# 2nc Overview

**Food Collapse is the biggest impact, it has comparatively the fastest timeframe, food yields will top out soon, causing short term crises before demand exceeds supply, warming is centuries away, even if the tipping point is now prefer short timeframe impacts they turn their extinction scenarios. Results in Asian war, that escalates to extinction. Famine independently results in extinction, rice is a staple crop loss of rice means everyone goes hungry, that’s idso**

**Its try or die for the neg, food shortage is inevitable even without warming—only an increase in CO2 boosts rice yield which solves famine and environmental collapse**

**IDSO 2006** (Sherwood, Craig, Keith, all PhDs, “Can the World Produce 40% More Rice by 2030?” CO2 Science Magazine, Volume 9, Number 9, March 1, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V9/N9/EDIT.php)

What will it take to feed five billion rice consumers in 2030? That is the question that plagues the mind of Gurdev S. Khush (2005) of the International Rice Research Institute in Metro Manila, Philippines. "According to various estimates," in his words, "we will have to produce 40% more rice by 2030 to satisfy the growing demand without affecting the resource base adversely," because, as he continues, "if we are not able to produce more rice from the existing land resources, land-hungry farmers will destroy forests and move into more fragile lands such as hillsides and wetlands with disastrous consequences for biodiversity and watersheds," echoing sentiments previously expressed by Wallace (2000), Tilman et al. (2001; 2002), Foley et al. (2005), and Green et al. (2005). Hence, as Khush puts it, the expected increase in the demand for food "will have to be met from less land, with less water, less labor and fewer chemicals." How is it to be done? Khush suggests a number of strategies for attacking the multifaceted problem, including conventional hybridization and selection procedures, ideotype breeding, hybrid breeding, wide hybridization and genetic engineering, all designed to increase the yield potential of rice. In addition, he emphasizes breeding for increased resistance to diseases and insect pests, as well as for enhanced abiotic stress tolerance, which is needed to withstand the negative impacts of drought, excess water, soil mineral deficiencies and toxicities, as well as unfavorable temperatures (both hot and cold). We agree that all of these things are needed; however, as indicated by Tilman et al. (2001), "even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems." This was also the conclusion of Idso and Idso (2000), who acknowledged that "expected advances in agricultural technology and expertise will significantly increase the food production potential of many countries and regions," but who went on to note that these advances "will not increase production fast enough to meet the demands of the even faster-growing human population of the planet." **Fortunately, we have a strong ally** in the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 concentration that may help us meet and surmount this daunting global challenge. Atmospheric CO2 enrichment, for example, has been demonstrated to significantly increase rice photosynthesis and biomass production (see our compilations of over 100 individual experimental results for photosynthesis and biomass responses of rice to CO2-enriched air in the Data section of our website). In addition, elevated CO2 concentrations have been shown to enhance the ability of rice to cope with both biotic and abiotic stresses (see Agriculture (Species - Rice) in our Subject Index). Hence, in addition to our purposeful directed efforts to increase rice yields in the years and decades to come, we will experience the unplanned help provided by the CO2 emissions that result from the burning of fossil fuels. Working together, these two positive forces may help us meet the clear and present need to ramp up rice production to the degree required to adequately feed the world a mere quarter-century from now, and to do so without usurping all of the planet's available land and water resources and thereby consigning the bulk of "wild nature" to the **ash heap of history**. Without the help of both approaches, we will in all likelihood fail and, with the **rest of the biosphere**, suffer **unimaginable negative consequences**.

**Comparatively outweighs warming**

**IDSO 2007** (Unclear which ones, but they’re all esteemed scientists with PhDs and decades of CO2 research experience, “Breeding Food Crops to Take Advantage of Rising Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations,” August 1, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V10/N31/B2.php)

