crossed the West Coast. Researchers in California, Oregon and Washington noticed specks of sulfur compounds, carbon and other byproducts of coal combustion coating the silvery surfaces of their mountaintop detectors. These microscopic particles can work their way deep into the lungs, contributing to respiratory damage, heart disease and cancer. Filters near Lake Tahoe in the mountains of eastern California "are the darkest that we've seen" outside smoggy urban areas, said Steven S. Cliff, an atmospheric scientist at the University of California at Davis. Unless China finds a way to clean up its coal plants and the thousands of factories that burn coal, pollution will soar both at home and abroad. The increase in global-warming gases from China's coal use will probably exceed that for **all industrialized countries combined** over the next 25 years, surpassing by five times the reduction in such emissions that the Kyoto Protocol seeks. The sulfur dioxide produced in coal combustion poses an immediate threat to the health of China's citizens, contributing to about 400,000 premature deaths a year. It also causes acid rain that poisons lakes, rivers, forests and crops. The sulfur pollution is so pervasive as to have an extraordinary side effect that is helping the rest of the world, but only temporarily: It actually slows global warming . The tiny, airborne particles deflect the sun's hot rays back into space. But the cooling effect from sulfur is short-lived. By contrast, the carbon dioxide emanating from Chinese coal plants will last for decades, with a cumulative warming effect that will eventually overwhelm the cooling from sulfur and deliver another large kick to global warming, climate scientists say. A warmer climate could lead to rising sea levels, the spread of tropical diseases in previously temperate climes, crop failures in some regions and the extinction of many plant and animal species, especially those in polar or alpine areas. Coal is indeed China's double-edged sword — the new economy's black gold and the fragile environment's dark cloud. Already, China uses more coal than the United States, the European Union and Japan combined. And it has increased coal consumption 14 percent in each of the past two years in the broadest industrialization ever. Every week to 10 days, another coal-fired power plant opens somewhere in China that is big enough to serve all the households in Dallas or San Diego

#### Newest and BEST studies show that warming is real and anthropogenic

Muller 12 (Richard A., professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and a former MacArthur Foundation fellow, “The Conversion of a Climate-Change Skeptic,” 7-28-12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/30/opinion/the-conversion-of-a-climate-change-skeptic.html?_r=2&pagewanted=all>)

CALL me a converted skeptic. Three years ago I identified problems in previous climate studies that, in my mind, threw doubt on the very existence of global warming. Last year, following an intensive research effort involving a dozen scientists, I concluded that global warming was real and that the prior estimates of the rate of warming were correct. I’m now going a step further: Humans are almost entirely the cause. My total turnaround, in such a short time, is the result of careful and objective analysis by the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature project, which I founded with my daughter Elizabeth. Our results show that the average temperature of the earth’s land has risen by two and a half degrees Fahrenheit over the past 250 years, including an increase of one and a half degrees over the most recent 50 years. Moreover, it appears likely that essentially all of this increase results from the human emission of greenhouse gases. These findings are stronger than those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations group that defines the scientific and diplomatic consensus on global warming. In its 2007 report, the I.P.C.C. concluded only that most of the warming of the prior 50 years could be attributed to humans. It was possible, according to the I.P.C.C. consensus statement, that the warming before 1956 could be because of changes in solar activity, and that even a substantial part of the more recent warming could be natural. Our Berkeley Earth approach used sophisticated statistical methods developed largely by our lead scientist, Robert Rohde, which allowed us to determine earth land temperature much further back in time. We carefully studied issues raised by skeptics: biases from urban heating (we duplicated our results using rural data alone), from data selection (prior groups selected fewer than 20 percent of the available temperature stations; we used virtually 100 percent), from poor station quality (we separately analyzed good stations and poor ones) and from human intervention and data adjustment (our work is completely automated and hands-off). In our papers we demonstrate that none of these potentially troublesome effects unduly biased our conclusions. The historic temperature pattern we observed has abrupt dips that match the emissions of known explosive volcanic eruptions; the particulates from such events reflect sunlight, make for beautiful sunsets and cool the earth’s surface for a few years. There are small, rapid variations attributable to El Niño and other ocean currents such as the Gulf Stream; because of such oscillations, the “flattening” of the recent temperature rise that some people claim is not, in our view, statistically significant. What has caused the gradual but systematic rise of two and a half degrees? We tried fitting the shape to simple math functions (exponentials, polynomials), to solar activity and even to rising functions like world population. By far the best match was to the record of atmospheric carbon dioxide, measured from atmospheric samples and air trapped in polar ice. Just as important, our record is long enough that we could search for the fingerprint of solar variability, based on the historical record of sunspots. That fingerprint is absent. Although the I.P.C.C. allowed for the possibility that variations in sunlight could have ended the “Little Ice Age,” a period of cooling from the 14th century to about 1850, our data argues strongly that the temperature rise of the past 250 years cannot be attributed to solar changes. This conclusion is, in retrospect, not too surprising; we’ve learned from satellite measurements that solar activity changes the brightness of the sun very little.

#### Warming is the most likely scenario for extinction

Deibel 7 (Terry L. Professor of IR @ National War College, 2007. “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon **which all earthly life depends**. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the **continued existence of life on this planet**.

**Chinese pollution causes CCP instability and kills economic growth**

**Nankivell 06**

[Nathan, Senior Research for the Canadian Department of National Defense, “China's Pollution Poses Security Threat in Asia,” 1/9/06, Japan Focus, News Analysis, <http://news.pacificnews.org/news/view_article.html?article_id=fd2421fbe9b4fe1ac727e145f8719b4e>]

As pollution and environmental degradation in China worsens, the Communist government has been unable or unwilling to prescribe measures needed to address the problem. This inability carries grave consequences for China and Asia, threatening stability not only in China but throughout the region. There is little disagreement that China’s environment is a mounting problem for Beijing. China produces as many sulfur emissions as Tokyo and Los Angeles combined; China is home to 16 of the world’s 20 most polluted cities; water pollution reduces crop returns; air pollution is blamed for the premature death of some 400,000 Chinese annually; and solid waste production is expected to more than double over the next decade, pushing China ahead of the U.S. In spite of greater awareness, pollution and environmental degradation are likely to worsen. Chinese consumers are expected to purchase hundreds of millions of automobiles. Despite pledges to put the environment first, national planners still aim to double per capita GDP by 2010. Cities will grow, leading to the creation of slums and stressing urban sanitation and delivery systems The nation lacks a powerful national body able to coordinate, monitor, and enforce environmental legislation: the State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) is under-staffed, has few resources, and must compete with other bureaucracies for attention. To address the problems, it will take an aggressive effort by the central government to eliminate corruption, establish the rule of law and transparency, incentives and investment. As it stands, decision-making falls to local officials who are more concerned with economic growth than the environment. The deficiency of capital and the lack of will to promote massive spending on environmental repair make it difficult to be optimistic. Estimates on the final cost of environmental repair range into the tens of billions of dollars. As the impact of pollution on human health becomes more obvious and widespread, it is leading to greater political mobilization and social unrest of affected citizens. There were more than 74,000 incidents of protest and unrest recorded in China in 2004, up from 58,000 the year before. Pollution issues unite communities. The effects, though not equally felt by each person within a community, affect rich and poor, farmers and businessmen, families and individuals alike. As local communities respond to pollution issues through united opposition, it is leaving Beijing with no easy target upon which to blame unrest, and no simple option for how to quell whole communities with a common grievance. Moreover, protests serve as a venue for the politically disaffected unhappy with the current state of governance and may be open to other forms of political rule. For the Communist Chinese Party (CCP), social unrest has the potential to challenge the CCP’s total political control, thus potentially destabilizing a state with a huge military arsenal and a history of violent, internal conflict that cannot be downplayed or ignored. A further key challenge is trying to contain protests once they begin. The steady introduction of new media like cell phones, email, and text messaging prevent China’s authorities from silencing and hiding unrest. Domestic and international observers will be aware of unrest, making it far more difficult for local authorities to employ state-sanctioned force. While many would treat political change in China, especially the implosion of the Party, as a welcome development, it must be noted that any slippage of the Party’s dominance would most likely be accompanied by a period of transitional violence. Though most violence would be directed toward dissident Chinese, regional security would be affected through immigration, impediments to trade, and an increased military presence along the Chinese border. While unrest presents the most obvious example of a security threat related to pollution, several other key concerns are worth noting. The cost of environmental destruction could, for example, begin to reverse the blistering rate of economic growth in China that is the foundation of CCP legitimacy. Estimates maintain that 7 percent annual growth is required to preserve social stability. Yet the costs of pollution are already taxing the economy between 8 and 12 percent of GDP per year. As environmental problems mount, this percentage will increase, reducing annual growth. As a result, the CCP could be challenged to legitimize its continued control.

#### **Cuts to China solar specifically triggers instability**

Xinhua 12

[China Daily, 9/4/12, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2012-09/04/content_15731380.htm>]

Miao Liansheng, chairman of the board of Yingli Green Energy, one of the most advanced solar PV enterprises in the world, said if the anti-dumping case is verified, Chinese PV companies will be forced to transfer their industry to other countries, which will cause a loss to the real economy in China, and this newly leading industry will also lose its development opportunities. Some enterprises in Hebei, Jiangsu and Jiangxi have started to explore new markets in Japan, Republic of Korea, Africa, South America and Southeast Asia. To encourage the development of the industry, Chinese governments and banks have issued some preferential policies for the companies, such as issuing credits to build up plants and expand production. If the companies shut down, the equipment and plants will depreciate, so the huge loan cannot be redeemed, and the stability of **economy and society will also be affected.** And the Chinese PV industry will face a devastating blow, said an official of Yingli, who refused to give the name. Millions of unemployment Statistics show that China has more than 300,000 practitioners directly working for the PV industry. Adding other relevant enterprises, the number of workers involved in this industry reaches more than one million. Liu Hanyuan, another senior official of CNECC, said that the case may force 80 percent of workers to lose their jobs or retain their roles but have their salary suspended. "If the situation goes bad, we will allow some of the staff to have paid vacation, but we will consider job cuts if it gets worse," said Ji Youqiang, an official of Lightway Solar, located in north China's Hebei Province with more than 1,800 workers. Based in Hebei Province, Jinglong Industry and Commerce Group Co Ltd has nearly 30,000 staff, and most of them were born in the 1980s and 1990s. The deputy general manager An Zengxian told Xinhua that unemployment among young people will be on the rise, which may result in demonstrations, protests and other extreme actions. Elsewhere, in east China's Jiangsu Province, the Yongyiyuan PV Technology Company has reduced staff by two-thirds. "We only receive orders so that we can keep the major technical workers at the company," said Pian Yong, chairman of the company. Call for dialogues Chinese industry insiders said that price advantages, outstanding management modes and forward-looking strategies in the field have made Chinese PV companies competitively stronger in the world market.

**Pollution pushes party instability over the brink – causes extinction**

**Yee and Storey 02**

[Herbert Yee, Professor of Politics and IR, Hong Kong Baptist University --AND-- Ian Storey, Lecturer in Defence Studies at Deakin, 02

“The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality,” p5]

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability. Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialisation and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government's ability to govern effectively. Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees seeking asylum in neighbouring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China's neighbours. A fragmented China could also result in another nightmare scenario - nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords.2 From this perspective, a disintegrating China would also pose a threat to its neighbours and the world.

**Specifically, causes nuclear war with Russia**

**Nankivell 9**

[Nathan, Senior Researcher at the Office of the Special Advisor Policy, Canadien Department of National Defence, “China's Pollution and the Threat to Domestic and Regional Stability”, Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-21, http://japanfocus.org/-Nathan-Nankivell/1799]

Moreover, protests serve as a venue for the politically disaffected who are unhappy with the current state of governance, and may be open to considering alternative forms of political rule. Environmental experts like Elizabeth Economy note that protests afford an opportunity for the environmental movement to forge linkages with democracy advocates. She notes in her book, The River Runs Black, that several environmentalists argue that change is only possible through greater democratization and notes that the environmental and democracy movements united in Eastern Europe prior to the end of the Cold War. It is conceivable that in this way, environmentally-motivated protests might help to spread democracy and undermine CCP rule. A further key challenge is trying to contain protests once they begin. The steady introduction of new media like cell phones, email, and text messaging are preventing China’s authorities from silencing and hiding unrest. Moreover, the ability to send and receive information ensures that domestic and international observers will be made aware of unrest, making it far more difficult for local authorities to employ state-sanctioned force. The security ramifications of greater social unrest cannot be overlooked. Linkages between environmental and democracy advocates potentially challenge the Party’s monolithic control of power. In the past, similar challenges by Falun Gong and the Tiananmen protestors have been met by force and detainment. In an extreme situation, such as national water shortages, social unrest could generate widespread, coordinated action and political mobilization that would serve as a midwife to anti-CCP political challenges, create divisions within the Party over how to deal with the environment, or lead to a massive show of force. Any of these outcomes would mark an erosion or alteration to the CCP’s current power dynamic. And while many would treat political change in China, especially the implosion of the Party, as a welcome development, it must be noted that any slippage of the Party’s dominance would most likely be accompanied by a period of transitional violence. Though most violence would be directed toward dissident Chinese, a ripple effect would be felt in neighboring states through immigration, impediments to trade, and an increased military presence along the Chinese border. All of these situations would alter security assumptions in the region. Other Security Concerns While unrest presents the most obvious example of a security threat related to pollution, several other key concerns are worth noting. The cost of environmental destruction could, for example, begin to reverse the blistering rate of economic growth in China that is the foundation of CCP legitimacy. Estimates maintain that 7 percent annual growth is required to preserve social stability. Yet the costs of pollution are already taxing the economy between 8 and 12 percent of GDP per year [1]. As environmental problems mount, this percentage will increase, in turn reducing annual growth. As a result, the CCP could be seriously challenged to legitimize its continued control if economic growth stagnates. Nationalists in surrounding states could use pollution as a rallying point to muster support for anti-Chinese causes. For example, attacks on China’s environmental management for its impact on surrounding states like Japan, could be used to argue against further investment in the country or be highlighted during territorial disputes in the East China Sea to agitate anti-Chinese sentiment. While nationalism does not imply conflict, it could reduce patterns of cooperation in the region and hopes for balanced and effective multilateral institutions and dialogues. Finally, China’s seemingly insatiable appetite for timber and other resources, such as fish, are fuelling illegal exports from nations like Myanmar and Indonesia. As these states continue to deplete key resources, they too will face problems in the years to come and hence the impact on third nations must be considered. Territorial Expansion or Newfound Alliances In addition to the concerns already mentioned, pollution, if linked to a specific issue like water shortage, could have important geopolitical ramifications. China’s northern plains, home to hundreds of millions, face acute water shortages. Growing demand, a decade of drought, inefficient delivery methods, and increasing water pollution have reduced per capita water holdings to critical levels. Although Beijing hopes to relieve some of the pressures via the North-South Water Diversion project, it requires tens of billions of dollars and its completion is, at best, still several years away and, at worst, impossible. Yet just to the north lies one of the most under-populated areas in Asia, the Russian Far East. While there is little agreement among scholars about whether resource shortages lead to greater cooperation or conflict, either scenario encompasses security considerations. Russian politicians already allege possible Chinese territorial designs on the region. They note Russia’s falling population in the Far East, currently estimated at some 6 to 7 million, and argue that the growing Chinese population along the border, more than 80 million, may soon take over. While these concerns smack of inflated nationalism and scare tactics, there could be some truth to them. The method by which China might annex the territory can only be speculated upon, but would **surely result in full-scale war between** two powerful, **nuclear-equipped nations**.

**Extinction**

**Sharavin, 2001** (Alexander, The Third Threat, What the Papers Say, 10/3, Lexis)

Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). **Massive nuclear strikes** on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

**Chinese environmental destruction from coal independently causes extinction**  
**Salon 97**

[ MARK HERTSGAARD, He embarked upon a seven-year global tour to investigate the issue of environmental degradation. The journey spanned four continents, 19 countries and hundreds of interviews.[1] The published result was a wide-ranging book called Earth Odyssey: Around the World in Search of Our Environmental Future, 10/29/1997. “The real China threat,” <http://www.salon.com/news/1997/10/29news.html>.]  
  
China's environmental disaster threatens not only the Chinese people -- who are dying in the hundreds of thousands every year from staggering levels of air and water pollution -- but **all humanity**. With its gigantic population and booming economy, China can single-handedly guarantee that climate change, ozone depletion and other deadly hazards become a reality for people the world over. In the back of our minds, Americans may suspect that China is an environmental wasteland -- after all, we know what happened in the Soviet Union. But the truth has yet to be revealed in all its ghastly vividness, not least because of China's restrictions on foreign journalists. I recently spent six weeks traveling unmonitored throughout China, interviewing everyone from senior government officials and scientific experts to unpaid workers and newly prosperous peasants. Everywhere, it seemed, the land had been scalped, the water poisoned, the air made toxic and dark. Five of the 10 most air-polluted cities in the world are in China, and one of every four deaths is caused by lung disease. Yet coal consumption will triple over the next 25 years, making China the world's leading greenhouse gas producer and all but dooming global efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by the 60 to 80 percent recommended by U.N. scientists.

**Removing the tariff solves Chinese solar power – eliminates reliance on coal and solves warming and pollution**

**Gallagher and Gallagher 12**

[ Kelly Sims Gallagher is associate professor of energy and environmental policy at The Fletcher School, Tufts University. Kevin P. Gallagher is associate professor of international relations at Boston University, 5/22/12, <http://blogs.ft.com/beyond-brics/2012/05/22/guest-post-blinded-by-the-solar-light/#axzz1vtSGjVvk>]

The Obama Administration’s preliminary decision to impose a 31 per cent tariff on solar panels imported from China is short sighted. The move could cause a trade war, hurt the US economy, jeopardize US security interests, and put the world further off course in terms of meeting its global climate change goals. The decision opens the US up to a trade war in renewable energy, of all things. The US currently has a trade surplus with China in solar energy because of large US exports of poly-silicon to China. Not surprisingly, Li Junfeng, a senior Chinese government official, has already proposed imposing retaliatory tariffs on US polysilicon—and a trade war might **not stop there**. The measure could also hurt one of the **few bright spots in the US economy**. Jobs in the solar sector grew by 7 per cent last year thanks to the combination of higher demand for solar PV (due to lower prices for the modules) and state and national incentives for renewable energy. Most of the new jobs are in the solar installation business. If the Obama Administration makes solar modules one-third more expensive by imposing these tariffs, US demand for solar PV will certainly fall, and new jobs in this sector will vanish. Chinese solar firms can shift their production to other countries to avoid the tariffs, and will still be more competitive than SolarWorld—the German company whose US subsidiary is behind the complaint. The Obama Administration should be praising, not punishing Chinese support for renewable energy. By supporting renewable energy, China is appropriately correcting for market distortions, which the United States should be doing too. Global fossil fuel subsidies are estimated at $300bn per year. Fossil fuels also damage the environment when they are burned, which imposes costs on public health from air and water pollution. In a 2011 paper, the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions today was estimated by Yale economist William Nordhaus to be between $40 and $288 per ton carbon, depending strongly on one’s choice of discount rate. Fossil fuel imports also account for 59 per cent of the US trade deficit, and the US Navy spends countless dollars defending international shipping lanes for oil and other commodities. Recognizing these problems in the Chinese context, the Chinese government recently announced a modest carbon tax, created domestic feed-in tariffs for both wind and solar energy, and is effectively supporting their clean energy industries. It is in the US’s interest to encourage China to reduce the growth of oil and gas imports, so that the global costs of these fuels will not continue to rise. Wind and solar-derived electricity can directly substitute for Chinese imports of natural gas for power generation. If China succeeds in developing an electric car industry, renewables could power their automotive fleet too. It is also smart for the US to support China’s efforts to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Given China’s heavy reliance on coal, major investments in renewables and energy efficiency can enable China to reduce the carbon intensity of its economy. If the Chinese don’t make a big shift to renewables, there’s **no chance** of avoiding **severe climate change** because **China is already the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world.** Finally, the merits of the actual case are dubious. Prices of Chinese-made PV modules in China are lower than they are outside of China, so it’s hard to see how they are “dumping” on the U.S. market. The true problem is overcapacity, which market forces will correct in time. The Chinese government has undoubtedly provided support to its solar industry, but so has the US government with its loan guarantees, investment tax credits, and production tax credits. At the local level, SolarWorld Industries America (the lead filer of the complaint) itself received millions in tax breaks and subsidies in Oregon when it decided to locate its manufacturing facility there. Indeed, the Commerce Department only found evidence of small Chinese subsidies in its March 2012 ruling. SolarWorld only had six co-filers, but more than 100 U.S. firms lined up against it. Chinese government support for solar energy has already benefited the world in terms of **improved welfare, climate mitigation, and reduced global energy prices**. The rest of us are essentially free-riding on this support. Rather than punish China for its laudable efforts, **the Obama Administration should applaud it and do its part to correct market distortions** too.

