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### 2AC warming – PRISM

#### CO2 fertilization is temporary and offset by negative climate effects.

J.L. Hatfield et. al, 2011, Laboratory Director, National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment, K.J. Boote, Agronomy Department, University of Florida, B.A. Kimball, USDA-ARS, U.S. Arid-Land Agricultural Research Center, L.H. Ziska, USDA Crop Systems and Global Change Laboratory, R.C. Izaurralde, Joint Global Change Research Institute, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, University of Maryland, D.R. Ort, USDA/ARS, Photosynthesis Research Unit, University of Illinois, A. M. Thomson, Joint Global Change Research Institute, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, University of Maryland, and David W. Wolfe, Department of Horticulture, Cornell University, “Climate Impacts on Agriculture: Implications for Crop Production,” Agronomy Journal, Vol. 103, Issue 2

Climate change, either as increasing trends in temperature, CO2, precipitation (decreasing as well as increasing), and/or O3, will have impacts on agricultural systems. Production of annual and perennial crops will be affected by changes in the absolute values of these climatic variables and/or increased variation. Episodic temperature changes exceeding the thresholds during the pollination stage of development could be quite damaging to crop production because of the sensitivity of crop plants to temperature extremes during this growth stage. These changes coupled with variable precipitation that places the plant under conditions of water stress would exacerbate the temperature effects. Warmer temperatures during the night, especially during the reproductive period, will reduce fruit or grain size because the rapid rate of development and increased respiration rates. A recent analysis by Ko et al. (2010), using the CERES–Wheat 4.0 module in the RZWQM2 model, evaluated the interactions of increasing CO2 obtained from a FACE experiment along with temperature, water, and N. They found the effects of water and N were greater than CO2 effects on biomass and yield and that temperature effects offset the CO2 effects. These results further confirm the concept that there are counterbalancing effects from different cli- mate variables and that development of adaptation or mitigation strategies will have to account for the combined effects of climate variables on crop growth, development, and yield. In an effort to examine potential solutions to low yields in sub-Saharan Africa, Laux et al. (2010) evaluated planting dates under climate change scenarios to evaluate the effect of increasing CO2 and higher temperature on groundnut (peanut) and maize. They found the positive effect of CO2 would offset the temperature response in the next 10 to 20 yr but would be overcome by higher temperatures by 2080. Changing planting dates were beneficial for the driest locations because of the more effective use of precipitation and avoidance of high temperature stresses. Both of these types of analyses will have to be conducted to evaluate potential adapta- tion strategies for all cropping regions. Increases in CO2 concentrations offer positive impacts to plant growth and increased WUE. However, these positive impacts may not fully mitigate crop losses associated with heat stress, increases in evaporative demand, and/or decreases in water availability in some regions. The episodic variation in extremes may become the larger impact on plant growth and yield. To counteract these effects will require management systems that offer the largest degree of resilience to climatic stresses as possible. This will include the development of man- agement systems for rainfed environments that can store the maximum amount of water in the soil profile and reduce water stress on the plant during critical growth periods.

# OFF CASE

### 2AC geo-engineering CP

#### Use precaution when endorsing geo-engineering no feasible way to shut down or curb effects if it goes wrong.

Alan Robock, May/June 2008, Department of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, receiving an S.M. and Ph.D. faculty of the Department of Meteorology of the University of Maryland, a Professor and the State Climatologist, Distinguished Professor in the Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers University, Associate Director of the Center for Environmental Prediction, Director of the Meteorology Undergraduate Program, and a member of the Graduate Program in Atmospheric Science, Fellow of the American Meteorological Society, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Editor of Reviews of Geophysics,ember of the International Association of Volcanism and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior (IAVCEI), Past-President of the Atmospheric Sciences Section of AGU and Retiring Chair of the Atmospheric and Hydrospheric Sciences Section, awarded a AAAS Congressional Science Fellowship, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “20 reasons why geoengineering may be a bad idea,” p. 17, Ebsco Host

There’s no going back. We don’t know how quickly scientists and engi-neers could shut down a geoengineer-ing system—or stem its effects—in the event of excessive climate cooling from large volcanic eruptions or other causes. Once we put aerosols into the atmosphere, we cannot remove them. 12. Human error. Complex mechan-ical systems never work perfectly. Hu-mans can make mistakes in the de-sign, manufacturing, and operation of such systems. (Think of Chernobyl, the Exxon Valdez, airplane crashes, and friendly fire on the battlefield.) Should we stake the future of Earth on a much more complicated arrangement than these, built by the lowest bidder? 13. Undermining emissions miti-gation. If humans perceive an easy tech-nological fix to global warming that al-lows for “business as usual,” gathering the national (particularly in the United States and China) and international will to change consumption patterns and en-ergy infrastructure will be even more dif-ficult. 18 This is the oldest and most persis-tent argument against geoengineering. 14. Cost. Advocates casually claim that it would not be too expensive to implement geoengineering solutions, but there have been no definitive cost stud-ies, and estimates of large-scale govern-ment projects are almost always too low. (Boston’s “Big Dig” to reroute an inter-state highway under the coastal city, one of humankind’s greatest engineering feats, is only one example that was years overdue and billions over budget.) Angel estimates that his scheme to launch re-flective disks into orbit would cost “a few trillion dollars.” British economist Nich-olas Stern’s calculation of the cost of cli-mate change as a percentage of global GDP (roughly $9 trillion) is in the same ballpark; Angel’s estimate is also orders of magnitude greater than current glob-al investment in renewable energy tech-nology.

