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#### Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats---also causes political apathy which turns case

Buell 3Frederick—cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books, *From Apocalypse To Way of Life,* pages 185-186

Looked at critically, then, crisis discourse thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “total solution” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “final solution.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into inhumanist authoritarianism; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “total solution.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode;** eco-authoritarianism was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

#### That causes mass wars

Brzoska 8Michael Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg, “The securitization of climate change and the power of conceptions of security,” Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Convention 2008

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it is difficult to limit this to an increase in attention and resources devoted to mitigating the problem (Brock 1997, Waever 1995). **Securitization regularly leads to all-round ‘exceptionalism’** in dealing with the issue as well as to a shift in institutional localization towards ‘security experts’ (Bigot 2006), such as the military and police. Methods and instruments associated with these security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence – will gain in importance in the discourse on ‘what to do’. A good example of securitization was the period leading to the Cold War (Guzzini 2004 ). Originally a political conflict over the organization of societies, in the late 1940s, **the East-West confrontation became an existential conflict that was overwhelmingly addressed with military means**, **including the potential annihilation of humankind**. Efforts to alleviate the political conflict were, throughout most of the Cold War, secondary to improving military capabilities. Climate change could meet a similar fate. An essentially political problem concerning the distribution of the costs of prevention and adaptation and the losses and gains in income arising from change in the human environment might be perceived as intractable, thus **necessitating the** build-up of military and police forces **to prevent it from becoming a major security problem**. The portrayal of climate change as a security problem could, in particular, cause the richer countries in the global North, which are less affected by it, to strengthen measures aimed at protecting them from the spillover of violent conflict from the poorer countries in the global South that will be most affected by climate change. It could also be used by major powers as a justification for improving their military preparedness against the other major powers, thus leading to arms races.

#### Vote neg to reframe environmental crisis away from crisis discourse---this moves the debate away from top-down expertism that causes serial policy failure

Foust et al. 8 Christina R. Foust, Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, et al., with William O. Murphy, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, and Chelsea Stow, Doctoral Student and Graduate Teaching Instructor in the Department of Human Communication Studies at the University of Denver, 2008, “Global Warming and Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Critical Frame Analysis of US Popular and Elite Press Coverage from 1997-2007,” Paper Submitted to the Environmental Communication Division of the National Communication Association Convention in San Diego, 11/20, p. 22-23

In conclusion, we hope to inspire more scholarship in the spirit of Moser and Dilling’s (2007) call for a greater inter-disciplinary conversation on climate change. The methodological tool of frame analysis can help foster common ground between humanities scholars, social scientists, and climate scientists, concerned about global warming. Frame analysis can also be a **valuable tool** in **identifying the troubling aspects of how a discourse evolves** and is communicated—and in so doing, it **can** lead to more effective communication. Deconstructing the **harmful effects of an apocalyptic frame**, we feel some responsibility to try to **offer alternative frames** which might balance the need to communicate the urgency of climate change, **without moving people to denial and despair**. We would like to see the press inspire more of a public dialogue on how we can mitigate climate change, rather than encouraging readers to continue to be resigned to the catastrophic telos. This does not mean that we should ignore the potentially devastating consequences of global warming (now and in the future); but it does mean that we must begin a conversation about how to change our daily routines to make things better. We believe that the press could promote greater human agency in the issue of climate change, so that people do not become resigned to the telos of global warming. **This includes encouraging more personal and civic responsibility,** rather than suggesting that experts will take care of it **(or that we can do nothing to mitigate the impacts of climate change).** Journalists could acknowledge the expertise of scientists, balanced with an acknowledgement of the power of common sense and morality— such a move may help avoid casting scientists as prophets. Through a less tragic, more productive framing of the issues of climate change, **we may expand the common ground needed to build a political will for dealing with climate change**.

### 1NC D Rule

#### You should prioritize questions of epistemology---in the context of economics the knowledge-production process is more important than the outcomes

Anderson 89 Thomas, Libertarian Alliance, "Economics and Knowledge" Economic Notes No. 21 www.libertarian.co.uk/lapubs/econn/econn021.pdf

Before there can be a substantial or meaningful advance of knowledge in any discipline, there must be a firm foundation laid in a theory of knowledge, an epistemology, and its application to the particular discipline. Obviously, one's conclusions cannot be any sounder than one's method of attaining them. With a few rare and wonderful exceptions, the intellectual leaders of today do not concern themselves publicly with epistemology, let alone with sound epistemology, or understandable epistemology. So there is a large vacuum in this area, and for obvious reasons especially in writings designed as popularizations. Those who hold positions of influence on recognised intellectual establishments may consider these questions when they congregate in little esoteric groups, but the whole field is supposed to be outside the realm of the average student, citizen or voter.