**Reducing barriers to investment between the U.S. and China is key to a global warming solution**

**Victor 09**

[David, professor at the University of California, San Diego, in the School of International Relations and Pacific Studies and director of the Laboratory on International Law and Regulation, 2/10/09, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/defining-ideas/article/5294>]

Serious solutions to the twin problems of energy security and global climate change hinge on the actions of China and the United States, which are the world’s largest emitters of carbon dioxide, the main human cause of global warming, and the largest users of oil. Other countries matter, but China and the United States are pivotal. Governments in both countries know this and have thus created an ever-growing array of mechanisms for engagement. The efforts at engagement so far have not achieved much, with the few real achievements in highly specialized areas that are not readily scaled up to serious and broad interaction on energy and environmental topics. Before fruitful negotiations get under way, we need to explore where and how China and the United States could engage with each other. Most engagement has been fruitless because both the Chinese and American governments have sought interactions that carry few costs and risks, meaning that what passes for engagement does not reflect the underlying interests and administrative capabilities of the two governments. The result is a large number of dialogues but no real impact on the investments and operations that affect energy security and climate change. The economic crisis is likely to make engagement even harder as both countries focus on internal problems and, as is typical during hard times, demonize their partners as the cause of trouble. Neither country is well served by its failure to promote serious engagement over energy, security, and pressing environmental issues. Doing better requires initiatives on at least three fronts. Most of what passes for engagement does not actually reflect the underlying interests and capabilities of the United States and China. First, abandon the bromides that occupy most discussions of engagement. Such bromides are harmful in that they make the Chinese skeptical of anything the U.S. government proposes. Credibility and trust are essential yet still in short supply. For example, many analysts claim that the United States can engage China by transferring to it advanced technology and that China can contribute by lowering its trade barriers. Such efforts, they aver, would help China cut energy consumption and staunch its emissions of greenhouse gases. Chinese firms, however, already have access to most top-tier energy technologies, including renewable power, nuclear power, advanced coal combustion, and efficient end-user devices. Trade barriers are few, and in some areas (such as advanced coal technology or the manufacture of solar cells) China is producing at the world’s best standard. (India, by contrast, would gain from fuller trade in energy technologies.) This outcome is hardly surprising; China is a world-class manufacturing nation in many areas, and its expertise extends to many energy technologies. Areas where such technologies are not deployed in China are those in which administration of public policies is poor and industry is fragmented—problems that outsiders, such as the U.S. government or industry, can do little to fix. Second, engagement over oil requires recognizing that the efforts to engage China provide little if any benefit to the country’s core interests and that many are threatening. For China, oil is a strategic commodity (according to the International Energy Agency [IEA], China will depend on imports for 60 percent of its oil by 2030), and sensitivities are high. The United States has spearheaded an effort to enlist China (and India) in the IEA, hoping that doing so would make the operation of Chinese oil markets more transparent and would help integrate China’s strategic oil reserves into the global system of reserves. Yet the United States has as yet not devoted much diplomatic effort to overcoming opposition to China’s membership by existing IEA members, especially those in Europe who fear a loss of influence. Those nations have blocked changes in the rules needed for China to become a member. The United States also demonizes China’s efforts to “go out” to get oil supplies (e.g., in Sudan) and to create a navy and system of pipelines that China feels necessary to secure its oil supplies. From the Chinese perspective, engagement over oil security carries huge risks that its current strategies will be undermined and that new Western-oriented strategies (e.g., membership in the IEA) will fail. Changing those perceptions will require that the United States be more credible in encouraging China to join market-oriented institutions and tolerating China’s need to build capabilities (e.g., an effective coast guard) to secure ship-borne oil. Joint U.S.-China exercises in key supply choke points such as the Strait of Malacca and offshore Somalia could be useful. China and the United States, however, are still struggling to find useful things to do together. Third, engagement over climate change has produced little benefit for either the United States or China. The countries are talking but until recently have done little else. Washington has leaned on Beijing to take a more positive stance on climate change; Beijing has responded handsomely in the last two years. Some of China’s analysts claim that their country is doing more to control climate warming emissions than any other—a claim that is too bold to be true—but China is certainly headed in that direction. Movement on the issue inside China has come not from an epiphany about the dangers of global warming but from Chinese planners finding many areas, such as energy efficiency, in which local priorities, including energy security and pollution control, align with global needs. Both China and the United States, however, are still struggling to find useful things to do together. The root cause of the struggle has been the lack of a U.S. policy on controlling emissions. Even as that changes—thanks to more climate-friendly policies on the American coasts and the (albeit slow) efforts to devise a national policy in Washington—there remains little to bring the United States and China together. Yet China is the world’s largest emitter of greenhouse gases; no scheme for protecting the climate can be effective or politically sustainable without visible progress in China. This means that the United States must abandon efforts to include trade sanctions as part of U.S. climate legislation; such measures threaten to damage the one area in which the United States and China have successfully engaged (i.e., trade and the World Trade Organization). Politically, such a move will be difficult to advance in Washington: the labor unions and Rust Belt politicians are strong, and supporters of trade sanctions and their votes are key to passage of climate legislation. Finding acceptable climate change proposals will require identifying those areas in which China can make policy changes that align with its underlying interests and reduce emissions. Most offers of engagement, such as the joint development of new power plant technologies, have not been viewed by the Chinese government as credible because of the United States’ poor track record in sustaining such promises. Absent such a constructive alternative, China’s major mode of engagement with the climate debate has been through investments (mainly from Europe) under the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). A careful look at those investments shows that most do not reduce emissions; until there is an attractive alternative, however, China will continue to view the Kyoto Protocol’s CDM as the only carrot for engaging with the outside world on climate change. Discussions about engagement have drifted from reality in part because they have lost sight of the important connection between international engagement and national policy. Most of the heavy lifting in international affairs is done through national policy because international institutions are weak. For this reason, the two countries might do better to signal tacitly to each other areas for engagement through stronger actions at home. For example, both countries could make more serious efforts to control emissions and to limit the demand for oil; they could also make their domestic markets more open to cross-investments that could, in turn, accelerate the diffusion of technology in both directions. Firms and investors, rather than governments, may prove to be the more consequential actors. Although the history of engagement efforts is not promising, I think the signs are hopeful. Energy officials from the Obama administration are spending more time in China listening to the new realities that will force the United States to get more serious. Although China’s system for investing and deploying new energy technologies is still flawed, it is a rapidly rising player. That rise gives China options, requiring potential partners, such as the United States, to be more relevant. The most substantive announcements of U.S. international policy during the run-up to the Copenhagen conference on global warming came from joint U.S.-Chinese communiqués, including encouraging news of a fresh round of U.S.-China efforts to cooperate on energy, though the size of the planned effort ($15 million per year) is still too small to be relevant. Also, during the past two years Chinese officials have been changing their tune on global warming, in part because they feared that China would be blamed for the world’s inability to reach serious agreements. Today, the spotlight is on Washington’s gridlock. What’s at stake here isn’t just the U.S.-China relationship but the vision of how big, important countries can solve common problems. None of the existing international institutions, such as the IEA, the G-8, or the G-20, seems well organized enough to solve problems such as the world’s perennial underinvestment in energy research and development. For China, especially, those institutions do a poor job of representing Chinese interests. The United States and China can fix such problems by finding meaningful ways to cooperate and understand each other. They still have a long way to go.

## Case

### A2: S02

#### SO2 causes warming- multiple feedback loops- all other studies fail because they don’t assume other particles

**Science Daily, 10** (Best Hope for Saving Arctic Sea Ice Is Cutting Soot Emissions, Say Researchers, J*uly 30, 2010,* <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/07/100728092617.htm>)

The quickest, best way to slow the rapid melting of Arctic sea ice is to reduce soot emissions from the burning of fossil fuel, wood and dung, according to a new study by Stanford researcher Mark Z. Jacobson. His analysis shows that soot is second only to carbon dioxide in contributing to global warming. But, he said, climate models to date have mischaracterized the effects of soot in the atmosphere. Because of that, soot's contribution to global warming has been ignored in national and international global warming policy legislation, he said. "Controlling soot may be the only method of significantly slowing Arctic warming within the next two decades," said Jacobson, director of Stanford's Atmosphere/Energy Program. "We have to start taking its effects into account in planning our mitigation efforts and the sooner we start making changes, the better." To reach his conclusions, Jacobson used an intricate computer model of global climate, air pollution and weather that he developed over the last 20 years that included atmospheric processes not incorporated in previous models. He examined the effects of soot -- black and brown particles that absorb solar radiation -- from two types of sources. He analyzed the impacts of soot from fossil fuels -- diesel, coal, gasoline, jet fuel -- and from solid biofuels, such as wood, manure, dung, and other solid biomass used for home heating and cooking in many locations. He also focused in detail on the effects of soot on heating clouds, snow and ice. What he found was that the **combination** of **both** types of soot is the second-leading cause of global warming after carbon dioxide. That ranks the effects of soot ahead of methane, an important greenhouse gas. He also found that soot emissions kill more than 1.5 million people prematurely worldwide each year, and afflicts millions more with respiratory illness, cardiovascular disease and asthma, mostly in the developing world where biofuels are used for home heating and cooking. Jacobson's study will be published in *Journal of Geophysical Research (Atmospheres)*. **Reducing soot could have immediate impact** It is the magnitude of soot's contribution, combined with the fact that it lingers in the atmosphere for only a few weeks before being washed out, that leads to the conclusion that a reduction in soot output would start slowing the pace of global warming almost **immediately**. Greenhouse gases, in contrast, typically persist in the atmosphere for decades -- some up to a century or more -- creating a considerable time lag between when emissions are cut and when the results become apparent. Mark Jacobson found that eliminating soot produced by the burning of fossil fuel and solid biofuel could reduce warming above parts of the Arctic Circle in the next 15 years by up to 1.7 degrees Celsius. Jacobson found that eliminating soot produced by the burning of fossil fuel and solid biofuel could reduce warming above parts of the Arctic Circle in the next 15 years by up to 1.7 degrees Celsius. For perspective, net warming in the Arctic has been at least 2.5 degrees Celsius during the last century and is expected to warm significantly more in the future if nothing is done. The most immediate, effective and low-cost way to reduce soot emissions is to put particle traps on vehicles, diesel trucks, buses, and construction equipment. Particle traps filter out soot particles from exhaust fumes. Soot could be further reduced by converting vehicles to run on clean, renewable electric power. Jacobson found that although fossil fuel soot contributed more to global warming, biofuel-derived soot caused about eight times the number of deaths as fossil fuel soot. Providing electricity to rural developing areas, thereby reducing usage of solid biofuels for home heating and cooking, would have major health benefits, he said. Soot from fossil fuels contains more **black** **carbon** than soot produced by burning biofuels, which is why there is a difference in impact. Black carbon is highly efficient at absorbing solar radiation in the atmosphere, just like a black shirt on a sunny day. Black carbon converts sunlight to heat and radiates it back to the air around it. This is different from greenhouse gases, which primarily trap heat that rises from the Earth's surface. Black carbon can also absorb light reflecting from the surface, which helps make it such a potent warming agent. **First model of its type** Jacobson's climate model is the first global model to use mathematical equations to describe the physical and chemical interactions of soot particles in cloud droplets in the atmosphere. This allowed him to include details such as light bouncing around inside clouds and within cloud drops, which he said are critical for understanding the full effect of black carbon on heating the atmosphere. "The key to modeling the climate effects of soot is to account for all of its effects on clouds, sea ice, snow and atmospheric heating," Jacobson said. Because of the complexity of the processes, he said it is not a surprise that **previous** **models** have not correctly treated the physical interactions required to simulate cloud, snow, and atmospheric heating by soot. "But **without treating these processes, no model can give the correct answer with respect to soot's effects**," he said. Jacobson argues that leaving out this scale of detail in other models has led many scientists and policy makers to undervalue the role of black carbon as a warming agent. The strong global heating due to soot that Jacobson found is supported by recent findings of Veerabhadran Ramanathan, a professor of climate and atmospheric science at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, who measures and models the climate effects of soot. "Jacobson's study is the first time that a model has looked at the various ways black carbon can impact climate in a quantitative way," said Ramanathan, who was not involved in the study. Black carbon has an especially potent warming effect over the Arctic. When black carbon is present in the air over snow or ice, sunlight can hit the black carbon on its way towards Earth, and also hit it as light reflects off the ice and heads back towards space. "It's a double-whammy over the ice surface in terms of heating the air," Jacobson said. Black carbon also lands on the snow, darkening the surface and enhancing melting. "There is a big concern that if the Arctic melts, it will be a **tipping** **point** for the Earth's climate because the reflective sea ice will be replaced by a much darker, heat absorbing, ocean below," said Jacobson. "Once the sea ice is gone, it is really hard to regenerate because there is not an efficient mechanism to cool the ocean down in the short term." Jacobson's work was supported by grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, the NASA high-end computing program and the National Science Foundation.

### A2: CCP Instability Good

#### Any transition would be violent.

Andrew J. **Nathan**, Professor of Political Science at Columbia University, **09**

[“Authoritarian Impermanence,” Journal of Democracy, Volume 20, Number 3, July 2009, ProjectMUSE]

We have been used to dramatic, bright-line transitions to democracy. Might the Chinese system instead reform and adapt, adapt and reform, to the point where it emerges on the other side of the looking glass as more democratic than not? This is the hope of China's rights-protection (weiquan) movement of lawyers, petitioners, bloggers, and journalists, and of the wider circle of civil society organizations and religious groups that have so far kept a low profile in order to avoid repression. They hope that the regime will become enmeshed in the logic of the institutions that it has created as safety valves to preserve its rule, such as [End Page 38] courts and the media. The Party would then find itself forced to coexist with an equally powerful civil society, and China would have become a democracy without a dramatic moment of change. Call it a new type of transition —not breakdown, extrication, or pact, but segue. The Party resists this scenario. The key lesson that its leaders learned from Tiananmen was to refuse equal dialogue with society. As the procrackdown premier Li Peng put it during his debates with the prodialogue Party secretary Zhao Ziyang during the crisis, to allow the demonstrating students to "negotiate with the Party and government as equals" would be to "negate the leadership of the CCP and negate the entire socialist system."6 Subsequent events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union confirmed that point for the leadership.7 The regime is willing to change in any way that helps it to stay in power, but is unwilling to relax the ban on autonomous political forces. This makes it more likely that regime change, should it come, will occur through some kind of rupture. But China's transition will not resemble the Soviet Union's. China is not in an arms race that it cannot afford. It is not overextended in a security rivalry with the United States. Its minority populations are only 5 or 6 percent of its demographic makeup, not more than half. It is not constitutionally structured as a federation whose units have the right to secede. Nor will the Chinese transition resemble Taiwan's.8 The Chinese government does not need to integrate a previously excluded ethnic majority. It has not permitted the formation of an organized opposition or trained the populace in competitive elections. The country is not a dependency of the United States. The most likely form of transition for China therefore remains the model of Tiananmen, with three elements coming together: 1) a robust plurality of disaffected citizens (in 1989 because of inflation and corruption, in the future possibly because of unemployment, an environmental disaster, or some form of national humiliation); 2) a catalytic event that sends a signal to scattered social forces that the time has come to rise up; and 3) a split in the leadership (whether due to personality differences, power struggle, uncertain support of the armed police and military, or ideological division) that renders the response from the top uncertain or weak and allows the challenge to snowball. That the regime considers itself vulnerable to just such a scenario is evidenced by the massive efforts that it makes to prevent these three elements from emerging. It seeks to shield the public from the impacts of economic instability, buy legitimacy among major social sectors, control bad news, outlaw mobilization, divide and repress opposition, monitor civil society, control networking tools such as the Internet and cellphones, strengthen the police and paramilitary, and above all, to keep its own internal divisions out of the public eye so that the opportunity structure for social mobilization remains unpromising. Such efforts have succeeded so far in dealing with the impact of the [End Page 39] global economic crisis on Chinese workers. Dispersed back to the countryside from which they came and given work generated by the government's stimulus package, the peasant workers have not mounted a challenge to the government. And the regime has succeeded in bottling up Charter 08, the most broadly based and intellectually sophisticated challenge to its principles of rule since Tiananmen itself. But the elements of potential crisis can come together at any time. If one imagines the Chinese system facing the kinds of problems that such countries as the United States, Britain, and Japan have recently gone through—unsuccessful wars, plummeting economies, unpopular leaders, hypercritical media, deep divisions over cultural identity—it is as hard to imagine the Chinese system surviving as it is to imagine the mature democracies collapsing. What keeps such crises of government from becoming crises of the regime are cultures of open dissent, the robust rule of law, and the institutional capacity to change leaders in response to public discontent without changing the system. Had China chosen the other path in 1989, it might have these stabilizing features today. Without them, the authoritarian regime must perform constantly like a team of acrobats on a high wire, staving off all crises while keeping its act flawlessly together. Today, on the evidence of our contributors, the regime is managing to do that. But it cannot afford to slip.

#### 3. The CCP will use the economic crisis to increase its power – killing chances for democracy

**Epoch Times 04**

["Epoch Times Commentaries on the Communist Party - Part 2", December 30, http://www.theepochtimes.com/news/4-12-13/24830.html]

The most prominent characteristic of the CCP is its eternal fear. Survival has been the CCP’s highest interest since its inception. Such interest managed to overcome the fear hidden underneath its ever-changing appearance. The CCP is like a cancer cell that diffuses and infiltrates every part of body, kills the surrounding normal cells and grows malignantly beyond control. In our cycle of history, society has been unable to dissolve such a mutated factor as the CCP and has no alternative but to let it proliferate at will. This mutated factor is so powerful that nothing within the level and range of its expansion can stop it. Much of society has become polluted, and larger and larger areas have been flooded with communism or communist elements. These elements are further strengthened and taken advantage of by the CCP and have fundamentally degraded the morality and society of humankind. The CCP doesn’t believe in any generally recognized principle of morality and justice. All of its principles are used entirely for its own interest. It is fundamentally selfish, and there are no principles that could restrain and control its desires. Based on its own principles, the Party needs to keep changing how it appears on the surface, putting on new skins. During the early period when its survival was at stake, the CCP attached to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to the KMT, to the KMT’s governing body, and to the National Revolution. After capturing power, the CCP attached itself to various forms of opportunism, to the citizens’ minds and feelings, to social structures and means—to anything it could put its hands on. It has utilized every crisis as an opportunity to gather more power and to strengthen its means of control.