#### Geo-engineering doesn’t solve the aff – violation of international treaties, moral obligation.

Alan Robock, May/June 2008, Department of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, receiving an S.M. and Ph.D. faculty of the Department of Meteorology of the University of Maryland, a Professor and the State Climatologist, Distinguished Professor in the Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers University, Associate Director of the Center for Environmental Prediction, Director of the Meteorology Undergraduate Program, and a member of the Graduate Program in Atmospheric Science, Fellow of the American Meteorological Society, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Editor of Reviews of Geophysics,ember of the International Association of Volcanism and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior (IAVCEI), Past-President of the Atmospheric Sciences Section of AGU and Retiring Chair of the Atmospheric and Hydrospheric Sciences Section, awarded a AAAS Congressional Science Fellowship, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “20 reasons why geoengineering may be a bad idea,” p. 17, Ebsco Host

Conflicts with current treaties. The terms of ENMOD explicitly prohib-it “military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or se-vere effects as the means of destruction, damage, or injury to any other State Party.” Any geoengineering scheme that adversely affects regional climate, for ex-ample, producing warming or drought, would therefore violate ENMOD. 18. Control of the thermostat. Even if scientists could predict the behavior and environmental effects of a given geoengineering project, and political leaders could muster the public support and funding to implement it, how would the world agree on the optimal cli-mate? What if Russia wants it a couple of degrees warmer, and India a couple of degrees cooler? Should global climate be reset to preindustrial temperature or kept constant at today’s reading? Would it be possible to tailor the climate of each region of the planet independent-ly without affecting the others? If we proceed with geoengineering, will we provoke future climate wars? 19. Questions of moral authority. Ongoing global warming is the result of inadvertent climate modification. Hu-mans emit carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases to heat and cool their homes; to grow, transport, and cook their food; to run their factories; and to travel—not intentionally, but as a by-product of fossil fuel combustion. But now that humans are aware of their ef-fect on climate, do they have a moral right to continue emitting greenhouse gases? Similarly, since scientists know that stratospheric aerosol injection, for example, might impact the ecosphere, do humans have a right to plow ahead regardless? There’s no global agency to require an environmental impact state-ment for geoengineering. So, how should humans judge how much climate control they may try? 20. Unexpected consequences. Sci-entists cannot possibly account for all of the complex climate interactions or pre-dict all of the impacts of geoengineer-ing. Climate models are improving, but scientists are discovering that climate is changing more rapidly than they predict-ed, for example, the surprising and un-precedented extent to which Arctic sea ice melted during the summer of 2007. Scientists may never have enough confi-dence that their theories will predict how well geoengineering systems can work. With so much at stake, there is reason to worry about what we don’t know.

#### Fast reactors are key to establishing clean power leadership – has a thirty trillion dollar return.

Steve Kirsch, 11-25-2009, M.S. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), writer for the Huffington Post, CEO Kirsch foundation on climate, founder/head of Center for Energy and Climate Change, National Award from the Caring Institute in Washington DC, written much about the Integral Fast Reactor, Fellow, with the Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Steve Kirsch’s blog, “Why We Should Build an Integral Fast Reactor Now,” <http://skirsch.wordpress.com/2009/11/25/ifr/>

\*\*\*cites Charles Till, former Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, The National Academy Studies, James Hansen, Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, Ray Hunter, former Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology in the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Leonard Koch, winner of the Global Energy International Prize, Barry Brook Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change\*\*\*

Creates an opportunity to become the world leader in clean energy. Obama said at MIT that he wants the US to be a world leader in clean power. Nuclear is the largest clean energy source and the IFR was determined to be the best nuclear power technology in the most extensive comparative nuclear study ever done. That means the IFR is, in the objective opinion of international energy experts, our single best clean power source. But we aren’t exploiting it. We are investing nothing in it today. One of the IFR scientists, an Argonne Distinguished Fellow, went to DOE recently and to ask for funds to at least start the IFR planning. He got nothing. Not even a dime. How do we expect to be a leader in clean energy by leaving our best technology sitting on the shelf? Nobody has been able to answer that. Creates enormous economic value. Because they use our existing nuclear waste as fuel, fast reactors turn our existing nuclear waste stockpile into an asset worth over $30 trillion dollars.

### 2AC natural gas DA

#### Russian economy growing and resilient – assumes current global crisis.

Reuters, 10-25-2011, “Update 1-Russian economic growth gains speed in Q3,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/25/russia-economy-idUSL5E7LP46T20111025>

Russia's gross domestic product (GDP) grew 5.1 percent in the third-quarter, the economy ministry said on Tuesday, with the figure meeting analyst expectations and suggesting economic expansion has gained speed in recent months. In September, GDP grew 5.7 percent year-on-year, Deputy Economy Minister Andrei Klepach said, which follows a 5.2 percent rise in August. "The third quarter was fairly positive for the economy ... we can talk about growth gaining in pace," Klepach told reporters. Reuters most recent poll showed that economists expect third-quarter economic expansion to reach 5.1 percent in annual terms. The data suggests that the country is on track to achieve official forecasts of 4.1 percent GDP growth this year. Klepach said that the ministry expects GDP growth to slow down in the fourth quarter to 3.8-3.9 percent. The GDP data follows largely positive news from last week that showed Russia's economy remains seemingly resilient despite global economic turmoil and disappointing industrial output in September.

#### No impact to Russian economic decline.

Robert Blackwill, 2009, former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2009/RAND_OP275.pdf>

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

#### Natural gas will inevitably collapse – price shocks and link to peak oil – no bridge.

Charles E. Till & Yoon Il Chang, 2011, longtime Associate Laboratory Director for Engineering Research at Argonne National Laboratory, directed civilian nuclear power reactor development at Argonne National Laboratory, PhD Engineering, Specialty Reactor Physics, Imperial College, University of London, National Research Council of Canada, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority , Fellow of the American Nuclear Society, awarded the Walker Cisler Medal, National Academy of Engineering, was at Argonne National Laboratory, General Manager of the Integral Fast Reactor Program, Associate Laboratory Director for Engineering Research, Interim Laboratory Director, Argonne Distinguished Fellow, Currently he also serves as the Chair of IAEA’s Technical Working Group on Nuclear Fuel Cycle Options and Spent Fuel Management, was awarded the U.S. Department of Energy’s prestigious E.O. Lawrence Award, a Fellow and a recipient of the Walker Cisler Medal of American Nuclear Society, M.E. in Nuclear Engineering from Texas A&M University, and his Ph.D. in Nuclear Science from The University of Michigan, Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Plentiful Energy: The Story of the Integral Fast Reactor, p. 89, Amazon.com

Natural gas is linked to oil. It has been suggested that a “natural gas bridge” is possible when oil production falls, “bridging” the gap between oil scarcity and some new non-fossil source of energy, typically wind or sun. Peak gas, however, is linked to peak oil in a fundamental way. World gas supplies, even today, are not assured, and will decline, loosely linked to oil. Demand projections for world electricity forecast annual growth rates approaching 9 percent or so; all assume, either explicitly or implicitly, that “abundant and cheap,” as well as “environmentally friendly” natural gas will take increasing load. No practical credence can be given to suggestions that wind farms or other new, dilute, and variable “alternative energy sources” will make a meaningful contribution. Without cheap gas, the “gas bridge” to “alternative energy sources” will make a meaningful contribution. Without cheap gas, the “gas bridge” to “alternative energy sources” collapses. The other end of the “bridge” exists in imagination only. Most U.S. gas comes from gas-only fields, although worldwide it is produced principally where oil is found. Gas is found in three types of formation: associated gas, the gas occurring in associated oil fields; non-associated gas, the dry gas from conventional gas fields with identifiable boundaries; and unconventional, continuous gas fields in tight formations, coal bed gas, and shale. The first two have discrete boundaries, high permeability, and consequent high recoveries. Unconventional gas fields have more diffuse boundaries, low permeability, and consequently low (and consequently more expensive) recoveries.