Continued…

A sound theory of knowledge is the only path leading to the rescue of economics. The great free market economists and philosophers are increasingly realising this and are laboring mightily to make up the deficit. All students of economics should join them.Remember to apply sound principles of knowledge theory to anything you study. In all of your writings or speeches, whether highly sublime and original, or merely popularizations, remember to trace back, isolate, present and check your fundamental premises.

#### The affirmative forecloses the ability of markets and human ingenuity to solve the impacts they invoke---fatal conceit in the context of energy policy makes their impacts inevitable and cause policy failure

Robinson 8 Colin, Institute of Economic Affairs “Climate Change Policy: Challenging the Activists,” http://www.iea.org.uk/files/upld-book440pdf?.pdf

There is, however, more to the apocalyptic forecast than that because it always contains a call to action. It comes in two parts. Part one is the ‘conditional’ forecast – what would happen on unchanged policy. Part two is the plan – what should be done to avoid the dire consequences that the forecast reveals. The latter-day apocalyptic forecaster, when turning to the plan, almost invariably recommends centralised solutions carried out by governments and international organisations. It would be unusual, if not unprecedented, for someone, having seen the apocalypse, to recommend leaving solution of the foreseen problems entirely to decentralised market forces. There must be coordinated, centralised national government or international action so that someone is seen to be doing something. Recom- mendations are usually for direct government intervention in the market by targets, regulations, government-controlled investment programmes, taxes or sometimes ‘market instruments’ (of which more later).

But there is a serious problem with the view that centralised action, via governments and international organisations, is required to avoid the apocalypse. This form of action suffers from the same inherent problems as does central planning, which has, wherever it has been tried, failed. Briefly, there are two reasons. First, the information required for centralised action to work – which is information about the future – cannot readily be gathered. Information is not available off the shelf, to be collected together in Whitehall or similar locations, because it is essentially decentralised and much of it is tacit. The production and dissemination of information are primarily market phenomena and the suppression of markets, which is the inevitable consequence of central planning, also suppresses the information that planners would need if they were to operate successfully.

The second problem is that, even if the information were avail- able, the incentives to deal with problems are lacking. There is no Whitehall counterpart to the powerful self-interest motives to solve problems that exist in markets. On the contrary, the pursuit of self-interest by people in organisations that have a monopoly of policy-making is most unlikely to be to the public benefit. Public choice theory has shown the dangers of assuming, as much main- stream economic theory does, that politicians and bureaucrats, domestic and international, are wise, far-sighted and disinterested and will simply identify and then pursue the ‘public good’.

By contrast, the market system is essentially a massive problem- solving mechanism. Markets may appear to operate slowly and ‘imperfectly’ but they do so surely: their existence is the reason why past apocalyptic forecasts have not come true. Competitive markets are powerful adaptive systems which contain strong incentives to solve the problems of the day, whether trivial or apparently serious. Unfortunately, the essence of the market’s functions is often clouded by the mechanistic neoclassical models used by many economists which concentrate on end-states of markets rather than the processes by which they adjust to change. Hayek’s insight – that competition is a process of discovery, quite different from stylised textbook models of competition which show the states of markets once competition has been exhausted – is the key to understanding the problem-solving power of markets (Hayek, 1948). Competitive markets provide the information and the incentives that spark the discovery process in which human ingenuity is exercised to deal with economic, social and technological problems. Marketplace incentives, operating mainly through price signals, induce entrepreneurs to seek out and then exploit market opportunities so as to make profits. Sometimes, entrepreneurial action may result in no more than the discovery of a slightly cheaper way of making a product or a slightly more efficient method of organising a firm. At other times, it may result in a major invention and its subsequent exploitation with global consequences. On a Hayekian view, the apocalyptic forecaster/ planner who believes he or she can see a long way into the future and has the answer to the world’s problems, substituting for and surpassing the problem-solving capabilities of markets, has been misled into the ‘pretence of knowledge’, if not into a ‘fatal conceit’ (Hayek and Bartley, 1988).