There is growing concern that it will be difficult to feed the expanding human population of the planet just a few decades from now without the taking of great quantities of land (Waggoner, 1995; Tilman et al., 2001, 2002; Huang et al., 2002) and nearly all available freshwater resources (Wallace, 2000) from what might be called "wild nature," which habitat usurpation could lead to the extinction of far greater numbers of plant and animal species (Raven, 2002) than what climate alarmists are predicting will be caused by global warming. Idso and Idso (2000) have described how the aerial fertilization effect of the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration can boost the yields of current crop varieties and help avert this disaster, as we discuss in more detail in our Editorial of 4 Sep 2002. The most recent work of De Costa et al. suggests an additional way of profiting from the expected increase in the air's CO2 content and its ability to stimulate agricultural productivity and water use efficiency. What was done The authors grew 16 genotypes of rice (Oryza sativa L.) under standard lowland paddy culture with adequate water and nutrients at the Rice Research and Development Institute in Sri Lanka from May to August (the yala season) and from November to March (the maha season) within open-top chambers maintained at either the ambient atmospheric CO2 concentration (370 ppm) or at an elevated CO2 concentration (570 ppm). What was learned De Costa et al. report that the CO2-induced enhancement of the light-saturated net photosynthetic rates of the 16 different genotypes during the grain-filling period of growth ranged from +2% to +185% in the yala season and from +22% to +320% in the maha season. Likewise, they found that the CO2-induced enhancement of the grain yields of the 16 different genotypes ranged from +4% to +175% in the yala season and from -5% to +64% in the maha season. What it means The five Sri Lanka researchers say their results "demonstrate the significant genotypic variation that exists within the rice germplasm, in the response to increased atmospheric CO2 of yield and its correlated physiological parameters," and they go on to suggest that "the significant genotypic variation in this response means that genotypes that are highly responsive to elevated CO2 may be selected and incorporated into breeding programs to produce new rice varieties which would be higher yielding in a future high CO2 climate," whereas Idso and Idso (2000) had merely calculated the increase in yield expected to result from projected increases in the air's CO2 content for existing crop varieties. The latter of these critically important benefits will occur automatically; but to achieve the benefits envisioned by De Costa et al. - and to avert the biological catastrophe foreseen by the scientists cited in the background section of this review - will require that the breeding programs De Costa et al. propose be initiated as soon as possible.

**And biodiversity collapse risks extinction**

**Diner** 19**94**

David JD Ohio State, Military Law Review, Winter

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist stress... [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which is cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wing, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

**C02 is the only way to stave it off**

**IDSO AND IDSO 2007** (Sherwood B., Craig D.. Craig received his B.S. in Geography from Arizona State University, his M.S. in Agronomy from the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, and his Ph.D. in Geography from Arizona State University. Investigated urban CO2 levels via a National Science Foundation grant as a faculty researcher in the Office of Climatology at Arizona State University. Sherwood is a Doctor of Geography former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, and The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Carbon Dioxide and Global Change:. 6 June. 24 June 2008 <co2science.org>. )