#### Natural gas not viable for continued scale-up – infrastructure leaks cause price volatility.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 62

Methane-rich natural gas is a much more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. [Methane is 20 times more potent in its effect]Already, about 2.3 percent of the natural gas produced by the industry leaks out of valves, pipes and other infrastructure, unburned. If that proportion makes it up to 3 percent, using natural gas is no better for the atmosphere than burning oil.65Granted, natural gas avoids some of coal’s nasty emissions, but relying on it in the long term is no solution, since even if you could stop the inevitable leakage it still produces prodigious amounts of greenhouse gases as it burns. Given a choice between coal and natural gas, the latter would be the obvious choice from a pollution standpoint, though its price volatility has made it a real concern for those who built gas generators only to find the price jumping due to the increased demand.

#### Natural gas wells are not producing to capacity now – no necessary trade-off - inflexibility with transport and enthusiasm drop-offs.

Charles E. Till & Yoon Il Chang, 2011, longtime Associate Laboratory Director for Engineering Research at Argonne National Laboratory, directed civilian nuclear power reactor development at Argonne National Laboratory, PhD Engineering, Specialty Reactor Physics, Imperial College, University of London, National Research Council of Canada, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority , Fellow of the American Nuclear Society, awarded the Walker Cisler Medal, National Academy of Engineering, was at Argonne National Laboratory, General Manager of the Integral Fast Reactor Program, Associate Laboratory Director for Engineering Research, Interim Laboratory Director, Argonne Distinguished Fellow, Currently he also serves as the Chair of IAEA’s Technical Working Group on Nuclear Fuel Cycle Options and Spent Fuel Management, was awarded the U.S. Department of Energy’s prestigious E.O. Lawrence Award, a Fellow and a recipient of the Walker Cisler Medal of American Nuclear Society, M.E. in Nuclear Engineering from Texas A&M University, and his Ph.D. in Nuclear Science from The University of Michigan, Science Council for Global Initiatives (SCGI), Plentiful Energy: The Story of the Integral Fast Reactor, p. 80-1

The outlook for natural gas historically has always been loosely related to that for oil. A very substantial fraction of gas produced worldwide is “associated gas”—that is to say, gas contained in reservoirs along with the liquid oil (incidentally providing the driving force for lifting oil in the bore hole) and therefore a byproduct of oil production. The obvious difficulties in transport of a gas make much natural gas production fairly local, certainly continentally local, and gas far less geographically flexible than oil in world markets. Pipelines have limitations over extreme distances and between continents. Liquefied natural gas (LNG) has constraints of a different kind, but they too are severe, so only a very small fraction of gas produced is transported in this way. Gas is still simply flared off in places where transport is too difficult or too uneconomic, or where it has simply not yet been provided for (such as Saudi Arabia). In some cases, gas is re-injected as storage for the future, or to enhance the driving force for increased recovery of the oil itself. In the U.S., substantial drilling for dry gas not associated with oil production over the last decades has made it the major source of domestic gas production. The U.S. today consumes about sixty-three billion cubic feet (bcf) of natural gas per day—an energy equivalent of about 10.5 million barrels of oil per day, or about half of the amount of oil that the U.S. consumes each day. Of that 63 bcf per day of natural gas consumption, we import about 1 bcf in the form of LNG, and we import about 8 bcf per day from Canada via pipelines. Thus we are about 98.5% self-reliant on natural gas supply from North America and about 86% self-reliant on natural gas supply from the U.S. Contrast that with oil, where we are much less self-reliant, only about 41% North American self-reliant and only about 27% self-reliant from U.S. sources. [2] This picture of a large supply of natural gas has been strengthened by the increase in production from a number of the gas shale fields, at the same time that the recession (and global financial crisis) hit; as a result, there has been more gas available than needed, and the price has therefore dropped considerably. This, in turn, has led to a considerable reduction in the number of rigs that have been drilling new wells. Even with this, however, there are concerns about the ability of wells in the gas shale to produce to the targets that are being set up. For instance, the very high costs for the wells and technology required to create them has mean that, as a result of having relatively short lives, only 28% of them have returned a reasonable profit. The subject remains controversial. Some see shale gas allowing substantial increases in domestic gas production; others argue, based on the rapid declines found after initial well production, that the present enthusiasm for the prospects of shale gas is overblown. [2] Gas production is thought to be sufficient to postpone the peak in total hydrocarbons for spans of time anywhere form a year to two up to a decade or two. But gas is not a direct substitute for oil and it is simply not plentiful enough to replace declining oil production for long, even where it can substitute for oil.

#### Operators know the system is faulty – history proves there will not be accidental launch on warning

Podvig 2005 (Pavel Podvig, PhD. Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, Reducing the Risk of Accidental Launch: Time for a New Approach? February 2005. http://russianforces.org/podvig/eng/publications/forces/20050204ponars.shtml)

The discussion of dangers associated with the launch-on-warning posture usually concentrates on the decline of the Russian early-warning and command and control systems. As a result, the efforts to reduce these dangers tend to center on finding ways to convince Russia to reduce the level of readiness of its nuclear forces. Any specific de-alerting measures that are proposed on the U.S. side are seen primarily as a way to create incentives for Russia to reciprocate. This line of argument, however, seems to overestimate the degree to which the Russian strategic forces rely on launch-on-warning as the primary response to a possible attack in their day-to-day operations. The history of the Russian early-warning system shows that although the Soviet military strived to achieve the capability to launch a retaliatory strike on warning, this goal has never been reached. The space-based early warning system built by the Soviet Union was not designed to detect launches of sea-based missiles and the Soviet radar network had serious gaps in coverage. As a result, the Soviet strategic forces could never rely on its early-warning system to provide a complete and accurate assessment of an incoming attack, so their response procedures favored measures that would ensure survivability of the command and control structure over those that would launch missiles immediately in response to the attack. The Soviet military never seemed to have high enough confidence in its early warning system to allow launch-on-warning based solely on the information provided by its satellites and radars.