#### 4. Chinese collapse causes CCP lashout with WMD that kills billions

**Rexing 5** (San, Staff – Epoch Times, The CCP’s Last Ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War, 8-5, http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html)

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. That is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that they will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: That of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

### A2: Get Around

#### Tariffs get boosted and shifted to take this out

Gonzalez 12

[Gloria Gonzalez, Environmental Finance, 8/13/12, <http://www.environmental-finance.com/news/view/2699>]

The duties on Chinese solar equipment imports into the US could rise dramatically if importers are caught trying to evade these penalties, with border officials on the prowl for circumvention efforts, according to a lawyer representing US manufacturers. The US Commerce Department has imposed preliminary tariffs of 31-250% on Chinese crystalline silicon cells and modules, due to foreign producers selling, or dumping, their products in the US at less than fair value. More modest countervailing duties (CVD) of 2.9-4.73% are charged on imports, due to unfair subsidies provided by the Chinese government. Final decisions are scheduled for October. But the anti-dumping and CVD duties are not set in stone, Tim Brightbill, a Washington, DC-based partner in the international trade and climate change practices of law firm Wiley Rein, said during a webinar by the Coalition for American Solar Manufacturing (CASM), which petitioned the regulators for the penalties. These duties were calculated based on solar prices and costs during the March-September 2011 time period, but companies can request reviews of these margins every year, he said. “If we think that the 31% margin does not represent the full amount of dumping going on, we can ask Commerce to recalculate those duties,” he said. Importers are liable for all duties and can pay cash deposits or purchase a bond to cover the duty amount that the US Customs and Border Protection is now collecting. But it is illegal for a foreign manufacturer or any other party to pay these duties on behalf of the importer, Brightbill noted. Importers are required to certify to Customs that no other party has reimbursed them for the duties and the penalty is double the current AD and CVD duties, he said. “The vast majority of the importing community is trying to follow the rules,” Brightbill said. “There may be a few that try to get around the rules and Customs and Border Protection keeps a very close eye on that, as do we in the domestic industry, and we’re able to recommend that they take action as appropriate.” Customs is monitoring imports from China and from third countries, including through specific ports. Schemes to avoid the penalties are being identified and addressed such as shipping through a third country, which does not change the country of origin, he noted. “They’re looking for any evasion or circumvention of the duties,” Brightbill said. Chinese importers could technically pay AD duties if they are at the lower end of the range and continue to sell below cost, but they would be hit with higher tariffs during future reviews, he said.

### A2: First Strike

#### First strike causes extinction

**Takai 09**

[Mitsuo Takai, retired colonel and former researcher in the military science faculty of the Staff College for Japan’s Ground Self Defense Force, 10/7/09, <http://www.upiasia.com/Security/2009/10/07/us-china_nuclear_strikes_would_spell_doomsday/7213/>]

What would happen if China launched its 20 Dongfeng-5 (ICBMs) intercontinental ballistic missiles, each with a 5-megaton warhead, at 20 major U.S. cities? Prevailing opinion in Washington D.C. until not so long ago was that the raids would cause over 40 million casualties, annihilating much of the United States. In order to avoid such a doomsday scenario, consensus was that the United States would have to eliminate this potential threat at its source with preemptive strikes on China. But cool heads at institutions such as the Federation of American Scientists and the National Resource Defense Council examined the facts and produced their own analyses in 2006, which differed from the hard-line views of their contemporaries. The FAS and NRDC developed several scenarios involving nuclear strikes over ICBM sites deep in the Luoning Mountains in China’s western province of Henan, and analyzed their implications. One of the scenarios involved direct strikes on 60 locations – including 20 main missile silos and decoy silos – hitting each with one W76-class, 100-kiloton multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle carried on a submarine-launched ballistic missile. In order to destroy the hardened silos, the strikes would aim for maximum impact by causing ground bursts near the silos' entrances. Using air bursts similar to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would not be as effective, as the blasts and the heat would dissipate extensively. In this scenario, the 6 megatons of ground burst caused by the 60 attacks would create enormous mushroom clouds over 12 kilometers high, composed of radioactive dirt and debris. Within 24 hours following the explosions, deadly fallout would spread from the mushroom clouds, driven by westerly winds toward Nanjing and Shanghai. They would contaminate the cities' residents, water, foodstuff and crops, causing irreversible damage. The impact of a 6-megaton nuclear explosion would be 360 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, killing not less than 4 million people. Such massive casualties among non-combatants would far exceed the military purpose of destroying the enemy's military power. This would cause political harm and damage the United States’ ability to achieve its war aims, as it would lose international support. On the other hand, China could retaliate against U.S. troops in East Asia, employing intermediate-range ballistic missiles including its DF-3, DF-4 and DF-21 missiles, based in Liaoning and Shandong provinces, which would still be intact. If the United States wanted to destroy China's entire nuclear retaliatory capability, U.S. forces would have to employ almost all their nuclear weapons, causing catastrophic environmental hazards that could lead to the annihilation of mankind. Accordingly, the FAS and NRDC conclusively advised U.S. leaders to get out of the vicious cycle of nuclear competition, which costs staggering sums, and to promote nuclear disarmament talks with China. Such advice is worth heeding by nuclear hard-liners.

### A2: CO2 Fertilization Disad

#### No offense – increase in CO2 will overall lead to decrease in crop production and cause global starvation

Strom 7 [Robert Strom, Professor Emeritus of planetary sciences in the Department of Planetary Sciences at the University of Arizona, 2007 (studied climate change for 15 years, the former Director of the Space Imagery Center, a NASA Regional Planetary Image Facility, “Hot House”, SpringerLink, p. 211-216]

Agriculture is critical to **the survival of civilization**. Crops feed not only us but also the domestic animals we use for food. Any disruption in food production means a disruption of the economy, government, and health. The increase in CO2 will result in some growth of crops, and rising temperatures will open new areas to crop production at higher latitudes and over longer growing seasons; however, the overall result will be decreased crop production in most parts of the world. A 1993 study of the effects of a doubling of CO2 (550 ppm) above pre-industrial levels shows that there will be substantial decreases in the world food supply (Rosenzweig et al., 1993). In their research they studied the effects of global warming on four crops (wheat, rice, protein feed, and coarse grain) using four scenarios involving various adaptations of crops to temperature change and CO2 abundance. They found that the amount of world food reduction ranged from 1 to 27%. However, the optimistic value of 1% is almost certainly much too low, because it assumed that the amount of degradation would be offset by more growth from "CO2 fertilization." We now know that this is not the case, as explained below and in Chapter 7. The most probable value is a worldwide food reduction between 16 and 27%. These scenarios are based on temperature and CO2 rises that may be too low, as discussed in Chapter 7. However, even a decrease in world food production of 16% would lead to large-scale starvation in many regions of the world. Large-scale experiments called Free-Air Concentration Enrichment have shown that the effects of higher CO2 levels on crop growth is about 50% less than experiments in enclosure studies (Long et al., 2006). This shows that the projections that conclude that rising CO2 will fully offset the losses due to higher temperatures are wrong. The downside of climate change will far outweigh the benefits of increased CO2 and longer growing seasons. One researcher (Prof. Long) from the University of Illinois put it this way: Growing crops much closer to real conditions has shown that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will have roughly half the beneficial effects previously hoped for in the event of climate change. In addition, ground-level ozone, which is also predicted to rise but has not been extensively studied before, has been shown to result in a loss of photosynthesis and 20 per cent reduction in crop yield. Both these results show that we need to seriously re-examine our predictions for future global food production, as they are likely to be far lower than previously estimated. Also, studies in Britain and Denmark show that only a few days of hot temperatures can severely reduce the yield of major food crops such as wheat, soy beans, rice, and groundnuts if they coincide with the flowering of these crops. This suggests that there are certain thresholds above which crops become very vulnerable to climate change. The European heat wave in the summer of 2003 provided a large-scale experiment on the behavior of crops to increased temperatures. Scientists from several European research institutes and universities found that the growth of plants during the heat wave was reduced by nearly a third (Ciais et al., 2005). In Italy, the growth of corn dropped by about 36% while oak and pine had a growth reduction of 30%. In the affected areas of the mid- west and California the summer heat wave of 2006 resulted in a 35% loss of crops, and in California a 15% decline in dairy production due to the heat-caused death of dairy cattle. It has been projected that a 2 °C rise in local temperature will result in a $92 million loss to agriculture in the Yakima Valley of Washington due to the reduction of the snow pack. A 4'C increase will result in a loss of about $163 million. For the first time, the world's grain harvests have fallen below the consumption level for the past four years according to the Earth Policy Institute (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the shortfall in grain production increased each year, from 16 million tons in 2000 to 93 million tons in 2003. These studies were done in industrialized nations where agricultural practices are the best in the world. In developing nations the impact will be much more severe. It is here that the impact of global warming on crops and domestic animals will be most felt. In general, the world's most crucial staple food crops could fall by as much as one-third because of resistance to flowering and setting of seeds due to rising temperatures. Crop ecologists believe that many crops grown in the tropics are near, or at, their thermal limits. Already research in the Philippines has linked higher night-time temperatures to a reduction in rice yield. It is estimated that for rice, wheat, and corn, the grain yields are likely to decline by 10% for every local 1 °C increase in temperature. With a decreasing availability of food, malnutrition will become more frequent accompanied by damage to the immune system. This will result in a greater susceptibility to spreading diseases. For an extreme rise in global temperature (> 6 'C), it is likely that worldwide crop failures will lead to mass starvation, and political and economic chaos with all their ramifications for civilization.

**Turns water shortages**

**Ramanathan 08** [Veerabhadran Ramanathan et al, Prof. Atmospheric Sciences @ UCSD, Atmospheric Brown Clouds, http://www.unep.org/pdf/ABCSummaryFinal.pdf]

The acceleration of the retreat of the HKHT glaciers since the 1970s, in conjunction with the decrease in the summer monsoon rainfall in the Indo-Gangetic Plain region, is a major environmental problem facing Asia, threatening both the water and the food security of South and East Asia. Glaciers and snow packs provide the head-waters for Asia’s major river systems, including the Indus, the Ganges, the Brahmaputra, the Mekong and the Yangtze. Widespread deglaciation is occurring in the HKHT region. This includes a 21 per cent decrease in the area of 466 glaciers that were studied in the Indian Himalayas. About 80 per cent of the Western Tibetan glaciers are retreating. The receding and thinning are primarily attributed in IPCC reports and other studies to global warming due to increases in greenhouse gases. The present report adds that soot in ABCs is another major cause of the retreat of HKHT glaciers and snow packs. The warming of the elevated atmospheric layers due to greenhouse warming is amplified by the solar heating by soot at elevated levels and an increase in solar absorption by snow and ice contaminated by the deposition of soot. New data shown in this report reveal substantial soot concentrations in the Himalayan region even at the altitude of 5 km. If the current rate of retreat continues unabated, these glaciers and snow packs are expected to shrink by as much as 75 per cent before the year 2050, posing grave danger to the region’s water security. This potential threat should be viewed in the context of the low per-capita water availability in South and East Asia, around 2000 - 3000 m3/cap/year, far less than the world average of 8549 m3/cap/year. Projections show that most parts of South and East Asia will suffer from water stress by 2050. Water stress occurs when the demand for water exceeds the available supply during a certain period, or when poor quality restricts its use. It should be noted that the above projections, as well as similar projections in IPCC reports, do not yet account fully for ABC effects on the monsoon and the HKHT glaciers. As a result, the actual water stress situation is expected to be much worse than the projections in the available reports.

#### Warming will halt photosynthesis overwhelming any benefits of C02

**Brown 8** [Brown, Director and Founder of the global institute of Environment in the U.S., 2008 [Lester E. Brown, “Plan B 3.0: Mobilizing to Save Civilization”]

Higher temperatures can reduce or even **halt photosynthesis**, prevent pollination, and lead to crop dehydration. Although the elevated concentrations of atmospheric C02 that raise temper­ature can also raise crop yields, the detrimental effect of higher temperatures on yields **overrides the C02 fertilization effect** for the major crops. In a study of local ecosystem sustainability, Mohan Wali and his colleagues at Ohio State University noted that as tempera­ture rises, photosynthetic activity in plants increases until the temperature reaches 20 degrees Celsius (68 degrees Fahrenheit). The rate of photosynthesis then plateaus until the temperature hits 35 degrees Celsius (95 degrees Fahrenheit), whereupon it begins to decline, until at 40 degrees Celsius (104 degrees Fahrenheit), photosynthesis ceases entirely '? The most vulnerable part of a plant's life cycle is the polli­nation period. Of the world's three food staples-rice, wheat, and corn-corn is particularly vulnerable. In order for corn to reproduce, pollen must fall from the tassel to the strands of silk that emerge from the end of each ear of corn. Each of these silk strands is attached to a kernel site on the cob. If the kernel is to develop, a grain of pollen must fall on the silk strand and then journey to the kernel site. When temperatures are uncommonly high, the silk strands quickly dry out and turn brown, unable to play their role in the fertilization process. The effects of temperature on rice pollination have been studied in detail in the Philippines. Scientists there report that the pollination of rice falls from 100 percent at 34 degrees Cel­sius to near zero at 40 degrees Celsius, leading to crop failure

### A2: EU

#### EU models our decision- now’s key

China Daily 12

[8/14/12, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2012-08/14/content_15673272.htm>]

In May, the United States decided to impose preliminary anti-dumping duties of up to 250 percent on imports of Chinese solar cell products. The EU will decide next month whether to follow the US' lead. If the EU does follow suit, the Chinese makers of solar panels will be squeezed between increased export costs and dwindling markets. The US and EU regulators, pressured by their local industries, are resorting to trade remedy measures to thwart imports from China, a major player in the global photovoltaic cell industry, despite the fact that past anti-dumping cases show they are the least constructive way to solve such disputes. The most telling example is the tire dispute between China and the US. In September 2009, the US imposed heavy "safeguard" tariffs on imports of Chinese tires on the grounds that Chinese tire-makers dumped their products in the US market. These tariffs have caused huge losses for Chinese firms, while US consumers have had to pay higher prices for their tires. According to the Peterson Institute for International Economics, the additional cost could have totaled more than $1 billion in 2011. In a similar vein, the US imposition of anti-dumping duties on Chinese solar panel products will backfire. Although it will benefit upstream domestic panel producers, the downstream installation sector will suffer from lost jobs, which is why the decision has been challenged by many people in the US. If we take into consideration the fact that the US exports hundreds of millions of dollars worth of polysilicon products to China each year, the US could lose more jobs if China reciprocates. Perhaps encouraged by the US action, some enterprises in the EU have demanded similar China-targeted investigation and punishment. But the EU should avoid repeating the US' blunder. Of course, if the EU decides to impose extra tariffs on Chinese products, the Chinese industry will receive a much heavier blow. The EU market accounts for more than half of its exports. However, they would also damage the EU's clean energy endeavors, as costs would surge. More importantly, the global effort to minimize greenhouse gas emissions would suffer serious setbacks.

### A2: Nationalism

#### Collapse causes Chinese nationalism and nuclear war

**Mead, 98**- Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (Walter, October 1998, Esquire)

If our currency collapses in the midst of the crisis, look for a global depression on the scale of the one in the 1930s. And a major war is more than likely to follow. But enough about us. The real worries are elsewhere—in, for example, China and Russia, two nuclear powers that had their doubts about the world system even before the global economic crisis threatened to crush them both. Next picture: China. Few Americans understand just how explosive the situation in China is. As the country undergoes the biggest economic revolution in world history, it is also in for the wildest ride in world history on the roller coaster of revolutionary capitalism. State-owned rust-bucket industries from Maoist times are slowly collapsing, putting heavy demands on the national treasury. Yet China’s banks—which may have the worst balance sheets in the world—would go bankrupt if the state cut off subsidies to the indebted state industries. And if these industries lay off workers faster than the private economy can find them jobs, China faces mass unrest in the big cities. This is what the Chinese government fears most, and it has good reason. Already, millions of Chinese, uprooted from the rural areas where they were born, are flooding into the coastal cities, looking for work. Many of them are young men—the most volatile group in any society. And in China today, they are especially volatile. Thanks to the government’s one-child policy, many Chinese families have aborted female fetuses to ensure that their one child is a boy. This preference has led to 110 boys being born for every 100 girls. Here’s a Chinese nightmare: millions of young, poorly educated men who have no jobs and no girlfriends. It’s almost unthinkable that China can escape a prolonged Asian showdown. China has also based its whole plan on exported growth working far into the future; with the failure of that strategy, China’s economy must slow dramatically. To survive, the Chinese government will have to play the nationalist card, taking a tougher foreign policy line on issues like Taiwan and whipping up public support by talking about foreign (read: American) threats to China. Alternatively, China could fall apart as it did earlier in the twentieth century, going through a period of civil war and anarchy—in a country with nuclear weapons—before a new and probably very unpleasant government establishes control.

## CP

### Delay CP 2ac

#### Perm – do both

#### Perm – do the counterplan

#### --“Should” means an obligation or duty

AHD, American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 1992 (4ed); Pg. 1612

Should—1. Used to express obligation or duty: *You should send her a note*.

#### -- “Resolved” means to make a firm decision

AHD 6 (American Heritage Dictionary, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

Resolve TRANSITIVE VERB:1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To cause (a person) to reach a decision. See synonyms at decide. 3. To decide or express by formal vote.

#### Increase doesn’t mean immediate – it can occur in the future

**Hening and Munford 1811** (“Reports of cases argued and determined in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia”, Ed. Isaac Riley, Volume IV, Google Books)

Thursday, November 23. On the merits\*. Wickham argued that, by the word H increase" children born after the death of die testator only passed ; for at the time of the death and not until ttan, the will speaks. This is a question of intention. If the children living when the will was made had names, it would have been more natural to describe them by name, than by the word increase\* But according to the general usage of the country, the word " increase" means the same as "future increase" Parol testimony on this subject is improper, as it goes to prove what the testator meant by particular words.

#### We defend the idea of the plan – not immediacy or certainty

AC 99 (Atlas Collaboration, “Use of Shall, Should, May Can,” http://rd13doc.cern.ch/Atlas/DaqSoft/sde/inspect/shall.html)

shall

'shall' describes something that is mandatory. If a requirement uses 'shall', then that requirement \_will\_ be satisfied without fail. Noncompliance is not allowed. Failure to comply with one single 'shall' is sufficient reason to reject the entire product. Indeed, it must be rejected under these circumstances. Examples: # "Requirements shall make use of the word 'shall' only where compliance is mandatory." This is a good example. # "C++ code shall have comments every 5th line." This is a bad example. Using 'shall' here is too strong.

should

'should' is weaker. It describes something that might not be satisfied in the final product, but that is desirable enough that any noncompliance shall be explicitly justified. Any use of 'should' should be examined carefully, as it probably means that something is not being stated clearly. If a 'should' can be replaced by a 'shall', or can be discarded entirely, so much the better. Examples: # "C++ code should be ANSI compliant." A good example. It may not be possible to be ANSI compliant on all platforms, but we should try. # "Code should be tested thoroughly." Bad example. This 'should' shall be replaced with 'shall' if this requirement is to be stated anywhere (to say nothing of defining what 'thoroughly' means).

#### Link to politics – all agencies are tied to Obama

**Nicholas and Hook 10** (Peter and Janet, Staff Writers – LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3)

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

### Courts CP 2ac

#### Perm – do both

#### Perm shields.

**Perine**, 6/12/**2008** (Katherine – staff at CQ politics, Congress unlikely to try to counter Supreme Court detainee ruling, CQ Politics, p. http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002896528&cpage=2)

Thursday’s decision, from a Supreme Court dominated by Republican appointees, gives Democrats further cover against GOP sniping. “This is something that the court has decided, and very often the court gives political cover to Congress,” said Ross K. Baker, a Rutgers University political science professor. “You can simply point to a Supreme Court decision and say, ‘The devil made me do it.’ ”

#### Perm – do the counterplan – we don’t spec an agent. The CP does not disprove the desirability of the plan.

#### **Saying “Federal Government” doesn’t mean “all three branches” – any one body acts as it**

Chicago 7 (University of Chicago Manual of Style, “Capitalization, Titles”, http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/CMS\_FAQ/CapitalizationTitles/CapitalizationTitles30.html)

Q. When I refer to the government of the United States in text, should it be U.S. Federal Government or U.S. federal government? A. The government of the United States is not a single official entity. Nor is it when it is referred to as the federal government or the U.S. government or the U.S. federal government. It’s just a government, which, like those in all countries, has some official bodies that act and operate in the name of government: the Congress, the Senate, the Department of State, etc.