How much land can ten billion people spare for nature? This provocative question was posed by Waggoner (1995) in an insightful essay wherein he explored the dynamic tension that exists between the need for land to support the agricultural enterprises that sustain mankind, and the need for land to support the natural ecosystems that sustain all other creatures. This challenge of meeting our future food needs - and not decimating the rest of the biosphere in the process - was stressed even more strongly by Huang et al. (2002), who wrote that humans "have encroached on almost all of the world's frontiers, leaving little new land that is cultivatable." And in consequence of humanity's usurpation of this most basic of natural resources, Raven (2002) stated in his Presidential Address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science that "species-area relationships, taken worldwide in relation to habitat destruction, lead to projections of the loss of fully two-thirds of all species on earth by the end of this century." In a more detailed analysis of the nature and implications of this impending "global land-grab" - which moved it closer to the present by a full half-century - Tilman et al. (2001) concluded that the task of meeting the doubled world food demand, which they calculated would exist in the year 2050, would likely exact a toll that "may rival climate change in environmental and societal impacts." But how could something so catastrophic manifest itself so soon? Tilman and his nine collaborators shed some light on this question by noting that at the end of the 20th century [hu]mankind was already appropriating "more than a third of the production of terrestrial ecosystems and about half of usable freshwaters." Now, think of doubling those figures, in order to meet the doubled global food demand that Tilman et al. predict for the year 2050. The results suggest that a mere 43 years from now [hu]mankind will be appropriating more than two thirds of terrestrial ecosystem production plus all of earth's remaining usable freshwater, as has also been discussed by Wallace (2000). In terms of land devoted to agriculture, Tilman et al. calculate a much less ominous 18% increase by the year 2050. However, because most developed countries are projected to withdraw large areas of land from farming over the next fifty years, the loss of natural ecosystems to crops and pastures in developing countries will amount to about half of their remaining suitable land, which would, in the words of the Tilman team, "represent the worldwide loss of natural ecosystems larger than the United States." What is more, they say that these land usurpations "could lead to the loss of about a third of remaining tropical and temperate forests, savannas, and grasslands." And in a worrisome reflection upon the consequences of these land-use changes, they remind us that "species extinction is an irreversible impact of habitat destruction." What can be done to avoid this horrific situation? In a subsequent analysis, Tilman et al. (2002) introduced a few more facts before suggesting some solutions. First of all, they noted that by 2050 the human population of the globe is projected to be 50% larger than it was just prior to the writing of their paper, and that global grain demand by 2050 could well double, due to expected increases in per capita real income and dietary shifts toward a higher proportion of meat. Hence, they but stated the obvious when they concluded that "raising yields on existing farmland is essential for 'saving land for nature'." So how can this readily-defined but Herculean task be accomplished? Tilman et al. proposed a strategy that focuses on three essential efforts: (1) increasing crop yield per unit of land area, (2) increasing crop yield per unit of nutrients applied, and (3) increasing crop yield per unit of water used. With respect to the first of these efforts - increasing crop yield per unit of land area - the researchers note that in many parts of the world the historical rate-of-increase in crop yield is declining, as the genetic ceiling for maximal yield potential is being approached. This observation, in their estimation, "highlights the need for efforts to steadily increase the yield potential ceiling." With respect to the second effort - increasing crop yield per unit of nutrients applied - they note that "without the use of synthetic fertilizers, world food production could not have increased at the rate [that it did in the past] and more natural ecosystems would have been converted to agriculture." Hence, they say that the ultimate solution "will require significant increases in nutrient use efficiency, that is, in cereal production per unit of added nitrogen." Finally, with respect to the third effort - increasing crop yield per unit of water used - Tilman et al. note that "water is regionally scarce," and that "many countries in a band from China through India and Pakistan, and the Middle East to North Africa either currently or will soon fail to have adequate water to maintain per capita food production from irrigated land." Increasing crop water use efficiency, therefore, is also a must. Although the impending man vs. nature crisis and several important elements of its potential solution are thus well defined, Tilman and his first set of collaborators concluded that "even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems." This was also the finding of Idso and Idso (2000), who concluded that although "expected advances in agricultural technology and expertise will significantly increase the food production potential of many countries and regions," these advances "will not increase production fast enough to meet the demands of the even faster-growing human population of the planet."

**CO2 fertilization solves their impact.**

**Idso Cubed** October 20**10**

Sherwood, Keith and Craig Idso, They've Left Life Out of the Equations …, Volume 13, Number 42: 20, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N42/EDIT.php

All else being equal, we would tend to agree with Lacis et al. on this point. However, as we all know, "all else being equal" is hardly ever the case in the real world; and in the case in point, CO2 affects earth's climate in several more ways than through its thermal radiative properties. **CO2 is**, after all, **the elixir of life**, promoting plant growth, both on land and throughout the surface waters of the world's oceans. And this vast assemblage of plant life has the ability to impact earth's climate in a number of different ways, all of which tend **to counteract** the heating or cooling effects of carbon dioxide's thermal radiative forcing as its concentration either rises or falls, thereby helping to maintain earth's temperature within a range that is conducive to the continued existence, and even flourishing, of the planet's myriad life forms. Time and space do not allow us to go into great detail about these several phenomena in this editorial; but in our website's Subject Index, under the general heading of Feedback Factors (Biophysical), we report the results of numerous observational studies that describe how earth's plants -- ranging all the way from unicellular algae in the sea, to grasses, shrubs and majestic trees on land -- emit copious quantities of gases that are converted to particles in the atmosphere, forming aerosols that reflect significant amounts of incoming solar radiation back to space, thereby cooling the planet, or that serve as condensation nuclei for cloud droplets that create more numerous, more extensive, longer-lasting and brighter clouds that also cool the globe. Therefore, depending on whether the air's CO2 content is increasing or decreasing, these phenomena result in changes in global radiative forcing similar in magnitude but opposite in sign to the direct thermal forcing induced by the increases or decreases in the air's CO2 concentration, which suggests that CO2 might well be considered the "principal control knob governing earth's temperature." However, CO2 controls the planet's temperature in such a way as to prevent the occurrence of both unduly hot and cold temperature extremes. Thus, the end result of these several simultaneous and interacting phenomena is that the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content is of great benefit to the biosphere, helping to increase both the amount and quality of life on earth, while not materially altering the globe's temperature, by stimulating biological phenomena that ultimately tend to negate the greenhouse gas's own global warming potential.