Of course, no one can be sure that there will always be an economic or technological fix for every conceivable problem that ever arises. But past history, including the failure of predicted catastrophes to materialise, suggests that market systems act effectively to deal even with predicted global disasters. Russell Lewis’s chapter in this volume gives some examples of past false predictions of catastrophe. One particularly apposite example, on which it is worth dwelling because it is the most recent and the one that bears similarities to the concerns of today, is the ‘energy crisis’ of the 1970s when there was a consensus that rapid depletion of energy resources (especially crude oil), allied with the exploitation of monopoly power by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), would result in ever-rising energy prices. ‘The days of cheap energy are gone for ever’ was the slogan of many commentators, unwise enough to think they could see ‘for ever’ into the future. Only centralised action by governments and inter- national bodies could, it was argued, avoid a major world energy crisis. In the event, despite the almost total absence of the government and international action that had been deemed so important, energy markets adjusted to the ‘crisis’ so that, within ten years, the world was (by the mid-1980s) awash with oil and OPEC was meeting to try to prop up crude oil prices. Instead of crude oil prices tripling in real terms by the end of the century, as had been the consensus of forecasts in 1980, they began to decline almost as soon as the fore- casts were made and halved by the end of the century. Even in the first half of 2008, despite increases in crude prices in the previous few years, they were still lower in real terms than in 1980.3

#### This is an a priori voting issue---sound economic epistemology is key to the efficacy of all social and political praxes---accesses every impact

Reisman 96 George, Pepperdine University Professor Emeritus of Economics, Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics, http://www.capitalism.net/Capitalism/Economics%20and%20Capitalism.htm

In the absence of a widespread, serious understanding of the principles of economics, the citizens of an advanced, division-of-labor society, such as our own, are in a position analogous to that of a crowd wandering among banks of computers or other highly complex machinery, with no understanding of the functioning or maintenance or safety requirements of the equipment, and randomly pushing buttons and pulling levers. This is no exaggeration. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our contemporaries feel perfectly free to enact measures such as currency depreciation and price controls. They feel free casually to experiment with the destruction of such fundamental economic institutions as the freedom of contract, inheritance, and private ownership of the means of production itself. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our civilization is perfectly capable of destroying itself, and, in the view of some observers, is actually in the process of doing so.

Thus, the importance of economics consists in the fact that ultimately our entire modern material civilization depends on its being understood. What rests on modern material civilization is not only the well-being but also the very lives of the great majority of people now living. In the absence of the extensive division of labor we now possess, the production of modern medicines and vaccines, the provision of modern sanitation and hygiene, and the production even of adequate food supplies for our present numbers, would simply be impossible. The territory of the continental United States, for example, counting the deserts, mountains, rivers, and lakes, amounts to less than nine acres per person with its present population—not enough to enable that population to survive as primitive farmers. In Western Europe and Japan, the problem of overpopulation would, of course, be far more severe. Needless to say, the present vast populations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would be unable to survive in the absence of Western food and medical supplies.

### 1NC CP

#### The United States federal government should establish a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions in the United States. The federal government should reduce the corporate income tax and business capital-gains taxes. The federal government should streamline NRC licensing processes for nuclear power plants and should reduce restrictions that disproportionately affect small modular thermal reactors. The United States federal government should phase out all energy subsidies.

#### Targeting specific industries and technology fails---cap and trade is key to market-based solutions that solve the case better

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

Public investments of these magnitudes, targeted at specific industries, arguably constitute an industrial policy, albeit a sectoral one, unlike the earlier proposals of the 1980's —that is, a government strategy to steer resources toward select producers or technologies. The rationale and efficacy of these clean-energy expenditures call for scrutiny.

Proponents offer numerous reasons for scaling up particular energy technologies at the taxpayer's expense. One set of reasons involves the need to remediate market failures that have not been corrected by other policies. For example, clean-energy technologies are said to emit fewer greenhouse gases than do traditional sources per unit of energy produced. The United States does not have an economy-wide policy to control greenhouse gases, most notably, one that puts a price on C02 that reflects the environmental harm associated with use of fossil fuels.