#### CP undermines legitimacy – takes out solvency.

**Bentley**, **2007** (Curt, Constrained by the liberal tradition, Brigham Young University Law Review, p. lexis)

This institutional limitation theory focuses primarily on the constraints imposed on the Court because of its relationship with the other branches of government. The Supreme Court is not wholly dependent upon other branches of government; the unique legitimacy given its interpretations of the Constitution by the American people provides it with real influence of its own. n116 However, the institutional limitation theory posits that since the Court possesses neither the purse nor the sword, n117 it relies upon its  [\*1745]  legitimacy in the eyes of the American people in order to pressure the legislative and executive branches to **enforce its decrees**: The Supreme Court ... possesses some bases of power of its own, the most important of which is the unique legitimacy attributed to its interpretations of the Constitution. This legitimacy the Court jeopardizes if it **flagrantly opposes the major policies** of the dominant alliance; such a course of action, as we have seen, is one in which the Court will not normally be tempted to engage. n118 **Without legitimacy** in the eyes of the public, both Congress and the President might feel justified in **resisting the ruling of the Court** either through jurisdiction-stripping n119 or by simply refusing to enforce its decrees. n120 **There is precedent for both in American history**. n121 The Court risks becoming substantially weakened, or even irrelevant, when the political branches ignore judicial decrees and where it nonetheless doggedly pursues the counter-majoritarian course. n122

#### Specifically in an election year

**Clark**, October **2009** (Tomas - assistant professor of political science at Emory University, The Separation of Powers, Court Curbing, and Judicial Legitimacy, American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 53, No. 4, p. 974)

Congress has preferences for both policy outcomes and position taking. A policy outcome refers to the Court’s decision in a case. That policy concerns are a primary motivation for legislators is a claim deeply rooted in leg- islative scholarship (Fenno 1973). Position taking, by con- trast, refers to official, observable activities by members of Congress that reflect their constituents’ opinions. Because the public can hold legislators accountable for misrepre- senting their preferences (Arnold 1990, 56–57; Canes- Wrone, Brady, and Cogan 2002), members of Congress will generally have an interest in correctly taking position in line with public opinion, which is a central activity in **the pursuit of reelection** (Mayhew 1974). I assume mem- bers of Congress have an interest in position taking in order to create a public record to which they can point to demonstrate they have taken some action to secure the goals of their constituents. It does not matter whether those actions lead directly to policy changes, because constituents may not hold their members of Congress ac- countable for policy outcomes but rather blame Congress as an institution for failed policy initiatives (Parker and Davidson 1979). Thus, an important consideration for members of Congress is to take public positions that are visible and popular with their constituents (Arnold 1990, chap. 4). Engaging in Court curbing and other political attacks on the Court can be reasonably considered a position- taking endeavor, because it is an effective way to help **build support from an issue constituency**. Interest groups con- cerned with the judiciary and its role in American politics closely monitor legislative activity concerning the Courts and draw their supporters’ attention to **legislators’ actions** and positions. Indeed, previous scholarship demonstrates that constituent preferences are a primary determinant of legislative responses to, and attacks on, the judiciary (Clark and McGuire 1996). Major Supreme Court deci- sions have even occupied central positions in presidential campaigns (Stephenson 1999). What is more, the sheer number of Court-curbing proposals that are introduced in Congress with great regularity, but never earn so much as a committee hearing, suggests that Court curbing is driven at least in part by interested contingents or groups from a member’s constituency. Finally, I note a **positive correlation** between the number of Court-curbing bills introduced and **negative public opinion about the Court**.4

#### No solvency: delay

Klein 84 (Mitchell S. G., MA and Ph.D in Political Science – Northwestern University, Law, Courts, and Policy, p. 117-118)

The aphorism “Justice delayed is justice denied” finds support from nay court analysts. Court delay is a significant administrative problem in the judiciary. As H. Ted Rubin observes: “Far too many courts operate essentially in the same fashion as fifty years ago … Too many judges have failed to effectively administer control of their own court calendar.” (1976, p. 185) A number of problems associated with court delay have been noted by Hans Zeisel and associates (1959, pp. xxii-xxiii). For example, delay in the courtroom jeopardizes justice because evidence may deteriorate over time. It also causes severe hardship to some parties, even depriving some of a basic public service. Finally, court delay also produces an unhealthy emphasis on the desirability of settling out of court.

#### Commerce Department is key --- any alternative causes China bashing

**Hart and Gordon**, 5/16/**2012** (Melanie – Policy Analyst on China Energy and Climate Policy at the Center for American Progress, and Kate – Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress, 5 Myths and Realities About U.S.-China Solar Trade Competition, Center for American Progress, p. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2012/05/16/11592/5-myths-and-realities-about-u-s-china-solar-trade-competition/)

The U.S. Commerce Department’s countervailing duty and antidumping procedures are designed to investigate these problems on a fact-based, case-by-case basis. Commerce Department investigators view the evidence and if they find wrongdoing, levy tariffs accordingly. The alternative to this fact-based approach would be to put trade issues in the hands of elected politicians who would immediately involve companies and other groups that contribute to their political campaigns—contributors who are likely to reward general China-bashing. With politicians at the helm, tariff decisions would be much more erratic, thus contributing to market uncertainty (since investors would have no idea what to expect in these disputes) and give lobbyists (including Chinese-funded lobbyists) more influence over these decisions.

#### Links to the net benefit

**Sunstein**, Fall **2006** (Cass – Distinguished Service Professor in the Law School and Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, Timing Controversial Decisions, Hofstra Law Review, 35 Hofstra L. Rev. 1, p. Lexis)

In any election, voters have a large menu of items on which to focus. They might be concerned about national security, unemployment, climate change, abortion, energy independence, the stock market, the price of gasoline, or some combination of these. If there is a highly salient event immediately before the election, it might have a large role, simply because of its immediacy. Such an "external shock" might well affect numerous votes. 1 Suppose, for example, that the nation faces a terrorist attack a month before a presidential election; that a natural disaster, two months before the election, devastates a city; that gasoline prices fall dramatically in the previous three months; or that the unemployment rate, in that time, suddenly spikes up. The idea of the "October Surprise" signals the possibility that events of this kind might be expected to influence electoral outcomes. We know enough about human cognition to know that a salient incident can have a significant effect on people's judgments. A great deal remains to be learned about this subject. Let us simply stipulate that in imaginable circumstances, such an effect is likely. But perhaps there is nothing wrong with that effect. Perhaps voters are simply updating on the basis of new information. If a terrorist strike occurs, voters learn that the nation is more vulnerable than they had [\*3] thought. If unemployment jumps, the economy is apparently weaker than had appeared. If voters are rationally incorporating new information, then any external shock provides a legitimate and perhaps an invaluable input into voter decisions. We might make some distinctions here. If the relevant event is not self-consciously timed by anyone, then there is no effort to manipulate the system - and if voters will rationally incorporate the relevant information, nothing is amiss. But suppose that some person or institution has deliberately triggered a salient event, and done so at the appropriate time for maximum effect. The problem here is that voters might be deceived, in a way that will affect their judgments. If voters are unaware of the manipulation, they might believe that, for example, gas prices or unemployment rates are falling, even though these effects are temporary ones, made visible by self-interested politicians who are unable or unwilling to maintain them for the long run. If a terrorist has been caught two weeks before the election, and if the timing of this event has been orchestrated to convince voters that an incumbent administration is winning the war on terror, then voters might be manipulated to believe that a victory is occurring when in reality it is not. Consider in this regard the controversial 2006 decision, by the Internal Revenue Service, to delay in the collection of back taxes until after the election, in part to avoid negative publicity. 2 Perhaps the political market can expose any real efforts at manipulation. Perhaps the market functions well enough to ensure that such efforts will be revealed as such. But suppose that political markets cannot be expected to work this well. Even if so, the conclusion does not speak to my question here: No one is arguing that courts should deliberatively time their announcements in order to influence the outcome of elections. Everyone agrees that any such effort would be illicit. The question is whether courts should deliberately time their announcements so as not to influence the outcome of elections. The discussion of the effect of manipulation of events shows why an affirmative answer is not implausible. The risk is that a recent judicial decision may distort voter behavior, simply because its timing gives undue salience to a particular issue. No one doubts that recent events can have large effects on public judgments. Consider the fact that public concern about risks usually tracks changes in the actual fluctuations in those risks. But public concern outruns actual fluctuations in the [\*4] important case of "panics," bred by vivid illustrations that do not reflect changes in levels of danger. 3 A "particularly vivid case or new finding that receives considerable media attention" played a major role in those leaps in public concern. 4 Legislation itself is often fueled by identifiable events, putting issues on the agenda that would otherwise be ignored. "Availability cascades" occur when an available event spreads through the public, spurring attention to an issue that had formerly been neglected. 5 To take just one example, legislation calling for disclosure of toxic releases was spurred by a chemical accident at Bhopal, India, which focused media attention on the safety issues and led members of Congress to introduce right-to-know legislation. 6 The relevant legislation could not possibly have been enacted without the highly publicized Bhopal disaster. These points should be enough to suggest the possibility that in a genuinely close election, a salient judicial decision will have a large impact, perhaps even altering its outcome. Even if it is agreed that a highly visible event can have a large effect on political processes, we might insist that the effect can be salutary and sensible, as voters and representatives respond to a problem that had received too little concern. Undoubtedly sensible responses often occur. Unfortunately, the optimistic view seems unwarranted, for at least some of the time, the recent event produces a distorted judgment and undesirable law. 7 Let me therefore sketch a highly tentative principle: To the extent that salient judicial decisions can significantly affect voters' judgments, such decisions should not be issued in the period immediately before an election. Of course this position would be vulnerable if a great deal were to be lost by the delay. But in ordinary circumstances, any delay will produce no harm at all; it is not important for a judicial decision to be announced in October rather than December. If the delay is costless, and if it avoids a potential distortion, why should courts refuse to delay?

#### Empirical research proves judicial independence not key to growth, democracy, or human rights

Peretti, Professor of Poli Sci, 03 Associate Professor of Political Science at Santa Clara University [Terri, “Perspectives on Judicial Independence” Ohio State University Law Journal 64 Ohio St. L.J. 349]

Extravagant claims are made on behalf of judicial independence. It is regarded as a guarantor of a variety of noble ends--the rule of law, democratic stability, economic development, and human rights. 4 Given their frequency, it is surprising that these claims have received such little empirical investigation and support. Charles Cameron's review confirms that research into these presumed causal connections is quite skimpy. 5 For example, he found no studies of the relationship [\*351] between judicial independence and democratic stability. 6 With regard to judicial independence and economic development, Cameron reports that the Barro study found a "significant, and substantively important link between economic growth and 'rule of law values.'" 7 Yamanishi, however, found no connection between judicial independence and rule-of-law values. 8 Additionally, the Yamanishi study failed to verify that judicial independence has a positive impact on economic growth. 9 Finally, Keith reports that, although judicial independence provisions individually have only a small impact on human rights behavior by the state, the "combined impact" of several such provisions "is rather substantial." 10 Lewis Kornhauser argues that "judicial independence is not a necessary condition for either stability or [economic] development," 11 pointing out that, although its judiciary lacks independence, Japan has had both a highly stable government and an impressive record of economic growth. 12 He additionally notes that nations in the OECD have achieved stability and prosperity, despite employing a wide variety of adjudicative structures. 13

**Judicial hegemony entrenches elite power – it hampers democratic transitions**

**Hirschl,** Professor of Law, **04** Professor of Political Science and Law at the University of Toronto [Ran, Towards Juristocracy pg. 1-2]

While the benefits of constitutionalization for economic libertarians and judicial elites appear obvious, its appeal for hegemonic sociopolitical forces and their political representatives may at first glance look questionable. However, when their policy preferences have been, or are likely to be, in­creasingly challenged in majoritarian decision-making arenas, elites that possess disproportionate access to, and influence over, the legal arena may initiate a constitutional entrenchment of rights and judicial review in order to transfer power to supreme courts. Based on the courts' relatively high public reputation for professionalism and political impartiality, their record of adjudication, and the justices' ideological preferences, these elites may safely assume that their policy preferences will be less effectively contested under the new arrangement. Judicial empowerment through constitution­alization may provide an efficient institutional solution for influential groups who seek to preserve their hegemony and who, given an erosion in their popular support, may find strategic drawbacks in adhering to majoritarian policy-making processes. More "demographically representa­tive" political processes are, in other words, a catalyst, not an outcome, of constitutionalization. The constitutionalization of rights is therefore often not a reflection of a genuinely progressive revolution in a polity; rather, it is evidence that the rhetoric of rights and judicial review has been appropri­ated by threatened elites to bolster their own position in the polity. By keep­ing popular decision-making mechanisms at the forefront of the formal democratic political process while shifting the power to formulate and pro­mulgate certain policies to semiautonomous professional policy-making bodies, those who possess disproportionate access to, and have a decisive in­fluence upon, such bodies minimize the potential threat to their hegemony.

#### Democracy doesn’t solve war

Taner 2 (Binner, PhD Candidate – Syracuse U., Alternatives: Turkish Journal of Int’l Relations, 1(3), p. 43-44, http://www.alternativesjournal.com/binnur.pdf)

The discussion above suggests that the most important drawback of the “democratic peace” theory is the essentialization of the political regime as the only factor contributing to international peace and war. The ‘democratic peace’ theory underemphasizes, and most often neglects, the importance of other domestic factors such as political culture,35 degree of development, socio-economic and military considerations,36 the role of interest-groups and other domestic constituencies,37 strategic culture38 among others in decision-making. In other words, it is easily the case that the “democratic peace theory” lacks sensitivity to context and decisionmaking process. Although one should not dispute the fact that domestic political structure/regime type is an important component of any analysis of war and peace, this should be seen as only one of domestic variables, not necessarily the variable. Devoid of an analysis that gives respect to a number of other factors, superficial and sweeping generalizations will leave **many details in decision-making unaccounted for**. Consequently, although “democratic peace” theory should not be discarded entirely, current emphasis on the importance of “democracy” in eliminating bloody conflicts in the world should not blind scholars and policy circles alike to the fact that “democratic peace” is theoretically and empirically overdetermined.
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#### Perm do both- Solves better – using capitalism to fight itself is more effective

Rothkrug 90 (Paul, Founder – Environmental Rescue Fund, Monthly Review, March, 41(10), p. 38)

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

#### 3. Capitalism is resilient – it’ll bounce back

Foster 9 (JD, Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of fiscal policy – Heritage Foundation, "Is Capitalism Dead? Maybe," 3-11, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=101694302)

Capitalism is down. It may even be out. But it's **far from dead**. Capitalism is **extremely resilient**. Why? Because here, as in every democratic-industrial country around the world, it has always had to struggle to survive against encroachments — both benign and malevolent — of the state. At the moment, capitalism is losing ground most everywhere. But when the economic crisis passes, capitalism and the freedoms it engenders will **recover again**, if only because freedom beats its lack. It is said that the trouble with socialism is socialism; the trouble with capitalism is capitalists. The socialist economic system, inherently contrary to individual liberties, tends to minimize prosperity because it inevitably allocates national resources inefficiently. On the other hand, a truly capitalist system engaged in an unfettered pursuit of prosperity is prone to occasional and often painful excesses, bubbles and downturns like the one we are now experiencing globally. When capitalism slips, governments step in with regulations and buffers to try to moderate the excesses and minimize the broader consequences of individual errors. Sometimes these policies are enduringly helpful. Severe economic downturns inflict collateral damage on families and businesses otherwise innocent of material foolishness. Not only are the sufferings of these innocents harmful to society, but they are also downright expensive. A little wise government buffering can go a long way. The trick, of course, is the wisdom part. A good example of a wise government buffer is deposit insurance at commercial banks. Without it, depositors would have withdrawn their funds en masse, leading to a rapid collapse of the banking system. It happened in years gone by. But today, deposits have flowed into the banking system in search of safety, helping banks staunch their many severe wounds. Yet for every example of helpful government intervention, there are many more that do more harm than good. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac leap to mind. These congressional creatures helped create, then inflate the subprime market. When that balloon popped, it triggered a global economic meltdown. The current financial crisis clearly has capitalism on its back foot. Government ownership of the largest insurance company, the major banks, and Fan and Fred are awesome incursions into private markets. But, as President Obama has underscored, these incursions are only temporary. In time, these institutions — even Fan and Fred — will be broken up and sold in parts. It will leave government agents with stories to tell their grandkids, and taxpayers stuck with the losses. But the power of the state will again recede, and **another new age of** freedom and **capitalism will arrive and thrive**… until we repeat the cycle again sometime down the road.

#### Collapsing neoliberalism results in increased corporate power

Phillipe **Legrain**, special adviser to the WTO director general Mike Moore, **2000**, The WTO: Boon or Bane for the Developing World, p. http://www.focusweb.org/publications/2000/The%20WTOThe%20WTO-Boon%20or%20Bane%20for%20the%20Developing%20World.htm

A convincing case for the WTO’s abolition must show two things. First, that the world would be **better off** without the WTO. Second, that the WTO's abolition is preferable to **any politically feasible reform**. You fail to show either. Abolishing the WTO would not **destroy globalisation, capitalism, or US corporate power**. But it would **wipe out** a forum for governments to negotiate multilateral trade rules and a mechanism for holding them to those rules. That would make **every country worse off**, but **the biggest losers would be the poor and the weak**. One benefit of rules is that they apply to big, rich countries as well as small, poor ones. When America blocked imports of Costa Rican underwear, Costa Rica appealed to the WTO. It won, and America lifted its restrictions. Do you honestly think Costa Rica would have such clout in Washington **without the WTO?** Granted, the dispute-settlement mechanism is not perfect: America has a battery of lawyers to fight its corner, whereas small countries scrimp. It should be improved. But it is already much better than the alternative: the law of the jungle, where might makes right. Another merit of WTO rules is that they tie governments’ hands. Once countries open their markets to foreign trade and investment, they cannot close them again at whim. Without this stability, companies would be reluctant to invest abroad, particularly in developing countries with a protectionist or politically unstable record. Abolishing the WTO would further **marginalise developing countries**. If there were no prospect of further multilateral liberalisation and no body to enforce existing rules, trade barriers would creep up as protectionists gain the upper hand. The world might split into hostile regional blocks, with rich-country exporters **seeking captive markets in developing countries**. Developing countries, which need access to rich-country markets more than rich countries need access to theirs, would have to join on **unfavourable terms** or be left out in the cold. In any case, there would be less trade. And less trade means slower economic growth, stagnating living standards and more people trapped in poverty – like in the Great Depression. Over the past 50 years, the 15-fold rise in world trade has driven a seven-fold rise in world output. Thanks to trade, Japan and South Korea are no longer developing countries. Jeffrey Sachs and Andrew Warner of Harvard University found that developing countries with open economies grew by 4.5 per cent a year in the 1970s and 1980s, while those with closed economies grew by 0.7 per cent a year. At that rate, open economies double in size every 16 years, while closed ones must wait a hundred. Of course, in the short term, some people lose from trade liberalisation. But in the long run, everyone gains: even the poorest South Koreans today are much richer than their counterparts 30 years ago.

#### And Extinction outweighs

Bok 88

(Sissela, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Rosenthal and Shehadi, Ed.)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical Imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences. Acknowledging such a rift would post a strong challenge to the unity and simplicity of Kant’s moral theory.

#### 5. Rejection won’t dislodge capitalism – no critical mass exists

Grossberg 92 (Lawrence, Professor of Communication Studies – UNC-Chapel Hill and Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, p. 388-389)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be **tempered by** the **realities** of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is **simply too weak** in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague** to provide any direction.