### 2AC critique

#### Weighing consequences is inevitable even in a deontological frameworks.

Joshua Green, November 2002, Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Harvard University, The Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Truth About Morality And What To Do About It, p. 314

Some people who talk of balancing rights may think there is an algorithm for deciding which rights take priority over which. If that’s what we mean by 302 “balancing rights,” then we are wise to shun this sort of talk. Attempting to solve moral problems using a complex deontological algorithm is dogmatism at its most esoteric, but dogmatism all the same. However, it’s likely that when some people talk about “balancing competing rights and obligations” they are already thinking like consequentialists in spite of their use of deontological language. Once again, what deontological language does best is express the thoughts of people struck by strong, emotional moral intuitions: “It doesn’t matter that you can save five people by pushing him to his death. To do this would be a violation of his rights!”19 That is why angry protesters say things like, “Animals Have Rights, Too!” rather than, “Animal Testing: The Harms Outweigh the Benefits!” Once again, rights talk captures the apparent clarity of the issue and absoluteness of the answer. But sometimes rights talk persists long after the sense of clarity and absoluteness has faded. One thinks, for example, of the thousands of children whose lives are saved by drugs that were tested on animals and the “rights” of those children. One finds oneself balancing the “rights” on both sides by asking how many rabbit lives one is willing to sacrifice in order to save one human life, and so on, and at the end of the day one’s underlying thought is as thoroughly consequentialist as can be, despite the deontological gloss. And what’s wrong with that? Nothing, except for the fact that the deontological gloss adds nothing and furthers the myth that there really are “rights,” etc. Best to drop it. When deontological talk gets sophisticated, the thought it represents is either dogmatic in an esoteric sort of way or covertly consequentialist.

#### Be pragmatic with nukes.

Marian Herbick & Jon Isham, October 2010, Marian Herbick is a senior at the University of Vermont, where she is studying natural resource planning and wildlife biology, member of the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources and the Honors College, Jon Isham, department of economics and the program in environmental studies at Middlebury College. teaches in environmental economics, environmental policy, introductory microeconomics, social capital in Vermont, and global climate change, “The Promise of Deliberative Democracy,” <http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/775>

Getting to 350 parts per million CO2 in the atmosphere will require massive investments in clean-energy infrastructure—investments that can too often be foiled by a combination of special interests and political sclerosis. Take the recent approval of the Cape Wind project by the U.S. Department of the Interior. In some ways, this was great news for clean-energy advocates: the project’s 130 turbines will produce, on average, 170 megawatts of electricity, almost 75 percent of the average electricity demand for Cape Cod and the islands of Martha’s Vineyard and Nantucket.1 But, because of local opposition by well-organized opponents, the approval process was lengthy, costly, and grueling —and all for a project that will produce only 0.04 percent of the total (forecasted) U.S. electricity demand in 2010.2,3 Over the next few decades, the world will need thousands of large-scale, low-carbon electricity projects—wind, solar, and nuclear power will certainly be in the mix. But if each faces Cape Wind–like opposition, getting to 350 is unlikely. How can the decision-making process about such projects be streamlined so that public policy reflects the view of a well-informed majority, provides opportunities for legitimate critiques, but does not permit the opposition to retard the process indefinitely? One answer is found in a set of innovative policy-making tools founded on the principle of deliberative democracy, defined as “decision making by discussion among free and equal citizens.”4 Such approaches, which have been developed and led by the Center for Deliberative Democracy (cdd.stanford.edu), America Speaks ([www.americaspeaks.org](http://www.americaspeaks.org/)), and the Consensus Building Institute (cbuilding.org), among others, are gaining popularity by promising a new foothold for effective citizen participation in the drive for a clean-energy future. Deliberative democracy stems from the belief that democratic leadership should involve educating constituents about issues at hand, and that citizens may significantly alter their opinions when faced with information about these issues. Advocates of the approach state that democracy should shift away from fixed notions toward a learning process in which people develop defensible positions.5 While the approaches of the Center for Deliberative Democracy, America Speaks, and the Consensus Building Institute do differ, all of these deliberative methodologies involve unbiased sharing of information and public-policy alternatives with a representative set of citizens; a moderated process of deliberation among the selected citizens; and the collection and dissemination of data resulting from this process. For example, in the deliberative polling approach used by the Center for Deliberative Democracy, a random selection of citizens is first polled on a particular issue. Then, members of the poll are invited to gather at a single place to discuss the issue. Participants receive balanced briefing materials to review before the gathering, and at the gathering they engage in dialogue with competing experts and political leaders based on questions they develop in small group discussions. After deliberations, the sample is asked the original poll questions, and the resulting changes in opinion represent the conclusions that the public would reach if everyone were given the opportunity to become more informed on pressing issues.6 If policymakers look at deliberative polls rather than traditional polls, they will be able to utilize results that originate from an informed group of citizens. As with traditional polls, deliberative polls choose people at random to represent U.S. demographics of age, education, gender, and so on. But traditional polls stop there, asking the random sample some brief, simple questions, typically online or over the phone. However, participants of deliberative polls have the opportunity to access expert information and then talk with one another before voting on policy recommendations. The power of this approach is illustrated by the results of a global deliberative process organized by World Wide Views on Global Warming ([www.wwviews.org](http://www.wwviews.org/)), a citizen’s deliberation organization based in Denmark.7 On September 26, 2009, approximately 4,000 people gathered in 38 countries to consider what should happen at the UN climate change negotiations in Copenhagen (338 Americans met in five major cities). The results derived from this day of deliberation were dramatic and significantly different from results of traditional polls. Overall, citizens showed strong concern about global warming and support for climate-change legislation, contrary to the outcomes of many standard climate-change polls. Based on the polling results from these gatherings, 90 percent of global citizens believe that it is urgent for the UN negotiations to produce a new climate change agreement; 88 percent of global citizens (82 percent of U.S. citizens) favor holding global warming to within 2 degrees Celsius of pre-industrial levels; and 74 percent of global citizens (69 percent of U.S. citizens) favor increasing fossil-fuel prices in developed countries. However, a typical news poll that was conducted two days before 350.org’s International Day of Climate Action on October 24, 2009, found that Americans had an overall declining concern about global warming.7 How can deliberative democracy help to create solutions for the climate-change policy process, to accelerate the kinds of policies and public investments that are so crucial to getting the world on a path to 350? Take again the example of wind in the United States. In the mid-1990s, the Texas Public Utilities Commission (PUC) launched an “integrated resource plan” to develop long-term strategies for energy production, particularly electricity.8 Upon learning about the deliberative polling approach of James Fishkin (then at the University of Texas at Austin), the PUC set up deliberative sessions for several hundred customers in the vicinity of every major utility provider in the state. The results were a surprise: it turned out that participants ranked reliability and stability of electricity supply as more important characteristics than price. In addition, they were open to supporting renewable energy, even if the costs slightly exceeded fossil-fuel sources. Observers considered this a breakthrough: based on these public deliberations, the PUC went on to champion an aggressive renewable portfolio standard, and the state has subsequently experienced little of the opposition to wind-tower siting that has slowed development in other states.8 By 2009, Texas had 9,500 megawatts of installed wind capacity, as much as the next six states (ranked by wind capacity) in the windy lower and upper Midwest (Iowa, Minnesota, Colorado, North Dakota, Kansas, and New Mexico).9 Deliberative democracy has proven effective in a wide range of countries and settings. In the Chinese township of Zeguo, a series of deliberative polls has helped the Local People’s Congress (LPC) to become a more effective decision-making body.10 In February 2008, 175 citizens were randomly selected to scrutinize the town’s budget—and 60 deputies from the LPC observed the process. After the deliberations, support decreased for budgeting for national defense projects, while support rose for infrastructure (e.g., rural road construction) and environmental protection. Subsequently, the LPC increased support for environmental projects by 9 percent.10 In decades to come, China must be at the forefront of the world’s investments in clean-energy infrastructure. The experience of Zeguo, if scaled up and fully supported by Chinese leaders, can help to play an important role. Deliberative democracy offers one solution for determining citizen opinions, including those on pressing issues related to climate change and clean energy. If democracy is truly about representing popular opinion, policymakers should seek out deliberative polls in their decision-making process.