A far more effective policy than subsidies for clean energy research, development and demonstration would be a tax or a cap-and-trade regime that would put an appropriate price on carbon and other greenhouse gases. Properly implemented, this alternative approach would help level the playing field for greener energy sources, for it would require emitters to pay prices that reflect the costs their emissions impose on society. The enhanced efficiency that would result has been widely recognized by economists.6 True costs would flow to purchasers of goods and services that require energy, suitably inducing conservation. Emitters would have incentives to invest in equipment and new production techniques, use alternative fuels, and seek other methods to reduce emissions. And America's innovators would channel their efforts into inventing, scaling up, and marketing competitive forms of clean energy. However, because existing market signals do not suffice to encourage climate-friendly technologies, carefully targeted federal funding seems warranted. But as we explain later, it is ironically only after incorporating the social costs of energy into market prices that many clean energy subsidies will succeed in deploying new technologies.

#### CP alone is key to preventing a collapse of innovation

Loris 11 Nicolas Loris is an analyst in the Heritage Foundation’s Roe Institute of Economic Policy Studies. "Power Down the Subsidies to Energy Producers" Aug 3 www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/08/power-down-the-subsidies-to-energy-producers

America has an energy addiction - and it’s not an addiction to oil, as many politicians would have you think. It’s an addiction to government subsidies. The addicts, you see, are energy producers, not the consumers.

Their growing dependence on federal handouts is the real cause of America’s energy crisis. Energy subsidies have needlessly wasted taxpayer dollars, retarded commercialization of new technologies and failed to reduce our reliance on foreign energy sources. Washington would do well to end all energy subsidies.

Energy subsidies come in numerous forms ranging from direct expenditures to targeted tax breaks, from production mandates to loan guarantees. Basically, any public policy that favorsthe production or consumption of one type of energy over another can be considered a subsidy.

None of them come cheap. According to the Energy Information Agency, the federal government gave the energy industry $8.2 billion in subsidies and financial aid in 1999. This figure more than doubled to $17.9 billion in 2007 and more than doubled again to $37.2 billion last year.

But the damage subsidies inflict on our economy extends well beyond direct costs. A special endorsement from the government artificially props up that technology. This reduces the incentive for the producer to become cost-competitive, stifles innovation and encourages government dependence.

The federal government has no business picking commercial winners and losers. That’s the job of the marketplace. Indeed, it’s doubly damaging when government decides to manipulate the market through subsidies, because government - almost invariably - picks losers. That’s not surprising, because companies that seek handouts most strenuously are those that cannot compete without them.

#### Solves great power war

**Baru 9** Sanjaya is a Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009 , pages 163 – 168

Hence, economic policies and performance do have **strategic consequences.**2 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the **foundation of power** was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic **wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to** efficiently **mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence**, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the **major Great Power wars**, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and **military power**.

### 1NC CP

#### The United States Department of Defense should acquire, via alternative financing, small modular thermal reactors to provide electricity for military installations in the United States.

#### DOD clean energy investment avoids politics---but the plan’s controversial

Appelbaum 12 Binyamin, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R&D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8, http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been more successful than other federal agencies because it is the main user of the innovations that it finances. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an unusually direct stake in the outcome of its research and development projects.¶ "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes."¶ Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda in controversial areas**.** No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

### 1NC DA

#### Obama’s ahead but the race is close---voters are paying attention which means the plan could cause a shift

Cooper 10/25 Michael is a writer at the New York Times’ Caucus blog. “Has Romney’s Rise in Polls Stopped?” 2012, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/has-romneys-rise-in-polls-stopped/?gwh=20374120E0C2B79985262EFF8E8CD19D