#### Alternatives to capitalism will inevitably collapse

Taylor 94 (Jerry, Director of Natural Resource Studies – Cato Institute, “The Challenge of Sustainable Development”, Regulation, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/reg17n1-taylor.html)

The free, competitive marketplace creates not only human capital but natural capital as well. That is because capitalism is the most productive engine of intellectual and technological advance, and it is that stock of human knowledge and technology that turns the earth's material into useful commodities. "Humans are the active agent, having ideas that they use to transform the environment for human purposes, observes economist Thomas De Gregori. "Resources are not fixed and finite because they are not natural. They are a product of human ingenuity resulting from the creation of technology and science." David Osterfeld adds that "since resources are a function of human knowledge, and since our stock of knowledge has increased over time, it should come as no surprise that the stock of physical resources has also been expanding." Closed societies and economies under the heavy hand of state planning are doomed to live within the **confines of dwindling resource bases** and **eventually experience the very collapse** feared by the proponents of sustainable development.

**alt causes transition wars**

Harris 3 (Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html)

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, **a full-fledged** civil **war** not just within one society, but **across the globe**. Without this **catastrophic upheaval**, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

**Extinction**

Kothari 82 (Rajni, Professor of Political Science – University of Delhi, Toward a Just Social Order, p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification of the old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for **eventual global holocaust**.

#### Capitalism is critical to peace.

Doug Bandow, Cato Institute, 05

[“Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace,” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193]

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets. The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism. But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets. An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems. Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends. Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, "liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight." In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels." Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences. Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains. His conclusion hasn't gone unchallenged. Author R.J. Rummel, an avid proponent of the democratic peace theory, challenges Gartzke's methodology and worries that it "may well lead intelligent and policy-wise analysts and commentators to draw the wrong conclusions about the importance of democratization." Gartzke responds in detail, noting that he relied on the same data as most democratic peace theorists. If it is true that democratic states don't go to war, then it also is true that "states with advanced free market economies never go to war with each other, either." The point is not that democracy is valueless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections and are more likely to protect other forms of liberty - civil and economic, for instance. However, democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe is does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict-free world. That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity. Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical. It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near-pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peace. If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war. Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

**Cap solves disease**

**Mahmoud et al 6** (Adel, Senior Molecular Biologist in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs – Princeton University, Former President – Merck Vaccines, The Impact of Globalization on Infectious Disease Emergence and Control: Exploring the Consequences and Opportunities,” <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11588&page=80>)

Changes in travel and trade and the disruption of economic and cultural norms have accelerated and made it much more difficult to control the emergence and spread of infectious diseases, as described in Chapters [1](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11588&page=21#p2000e6299970021001)and [2](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11588&page=49#p2000e6299970049001) of this report. Even as progress is made, the public health community will likely encounter further setbacks, such as growing antimicrobial resistance. Yet there is a positive side to these developments as well. While globalization intensifies the threat of infectious disease, it also results in stronger tools for addressing that threat. From technological advances in information dissemination (e.g., the Internet) to the growing number of bidirectional infectious disease training programs that are bringing clinicians, scientists, and students from both sides of the equator together, the opportunities made available by globalization appear as endless as the challenges are daunting. At the same time, the opportunities afforded by globalization do not necessarily come easily. Workshop participants identified obstacles that, if not addressed, may prevent or retard the ability to take full advantage of some of these new global tools. Global surveillance capabilities made possible by advances in information and communications technologies, for example, are still fraught with numerous challenges. This chapter summarizes the workshop presentations and discussions pertaining to some of these opportunities and obstacles. One of the most enthusiastically discussed opportunities made available by our increasingly interconnected world is the type of transnational public health research, training, and education program exemplified by the Peru-based Gorgas Course in Clinical Tropical Medicine. This program not only benefits its northern participants, but also helps build a **sustainable public health capacity** in the developing world. Historically, the goal of many tropical disease training programs was to strengthen the northern country’s capacity for tropical disease diagnosis and treatment. The trend toward a bidirectional, more egalitarian approach that benefits the developing-country partner as much as its northern collaborator reflects a growing awareness that a sustainable global public health capacity can be achieved only with the full and equal participation of the developing world. Thus, not only are the Gorgas Course and other, similar programs becoming more popular, both politically and among students, but their nature is also changing in significant and telling ways. The shifting focus of many of the international training programs of the Fogarty International Center (FIC) within the National Institutes of Health (NIH) further reflects the increased awareness, funding, and efforts needed to strengthen bidirectional international training in epidemiology, public health, and tropical medicine in particular.

**extinction**

**Scotsman 95** (9-11, “The Mega Death”, p. 13, Lexis)

Bullets and bombs may be the weapons of the present, but plagues, viruses and killer microbes are the arsenal of the future. Together with the sarin gas which it released on the Tokyo underground in April, the Japanese Ohm cult had stockpiled a lethal bacterium which it chose not to unleash. Crippling continents by using killer infectious diseases is no far- fetched idea of sci-fi novels. But the scientists’ inability to distinguish between naturally emerging and synthetic disease outbreaks means whole areas could be laid waste before anyone realised what was happening, warns Laurie Garrett, author of a ground-breaking book on the burgeoning of infectious disease. All this on top of the fact that new diseases are emerging naturally at an alarming rate - representing a real threat to the survival of the human species - says The Coming Plague. Meticulously researched over the past decade, Garrett’s book charts the history of our age-old battle against the microbes, and concludes that we are beginning to cede the advantage to the disease-carriers. The optimism born out of defeating smallpox in the Sixties was dangerously premature. Everything from overuse of antibiotics to increased promiscuity have helped smooth the path for the microbes ever since. “The survival of the human species is not a pre- ordained evolutionary programme,” warns Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg in The Coming Plague. When Garrett’s book was released in the United States, it caused such widespread alarm that Vice President Al Gore set up a special task force to review American preparedness to tackle newly-emerging epidemics. In July, the evaluation concluded that the microbial threat was not just a domestic problem, but a national security question. It is no longer just governments which had the capability to engage in biological warfare.

#### Cap key to value to life

Robert Tracinski, Editor, The Intellectual Activist, 08

[“The Moral and the Practical,” http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm]

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each [hu]man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity.

#### No root cause- alt can’t solve individual greed

Richard Aberdeen, Owner of Freedom Tracks, 03

[“THE WAY A Theory of Root Cause and Solution,” http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/theway.html]

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed. This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon resorted to violence as a means to achieve rather questionable ends. And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem. Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors. These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed. For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors. Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation. More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation. The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹ does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see Gallo Brothers for more details). So-called “classes” of people, unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation. Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest. War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this. Junior Bush and the neo-conservative genocidal maniacs of modern-day America could not have recently effectively gone to war against Iraq without the individual support of individual troops and a certain percentage of individual citizens within the U.S. population, each lending support for their own personal motives, whatever they individually may have been. While it is true that corrupt leaders often provoke war, using all manner of religious, social and political means to justify, often as not, entirely ludicrous ends, very rare indeed is a battle only engaged in by these same unscrupulous miscreants of power. And though a few iniquitous elitist powerbrokers may initiate nefarious policies of global genocidal oppression, it takes a very great many individuals operating from individual personal motivations of survival, desire and greed to develop these policies into a multi-national exploitive reality. No economic or political organization and no political or social cause exists unto itself but rather, individual members power a collective agenda. A workers’ strike has no hope of succeeding if individual workers do not perceive a personal benefit. And similarly, a corporation will not exploit workers if doing so is not believed to be in the economic best interest of those who run the corporation and who in turn, must answer (at least theoretically) to individuals who collectively through purchase or other allotment of shares, own the corporation. Companies have often been known to appear benevolent, offering both higher wages and improved benefits, if doing so is perceived to be in the overall economic best interest of the immediate company and/or larger corporate entity. Non-unionized business enterprises frequently offer ‘carrots’ of appeasement to workers in order to discourage them from organizing and historically in the United States, concessions such as the forty-hour workweek, minimum wage, workers compensation and proscribed holidays have been grudgingly capitulated to by greedy capitalist masters as necessary concessions to avoid profit-crippling strikes and outright revolution.

### Trade War K 2ac

#### K doesn’t come first

**Owens 2002** (David – professor of social and political philosophy at the University of Southampton, Re-orienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning, Millenium, p. 655-657)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology **over explanatory** and/or interpretive **power** as if the latter two were merely a **simple function** of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), **it is by no means clear that it is**, in contrast, wholly dependent **on these philosophical commitments**. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but **this does not undermine** the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, **it is not the only or even necessarily the** most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a **question for social-scientific inquiry**, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one **theoretical approach which gets things right**, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

#### There is no monolithic conception of “TRADE IS WAR” – ours is one of international cooperation which their author finds acceptable

Philip **Eubanks**, assistant professor of English at Northern Illinois University, **1999**, The Story of Conceptual Metaphor: What Motivates Metaphoric Mappings?, Poetics Today, 20.3, p. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/poetics\_today/v020/20.3eubanks.html

The pervasiveness of TRADE IS WAR may well indicate a cultural consensus of sorts. But the nature of that consensus is not at all obvious. TRADE IS WAR is not just used by concrete speakers, it consists of their uses. In order to understand TRADE IS WAR as a conceptual metaphor, we need to **understand the degree to which speakers endorse it**, the influence of individual and cultural commitments upon it, and the normative patterns that characterize its use. In this light, even the few instances I have offered present important problems for a view of conceptual metaphor as a preexistent, culturally apt metaphor that is available to be instantiated. Thurow’s book may speak of “economic battle” **on its cover**, but inside Thurow **disavows TRADE IS WAR** as “fundamentally incorrect” (Thurow 1993: 31). Asked about this apparent contradiction, Thurow concedes the military metaphor’s limited utility but attributes the book title to his editors, rejecting the aptness of TRADE IS WAR in general (personal interview 1996). This defensive attribution is typical of TRADE IS WAR. Serious commentators [End Page 422] on international trade seldom utter it without ascribing it to someone else—usually to a trade competitor or to an opponent in the public debate about trade. Buchanan, on the other hand, endorses TRADE IS WAR unreservedly, applying trade hawk to himself. His endorsement of TRADE IS WAR violates standard use of the metaphor in discussions of international trade: few want to be seen as fomenting trade friction, and thus most speakers and writers do not ascribe bellicose intentions to themselves. But Buchanan’s endorsement is consonant with his truculent political rhetoric and with his political commitments. When Andreas says, “The competitor is our friend; the customer is our enemy,” he also endorses TRADE IS WAR. Despite its oddity, **his motto does not violate conventional use of the war metaphor**. In business, as opposed to international trade, war metaphors are often endorsed when expressing a rough-and-tumble view of competitiveness. At the same time, however, Andreas’s way of endorsing the metaphor contradicts the ideological commitments that TRADE IS WAR conventionally **entails in business discussions**. After all, isn’t the competitor supposed to be the enemy? In short, it is conventional that Andreas endorses TRADE IS WAR in general, but his variant of the metaphor is anything but routine. The variation among concrete instances of TRADE IS WAR does not support the idea of a conceptual metaphor that is simply available to be instantiated. If mere instantiation were what we do, speakers would employ TRADE IS WAR for typified purposes, and new uses would not influence the way the metaphor maps. But Thurow, Buchanan, and Andreas do not share the same political, philosophical, and economic commitments, and they **do not map TRADE IS WAR the same way**. Thurow favors international cooperation in trade. When he uses TRADE IS WAR, he **limits its conventional implications by specifying a variant mapping**. In Head to Head, he writes, “On one level a prediction that economic warfare will replace military warfare is good news. . . . There is nothing morally wrong with an aggressive invasion of well-made or superbly marketed German or Japanese goods” (Thurow 1993: 31). Thus he remaps “invasion” as positive because the “invaders” are goods (in both senses)—things that should not be met with resistance. As an economic nationalist, Buchanan maps TRADE IS WAR more conventionally. That is, to speak of himself as a trade hawk suggests that he favors hostile action between nations. Even so, in conventional discussions of international trade, hostile action is mapped as something to defend against, not something in which to be willingly engaged. Andreas—whose company recently admitted to price fixing—is conventional in mapping outwardly directed, aggressive action. But when he calls the customer the enemy, he points that [End Page 423] action in the “wrong” outward direction. In these cases, and in innumerable cases, the speaker makes TRADE IS WAR apt by remapping it to fit **his or her ideological commitments**. Of course, if unconventional mappings depend upon unconventional ideologies, then conventional mappings must depend upon conventional ideologies.

#### The alt creates a political void filled by elites – locking in oppression

Cook 92 (Anthony, Associate Professor – Georgetown Law, New England Law Review, Spring, 26 New Eng.L. Rev. 751, Lexis)

The effect of deconstructing the power of the author to impose a fixed meaning on the text or offer a continuous narrative is both debilitating and liberating. It is debilitating in that any attempt to say what should be done within even our insular Foucaultian preoccupations may be oppositionalized and deconstructed as an illegitimate privileging of one term, value, perspective or narrative over another. The struggle over meaning might continue ad infinitum. That is, if a deconstructionist is theoretically consistent and sees deconstruction not as a political tool but as a philosophical orientation, political action is impossible, because such action requires a degree of closure that deconstruction, as a theoretical matter, does not permit. Moreover, the approach is debilitating because deconstruction without material rootedness, without goals and vision, **creates a political** and spiritual **void** into which the socially real power we theoretically deconstruct steps and **steps on** the disempowered and dispossessed.  [\*762]  To those dying from AIDS, stifled by poverty, dehumanized by sexism and racism, crippled by drugs and brutalized by the many forms of physical, political and economic violence that characterizes our narcissistic culture, power hardly seems a matter of illegitimate theoretical privileging. When vision, social theory and political struggle do not accompany critique, the **void will be filled** by the rich, the powerful and the charismatic, those who influence us through their eloquence, prestige, wealth and power.

#### The impact is extinction

Rorty 98 (Richard, Professor of Comparative Literature – Stanford University, Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America, p. 89-94)

At that point, something will crack. The nonsuburban electorate will decide that the system has failed and start looking around for a strongman to vote for someone willing to assure them that, once he is elected, the smug bureaucrats, tricky lawyers, overpaid bond salesmen, and postmodernist professors will no longer be calling the shots. A scenario like that of Sinclair Lewis’ novel It Can’t Happen Here may then be played out. For once such a strongman takes office, nobody can predict what will happen. In 1932, most of the predictions made about what would happen if Hindenburg named Hitler chancellor were **wildly overoptimistic**. One thing that is very likely to happen is that **the gains made in the past forty years** by black and brown Americans, and by homosexuals, **will be wiped out**. Jocular contempt for women will come back into fashion. The words "nigger" and "kike" will once again be heard in the workplace. **All the sadism** which the academic Left has tried to make unaccept­able to its students will come flooding back. All the resent­ment which badly educated Americans feel about having their manners dictated to them by college graduates will find an outlet. But such a renewal of sadism will not alter the effects of selfishness. For after my imagined strongman takes charge, he will quickly make his peace with the international super­rich, just as Hitler made his with the German industrialists. He will invoke the glorious memory of the Gulf War to **pro­voke military adventures which will** generate short-term prosperity. He will be a disaster for the country and the world. People will wonder why there was so little resistance to his evitable rise. Where, they will ask, was the American Left? Why was it only rightists like Buchanan who spoke to the workers about the consequences of globalization? Why could not the Left channel the mounting rage of the newly dispossessed? It is often said that we Americans, at the end of the twenti­eth century, no longer have a Left. Since nobody denies the existence of what I have called the cultural Left, this amounts to an admission that that Left is unable to engage in national politics. It is not the sort of Left which can be asked to deal with the consequences of globalization. To get the country to deal with those consequences, the present cultural Left would have to transform itself by opening relations with the residue of the old reformist Left, and in particular with the labor unions. It would have to talk much more about money, even at the cost of talking less about stigma. I have two suggestions about how to effect this transition. The first is that the Left should put a moratorium on theory. It should try to kick its philosophy habit. The second is that the Left should try to mobilize what remains of our pride in being Americans. It should ask the public to consider how the country of Lincoln and Whitman might be achieved. In support of my first suggestion, let me cite a passage from Dewey's Reconstruction in Philosophy in which he ex­presses his exasperation with the sort of sterile debate now going on under the rubric of "individualism versus commu­nitarianism." Dewey thought that all discussions which took this dichotomy seriously suffer from a common defect. They are all committed to the logic of general notions under which specific situa­tions are to be brought. What we want is light upon this or that group of individuals, this or that concrete human being, this or that special institution or social arrangement. For such a logic of inquiry, the tradition­ally accepted logic substitutes discussion of the mean­ing of concepts and their dialectical relationships with one another. Dewey was right to be exasperated by sociopolitical theory conducted at this level of abstraction. He was wrong when he went on to say that ascending to this level is typically a right­ist maneuver, one which supplies "the apparatus for intellec­tual justifications of the established order. "9 For such ascents are now more common on the Left than on the Right. The contemporary academic Left seems to think that the higher your level of abstraction, the more subversive of the estab­lished order you can be. The more sweeping and novel your conceptual apparatus, the more radical your critique. When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been "inadequately theorized," you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of lan­guage, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist ver­sion of economic determinism. Theorists of the Left think that dissolving political agents into plays of differential sub­jectivity, or political initiatives into pursuits of Lacan's im­possible object of desire, helps to subvert the established order. Such subversion, they say, is accomplished by "problematizing familiar concepts." Recent attempts to subvert social institutions by prob­lematizing concepts have produced a few very good books. They have also produced many thousands of books which represent scholastic philosophizing at its worst. The authors of these purportedly "subversive" books honestly believe that they are serving human liberty. But it is almost impossi­ble to clamber back down from their books to a level of ab­straction on which one might discuss the merits of a law, a treaty, a candidate, or a political strategy. Even though what these authors "theorize" is often something very concrete and near at hand-a current TV show, a media celebrity, a re­cent scandal-they offer the most abstract and barren expla­nations imaginable. These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into polit­ical relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left re­treats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice pro­duces **theoretical hallucinations**. These result in an intellec­tual environment which is, as Mark Edmundson says in his book Nightmare on Main Street, Gothic. The cultural Left is haunted by ubiquitous specters, the most frightening of which is called "power." This is the name of what Edmund­son calls Foucault's "haunting agency, which is everywhere and nowhere, as evanescent and insistent as a resourceful spook."10

#### Our impact shatters the alt – preventing nuclear warthrough negative conceptions of peace is a pre-req for positive conceptions

**Folk 78** (Jerry, Professor of Religious and Peace Studies – Bethany College, “Peace Educations – Peace Studies: Toward an Integrated Approach”, Peace & Change, 5(1), Spring, p. 58)

Those proponents of the positive peace approach who reject out of hand the work of researchers and educators coming to the field from the perspective of negative peace too easily forget that the prevention of a nuclear confrontation of global dimensions is the **prerequisite** for all other peace research, education, and action. Unless such a confrontation can be avoided there will be **no world left in which to build positive peace**. Moreover, the blanket condemnation of all such negative peace oriented research, education or action as a reactionary attempt to support and reinforce the status quo is doctrinaire. Conflict theory and resolution, disarmament studies, studies of the international system and of international organizations, and integration studies are in themselves neutral. They do not intrinsically support either the status quo or revolutionary efforts to change or overthrow it. Rather they offer a body of knowledge which can be used for either purpose or for some purpose in between. It is much more logical for those who understand peace as positive peace to integrate this knowledge into their own framework and to utilize it in achieving their own purposes. A balanced peace studies program should therefore offer the student exposure to the questions and concerns which occupy those who view the field essentially from the point of view of negative peace.