#### The PRISM changes patterns for nuclear manipulation based on energy.

Tom Blees, 2008, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, Prescription for the Planet, p. 335-6

When the material comforts of existence are seen as being limited, then consumption beyond one’s needs does indeed carry an undeniable ethical weight. As Ralph Waldo Emerson put it lo those many years ago, “Superfluity is theft.” Even when the energy and raw materials involved are plentiful, there remains the often conveniently ignored issue of the conditions under which goods have been produced, be they agricultural or manufactured commodities. It is disingenuous in the extreme to point to the abolition of slavery as evidence of the social evolution of mankind when millions of desperately poor people labor under conditions that can still honestly be considered as slavery. The fact that we don’t335have slaves in our home is hardly confirmation of our benevolence. The moral questions of economic fairness will not be settled by availing ourselves of the technologies promoted in this book, but should command our attention and concern indefinitely. My point is not to justify exploitation of either human or material resources, but to point out that a transformation of energy and raw material technologies as proposed herein will present a radically transformed palette upon which to paint the picture of humanity’s future. Our new course will remove the limitations by which finite natural resources and energy supplies have circumscribed our existence. Unlimited energy coupled with virtually complete recycling of materials and the production of consumer goods from plentiful or renewable resources will finally allow humanity to be unshackled from the zero-sum mentality. Raising the living standards of our billions of disadvantaged brethren will be seen as a positive development by even the most voracious consumer societies, rather than perceived with foreboding as somehow detrimental to their way of life. Admittedly this will take some getting used to. The revolution will be not just technological and political, but psychological. The passion with which consumerism is pursued is frequently grotesque in its extremes, yet the revulsion it engenders may not be so strong when it can be viewed more as shallow foolishness than callous selfishness. Much of what is considered virtuous today will be seen more as simply a matter of personal preference in a world where creature comforts are no longer in limited supply. The concept of self-denial will have to be looked at anew. Rather than concentrating on husbanding limited resources, our attention can be turned to welcoming the rest of our fellow humans into a new reality where creature comforts are the universal norm. Abundant energy and wise336use of basic resources are the keys. Clearly the technologies are already within our grasp. This won’t happen overnight, but it would be foolish to dally. The conversion of primary power systems to fast reactors will necessarily be a gradual process, which in the best-case scenario will take a few decades. Conversion of the vehicle industry to boron, however, is another story. It is entirely conceivable that boron fueled vehicles could be driving on our highways within five years. Ironically the first boron recycling plants that would be a corollary of the conversion may end up operating with natural gas for their heat requirements, since the IFR program simply won’t be able to be implemented as quickly as the boron system, and it’s questionable whether existing electrical generation systems would be able to handle the increased demand of electrically powered boron recycling plants. This would, however, be only an interim fix, and would allow the vehicle fleets to get off to a quick start. If the plasma conversion method proves feasible, though, then garbage alone will provide all the energy we need for boron recycling. Long before the conversion to boron is complete, the demand for oil will have dropped to the point where the USA, one of the world’s thirstiest countries when it comes to oil, will be able to rely solely on North American supplies, resulting in geopolitical and economic realignments that will be a harbinger of things to come. Even though oil prices will surely plummet worldwide, and while the temporary price of boron recycling may well be higher than it will be once IFRs are able to provide all the power necessary to support the system, the price disparity will easily be great enough and the environmental benefits so overwhelming that boron vehicles will surely carry the day even in the near term.