# 2NC CO2 GOOD (RICE SPECIFIC)

**Extend our 1NC Idso evidence—experimental evidence shows that CO2 increases rice yields enough to solve impending famine in Asia. All of our evidence is specific to rice yield, not crops in general—aff evidence doesn’t apply and it’s impossible to win offense because famine is coming now even if there’s no warming.**

**And, CO2 improves rice growth and solves droughts and parasites**

**NIPCC 2009** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf)

In summary, as the CO2 concentration of the air continues to rise, rice plants will likely experience greater photosynthetic rates, produce more biomass, be less affected by root parasites, and better deal with environmental stresses, all of which effects should lead to greater grain yields.

**And, it improves both photosynthesis and dark respiration**

**NIPCC 2009** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf)

DeCosta et al. (2003a) grew two crops of rice (Oryza sativa L.) at the Rice Research and Development Institute of Sri Lanka from January to March (the maha season) and from May to August (the yala season) in open-top chambers in air of either ambient or ambient plus 200 pppm CO2, determining that leaf net photosynthetic rates were significantly higher in the CO2-enriched chambers than in the ambient-air chambers: 51-75 percent greater in the maha season and 22-33 percent greater in the yala season. Likewise, in the study of Gesch et al. (2002), where one-month-old plants were maintained at either 350 ppm CO2 or switched to a concentration of 700 ppm for 10 additional days, the plants switched to CO2enriched air immediately displayed large increases in their photosynthetic rates that at the end of the experiment were still 31 percent greater than those exhibited by unswitched control plants. With respect to the opposite of photosynthesis, Baker et al. (2000) reported that rates of carbon loss via dark respiration in rice plants decreased with increasing nocturnal CO2 concentrations. As a result, it is not surprising that in the study of Weerakoon et al. (2000), rice plants exposed to an extra 300 ppm of atmospheric CO2 exhibited a 35 percent increase in mean season-long radiation-use efficiency, defined as the amount of biomass produced per unit of solar radiation intercepted. In light of these several observations, therefore, one would logically expect rice plants to routinely produce more biomass at elevated levels of atmospheric CO2.

And, higher CO2 levels solve lodging—this increases yield

IDSO 2007 (Some combination of them, excellent scientists all, “Effect of Elevated CO2 on Lodging in Rice,” Feb 14, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V10/N7/B2.php)

The authors note that lodging - the beating down of a crop - "can occur under heavy rains and strong winds," and that this phenomenon "decreases canopy photosynthesis due to self-shading (Setter et al., 1997) and disturbs the translocation of carbon and nutrients to the rice grains (Hitaka and Kobayashi, 1961), resulting in lower yield and poor grain quality." In fact, they report that Setter et al. (1997) showed that a moderate degree of lodging, which reduced canopy height by 35%, decreased yield by about 20%, and that severe lodging, which reduced canopy height by 75%, decreased yield by up to 50%." What was done In a Free-Air CO2-Enrichment (FACE) study designed to discover the effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment on lodging in rice (Oryza sativa L.) plants, Shimono et al. grew the cultivar Akitakomachi in paddy fields at Shizukuishi, Iwate, Japan, under three nitrogen (N) fertilization regimes - low N (6 g N m-2), medium N (9 g N m-2) and high N (15 g N m-2) - at two different season-long 24-hour mean CO2 concentrations - 375 ppm (ambient) and 562 ppm (enriched) - while the degree of naturally-occurring lodging was measured at the time of grain maturity on a scale of 0-5 based on the bending angles of the stems at 18° intervals, where 0 = 0° from the vertical, 1 = 1°-18°, 2 = 19°-36°, 3 = 37°-54°, 4 = 55°-72° and 5 = 73°-90°. What was learned As expected, and as often has been observed before, the six scientists found that lodging was significantly higher under high N than under medium and low N. However, they found that the lodging experienced in the high N treatment "was alleviated by elevated CO2," because the lowest internodes of the rice stems "became significantly shorter and thicker under elevated CO2," which presumably "strengthened the rice culms against the increased lodging that occurred under high N." In addition, they found that the reduced lodging experienced under elevated CO2 in the high N treatment increased the grain ripening percentage of the rice by 4.5% per one-unit decrease in lodging score. What it means Some people have worried, in the words of Shimono et al., that "to increase rice yield under projected future CO2 levels, N fertilization must be increased to meet increased plant demand for this nutrient as a result of increased growth rates," but that greater N fertilization might enhance lodging, thereby defeating the purpose of the fertilization. However, they learned from their study that "elevated CO2 could significantly decrease lodging under high N fertilization, thereby increasing the ripening percentage and grain yield," in what amounts to another CO2-induced success story for what the researchers call "the most important crop for feeding the world's population."