#### Positive conceptions of peace fails – it's a hollow and meaningless concept

**Lawler 95** (Peter, Lecturer in IR – University of Manchester, A Question of Values: Johan Galtung’s Peace Research, p. 237)

Two concluding points concerning peace research generally can be drawn from the preceding discussion. The first is that, by and large, self-consciously labeled peace research, and not only Galtung’s contribution to it, continues to suffer from a **philosophical deficit**. But the addressing of their deficiency seems hardly to be a task solely for something called peace research unless the label is stripped of meaning. It is when the philosophical and normative content of “peace” in its fullest sense is addressed that disciplinary boundaries necessarily dissolve. If the range of themes found within Galtung’s work can be contained within the rubric of peace research, then **all** contemporary critical writing on the global dimensions of social life warrants inclusion. A distinctive province of peace research becomes difficult, perhaps **impossible** to discern. The label *peace research* now indicates little more than an imprecise normative orientation the content of which is continually contested. Alternatively, it can be case as a rather large exercise in collation. If we consider the conceptual icons of contemporary peace research, most of them introduced by Galtung, we might rightly suspect that much of their substantive content comes from elsewhere. For example, the concept of structural violence would be familiar to anyone working within the Marxist tradition of political economy. The concept of positive peace is amenable to a variety of readings and interchanges comfortably with social justice, human fulfillment, or a just world order. In sum, there is little evidence that peace research constitutes in and of itself a distinctive philosophical or theoretical viewpoint. The constant expansion of its purview may be interpreted as a sign of dynamism, the arbitrariness of the label a virtue; but it can also be seen as acquiring the qualities of an **intellectual black hole** **wherein something** **vital**, a praxeological edge or purpose, **is lost**.

#### Alternative fails – critical theory has no mechanism to translate theory into practice

**Jones 99** (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### And Extinction outweighs

Bok 88

(Sissela, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Rosenthal and Shehadi, Ed.)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical Imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences. Acknowledging such a rift would post a strong challenge to the unity and simplicity of Kant’s moral theory.

### Heidegger K 2ac

#### Perm – do both It solves best.

**McWhorter 92** (Ladelle, Assistant Professor of Philosophy – Northeast Missouri State University, Heidegger and the Earth, p. 3)

Heidegger's work is a call to reflect, to think in some way other than calculatively, technologically, pragmatically. Once we begin to move with and into Heidegger's call and begin to see our trying to seize control and solve problems as itself a problematic approach, if we still believe that thinking's only real purpose is to function as a prelude to action, we who attempt to think will twist within the agonizing grip of paradox, feeling nothing but frustration, unable to conceive of ourselves as anything but paralyzed. However, as so many peoples before us have known, paradox is not only a trap; it is also a scattering point and passageway. Paradox invites examination of its own constitution (hence of the patterns of thinking within which it occurs) and thereby breaks a way of thinking open, revealing the configurations of power that propel it and hold it on track. And thus it makes possible the dissipation of that power and the deflection of thinking into new paths and new possibilities.

#### Valuing nature for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species—only humans have to cognitive ability to make moral decisions to preserve their environment

Younkins 4 (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans] men affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress. Mankind’s survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things, even man himself. Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans] men sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.

#### Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

**Zimmerman 93** (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

#### Alt fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

#### That’s especially true for the environment

**Levy 99** (Neil, Ph.D. in Comparative Literature and Critical Theory – Monash University, and Currently Tutor, Centre for Critical Theory, Monash University, (Discourses of the Environment edited by Eric Darier) p. 214-215)

If our current situation can really be accurately characterized as the extension of bio-power from the realm of population to that of all life, does that entail that the strategies we should be adopting are those of management of the non-human world, as well as that of the human? I believe that **it does**. But I do not believe that this necessitates, or even makes possible, the genetically engineered, artificial world which McKibben and many others who have advocated non-anthropocentric ethics have feared, the replacement of the natural world with `a space station' (McKibben 1989: 170). And not just for the reason that, after the end of nature, the artificial/natural distinction is impossible to maintain. The world McKibben fears, in which forests are replaced by trees designed by us for maximum efficiency at absorbing carbon, and new strains of genetically engineered corn flourish in the new conditions brought about by global warming, seems to me unlikely in the extreme. The systems with which we are dealing, the imbrication of a huge variety of forms of life with chemical processes, with meteorological and geographic processes, are so complex, and occur on such scale, that I can see no way in which they could be replaced by artificial systems which would fulfil the same functions. Every intervention we make in' that direction has consequences which are so far-reaching, and involve so many variables and as yet undetected connections between relatively independent systems, that they are practically unforeseeable. To replace non-human systems with mechanisms of our own devising would involve thousands of such interventions, each of which would then require follow-up interventions in order to reverse or control their unintended consequences. Even when, and if, our knowledge of the environment were to reach a stage at which we were able to predict the consequences of our interventions, it would be likely to be far easier, and, in the long run, cheaper, simply to turn the already functioning, `natural' systems to our advantage. No method of reducing the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere is likely to be more effective than preserving the Amazonian rain forest. For this reason, I believe, environmentalists **have nothing to fear from** such **an apparently instrumental approach.** If the `technological fix' is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are nevertheless **unable simply to leave the environment as it is.** There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have **already set in train** will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to **develop** real, **concrete proposals for action**, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also **preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources** and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, **we risk exacerbating these inequalities**. It is not us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current green-house gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals **for concrete action** must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, **very much the province of Foucault's specific intellectual,** the one who works `within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them' (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as `the strategists of life and death' than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man's `politics places his existence as a living being in question' (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the **fate of our species**, and of those with whom we share this planet, **will be decided**.

#### The alt rejects humanism – dooming the planet to extinction

**Davies 97** (Tony, Professor of English – Birmingham University, Humanism, p. 130-132)

So there will not after all be, nor indeed could there be, any tidy definitions. The several humanisms – the civic humanism of the quattrocento Italian city-states, the Protestant humanism of sixteenth century northern Europe, the rationalistic humanism that attended at the revolutions of enlightened modernity, and the romantic and positivistic humanisms through which the European bourgeoisies established their hegemony over it, the revolutionary humanism that shook the world and the liberal humanism that sought to tame it, the humanism of the Nazis and the humanism of their victims and opponents, the antihumanist humanism of Heidegger and the humanist antihumanism of Foucault and Althusser – are not reducible to one, or even to a single line or pattern. Each has its distinctive historical curve, its particular discursive poetics, its own problematic scansion of the human. Each seeks, as all discourses must, to impose its own answer to the question of ‘which is to be master’. Meanwhile, the problem of humanism remains, for the present, an inescapable horizon within which all attempts to think about the ways in which human being have, do, might live together in and on the world are contained. Not that the actual humanisms described here necessarily provide a model, or even a useful history, least of all for those very numerous people, and peoples, for whom they have been alien and oppressive. Some, at least, offer a grim warning. Certainly it should no longer be possible to formulate phrases like ‘the destiny of man’ or ‘the triumph of human reason’ without an instant consciousness of the folly and brutality they drag behind them. All humanisms, until now, have been imperial. They speak of the human in the accents and the interests of a class, a sex, a ‘race’. Their embrace suffocates those whom it does not ignore. The first humanists scripted the tyranny of Borgias, Medicis and Tudors. Later humanisms dreamed of freedom and celebrated Frederick II, Bonaparte, Bismarck, Stalin. The liberators of colonial America, like the Greek and Roman thinkers they emulated, owned slaves. At various times, not excluding the present, the circuit of the human has excluded women, those who do not speak Greek or Latin or English, those whose complexions are not pink, children, Jews. It is almost impossible to think of a crime that has not been committed in the name of humanity. At the same time, though it is clear that the master narrative of transcendental Man has outlasted its usefulness, **it would be unwise** simply **to abandon the ground occupied by** the historical **humanisms**. For one thing, some variety of humanism remains, on many occasions, the only available alternative to bigotry and persecution. The freedom to speak and write, to organize and campaign in defence of individual or collective interests, to protest and disobey: all these, and the prospect of a world in which they will be secured, can only be articulated in humanist terms. It is true that the Baconian ‘Knowledge of Causes, and Secrett Motions of Things’, harnessed to an overweening rationality and an unbridled technological will to power, has enlarged the bounds of human empire to the point of **endangering the survival of the** violated **planet** on which we live. But how, if not by mobilizing collective resources of human understanding and responsibility of ‘enlightened self-interest’ even, can that danger be turned aside?

#### No single cause of violence

Muro-Ruiz 2 (Diego, London School of Economics, “The Logic of Violence”, Politics, 22(2), p. 116)

Violence is, most of the time, a wilful choice, especially if it is made by an organisation. Individuals present the scholar with a more difficult case to argue for. Scholars of violence have now a wide variety of perspectives they can use – from sociology and political science, to psychology, psychiatry and even biology – and should escape easy judgements. However, **the fundamental difficulty** for all of us is the absence of a synthetic, general theory able of integrating less complete theories of violent behaviour. In the absence of such a general theory, researchers should bear in mind that violence is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that resists mono-causal explanations. Future research on violence will have to take in account the variety of approaches, since they each offer some understanding of the logic of violence.

## T

**2AC – T Restriction / Production**

**Production is operation of energy facilities**

**DOCC 8** (National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Guidelines, Department of Climate Change Australian Government, p. http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/~/media/publications/greenhouse-report/nger-reporting-guidelines.ashx)

Energy production ‘Energy production’ is defined in r. 2.23: Production of energy, in relation to a facility, means any one of the following: a. the extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in operation of the facility; 11 b. the manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility.

#### And increasing PV increases production

Eurostat 5 (Statistical Office of the European Communities, “Energy Statistics Manual,” International Energy Agency, http://www.iea.org/stats/docs/statistics\_manual.pdf)

Production

General information

As highlighted in the definition of renewables and waste products (Section 1 of this chapter), some of the products (hydro, solar photovoltaic) need to be transformed into electricity in order to be captured. As a consequence, energy production from these products, listed as Group I above, is limited solely to electricity production at this time.

**Restriction means limitations, including price requirements**

**Ottinger et al 5** (Richard L., Dean Emeritus – Pace University School of Law, Former U.S. Congressman, Chair of the Energy Law and Climate Change Specialist Group of the Commission on Environmental Law of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and is on the IUCN Energy Initiative Executive Committee, Co-Director – Pace Center for Environmental Legal Studies, *Compendium of Sustainable Energy Laws*, IUCN Academy of Environmental Law Research Studies, p. 221)

restriction means any limitation, whether **made effective through quotas, licenses, permits, minimum or maximum price requirements** or any other means;

**Financial incentives include removing tariffs**

**RWI 8** [Revenue Watch Institute is a non-profit policy institute and grantmaking organization that promotes the effective, transparent and accountable management of oil, gas and mineral resources for the public good, “Extractive Industries” <http://archive-2011.revenuewatch.org/our-work/countries/indonesia/extractive-industries>]

As the only OPEC country that is a net importer of oil, Indonesia is strongly pushing the exploration and extraction of its remaining oil and gas reserves. The most recent financial incentives include eliminating tariffs for importing equipment used in oil, gas and geothermal production, such as drilling platforms, offshore production and undersea exploration facilities. This is in response to Indonesia's decreasing production despite untapped reserves. In 2007 production levels dropped to 899,000 b/d, down from 1.01 b/d in 2006 and the peak of 1.69 b/d in 1977.3

#### Tariffs are bans

**Sumner et. al**, September **2001** (Daniel – University of California-Davis, Vincent Smith – Montana State University, C. Parr Rosson – Texas A&M University, Tariff and Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade, p. <http://www.farmfoundation.org/news/articlefiles/816-sumner.pdf>)

Tariffs, which are taxes on imports of commodities into a country or region, are among the oldest forms of government intervention in economic activity. They are implemented for two clear economic purposes. First, they provide revenue for the government. Second, they improve economic returns to firms and suppliers of resources to domestic industry that face competition from foreign imports. Tariffs are widely used to protect domestic producers’ incomes from foreign competition. This protection comes at an economic cost to domestic consumers who pay higher prices for import competing goods, and to the economy as a whole through the inefficient allocation of resources to the import competing domestic industry. Therefore, since 1948, when average tariffs on manufactured goods exceeded 30 percent in most developed economies, those economies have sought to reduce tariffs on manufactured goods through several rounds of negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs Trade (GATT). Only in the most recent Uruguay Round of negotiations were trade and tariff restrictions in agriculture addressed. In the past, and even under GATT, tariffs levied on some agricultural commodities by some countries have been very large. When coupled with other barriers to trade they have often constituted formidable barriers to market access from foreign producers. In fact, tariffs that are set high enough can block all trade and act just like import bans.

#### No FX- production is all stages

Koplow 4

[Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf ]

Energy production includes all stages from the point of resource location through distribution to the ﬁnal consumers. Speciﬁc items examined here include resource extraction, resource conversion (including electricity), the various distribution links to bring the energy resource to the point of ﬁnal use, and accident risks.

### 1AR – A2: Must Be Bans/Just Prohibition

#### Restriction means “limiting condition” not prohibition

Yanovich 11 (Alan, Counselor – WTO Appellate Body Secretariat, *Regulation of Energy in International Trade Law: WTO, NAFTA, and Energy Charter*, p. Google Books, p. 6)

Article XI of the GATT 1994 provides that no prohibitions or restrictions, other than duties, taxes or other charges, shall be applied by any WTO Member on the importation of any product or on the exploration or sale for export of any product. Several WTO dispute settlement panels have interpreted the term 'restriction' in a broad manner and have emphasized that the on ligation in this provision is not limited to absolute prohibitions or numerical quotas: The question of whether [the] measure can appropriately be described as a restriction on importation turns on the issue of whether Article XI can be considered to cover situations where products are technically allowed into the market without an express formal quantitative restrictions, but are only allowed under certain conditions which make the importation more onerous than if the condition had not existed, thus generating a disincentive to import. On a plain reading, it is clear that a restriction **need not be a blanket prohibition or a precise numerical limit**. Indeed, the term 'restriction' cannot mean merely 'prohibitions' on importation, since Article XI:I expressly covers both 'prohibition or restriction'. Furthermore, the Panel considers that the expression 'limiting condition' used by the India -- Quantitative Restrictions panel to define the term 'restriction' and which this Panel endorses, is helpful in identifying the scope of the notion in the context of the facts before it. That phrase suggests the need to identify not merely a condition placed on importation, but a condition that is limiting i.e. that has a limiting effect. In the context of Article XI, that limiting effect must be on importation itself.

### 1AR – Restriction Definition

#### “Restriction on production” are a government imposed cost – removing the tariff is topical

**Ludwig Von Mises Institute 96** Original Book by Ludwig Von Mises, Austrian Economist in 1940. Evidence is cut from fourth edition copyright Bettina B. Greaves, “Human Action” http://mises.org/pdf/humanaction/pdf/ha\_29.pdf

Restriction of production means that the government either forbids or makes more difficult or more **expensive the production**, transportation, or distribution of definite articles, or the application of definite modes of production, transportation, or distribution. The authority thus eliminates some of the means available for the satisfaction of human wants. The effect of its interference is that people are prevented from using their knowledge and abilities, their labor and their material means of production in the way in which they would earn the highest returns and satisfy their needs as much as possible. Such interference makes people poorer and less satisfied.¶ This is the crux of the matter. All the subtlety and hair-splitting wasted in the effort to invalidate this fundamental thesis are vain. On the unhampered market there prevails an irresistible tendency to employ every factor of production for the best possible satisfaction [p. 744] of the most urgent needs of the consumers. If the government interferes with this process, it can only impair satisfaction; it can never improve it.¶ The correctness of this thesis has been proved in an excellent and irrefutable manner with regard to the historically most important class of government interference with production, the barriers to international trade. In this field the teaching of the classical economists, especially those of Ricardo, are final and settle the issue forever. All that a tariff can achieve is to divert production from those locations in which the output per unit of input is higher to locations in which it is lower. It does not increase production; it curtails it.

### Tariff Raises Cost

**Tariffs raise cost of installation**

**Kavilanz 12**

[Parija Kavilanz, CNN Money, 5/22/12, <http://money.cnn.com/2012/05/21/smallbusiness/solar-tariffs/index.htm>]

Last week, the Department of Commerce announced it would impose punitive tariffs as high as 250% on panels imported from China after finding that Chinese companies have been "dumping" them at prices below production costs. But many installation firms in the United States rely on lower-priced Chinese-made solar panels, and say the tariffs will hit their businesses hard -- potentially increasing their costs, hurting demand for their services, and stalling their hiring plans.

## DA

### Obama Good Agenda Fiscal Cliff DA 2ac

#### 1. Won’t pass- Obama not spending capital on fiscal cliff compromise now

Eisinger 9/12/12 (Robert, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts @ Savannah College of Art and Design, "The Myth of the Pandering, Rudderless President," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-eisinger/obama-polls\_b\_1874866.html)

When asked if he was confident a budget deal could be reached, Speaker of the House John Boehner answered, "Listen, the House has done its job, both on the sequester and the looming debt fights that'll cost our economy some 700,000 jobs. On both of these, where's the president, where's the leadership?"¶ On its face, Speaker Boehner's comment sounds innocuous. The problem is that it contradicts an earlier remark he apparently made to President Obama during last year's budget negotiations: "Mr. President, as I read the Constitution, the Congress writes the laws. You get to decide if you want to sign them."¶ Put another way, the president should lead, but not get too involved.¶ Boehner is not alone in contending that the Obama White House both lacks leadership and focus, and that it is focused too much on polls. Republican keynote speaker, New Jersey Governor Chris Christie, echoed this cacophonous sentiment at the GOP convention:¶ "There's only one thing missing now. Leadership. It takes leadership that you don't get from reading a poll. You see, Mr. President -- real leaders don't follow polls. Real leaders change polls."

#### 2. Nothing passes in the lame duck

**Geewax 9/20/12** (Marilyn, NPR, "'Fiscal Cliff' Scenarios Leave Economists On Edge," http://www.northcountrypublicradio.org/news/npr/161442506/fiscal-cliff-scenarios-leave-economists-on-edge)

But that's not the worst-case scenario. This is: Congress may not have time to do anything at all during the lame-duck session.¶ Why? Because this election season could bring major distractions, similar to those that followed the 2000 presidential election. That year's "hanging chad" drama in Florida turned into a massive time-suck for political leaders. Florida officials spent weeks trying to count paper ballots to determine which presidential candidate had won that state's tie-breaking electoral votes.¶ Another tussle over ballots is possible this year, especially given the array of new state laws involving voter ID.¶ It's also possible in this tight presidential election that neither candidate may win enough electoral votes to clinch victory. Dozens of combinations of battleground-state outcomes could leave the race undecided. If no one wins, then the House would decide the election — not exactly a scenario for holding down partisanship on Capitol Hill.¶ And it's not just the presidential race that could spur demands for recounts. All of the House seats are up for grabs, as well as 33 Senate slots. With Congress so narrowly split, each disputed seat could enflame partisan rancor and make it harder to come up with compromises by New Year's Eve.

4. **Plan key to appease environmentalists**  
**Higgins 12** (sean—washington examiner, “Are environmentalists embracing free trade?”, July 31, 2012,<http://washingtonexaminer.com/are-environmentalists-embracing-free-trade/article/2503642#.UEUiBsFlQrM)>

They're not quoting free market economists Friedrich Hayek or Milton Friedman yet, but some environmentalist voices are asking whether protectionist trade policies aren't undermining renewable energy. And the broader Green movement may be listening. What has them concerned is that the escalating trade war over the China's cheap solar panels. Domestic manufacturers have pushed hard for tariffs on them, and the White House has agreed. That threatens to put the brakes on solar panel installation in the United States, which has taken off in the last few years, thanks in large part to those same cheap imports. "Tariffs on Chinese solar are bad for us all," warned Sierra Club blogger Garvin Jabusch in a May posting. The policy, he said, is making solar panels "much less affordable for U.S. consumers." In a post last month on the environmental news website Grist.org, Terry Tamminen, former secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency, wrote: "If China is subsidizing solar panels, let's thank them and ask them to do more." Last week, Bill Waren, trade policy analyst for Friends of the Earth, concluded a lengthy blog post with this warning: "Trade complaints will not solve our problems; in fact, in the long run, they may undercut clean energy and low carbon policies globally."