#### Nuclear exceptionalism is a myth.

Christopher Ford, January 2011, is a Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute in Washington, D.C., previously served as U.S. Special Representative for Nuclear Nonproliferation, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and General Counsel to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Oxford University (as a Rhodes Scholar), and Yale Law, “Haves and Have-Nots: “Unfairness” in Nuclear Weapons Possession,” <http://www.newparadigmsforum.com/NPFtestsite/?p=658>

After all, while a local monopoly on iron swords may have given the Vikings some advantage in skirmishes with Native Americans in what the Norsemen called Vinland, such technological asymmetry was not strategically decisive. (Indeed, the Vikings seem ultimately to have been pushed out of the New World entirely.) If iron had threatened to offer the Vikings an insuperable advantage, would the Skraelings have been justified in developing a moral language of “have/have not” resentment that demanded either the sharing of iron weaponry or Viking disarmament in the name of achieving a global “iron zero”? I’m skeptical, but for the sake of argument let’s say “maybe.” The argument that nuclear weapons are “special,” however, is a two-edged sword. Perhaps they are indeed so peculiarly potent and militarily advantageous that their asymmetric possession is sufficiently “unfair” to compel sharing or disarmament. Such an argument, however, sits only awkwardly – to say the least – with the simultaneous claim by many advocates of the “have/have not” critique that nuclear weapons have no real utility in the modern world and can therefore safely be abandoned by their possessors. After all, it is hard to paint nuclear weapons as being strategically decisive and useless at the same time. (If they are indeed useless, the conclusion of “unfairness” hardly sounds very compelling. If they aren’t useless, however, it may be appropriately hard to abolish them.) More importantly, any argument about the destructively “special” character of nuclear weaponry cuts against the “unfairness critique” in that it is this very specialness that seems to rob the “have/have not” issue of its moral relevance. Unlike iron swords, the bingjia literature, Greek Fire, or essentially all other past military technologies the introduction of which produced global control/acquisition dynamics, nuclear weapons have introduced existential questions about the future of human civilization which utterly swamp the conventional playground morality of unfair “have/have not” competition. No prior technology held the potential to destroy humanity, making nuclear weapons – with the possible exception of certain techniques of biological weaponry – a sui generis case to which the conventional “unfairness” critique simply does not very persuasively apply.

#### The plans representations are aimed at leaders not the public - instilling fear in leader’s minds is key to prevent global nuclear conflict.

Stephen Lee, 3-1-1996, Cambridge University Press, “Morality, Prudence, and Nuclear Weapons,” p. 327

The prospects for the delegitimation of nuclear weapons depends on the clarity of the crystal ball – that is, on the keenness and the immediacy with which the horrors of nuclear war are present in the minds of those who make decisions about military matters. When the vision is sharp, the mental connection between a possible act of aggression, whether nuclear or nonnuclear, and the potential for societal destruction is clear, and when that connection is clear, the aggression will likely be unthinkable. When each side believes that this connection is clear and strong fo the other, it comes to expect nonaggression from the other, and this allows its own inclination against aggression to become habitual. The problem is that time clouds the crystal ball, and an expectation that nuclear weapons would not be used y the other side in response to nonnuclear aggression clouds it further, and this weakens the connection. To promote the habits, one must counteract this obscuration. One way to do this is constantly remind people in general, and leaders in particular, of the horrors of nuclear war. Leaders must be continually scared straight. There must be an ongoing educational campaign to keep the potential destructivness of nuclear war ever-present in their minds. Those engaged in this campaign should not be deterred by critics who claim that the danger of nuclear war is something everyone knows about already and that talking about it succeeds only in frightening people

### 2AC agenda politics

#### Fiscal cliff won’t be addressed right away – Congress will punt the problem – no direct trade-off.

Patti Domm, 11-9-2012, CNBC business, “What Markets Want from Washington on 'Fiscal Cliff',” <http://www.cnbc.com/id/49759522>

McCarthy expects the process to go well into next year and he expects it to be difficult. Some analysts expect Congress to find a way to punt the problem into next year, by partially resolving some issues this year. “This is not going to go smoothly and I’m not optimistic about what happens between now and year end, but I am optimistic that some type of coherent agreement will be reached by the middle of next year,” he said. “The fiscal cliff is going to morph into fiscal water torture. There will be a series of crisis driven events that force them to address the budget, and it will happen right after the inauguration because that’s when the debt ceiling will become a binding constraint and when that happens it threatens the Treasury auctions and it threatens government shutdown.”

#### Don’t buy their doomsday fiscal cliff scenarios – it’s more of a gentle slope.

Danielle Kurtzleben, 11-8-2012, is a business and economics reporter for U.S. News & World Report, U.S. News & World Report, “An Extremely Simple Explanation of the 'Fiscal Cliff',” <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/11/08/an-extremely-simple-explanation-of-the-fiscal-cliff?page=2>

So if they don't do anything by New Year's Eve, then we're all doomed? Things will be bad, yes, but not immediately. With all of the scary talk about recessions and unemployment, it's easy to think of all this as a reason for a Y2K-style, build-a-bunker-and-amass-weaponry freak-out. But the effects won't be immediate. Rather, the fiscal cliff is really more of a hill—we wouldn't all wake up on Jan. 1 to a new jobs crisis and immediate recession. The provisions would affect the economy over months. Defense cuts could hurt defense contractors, causing those companies to lay off workers. And tax hikes could mean that, come April, tax bills could be thousands of dollars higher for some families. So calling it a "fiscal gentle slope" doesn't really convey a sense of the painful recession it could cause (not to mention the fact that it's not very punchy).

#### Congress is far apart from a compromise on the fiscal cliff now – tax rates – won’t happen in the lame duck.

John H. Cushman Jr., 11-7-2012, The New York Times, “Boehner Strikes Conciliatory Tone in Talk of Fiscal Cliff,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/08/us/politics/back-to-bargaining-table-with-fiscal-cliff-dead-ahead.html?pagewanted=all>

 “Mr. President, this is your moment,” Mr. Boehner told reporters in the Capitol. “We’re ready to be led, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans.” The offer may be enough to bring the parties to the table in the wake of an election that kept President Obama in power, strengthened the Democrats’ grip on the Senate and chipped away at the still-large Republican majority in the House. But Democrats and Republicans are still far apart. Mr. Boehner made it clear that his vision for additional revenue includes a tax code that lowers even the top income tax rate from where it is now, 35 percent, not where it would be in January when the Bush-era tax cuts are set to expire — 39.6 percent. At least some of that additional revenue would come from economic growth that he said would be fueled by a simpler tax code. Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, the third-ranking Democrat, has said those constructs are unacceptable. Democratic leaders say tax reform that lowers tax rates across the board would either hurt the middle class by trimming vital tax benefits like the home mortgage deduction or would not raise enough taxes to meaningfully reduce the deficit. Mr. Reid underscored Mr. Obama’s contention that tax rates on the rich must rise, saying “the vast majority of Americans” support that, “including rich people.” But in language and timing, the leaders of Congress’s two chambers left the unmistakable impression that they want a deal at least large enough to avert the worst economic impacts of a sudden rise in income, payroll, capital gains, dividend, interest and estate tax rates that would affect virtually every American family, working or not. Mr. Boehner has said for months that a deal to reform taxes and entitlements and substantially lower the deficit is not appropriate for a lame-duck Congress.