# A2: PESTS

**CO2 solves pests in rice**

**IDSO 2011** (Some combination of Idsos, “The Deleterious Effects of a Major Root Parasite of Rice Are Greatly Reduced by Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment,” http://www.co2science.org/articles/V4/N18/B2.php)

According to the authors, the root hemiparasitic angiosperm Striga hermonthica (Del) Benth "infects mainly tropical grasses with the C4 photosynthetic pathway, including a number of important crop species such as maize, sorghum, sugar cane and millets." However, it also infects rice, a C3 crop, particularly throughout much of Africa, where it is currently one of the region's most economically important parasitic weeds. What was done Upland rice (Oryza sativa L. cv. 'Namroo' from Keyna) was grown in pots in controlled environment chambers maintained at 350 and 700 ppm CO2 in either the presence or absence of the root parasite for a period of eighty days after sowing, during which a number of biochemical and physiological measurements were made on the plants, and after which the various parts of the plants were harvested and weighed. What was learned The doubling of the air's CO2 concentration in this experiment reduced the negative impact of the root parasite on photosynthesis and growth of rice. In ambient air, the presence of the parasite reduced the biomass of rice to only 35% of what it was in the absence of the parasite; whereas in air enriched with CO2, the biomass of infected plants was reduced to but 73% of what it was in the absence of the parasite. What it means In the words of the authors, "these results demonstrate that elevated CO2 concentrations can alleviate the impact of infection with Striga on the growth of C3 hosts such as rice and also that infection can delay the onset of photosynthetic down-regulation in rice grown at elevated CO2." Hence, as the air's CO2 concentration continues to rise, we can expect to see African agriculturalists reap ever greater harvests of rice, as the deleterious effects of this important crop parasite grow ever smaller, compliments of humanity's ever increasing CO2 emissions.

**CO2 solves rice pests**

**NIPCC 2009** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf)

In a somewhat different type of study, Watling and Press (2000) found that rice plants growing in ambient air and infected with a root hemiparasitic angiosperm obtained final biomass values that were only 35 percent of those obtained by uninfected plants. In air of 700 ppm CO2, however, the infected plants obtained biomass values that were 73 percent of those obtained by uninfected plants. Thus, atmospheric CO2 enrichment significantly reduced the negative impact of this parasite on biomass production in rice.

**CO2 solves pests—makes Bt crops more effective**

**NIPCC 2009** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf)

Toxins produced by Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) supplied to crops via foliar application have been used as a means of combating crop pests for well over half a century. More recently, the Bt gene for producing the toxin has been artificially inserted in some species of plants, producing transgenic plants that are pest resistant. The effectiveness of this management technique depends primarily upon the amount of Bt-produced toxins that are ingested by targeted insects. Another kind of transgenic plant is wheat that has been made heat resistant by the introduction into its gene code of heat shock protein (HSP) or plastidial EF-Tu (protein synthesis elongation factor). How does atmospheric CO2 enrichment affect transgenic plants? If soil nitrogen levels are low, foliar nitrogen concentrations in plants grown in enhanced CO2 environments are generally reduced from what they are at the current atmospheric CO2 concentration, which suggests that insects would have to eat more foliage to get their normal requirement of nitrogen for proper growth and development in CO2-enriched air. But by eating more foliage, the insects would also ingest more Bt-produced toxins, and they would be more severely impacted by those substances.