#### Environmental groups control the agenda

**Simon 07** University of Nevada Associate Professor of political science

[Christopher A., Alternative Energy: Political, Economic and Social Feasibility, Pg. 204]

Interest groups have shown themselves to be a highly effective at influencing public policy in all stages of the policy process. Elected officials, usually members of the two major political parties, often face significant time and resource constraints (and limited incentives) in shaping public policies following the creation of statutes. The budget and committee oversight are tools Congress uses to shape policy postulate, but time limitations and disincentives often mean that Congress eschews large-scale regular oversight. The president, too has significant time constraints and relies heavily on appointed officials to represent his views, which has varying impacts on policy postulate**.** Interest groups, however, have significant time to follow individual policy arenas and to advance their goals throughout the policy processEnvironmental groups have and will likely remain very influential in energy policy.A centuries-old movement**,** interest group influence grew tremendously in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s in the United States. Environmental groups generally do not seek personal economic benefitfrom their efforts to protect the environmentbut tend to be driven by a notion of societal benefit. Many groups have significant resources needed to keep group to promote legislative action. Through lobbying efforts and information campaigns, interest groups shape policy outcome. Economic groups have played a significant role in shaping the energy policy debate and in a variety of different ways. Rural agrarian counties in the midwestern United States for instance, have faced economic and social decline for several decades. In the 1970s and 1980s in part due to rising energy costs—family farmers in the heartland were faced with serious economic depravation. Many of these family farmers were forced to sell their farms, often to large corporate farming interests. Social changes led many mid-western youth to migrate to the cities for greater opportunity, which meant that the next generation of farmers and ranchers disappeared from the rural landscape. Government groups at the state and local levels, such as associations or counties, began to pressure state and national policymakers to promote the use of corn in the alternative energy paradigm—federal ethanol subsidies have played a major role it making this aspect of farming much more profitable and, as a consequence, making farming a more lucrative enterprise. Urban government interest groups, such as the League of Cities, have also played a major role in shaping regulations and distributive policy incentives to promote sustainable communities. The supply of abundant and cheap energy is the cornerstone of the U.S. city of twentieth century; curtailing demand but maintaining quality of life will be the challenge of the twenty-first-century U.S. city. In order to accomplish this significant goal, however, government interest groups seek the economic aid of governments at all levels. Given Tiebout’s (1956) overarching thesis, it is natural that government interests will jockey for financial opportunities to prommmote the policy innovations unique to their locale and the needs of their communities in relation to other urban areas.

7. **Winners win**

**Halloran 10** (Liz, Reporter – NPR, “For Obama, What A Difference A Week Made”, National Public Radio, 4-6, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=125594396)

Amazing what a win in a major legislative battle will do for a president's spirit. (Turmoil over spending and leadership at the Republican National Committee over the past week, and the release Tuesday of a major new and largely sympathetic book about the president by New Yorker editor David Remnick, also haven't hurt White House efforts to drive its own, new narrative.) Obama's Story Though the president's national job approval ratings failed to get a boost by the passage of the health care overhaul — his numbers have remained steady this year at just under 50 percent — he has earned grudging respect even from those who don't agree with his policies. "He's achieved something that virtually everyone in Washington thought he couldn't," says Henry Olsen, vice president and director of the business-oriented American Enterprise Institute's National Research Initiative. "And that's given him confidence." The protracted health care battle looks to have taught the White House something about power, says presidential historian Gil Troy — a lesson that will inform Obama's pursuit of his initiatives going forward. "I think that Obama realizes that presidential power is a muscle, and the more you exercise it, the stronger it gets," Troy says. "He exercised that power and had a success with health care passage, and now he wants to make sure people realize it's not just a blip on the map." The White House now has an opportunity, he says, to change the narrative that had been looming — that the Democrats would lose big in the fall midterm elections, and that Obama was looking more like one-term President Jimmy Carter than two-termer Ronald Reagan, who also managed a difficult first-term legislative win and survived his party's bad showing in the midterms. Approval Ratings Obama is exuding confidence since the health care bill passed, but his approval ratings as of April 1 remain unchanged from the beginning of the year, according to [Pollster.com](http://www.pollster.com/polls/us/jobapproval-obama.php). What's more, just as many people disapprove of Obama's health care policy now as did so at the beginning of the year. According to the most recent numbers: Forty-eight percent of all Americans approve of Obama, and 47 disapprove. Fifty-two percent disapprove of Obama's health care policy, compared with 43 percent who approve. Stepping Back From A Precipice Those watching the re-emergent president in recent days say it's difficult to imagine that it was only weeks ago that Obama's domestic agenda had been given last rites, and pundits were preparing their pieces on a failed presidency. Obama himself had framed the health care debate as a referendum on his presidency. A loss would have "ruined the rest of his presidential term," says Darrell West, director of governance studies at the liberal-leaning Brookings Institution. "It would have made it difficult to address other issues and emboldened his critics to claim he was a failed president." The conventional wisdom in Washington after the Democrats lost their supermajority in the U.S. Senate when Republican Scott Brown won the Massachusetts seat long held by the late Sen. Edward Kennedy was that Obama would scale back his health care ambitions to get something passed. "I thought he was going to do what most presidents would have done — take two-thirds of a loaf and declare victory," says the AEI's Olsen. "But he doubled down and made it a vote of confidence on his presidency, parliamentary-style." "You've got to be impressed with an achievement like that," Olsen says. But Olsen is among those who argue that, long-term, Obama and his party would have been better served politically by an incremental approach to reworking the nation's health care system, something that may have been more palatable to independent voters Democrats will need in the fall. "He would have been able to show he was listening more, that he heard their concerns about the size and scope of this," Olsen says. Muscling out a win on a sweeping health care package may have invigorated the president and provided evidence of leadership, but, his critics say, it remains to be seen whether Obama and his party can reverse what the polls now suggest is a losing issue for them.

#### 9. Capital does not affect the agenda

**Dickinson, 9** (Matthew, Professor of political science at Middlebury College, Sotomayer, Obama and Presidential Power, Presidential Power, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### 11. No impact to fiscal cliff – economic and military impacts will be gradual and minimal

Lillis 9/12/12 (Mike, The Hill, "House Democrats pushing hard from the left on budget as 'fiscal cliff' nears," http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/249135-house-dems-pushing-hard-from-the-left-as-fiscal-cliff-nears)

Complicating the debate, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) warned that a failure to extend many of the expensive fiscal cliff benefits would threaten to send the economy back into a recession.¶ Still, a number of liberal economists say the image of a fiscal "cliff" is misleading. They argue that getting the policy right is more important than finalizing a budget package this year – even if it means the debate extends into next year.¶ "I don't disagree with the CBO's assessment," Chad Stone, an economist at the left-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), said Wednesday. "But it's not a Wile E. Coyote moment where the economy on Jan. 2 all of a sudden finds itself with the legs spinning in place. It's a gradual slope."¶ Lawrence Korb, a top defense official under President Reagan and now a senior fellow at the liberal Center for American Progress, said the same dynamic is true of the military cuts threatened by sequestration.¶ "It really won't have an impact for a couple of years," Korb told members of the CPC Wednesday.

### Obama Good- Russia DA 2ac

#### 1. Obama will lose

**Chambers**, **9/19**/2012 (Dean, Mitt Romney likely win in presidential election shown by three key polls, Examiner, p. http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-win-presidential-election-shown-by-three-key-polls)

Rasmussen Reports has released today, three key polls that show Mitt Romney's likely win in this year's presidential election over President Obama. The Rasmussen Reports Presidential Daily Tracking Poll released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Obama. Rasmussen's Daily Swing State Tracking Poll of 11 key swing states won by President Obama in 2008 shows Romney leading them by the exact same percentages. The latest Rasmussen poll of New Hampshire released today shows Romney leading there 48 percent to 45 percent. New Hampshire is a key swing state that could make a difference with its four electoral votes, and George W. Bush would have reached 270 electoral voters in 2000 without having won this state. New Hampshire had narrowly favored Obama in many polls over the last few months and while the analysis conduced here by this columnist has consistently predicted Mitt Romney will win the state (based in part on knowledge of local politics in the state having lived in New England for years), most projected have shaded New Hampshire blue and predicted it will go for Obama. This Rasmussen survey is key in that it likely shows movement in New Hampshire in the direction of Mitt Romney. In the instance of an incumbent president who enjoys just about 100 percent name recognition and is seeking reelection, most of the undecided voters are likely to swing to the challenger by election day. This is especially true when the challenger remains still less known to the public than the incumbent, as is true with former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. By election day, those other nine percent not favoring Romney or Obama in the Rasmussen Daily Tracking poll are likely include less than one percent voting for third party candidates and five or six percent of those nine will likely vote for Mitt Romney. That would indicate a popular vote win by Romney of about 53 percent to 46 percent, or the reverse of Obama's win in 2008. This would lead to an electoral college total of more than 300 electoral votes for Romney. The 11 swing states tracked by Rasmussen in it's swing state tracking poll show Romney leading 47 percent to 46 percent, where some weeks ago the two candidates were tied at 45 percent in the Rasmussen tracking poll of these 11 key swing states. President Obama won these same states collectively by a 53 percent to 46 percent margin in 2008. Now he is seven percent behind that finish now in these states. Romney is likely to capture most of the undecided votes and could win these states collectively by at least a 52 percent to 47 percent margin. That would likely lead to Romney winning Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin while having a competitive chance in Michigan and Pennsylvania. If President Obama can only win Michigan and Pennsylvania among those 11 swing states, he can not be reelected to the presidency. As these polls stand today, the election of Mitt Romney as our next president looks likely.

#### 2. Energy is not a key election issues --- other issues outweigh.

**The Washington Post**, 6/27/**2012** (Energy ads flood TV in swing states, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/energy-ads/2012/06/27/gJQAD5MR7V\_story.html)

Energy issues don’t spark much excitement among voters, ranking below health care, education and the federal budget deficit — not to mention jobs and the economy. And yet those same voters are being flooded this year with campaign ads on energy policy. Particularly in presidential swing states, the airwaves are laden with messages boosting oil drilling and natural gas and hammering President Obama for his support of green energy. The Cleveland area alone has heard $2.7 million in energy-related ads. The disconnect between what voters say they care about and what they’re seeing on TV lies in the money behind the ads, much of it coming from oil and gas interests. Those funders get the double benefit of attacking Obama at the same time they are promoting their industry. Democrats also have spent millions on the subject, defending the president’s record and tying Republican candidate Mitt Romney to “Big Oil.” Overall, more than $41 million, about one in four of the dollars spent on broadcast advertising in the presidential campaign, has gone to ads mentioning energy, more than a host of other subjects and just as much as health care, according to ad-tracking firm Kantar Media/Cmag. In an election focused heavily on jobs and the economy, all of this attention to energy seems a bit off topic. But the stakes are high for energy producers and environmentalists, who are squared off over how much the government should regulate the industry. And attention has been heightened by a recent boom in production using new technologies such as fracking and horizontal drilling, as well as a spike in gas prices this spring just as the general election got underway. When asked whether energy is important, more than half of voters say yes, according to recent polls. But asked to rank their top issues, fewer than 1 percent mention energy.

#### 3. If Obama gets ahead, overconfidence will kill base turnout.

**Cillizza**, **9/16**/2012 (Chris – writer for The Fix at the Washington Post, Will Obama win in November? Wide gap between preference and prediction., p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/will-obama-win-in-november-wide-gap-between-preference-and-prediction/2012/09/16/885d31ca-001c-11e2-b257-e1c2b3548a4a\_story.html)

Not so, according to Ed Goeas, a longtime Republican pollster. “Large numbers of people saying that your candidate is going to win is not a good thing,” he said. “It has a dampening effect on driving your candidate’s vote to turn out. It allows other things in a person’s busy day to become more important because their candidate is going to win anyway.” There is some evidence that Goeas is on to something. As we mentioned, Obama and Romney were running neck and neck among likely voters in an Post-ABC poll earlier this month. But among registered voters Obama led by 50 percent to 44 percent. That trend has been apparent in a slew of national polls for months; the more the sample is trimmed to those absolutely planning to vote on Nov. 6, the better Romney performs.

**4.** **Plan key to appease environmentalists**  
**Higgins 12** (sean—washington examiner, “Are environmentalists embracing free trade?”, July 31, 2012,<http://washingtonexaminer.com/are-environmentalists-embracing-free-trade/article/2503642#.UEUiBsFlQrM)>

They're not quoting free market economists Friedrich Hayek or Milton Friedman yet, but some environmentalist voices are asking whether protectionist trade policies aren't undermining renewable energy. And the broader Green movement may be listening. What has them concerned is that the escalating trade war over the China's cheap solar panels. Domestic manufacturers have pushed hard for tariffs on them, and the White House has agreed. That threatens to put the brakes on solar panel installation in the United States, which has taken off in the last few years, thanks in large part to those same cheap imports. "Tariffs on Chinese solar are bad for us all," warned Sierra Club blogger Garvin Jabusch in a May posting. The policy, he said, is making solar panels "much less affordable for U.S. consumers." In a post last month on the environmental news website Grist.org, Terry Tamminen, former secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency, wrote: "If China is subsidizing solar panels, let's thank them and ask them to do more." Last week, Bill Waren, trade policy analyst for Friends of the Earth, concluded a lengthy blog post with this warning: "Trade complaints will not solve our problems; in fact, in the long run, they may undercut clean energy and low carbon policies globally."

**They’re key   
Bloomberg 11**

[Mark Drajem and Jim Efstathiou Jr. “Green Vote Cools Toward Obama Risking A Replay Of Gore-Nader,” Aug 30, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/green-vote-cools-to-obama-over-pipeline-concerns.html>]

Democratic Vice President Al Gore paid a price in his 2000 presidential campaign for the splintering of environmentalists’ votes. Leaders of some groups, including in Florida, endorsed the independent candidacy of Ralph Nader instead. Gore, who later won the Nobel Peace Prize for his advocacy of limits on greenhouse-gas emissions, lost Florida by 537 votes in the official tally, making Republican George W. Bush president. Nader garnered 97,488 votes in the state. Nader predicted in April that Obama will win re-election, in part because “the liberal base has nowhere to go to send a message” this time. Still, apathy among voters sympathetic to environmentalist goals may prove costly to Obama, according to Doug Schoen, who was a strategist for President Bill Clinton. “Obama won the election because the left, young people who are disproportionately environmentalists, came out in huge numbers,” Schoen said in an interview yesterday. “If he doesn’t have the kind of support he had from the left, from young people, from environmentalists, he is not going to be re- elected. It’s as simple as that.”

#### 5. Protecting domestic solar manufacturing causes Obama to lose

**Belogolova**, 6/6/**2012** (Olga – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders: Romney Wins on Clean-Energy Messaging, National Journal, p. <http://nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-romney-wins-on-clean-energy-messaging-20120606?page=1>)

The GOP and the Romney campaign criticizing President Obama for backing the now-bankrupt solar-panel maker Solyndra “In a deeply anti-Washington political environment colored by never-ending discussions on tax and spending policy, Solyndra will continue to have traction. The public's response to the GSA's antics drive the point.” “The election will be a referendum on the president's record and the decisions he has made. Solyndra is example A of the president's failed policies.” “The Obama issue is based on 'facts' while the Romney issue is based on perception” “With the recession headed towards a double dip, voters want affordable energy and jobs - not expensive renewables that appear to be more bust than boom.” “Playing the China card rarely translates into votes.” “What, will Obama argue we didn't give enough money to Solyndra?” “Solyndra is a powerful symbol of wasteful spending, yawning federal deficits, and ineffective stimulus - the charge that Romney wants to surrender to China does not wash."

#### ----No link- China trade isn’t unpopular

Pew Research 10

[ PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS, 11/9/10, <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1795/poll-free-trade-agreements-jobs-wages-economic-growth-china-japan-canada>]

For instance, while Republicans and Democrats have about the same view of increased trade with China, there are wide age and educational differences. By 56% to 37%, those younger than age 30 say that more trade with China is good for the U.S. Those ages 30-49 and 50-64 are divided, but more of those ages 65 and older see increased trade with China as bad for the country rather than good (52% to 37%). Roughly half of college graduates (50%) and those with some college experience (51%) say increased trade with China would be good for the United States. That compares with 39% of those with no more than a high school education.

#### Plan key to Obama spin on jobs

David Nicklaus 12, who is the business columnist for the Post-Dispatch, 6/3, “Solar Panel Tariff Could backfire on US” <http://www.stltoday.com/business/columns/david-nicklaus/solar-panel-tariff-could-backfire-on-u-s/article_eca6a6e4-ac01-11e1-9f82-0019bb30f31a.html>

The Obama administration likes to promote renewable energy, and it likes to take a tough stance on trade with China. It may soon find that it can't do both. Solar energy firms, in fact, say a recent Commerce Department trade ruling will eliminate thousands of the green jobs that President Barack Obama likes to talk about. The department made a preliminary decision last month to impose a 31 percent tariff on solar panels imported from China. The punitive levy was sought by SolarWorld, a German company that makes solar panels in the U.S. and six other companies.

#### Link is self-correcting --- Obama will October Surprise if he is behind.

**Whittington**, **6/14**/2012 (Mark, Obama’s October Surprise Could Be Legalizing Pot, Yahoo! News, p. http://news.yahoo.com/obamas-october-surprise-could-legalizing-pot-191100768.html

The Atlantic Wire believes that it has hit upon President Obama's surefire October Surprise to change his political fortunes and get him re-elected for a second term. That October surprise would be for him to support the legalization of pot. This last-minute gambit has an advantage to starting a war, being that no one would get killed. The theory is that young voters, disenchanted with Obama because of the fact they are still living in their parents' garage three years after graduation and can't get a job, will be motivated to turn out for him because he supports legalized dope smoking. The Washington Post related David Maraniss' claims of Barack Obama being a pothead during his high school days. The gambit would also answer Penn Jillette's recent rant on the hypocrisy of Obama, a self-admitted former doper, enforcing drug laws that put people like he used to be in jail. The idea that Obama can get potheads motivated enough to turn off "The Daily Show," get off the couch, and go to the polls is a very charming one. To be sure, people voting while stoned could explain a lot of election results -- the re-election of Jerry Brown as governor of California comes to mind. But the legalized pot gambit has some pitfalls. Millions of people, likely more than who toke while laughing hysterically at Bill Maher, are against legalized drug use. Rasmussen suggested that a plurality of 47 percent of Americans favor legalizing marijuana and taxing it, which makes the say yes to drugs gambit just a little tempting to a president facing defeat in November. But such a move could be turned back on Obama fairly quickly. Mitt Romney, whose skill at the political riposte has become well known, would have lots of fun with an Obama legalize dope initiative. What next, he will ask. Selling crystal meth to school kids from vending machines? And if Obama proposed taxing pot at the same time, Romney would think that the good lord really does want him to be president. The conservative base likes few things less, besides gays getting married, than legalized dope and raising taxes, even on legalized dope. What, Obama would ask, does this have to do with a bad economy? One hope would be left for Obama: a stimulus package for pot growers. It may be his only hope.

**Winners win with the public**

**Singer, ‘9**

[Johnathan, editor of MyDD, a position he has held since 2005, JD candidate at Berkeley Law, My direct Democracy, “By expending capital, Obama Grows His Capital,” 3-3, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### 6. No link- Not tied to Obama

**Bradsher 11**

[Keith Bradsher, Hong Kong bureau chief of The New York Times, covering Asian business, economic, political and science news, 11/9/11, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/10/business/global/us-and-china-on-brink-of-trade-war-over-solar-power-industry.html?pagewanted=all>]

The Commerce Department uses a quasi-judicial process administered mainly by civil servants to adjudicate antidumping and antisubsidy cases. Congress created the process in the 1970s to shield the decision makers from political influence. There had been a perception that Republican and Democratic administrations had ignored violations of international trade rules during the cold war by Japan and other countries as long as they remained strong geopolitical allies against the Soviet Union. Republican and Democratic administrations have defended the current process as insulated from politics. “**The methodology of this is not political**,” said Frank L. Lavin, a longtime Republican who has held a series of appointments in Republican administrations, including overseeing the antidumping and antisubsidy investigations office when he was the undersecretary of commerce for international trade during President George W. Bush’s second term.