#### Carbon tax bundled in kill’s consensus.

Reuters, 11-8-2012, “Carbon tax suddenly part of 'fiscal cliff' debate,” <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/49751113/ns/us_news-environment/>

A potential tax on big polluters, a taboo subject in the United States in recent years, has come back into the spotlight as some sense potential for a revenue windfall at a time lawmakers look for ways to the so-called "fiscal cliff" of tax rises and spending cuts due in early 2013. The aftermath of Superstorm Sandy, which devastated parts of the U.S. East Coast last week, has raised fresh questions about the links between climate change and extreme weather events, which also makes the idea of a carbon tax more appealing. A carbon tax is a mechanism to charge emitters of greenhouse gases, such as power plants and oil refiners, for each ton of carbon dioxide they emit. Prospects for such a tax as a way to address pollution and climate are probably dim in a still deeply-divided Congress, but some analysts say the measure would be more attractive if positioned as a source of new revenue. In fact, a recent report by the Congressional Research Service, suggesting a $20 per ton tax on carbon emissions could halve the U.S. budget deficit over time. Such a tax would generate about $88 billion in 2012, rising to $144 billion by 2020, the report said, slashing U.S. debt by between 12 and 50 percent within a decade, depending on how high the deficit climbs, the report said. A handful of former Republican policymakers - ones most likely to reject new or higher taxes as a matter of principle - have been touting its potential to raise revenue for a cash-strapped federal budget. In research notes after Tuesday's presidential election, analysts at global banks HSBC and Citigroup flagged a carbon tax as a program that could potentially emerge in President Barack Obama's second term." One major fiscal possibility is a new carbon tax, which is likely to garner far more support this time around than at any time in the past and could become an appealing part of an emerging consensus on how to avoid the fiscal cliff," said a note from Citigroup's investment research group. Paul Bledsoe, an independent policy consultant, said a carbon tax on polluters would be "better for the economy than our current taxes on work." The measure would garner more support if its economic benefits are touted rather than its ability to help the administration achieve its green goals, said Bledsoe, who served as staff on the Senate finance committee during the 1993 budget negotiations. The U.S. Treasury has funded a major carbon tax analysis that will explore how the country's tax code can be used to cut greenhouse gas emissions. The report is being drafted by the National Academies of Science (NAS), which has commissioned a panel of economic specialists to analyze how to reform the way the government raises revenue to encourage cuts in emissions of gases that are blamed for climate change. The committee, which has met five times since April 2011, is reviewing how direct taxes, such as fuel-related provisions, and indirect measures, such as home mortgage deductions, will increase or decrease emissions rates. The paper was commissioned by legislation enacted during the George W. Bush administration in 2008, but not funded until 2009. It will be submitted to Congress next spring. In recent months, a number of moderate Republicans, including a few economists that advised Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, have declared their support for a carbon tax, leading some to believe there is a chance for bipartisan support in Congress. Harvard professor Gregory Mankiw, economic adviser to Romney, wrote in a 2007 column that "if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax." Former Republican Congressmen Sherwood Boehlert and Wayne Gilchrest joined Democrats Henry Waxman and Ed Markey to support a carbon tax in February. In July, former Republican Congressman Bob Inglis launched a think tank to promote a plan to raise taxes on fossil fuels while cutting income tax, a concept previously supported by former Democratic Vice President Al Gore. Even George Shultz, Ronald Reagan's former Secretary of State and a fellow at the Hoover Institution, entered the fray, saying that a carbon tax that returns revenue to taxpayers could garner the support of his party." The fact that you are seeing more voices come into the conversation and talk about it is a welcome one," said Nat Keohane, vice president at the Environmental Defense Fund and former special assistant to Obama on energy and environmental issues. "Hurricane Sandy has helped reboot this conversation," he said, by becoming just the latest in a year of extreme weather events in the United States, including major droughts and historic wildfires. Some remain unconvinced that the Republican-controlled House Of Representatives will be anything but hostile to attempts to price carbon, despite the post-election, post-Sandy buzz. "I'm quite a skeptic regarding carbon taxes, and I doubt that President Obama could gain enough support in the House to enact one even as part of a broader tax-reform package," said Kenneth Green, a resident scholar at the conservative American Enterprise Institute.

#### The plan would be a political motivator for nuclear power development – solves the waste issue.

Barry Brook & Tom Blees, 10-23-2012, a leading environmental scientist, holding the Sir Hubert Wilkins Chair of Climate Change at the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and is also Director of Climate Science at the University of Adelaide’s Environment Institute, published three books, over 200 refereed scientific papers, is a highly cited researcher, received a number of distinguished awards for his research excellence including the Australian Academy of Science Fenner Medal, is an International Award Committee member for the Global Energy Prize, Australian Research Council Future Fellow, ISI Researcher, Ph.D., Macquarie University in Environmental Engineering, Science Council for Global Initiatives, Edgeworth David Medal Royal Society of NSW, Cosmos Bright Sparks Award, Tom Blees is the author of Prescription for the Planet, the president of the Science Council for Global Initiatives, member of the selection committee for the Global Energy Prize, BraveNewClimate, “The Case for Near-term Commercial Demonstration of the Integral Fast Reactor,” <http://bravenewclimate.com/2012/10/23/the-case-for-near-term-commercial-demonstration-of-the-integral-fast-reactor/>

Light-water reactors (LWR) of any stripe, however, produce only a tiny fraction of the potential energy in uranium, less than 1%. Fast reactors, in contrast, unlock nearly all of it. The IFR, with its metal-fuel system and pyroprocessing, is able to utilize the actinides to such an extent as to essentially solve the waste problem by reducing the radiological toxicity of the waste products from hundreds of thousands of years to a mere few hundred years. Even if the “million-year problem” of LWR spent fuel is more a political than a technical challenge (given the small volume of the waste stream), nevertheless the issue of public perception of that issue is the one that guides nuclear policy in many countries [14]. As such, the transition to fast reactors and a closed nuclear fuel cycle is both a technical advancement and a political enabler for nuclear power of all kinds.