### Sp

**Cant change it**

**Gray 11** – Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England. (Colin S., April, “HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY.” Published by Strategic Studies Institute)

Moreover, no contemporary U.S. government owns all of America’s soft power—a considerable understatement. Nor do contemporary Americans and their institutions own all of their country’s soft power. America today is the product of America’s many yesterdays, and the worldwide target audiences for American soft power respond to the whole of the America that they have perceived, including facts, legends, and myths.41 Obviously, what they understand about America may well be substantially untrue, certainly it will be incomplete. At a minimum, foreigners must react to an American soft power that is filtered by their local cultural interpretation. America is a futureoriented country, ever remaking itself and believing that, with the grace of God, history moves forward progressively toward an ever-better tomorrow. This optimistic American futurism both contrasts with foreigners’ cultural pessimism—their golden ages may lie in the past, not the future—which prevails in much of the world and is liable to mislead Americans as to the reception our soft power story will have.42 **Many people indeed, probably most people, in the world beyond the United States have a fairly settled view of America, American purposes, and Americans**. This locally held view derives from their whole experience of exposure to things American as well as from the features of their own “cultural thoughtways” and history that shape their interpretation of American-authored words and deeds, past and present.43

**Soft power doesn’t solve wars – increases resentment**

**Gray 11** – Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England. (Colin S., April, “HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY.” Published by Strategic Studies Institute)

An inherent and unavoidable problem with a country’s soft power is that it is near certain to be misassessed by the politicians who attempt to govern soft power’s societal owners and carriers. Few thoroughly encultured Americans are likely to undervalue “the American way” in many of its aspects as a potent source of friendly self-co-option abroad. Often, this self-flattering appreciation will be well justified in reality. But as an already existing instrument of American policy, the soft power of ideas and practical example is fraught with the perils of self-delusion. If one adheres to an ideology that is a heady mixture of Christian ethics (“one nation, under God . . .”), democratic principles, and free market orthodoxy, and if one is an American, which is to say if one is a citizen of a somewhat hegemonic world power that undeniably has enjoyed a notably successful historical passage to date, then it is natural to confuse the national ideology with a universal creed. Such confusion is only partial, but nonetheless it is sufficiently damaging as to be a danger to national strategy. Since it is fallacious to assume that American values truly are universal, the **domain of high relevance** and scope for American soft power to be influential **is** distinctly **limited**. If one places major policy weight on the putative value for policy of American soft power, one needs to be acutely alert to the dangers of an under-recognized ethnocentrism born of cultural ignorance. This ignorance breeds an arrogant disdain for evidence of foreigners’ lack of interest in being coopted to join American civilization. The result of such arrogance predictably is political and even military strategic counterreaction. It is a case of good intentions gone bad when they are pursued with indifference toward the local cultural context. Some people have difficulty grasping the unpalatable fact that much of the world is not receptive to any American soft power that attempts to woo it to the side of American interests. Not all rivalries are resolvable by ideas, formulas, or “deals” that seem fair and equitable to us. There are conflicts wherein the struggle is the message, to misquote Marshal MacLuhan, with value in the eyes of local belligerents. Not all local conflicts around the world are amenable to the calming effect of American soft power. True militarists of left and right, secular and religious, find intrinsic value in struggle and warfare, as A. J. Coates has explained all too clearly. The self-fulfilment and self-satisfaction that war generates derive in part from the religious or ideological significance attributed to it and from the resultant sense of participating in some grand design. It may be, however, that the experience of war comes to be prized for its own sake and not just for the great ends that it serves or promotes. For many, the excitement unique to war makes pacific pursuits seem insipid by comparison. This understanding and experience of moral, psychological, and emotional self-fulfillment increase our tolerance for war and threaten its moral regulation. It transforms war from an instrumental into an expressive activity.49 It is foolish to believe that every conflict contains the seeds of its own resolution, merely awaiting suitable watering through co-option by soft power. To be fair, similarly unreasonable faith in the disciplinary value of (American) military force is also to be deplored.