#### 7 Either its too far off or plan can’t change votes

**Farhi**, 7/6/**2012** (Paul – reporter for the Washington Post, Do campaigns really change voters’ minds?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/do-campaigns-really-change-voters-minds/2012/07/06/gJQAEljyRW_story.html>)

Academic election-forecast models rest on the notion that campaigns don’t have much effect because there aren’t many voters left for the candidates to persuade, especially as the election approaches. Even in the worst of times, both major-party candidates can count on at least 40 percent of the vote; in the best of times, neither can expect more than 60 percent, Campbell says. “Defections” to another party are rare; some research suggests that voters change their party identification about as often as their religious affiliation, which is to say not very often. People who describe themselves as “leaning” toward one candidate months ahead of the election overwhelmingly end up voting for that candidate. About 91 percent of Obama’s “leaners” went for him in 2008, Campbell says. This implies that the pool of “persuadable” voters is tiny — more kiddie-size than Olympic. And the pool becomes even shallower as the few holdouts start making up their minds. The closer to the election, the fewer persuadables there are. In a Gallup/USA Today poll in May, the most recent time that Gallup asked, only 7 percent of registered voters in 12 swing states said they were undecided. That number probably is lower now.

**9. Obama can’t solve relations**

Kupchan 8/21

[Charles, Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow, 8/21/12, <http://www.cfr.org/russian-fed/russia-joins-wto-amid-continuing-tensions-us/p28858>

Russia’s accession to the WTO this Wednesday marks the successful end of a long and tortuous road of negotiations. Washington played an important role in paving the way, in the end game helping to remove the final hurdle by pressing Georgia to acquiesce to Russian membership despite the continuing acrimony between Tblisi and Moscow. Russia’s admission to the WTO should thus mark a significant advance in U.S.-Russian relations – a major step forward in the so-called “reset.” But the opposite is true. Relations between Washington and Moscow have been particularly strained of late, with the Obama administration justifiably angry over the Kremlin’s intransigent alignment with a Syrian regime using brute force against its own people. Meanwhile, the U.S. Congress has yet to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik restrictions – economic sanctions put in place in the 1970s intended to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration of its Jews. Congress is also considering legislation which would link normal trade relations with Russia to the country’s readiness to improve its record on human rights. The so-called Magnitsky Bill and related proposals envisage the public disclosure of a blacklist of human rights violators and the imposition of a visa ban on such individuals. Sergei Magnitsky was a Russian whistleblower who was imprisoned and then died while under policy custody in 2009. Without Russia’s graduation from Jackson-Vanik, commerce between the U.S. and Russia will not fully benefit from Russia’s accession to the WTO. And the Kremlin has expressed outrage that Congress is linking trade and human rights, claiming that Washington has no right to interfere in Russia’s domestic affairs. Senior Russian officials have threatened to retaliate with their own restrictions on visas for Americans, a move that could impair economic cooperation. Congress’ reluctance to repeal Jackson-Vanik stems in part from partisan wrangling amid the home stretch of the presidential race. Mitt Romney is positioning himself as the foreign policy hardliner in the contest, seeking to portray Obama as insufficiently tough in his conduct of statecraft. Romney is reserving his best rhetoric for the Kremlin, going so far as to declare that Russia is America’s chief foe. Although such claims bear little semblance to reality, the Republicans are ready to pounce if Democrats appear to be too accommodating of the Kremlin. As a result, the effort to move Russia past the Jackson-Vanick era has bogged down on Capitol Hill. Moreover, although Congress is more than justified in criticizing Russia on matters of human rights, there is also a counterproductive Russophobia on Capitol Hill that is best explained as a hangover from the Cold War. It is appears probable that Congress will be finally be ready to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik during the lame duck session that follows the November election. But even so, this episode is revealing America’s schizophrenic view of Russia and casting an unfortunate shadow over what should be an auspicious moment in commercial ties between the two countries. For its part, Russia has played right into the hands of American voices arguing that the Kremlin should be kept at arm’s length. The Russian government continues to trample on political freedoms; last week’s conviction of the punk band Pussy Riot is a case in point. The Kremlin’s **repression of political opponents** is not only distasteful, but also unnecessary; Putin’s political machine and personal popularity are more than sufficient to give him a strong hand. Putin’s more **confrontational foreign policy** is also costing him dearly in Washington. Initially, many American observers presumed that his more blustery tone was aimed at shoring up support in preparation for the presidential election. But Putin’s provocations have not abated, especially when it comes to NATO’s plans for **missile defense and**, most importantly, the crisis in **Syria**. Putin was arguably justified in reacting with pique to the NATO operation in Libya on the grounds that it brought about regime change under the cover of a UN mandate intended to protect civilians. But smarting over the Libya mission provides Putin no reason whatsoever to embrace a government in Syria that is mercilessly killing its own citizens. Indeed, the Kremlin seems to have backed itself into a corner, stuck supporting a regime that has lost its legitimacy and decency in the court of world opinion. Russia gains nothing from standing with Assad – and the chilling effect on U.S.-Russian relations will last a long time. Indeed, the Kremlin’s policy toward Syria is raising troubling questions in Washington about Russian intentions and its suitability as a strategic partner. Even in the absence of these tensions in U.S.-Russian relations, the implications of Russia’s accession to the WTO should not be overstated. To be sure, there will be significant economic benefits to Russia and its trading partners. But WTO membership has only modest potential to foster ambitious economic and political reforms or to encourage Russia to more fully embrace Western norms. After all, China has been a WTO member since 2001, but its inclusion has done little to dismantle state capitalism or encourage political reform. Russia takes an important step in the right direction on Wednesday. But when it comes to consolidating rapprochement between Washington and Moscow and more fully anchoring Russia in Western markets and institutions, there is still much hard work to be done.

#### Romney Won’t kill realtions

Business Insider, 9/1/**2012** (Romney Could Screw Up US Relations With Russia, p. <http://www.businessinsider.com/mitt-romneys-foreign-policy-chops-come-into-light-2012-9>)

At the same time, the potential impact of a Romney presidency should not be exaggerated. Mr Romney is not an ideological politician, and he will have solid reasons to maintain a working relationship with Russia. These include reliance on Russian transit corridors to support US forces in Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond, Russia's veto in the UN Security Council, and its potential to act as interlocutor between the US and rogue states. Finally, there is a significant element of uncertainty that stems from the lack of clarity about what Mr Romney, who has often changed his position, actually stands for. In particular, the extent of the influence on him of several competing Republican foreign policy schools (neo-conservativism, populist isolationism, realism, liberal internationalism) is unclear.

#### No escalation

Newsday 5 (2-27, Lexis)

Relations between Washington and Moscow are now more like a marriage of convenience. It's no longer the antagonistic, hostile rivalry of the Cold War, and it's **unlikely ever to revert** to that. One reason is that the United States remains a superpower and Russia is **only a shell** of the old Soviet Union. Instead, it has turned into a wary relationship defined by a need to cooperate on mutually useful issues and by fundamental disagreements not easily resolved.

#### Low Solar solves water shortages

Bradford 6 (Travis--Associate Professor of Practice in International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, “Solar Revolution: The Economic Transformation of the Global Energy Industry” MIT Press, Print.)

In addition, new and equally vital industries could benefit from access to globally distributed and inexpensive solar electricity. As discussed in chapter 3, declining water availability is one of the largest problems facing the developing world, proportionately larger in the drier and sunnier parts of the world. Few adequate solutions currently exist to provide additional water supplies as underground aquifers continue to be depleted and freshwater in lakes and rivers is increasingly diverted. The problem of water availability is made more difficult by the economics of water distribution. Water is heavy and, despite its vital nature, of relatively low economic value for its weight, making it economically prohibitive to transport over long distances, which is why most water solutions have involved local ground pumps as opposed to pipelines or trucking. The most promising (and in some cases only) solution that nations have employed to provide freshwater to islands and other remote locations has been desalination. Unfortunately, most of the cost of desalination, either via thermal distillation or reverse osmosis, is in the energy used during the desalination process, limiting its economic deployment around the world. PV can be used to power either thermal or reverse-osmosis desalination plants.' 8 Declining PV prices make these projects increasingly feasible, and the necessary sea water and solar power to run them are ubiquitous and often available in the same location. With more than half of the people in the world living within sixty miles of an ocean, PV can become a powerful tool to facilitate access to adequate water supply.'9 Increasingly cheap generation of solar electricity has the potential to provide affordable freshwater without any need for batteries, power lines, or fuel supplies-and can do so with modular systems ranging from small domestic to large industrial.

#### Goes nuclear

Weiner 90 (Jonathan, Pulitzer Prize winning author, “The Next One Hundred Years”, p. 270)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

### A2 Iran

#### Romney won’t strike Iran

**Foster**, 7/25/**2012** (Peter – Telegraph’s US Editor, Mitt Romney wants to put the spine back into US foreign policy, but he's not a warrior. He’s a pragmatist, The Telegraph, p. <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/peterfoster/100172414/mitt-romney-wants-to-put-the-spine-back-into-us-foreign-policy-but-hes-not-a-warrior-hes-a-pragmatist/>)

The Obama campaign will try and cast this as a return to the ‘dark days of Dubya’ when crusading neo-cons waged righteous war after 9/11, leading the free world into a financially ruinous quagmire from which only now, Obama is finally managing to extract us. But we this doesn't ring true for two reasons: first, America is war-weary, and Romney knows it; there is no appetite for adventure right now and second, because ‘Dubya’ himself is nowhere to be seen during this campaign. He is conspicuously and deliberately absent. Romney isn’t a neo-con. He’s a data-drive politician who privately knows the limits of US hard power and, in a time of recession, the public will-power to sustain further conflict – but critically he also knows that in a world in such economic and geopolitical flux, US backbone has never been more important. That is why Romney, for all his huffing and puffing about Obama and Afghanistan, is still planning to have the troops out by 2014. It is why when he talks about Iran, he talks about the iron application of sanctions and not unleashing the bunker-buster at first light. And also why there's no mention of designating China as a currency manipulator on day one of his presidency. Romney is **not saying he plans to take up where Bush left off**, but that he wants America to re-discover its spine and end the Obama administration’s policy of giving “trust where it is not earned, insult where it is not deserved, and apology where it is not due.” Romney recognizes the truth that Russia under Putin and China under the mandarins, are fundamentally transactional and Cold War in their approach to the world. Playing nice has yielded nothing over Syria, just as it didn’t when Obama came to Beijing shortly after being elected and was made a laughing stock by the Chinese. And the result of the Obama doctrine is plain for all to see right now in Syria, a conflict that is crying out for US presidential leadership – not military intervention, note, but leadership.

#### Romney won’t green light Israeli strikes

**Blair**, 7/31/**2012** (David, Mitt Romney's green light for an Israeli attack on Iran is just campaign-trail big talk, The Telegraph, p. http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/davidblair/100173701/mitt-romneys-green-light-for-an-israeli-attack-on-iran-is-just-campaign-trail-big-talk/)

So Mitt Romney’s remarkable statement – made via his spokesman – that he would “respect” any Israeli decision to “take action on its own” represents a break with settled US policy adopted by the last Republican administration. Romney is, of course, on the campaign trail – and what politicians do when they take office often bears little resemblance to what they say when they are trying to win votes. My hunch is that if a President Romney were to enter the White House, he would quickly forget his sanguine view of the consequences of an Israeli strike on Iran. Leave aside the arguments for and against going to war with Iran. Just consider the consequences of a unilateral Israeli strike. Iran would almost certainly retaliate by trying to disrupt shipping through the Strait of Hormuz – and the US Navy is the only military force in the world with the power to prevent that from happening. So America would almost certainly be dragged into the war pretty quickly. Could any US president live with the idea of becoming embroiled in a war started by an ally? I cannot imagine a leader of the world’s only superpower tolerating – let alone “respecting” – a decision taken by another country that would inevitably drag it into a new conflict. If America is going to fight a war, the president of the day will insist on reserving that decision for himself, rather than ceding it to an ally. Mitt Romney, if he wins with White House, will feel the same way.

#### Iran strikes don’t go nuclear

**Plesch and Butcher**, September **2007** (Dan – Director of the School of Oriental and African Studies at the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy and Martin – international consultant on security politics, Considering a war with Iran: A discussion paper on WMD in the Middle East, p. http://www.rawstory.com/images/other/IranStudy082807a.pdf)

The US has strategic forces prepared to launch massive strikes on Iran with hours of the order being given. Although there is clear evidence that nuclear weapons use is being given serious political consideration, actual use is unlikely given the lack of effectiveness of nuclear weapons against concealed and buried targets and the negative political consequences of such use. The aim of the new Triad and the Global Strike capability developed under the Bush administration is stated to be making nuclear weapons use less likely.

### Oil DA 2ac

#### Peak oil now

**Jamail 11**

(Dahr, Independent Journalist, Citing Tom Whipple, Energy Scholar at the CIA 2011, "The scourge of 'peak oil'," http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/features/2011/07/201172081613634207.html)

Tom Whipple, an energy scholar, was a CIA analyst for 30 years - and believes we are likely at, or very near, a point in history when the maximum production capacity for oil is reached, a phenomenon often referred to as "peak oil". "Peak oil is the time when the world's production reaches the highest point, then starts back down again," Whipple told Al Jazeera. "Oil is a finite resource, and [it] someday will go down, and that is what the peak oil discussion is all about." There are signs that peak oil may have already arrived. The International Energy Agency (IEA) recently increased its forecast for average global oil consumption in 2011 to 89.5 million barrels per day (bpd), an increase of 1.2 million bpd over last year. For 2012, the IEA is expecting another increase of 1.5 million bpd for a total global oil consumption of 91million bpd, leaving analysts such as Whipple to question how production will be able to keep up with increasing consumption. Whipple's analysis matches IEA data which shows world oil production levels have been relatively flat for six years. "This is getting very close to the figure that some observers believe is the highest the world will ever produce," Whipple wrote of the IEA estimate in the July 14 issue of Peak Oil Review. He told Al Jazeera that peak oil could be reached at some point in the next month, or at the latest, within "a few years". Low-hanging fruit Marion King Hubbert, a geoscientist who worked at the Shell oil research lab developed the "Hubbert curve", a logistical model that accurately predicted that oil production in the United States would peak between 1965 and 1970. His model has described fairly accurately the peak and decline of production from oil fields, wells, regions, and countries. According to Hubbert's model, oil production rates will follow a roughly symmetrical distribution curve based on exploitability and market pressures. Optimists estimate that peak oil production and global availability will decline beginning in 2020 or later, and don't see a crisis happening that would affect major changes in lifestyles of oil-consuming nations. A study published in the Energy Policy journal, however, predicts that demand will surpass supply by 2015 unless sustained economic recession constrains demand. The IEA says that production of conventional crude oil already peaked in 2006, and economic indicators show that, through the first two quarters of 2008, the global economic recession was made worse by a series of record oil prices. Both production and discovery of new oil fields appear now to be relatively stagnant compared with recent decades, and world oil generating levels reached a plateau several years ago, reports the IEA. Richard Heinberg, author of ten books related to peak oil and its impact on our economic, food, and transportation systems, believes peak oil is a function of the dominant principles of resource extraction. "Many people believe it's about running out of oil, and it's not," he told Al Jazeera. "It's about finishing off the low-hanging fruit." Oil is an energy dense, portable resource, and the energy that has been expended finding and extracting it is minute when compared to the energy it produces. But Heinberg argues that we have likely already reached the maximum production limits for oil. "Prices are almost at all-time highs, global output of oil has been stagnant for six years, and look at the cost of the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico," he said. "The cost of producing oil has increased dramatically in the last decade, both financially as well as the cost to the environment." Meanwhile, world demand for crude oil grew at nearly two per cent each year between 1994 and 2006. In 2007, global demand peaked at 85.6 million bpd, but decreased in 2008 and 2009 by a total of 1.8 per cent, reportedly due to rising fuel costs. Despite the lull, world demand for oil is projected by the IEA to increase more than 21 per cent over 2007 levels by 2030, from 86 million bpd to 104 million bpd, due largely to increases in demand from the transportation sector. According to the US Energy Information Administration, current world oil consumption is approximately 88 million bpd, enough to fill roughly 5,500 Olympic-sized swimming pools each day. In 2007 the IEA issued a warning in their World Energy Outlook publication: "Although new oil-production capacity additions from greenfield projects are expected to increase over the next five years, it is very uncertain whether they will be sufficient to compensate for the decline in output at existing fields and keep pace with the projected increase in demand." The report added, "A supply-side crunch in the period to 2015, involving an abrupt escalation in oil prices, cannot be ruled out." As consumption continues to increase in such major users as China, India, and the US, existing oil fields are being depleted and new discoveries are not keeping apace in order to offset growing demand. "One thing to remember is that there is global depletion," Whipple said. "If you don't come up with new sources every year, you can't keep up. Wells are going dry daily. World depletion is three to four million barrels less oil available each year in existing fields." Whipple is blunt about what life will look like in a post-peak oil world. "You're going to see major changes in industrial civilisation," he said, adding that he expects oil to once again approach $150 per barrel in the next 18 months. "In the US, where we aren't used to paying $10 for a gallon of gas like they do in Germany, that [$150 per barrel of oil] will really slow things down." He believes discretionary driving will basically stop, and added: "Anything with a parking lot out front is going to be in trouble."

#### Solar doesn’t trade off

Powell and Danby 10

[ Dr. James Powell and fellow scientist, Dr. Gordon Danby are the holders of the first patent for superconducting Maglev awarded in 1968, as well as many recent patents on their 2nd generation advanced maglev system. Powell and Danby are the recipients of the 2000 Benjamin Franklin Medal in Engineering for their invention of superconducting Maglev. , 2/17/10, <http://www.magneticglide.com/pdf/ImpactWindSolarEnergy.pdf>]

Renewable wind and solar power sources hold promise as a way to reduce dependence on fossil fueled power generation, eliminating the contribution to global warming from their greenhouse gas emissions. However, because virtually all fossil fueled power generation comes from coal and natural gas fuels, electric generation from wind and solar will have very little impact on US consumption of oil, and our need for oil imports. Oil is only a minor contributor to electric energy generation in America. 70% of US oil consumption goes for our autos, trucks and airplanes. Electric energy from wind and solar can only displace oil from the Mideast if there is a massive shift away from oil fueled transport to electrically powered transport. So far, the US is pinning its hopes on electric autos and high speed trains. Both have major limitations. Electric autos have short driving distances. The Chevy Volt driving distance is only 40 miles with a 400 pound battery pack, and it takes 8 hours to charge. For longer distance trips, or if a charging site is not available, the Volt switches to a small internal combustion engine. While some reductions in transport oil consumption will be possible using the Volt, it is doubtful that it will have a major impact.

**Oil prices not key to Russian econ— inflation and prevents oil from driving growth**

Kelly 11 — writer for Reuters (Lidia, May 19, 2011, “Russia's economy struggles for sustainable growth” http://in.reuters.com/article/2011/05/18/idINIndia-57105920110518)

Russia's economy is struggling to attain sustainable growth despite the surge in prices for its oil exports, data showed on Wednesday, pointing to another tough decision on official interest rates later this month. Industry output grew at its slowest rate in 18 months in April, while producer prices rose more than forecast and weekly consumer inflation, stuck at 0.1 percent, underlines the conflicting pressures on the central bank. Pledging to keep full-year inflation below 7.5 percent ahead of presidential elections in March 2012, the central bank is expected to continue tightening monetary policy -- but a sluggish economy will complicate its decision-making on how to control prices and manage rouble appreciation driven by high oil prices. Investors have been scrutinising data for clues on the central bank's move after the regulator unexpectedly raised all key rates last month, including the benchmark refinancing rate. The latest data, including Monday's figures showing gross domestic product growing a weaker than expected 4.1 percent year-on-year despite surging oil prices, suggests that emerging Europe's largest economy is struggling. "We would have expected that given the high oil prices something of this would transfer to the real economy, but the big story is inflation, which is eating into the real income of consumers," said David Oxley, an emerging markets economist at Capital Economics in London.