#### Loan guarantees for nuclear specifically popular – lower tax liability.

Sharon Squassoni, November 2009, is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in the nonprolifera-tion program. Prior to joining Carnegie, she held various positions in the US government, including at the Congressional research Service, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the US State Department, is a frequent contributor to journals, magazines and books on nuclear proliferation and defense, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, No. 7, “The US Nuclear Industry: Current Status and Prospects under the Obama Administration,” p. 8, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Nuclear_Energy_7_0.pdf>

The single most important spur to build new reactors in the United States is loan guarantees. In fact, industry sources indicate they are so critical that new plants may not be built without them. These guarantees are attractive to the US Congress because they offer a way to influence markets and incentivize specific projects, and because they are “scored” as a lower liability for the taxpayer than the actual amount. Thus, a potential US$50 billion in loan guarantees could be scored by the Congressional Budget Office as only costing the taxpayer US$500 million. As originally proposed in the Energy Policy Act (EPACT) of 2005, loan guarantees would only have applied to nuclear power, but this was broadened to apply to a wide range of “innovative energy technologies,” including renewable energy technologies, which further extends their attractiveness within Congress.

## 1AR

### 1AR critique

#### Language focus creates a prison house- prevents solutions to problems.

David McNally, 1997, professor of political science at York University, “in defense of history,” p. 26-7

We are witnessing today a new idealism, infecting large sections of the intellectual left, which has turned language not merely into an independent realm, but into an all pervasive realm, a sphere so omnipresent, so dominant, as virtually to extinguish human agency. Everything is discourse, you see and discourse is everything. Because human beings are linguistic creatures, because the world in which we act is a world we know and describe through language, it allegedly follows that there is nothing outsides language. Our language, or “discourse”, or “text” – the jargon varies but not the message – define and limits what we know, what we can imagine, what we can do. There is a political theory here too. Oppression is said to be rooted ultimately in the way in the way in which we are and others are defined linguistically, the way in which we are positioned by words in relation to other words, or by codes which are said to be “structured like a language.” Our very being, our identities and “subjectivites,” are constituted through language. As one trendy literary theorist puts it in David Lodge’s novel Nice Work, it is not merely that you are what you speak; no, according to the new idealism, “you are what speaks of you,” Language is thus the final “prison-house”. Our confinement there is beyond resistance: It is impossible to escape from that which makes us what we are. This new idealism corresponds to a profound collapse of political horizons. It is the pseudoradicalism of a period of retreat for the left, a verbal radicalism of the world without deed, or, rather, of the word as deed. In response to actual structures and practices of oppression and exploitation, it offers the rhetorical gesture, the ironic turn of phrase. It comes as little surprise, then, when on of the chief philosophers of the new idealism, Jacques Derrida, tells us that he “would hesitate to use such terms as ‘liberation’” Imprisoned within language, we may play with words; but we can never hope to liberate ourselves from immutable structures of oppression rooted in language itself. The new idealism and the politics it entails are not simply harmless curiosities; they are an abdication of political responsibility, especially at a time of ferocious capitalist restructuring, of widening gaps between rich and poor, of ruling class offensives against social programs. They are also an obstacle to the rebuilding of mass movements of protest and resistance.

#### No root cause of war – decades of research votes aff.

Greg Cashman, 2000, Professor of Political Science at Salisbury State University, “What Causes war?: An introduction to theories of international conflict,” p. 9

Two warnings need to be issued at this point. First, while we have been using a single variable explanation of war merely for the sake of simplicity, multivariate explanations of war are likely to be much more powerful. Since social and political behaviors are extremely complex, they are almost never explainable through a single factor. Decades of research have led most analysts to reject monocausal explanations of war. For instance, international relations theorist J. David Singer suggests that we ought to move away from the concept of “causality” since it has become associated with the search for a single cause of war; we should instead redirect our activities toward discovering “explanations”—a term that implies multiple causes of war, but also a certain element of randomness or chance in their occurrence.

### 1AR – agenda politics

#### We would quickly readjust to the fiscal cliff – support systems ensure low unemployment and increases in growth.

Cyrus Sanati, 11-9-2012, market analyst, CNN, Finance-Fortune, “The fiscal cliff may be overblown,” <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2012/11/09/fiscal-cliff-2/>

The increase in federal taxes and the reductions in federal spending would cut the budget deficit (the difference between how much revenue the government takes in how much it spends) from $1.1 trillion last year to $641 billion in fiscal 2013, roughly a $500 billion cut. That represents a reduction in the budget deficit (as a percentage share of GDP) not seen since 1969 when the conservative Richard Nixon booted the free-spending Lyndon Johnson out of the White House. The cuts in spending and the increased taxes will cause thousands of people to lose their jobs pretty much overnight (millions of Americans owe their jobs directly or indirectly to federal government spending). This would push unemployment up across the country from 7.9% to 9.1%. As a result, the CBO projects that real GDP would drop by 0.5% in 2013 after growing by 2.1% in 2012. Real GDP would fall at an annual rate of 2.9% in the first half of next year, tipping the nation into a recession that the CBO figures would be similar in magnitude to the one the nation experienced following the first Persian Gulf War in the early 1990s (for those who didn't live through that, it was bad). The CBO anticipates that the Federal Reserve would engage in another round of quantitative easing and buy up bonds in the open markets to keep rates low – this would ironically be done by printing money out of thin air (but no one in Washington, save Rep. Ron Paul, seems to care about that). This counterweight to the spending cuts should help support the markets, but it probably won't be enough to counter the negative impact associated with the tax increases on dividends and capital gains. That all sounds pretty grim, but the CBO suggests that the nation would begin to rapidly adjust to the fiscal cliff, projecting that economic growth would "be brisk" in 2014 and 2015, pushing economic output back to where it projects it will be if the government doesn't head down the fiscal cliff. Unemployment would remain elevated but would fall back to 8.4% in the last quarter of 2014 and then drift down slowly to a more reasonable 5.7% by the end of 2017. For all the panic that the fiscal cliff has set off, it doesn't seem like the end of the world.