### Econ

**Makes a double dip recession inevitable**

**Ferguson 11-13** (Niall Ferguson is a professor of history at Harvard University and a professor of business administration at Harvard Business School. He is also a senior research fellow at Jesus College, Oxford University, and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. His Latest book, Civilization: The West and the Rest, will be published in November. The Daily Beast, “ Europe's Financial Crisis is Headed to America - The Daily Beast”, Nov 13 2011, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/11/12/europe-s-financial-crisis-is-headed-to-america.html>)

As an author who has just published a book on the crisis of Western civilization, I couldn’t really have asked for more: simultaneous crises in Athens and Rome, the cradles of the West’s law, languages, politics, and philosophy. Yet most Americans are baffled by the ongoing economic pandemonium in the European Union. For them, places like Greece and Italy are primarily tourist destinations they’ll visit at most once. The finer points of Mediterranean politics leave them cold, except insofar as they’re funny. After all, who could resist the opera-buffa character of Silvio “Bunga-Bunga” Berlusconi? But only a few weirdos really feel their pulses quicken when they hear news like: the new Greek prime minister is a former central banker called Papademos! Ever tried to explain to a New Yorker the finer points of Slovakian coalition politics? I have. He almost needed an adrenaline shot to come out of the coma. So why should Americans care about any of this? The first reason is that, with American consumers still in the doldrums of deleveraging, the United States badly needs buoyant exports if its economy is to grow at anything other than a miserably low rate. And despite all the hype about trade with the Chinese, U.S. exports to the European Union are nearly three times larger than to China. Until March, it seemed as if exports to Europe were on an upward trajectory. But the eurozone crisis has stopped that. Governments that ran up excessive debts have seen their borrowing costs explode. Unable to devalue their currencies, they’ve been forced to adopt austerity measures—cutting spending or hiking taxes—in a vain effort to reduce their deficits. The result has been Depression economics: shrinking economies and unemployment rates approaching 20 percent. As a result, according to the new president of the European Central Bank, Mario Draghi**, a “double dip” recession** in Europe **is** now all but **inevitable**. And that’s lousy news for U.S. exporters targeting the EU market. But there’s more. Europe’s problem is not just that governments are overborrowed. There are an unknown number of European banks that are effectively insolvent if their holdings of government bonds are “marked to market”—in other words, valued at their current rock-bottom market prices. In our interconnected financial world, it would be very odd indeed if no U.S. institutions were affected by this. Just as European institutions once loaded up on assets backed with subprime U.S. mortgages, so most big U.S. banks have at least some exposure to eurozone bonds or banks. One institution—MF Global, run by former Goldman Sachs CEO Jon Corzine—just blew up because of its highly levered euro bets. Others are biting their fingernails because it is suddenly far from clear that the credit default swaps they have bought as insurance against, say, a Greek default are worth the paper they are written on. But the third reason Americans should care about Europe is more important even than the risk of a renewed financial crisis. It is the danger that what is happening in Europe today could ultimately happen here. Just a few months ago, almost nobody was worried about Italy’s vast debt, which amounts to 121 percent of GDP. Then suddenly panic set in, and Italy’s borrowing costs exploded from 3.5 percent to 7.5 percent. Today the U.S. gross federal debt stands at around 100 percent of GDP. Four years ago it was 62 percent. By 2016 the International Monetary Fund forecasts it will be 115 percent. Economists who should know better insist that this is not a problem because, unlike Italy, the United States can print its own money at will. All that means is that the U.S. reserves the right to inflate or depreciate away its debt. If I were a foreign investor—and half the debt in public hands is held by foreigners—I would not find that terribly reassuring. At some point I might demand some compensation for that risk in the form of ... higher rates. Athens, Rome, Washington ... The shortest route from imperial capital to tourist destination is precisely this death spiral of debt.

**That decks the economy – empirically proven**

**Shiller 11** (Robert J. Shiller is a professor of economics and finance at Yale and a co-founder and the chief economist of MacroMarkets LLC., NYT, 5/16/11, [http://www.nytimes.com/\*\*2010\*\*/05/16/business/16view.html](http://www.nytimes.com/**2010**/05/16/business/16view.html))

Under that definition, there has been only one serious double-dip recession in the last century — and it was serious indeed. It started with the 1929-33 recession, which was followed by a recession in 1937-38. Between those declines, the unemployment rate never moved below 12.2 percent. Those two recessions, four years apart, are now typically lumped together as one event, the Great Depression. Many negative factors persisted between those dips. High among them was a widespread sense then that something was amiss with the economy. There was a feeling of uncertainty that discouraged entrepreneurship, lending and spending, and most important, hiring.

# Exts – No War

**Economic collapse leads to war**

**a.) History**

**Ferguson 06—**prof of history, Harvard and Senior Fellow at Stanford’s Hoover Institution (Niall, “The Next War of the World,” September/October 2006, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

b.) Studies

Miller 2k – economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank (Morris, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?”)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. **After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries** in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the **conventional wisdom** about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

No risk of an impact – stability and cooperation will only increase

Barnett 09, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC and a contributing editor/online columnist for Esquire magazine, columnist for World Politics Review, (Thomas P.M. “The New Rules: The Good News on the Global Financial Downturn,” World Politics Review, 5/25/09 <http://dan92024.blogstream.com/v1/date/200905.html>)

When the global financial contagion kicked in last fall, the blogosphere was quick to predict that a sharp uptick in global instability would soon follow. While we're not out of the woods yet, it's interesting to note just how little instability -- and not yet a single war -- has actually resulted from the worst global economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Run a Google search for "global instability" and you'll get 23 million hits. But when it comes to actual conflicts, the world is humming along at a level that reflects the steady decline in wars -- by 60 percent -- that we've seen since the Cold War's end. As George Mason University's Center for Systemic Peace (CSP) notes, that trend applies within the Muslim world, too, so even America's "war on terror" has not quite lived up to the pessimists' expectations.

Wikipedia's page for "ongoing conflicts" cites a whopping seven wars with annual death rates of 1,000-plus. And they're all familiar situations:

Arabs-Israel, Somalia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Sudan and Mexico. None have been helped by the financial crisis, but all predate it. Iraq's internal situation has actually improved, despite slumping oil revenue. And as for fears that Mexico might soon become a "failed state," that government's recent response to the swine flu indicates otherwise.

The CSP's database lists only three new conflicts since 2008 -- Russia-Georgia, Kenya and southern Sudan. None can be blamed on the global economy. Meanwhile, Colombia's internal security has improved dramatically, and Sri Lanka's stubborn separatist movement just collapsed.

Yes, we suffer from Somali piracy, and American and Chinese subs continue their cat-and-mouse games off China's otherwise quiet coast. Still, many expected more from a financial panic that, according to the IMF, erased roughly 6 percent of global GDP: Beijing and Washington locking horns, for instance, instead of letting Taiwan negotiate peace with the mainland.

But disappointment abounds for the doom-and-gloomers:

- Instead of coming apart at the seams, China implemented a stimulus package that seems to be working at home and abroad (see America's construction industry exports). Beijing's flagship companies have exploited the crisis for the extraordinary buying opportunities it has created, locking in long-term commodity and energy contracts in exchange for much-needed cash. Meanwhile its central bank has swapped $100 billion worth of currency with major trade partners.

- Asia's big powers should be at each other's throats over sea-based energy deposits, or at least over North Korea. And yet recently we've witnessed the first China-Japan-South Korea summit, followed soon after by the creation of a $120-billion liquidity fund to help out their smaller neighbors.

- India's Congress Party just won a decisive victory in national elections, allowing it to rule without relying on anti-globalizing elements like its native Communist party. Expect another young Gandhi to champion India's next round of reforms.

- The EU definitely regrets its fast integration of all those now-shaky Eastern European economies. And yet, as Washington Post economic columnist Steve Pearlstein recently noted, ". . . the real story in Europe may be how firmly market liberalization seems to have taken hold. Not only have there been few, if any, calls for renationalizations, but some countries are still moving toward privatization and reregulation. Instances of protectionism are outweighed by the examples of cross-border mergers and acquisitions that have been accepted as a matter of course . . ."

- In the Middle East, the Arab world's biggest state, Egypt, remains committed to opening up its state-heavy economy even more, while Arab sovereign wealth funds continue their aggressive investment in Africa, where China and India's portfolios also grow.- In Latin America, market-friendly forces (e.g., Brazil's Lula) are gaining steam, while market-hostile ones (e.g., Venezuela's Chávez) lose traction.

- Even "axis of diesel" Russia has quieted down considerably over the past nine months, with Vladimir Putin's hand-picked successor, Dmitry Medvedev, slowly emerging as a force of level-headed moderation.

Add it all up and it's clear that assessments such as "the world is in chaos" -- a David Rothkopf beauty -- just don't fly. Periodic riots do not an Armageddon make.

Instead, this crisis has elicited unprecedented cooperation among the world's great powers on both coordinated stimulus spending and making intermarket financial flows more transparent (keep an eye on the IMF). It's also triggered awareness of the need for an additional global reserve currency to help the euro balance the dollar (a convertible renminbi would help).