A debate has been raging among polling analysts and commentators about whether Mitt Romney is still gaining ground, as he did after the first debate, or if his bounce has slowed or stalled. But while some Republicans say that they still have the wind at their backs, several polling analysts weighed in recently to argue that the data suggests there is no longer a Romney surge.¶ Mark Blumenthal, the senior polling editor of the Huffington Post and the founding editor of Pollster.com, wrote a piece this morning with the headline: “Presidential Polls Counter Romney Surge Myth.”¶ “While Romney gained significantly in the wake of the first presidential debate in early October,’’ he wrote, “the lack of a continuing trend over the past two weeks helps counter a theme in some campaign coverage that Romney’s support continues to ‘surge’ nationwide.”¶ Sam Wang, who analyzes state polls at the Princeton Election Consortium, wrote this week that the Mr. Obama’s plunge after the first debate had **stopped with him still ahead**, and delivered the following verdict: “Indeed **the race is close,** but it seems stable. For the last week, there is no evidence that conditions have been moving toward Romney. There is always the chance that I may have to eat my words — but that will require movement that is not yet apparent in polls.”¶ Nate Silver, who writes the FiveThirtyEight blog in The New York Times, wrote Thursday: “Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so.”¶ With the race so close in so many places, it can be difficult to assess the true state of play. ¶ Most major national polls, with the exception of a few tracking polls, have shown the race to be essentially tied for months. Some polls in crucial swing states where Mr. Obama has been leading have tightened between the two candidates since the first debate, including Ohio, which is closer than it was a month ago. And **now is the point where many voters pay more attention** to the election, **which can move the polls**. But even with the proliferation of polls and the increased reliance on aggregated polls — lumping or averaging many polls together — it can be difficult to get a realistic picture on any given day in the closing weeks, given that some polls do not reach voters who use only cellphones, and many polls have struggled in an environment where fewer people want to respond to questions.

#### Advocating nuclear would be election suicide for Obama---he’s backing off it now

Levine 9/7 Gregg is a contributing editor and former managing editor of Firedoglake. “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech,” 2012, http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/

That Duke’s CEO thought to highlight efficiency is interesting. That President Obama, with his well-documented ties to the nuclear industry, chose **not to even mention nuclear power** is important. In the wake of Fukushima, where hundreds of thousands of Japanese have been displaced, where tens of thousands are showing elevated radiation exposure, and where thousands of children have thyroid abnormalities, no one can be cavalier about promising a safe harnessing of the atom. And in a world where radioisotopes from the breached reactors continue to turn up in fish and farm products, not only across Japan, but across the northern hemisphere, no one can pretend this is someone else’s problem. Obama and his campaign advisors know all this and more. They know that most industrialized democracies have chosen to shift away from nuclear since the start of the Japanese crisis. They know that populations that have been polled on the matter want to see nuclear power **phased out**. And they know that in a time of deficit hysteria, nuclear power plants are an **economic sinkhole**. And so, on a night when the president was promised one of the largest audiences of his entire campaign, **he and his team decided that 2012 was not a year to throw a bone to Obama’s nuclear backers.** Obama, a consummate politician, made the decision that for his second shot at casting for the future, nuclear power is political deadweight.

#### Romney will start a trade war with China---this time is different---collapses the global economy

Bohan 10/3 Caren is a writer for the National Journal and White House correspondent for Reuters. “Why China-Bashing Matters,” 2012, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/why-china-bashing-matters-20120927>

Mitt Romney is blasting China on the campaign trail as a trade cheat and a thief of American ideas and technology. He has pledged that if he’s elected president, **one of his first acts would be to label the country a currency manipulator**. It’s a theme the Republican nominee hopes will play well in Midwestern industrial states where workers have seen factories—and their jobs—move overseas. President Obama is talking tough, too. In Ohio this month, he announced a push to try to get the World Trade Organization to sanction China over its subsidies of autos and auto parts.¶ China-bashing by U.S. presidential candidates is nothing new. On the stump in 2008, Obama and Democratic rival Hillary Rodham Clinton both vowed to confront Beijing over a yuan currency that U.S. manufacturers say is kept artificially low. As president, Obama has followed a pragmatic approach, using a combination of pressure and cajoling over the currency while pursuing trade actions in cases involving such goods as tires and autos. Like his predecessor George W. Bush, he has stopped short of branding China a currency manipulator, a step that would sharply ratchet up tensions and possibly ignite a trade war. The interdependence of the United States and its biggest creditor has led many analysts to predict that no matter who wins the White House on Nov. 6, the tough talk on China will soon fade away.¶ But this time could be different.¶ After years of robust, export-fueled expansion, the world’s second-largest economy is slowing. China is grappling with an uneven pace of growth within its borders as it faces a once-in-a-decade leadership transition, with Xi Jinping expected to succeed Hu Jintao as the top leader. And with Europe in crisis, the global economy is fragile, shrinking the market for Chinese-made goods and increasing the temptation for Beijing to use a weak currency to allow it to sell cheap exports. Meanwhile, as American workers struggle with a stagnating jobs market and unemployment above 8 percent, U.S. frustrations over China could grow, **putting pressure on politicians in Washington to keep the heat on Beijing.** All of this could add up to **heightened trade frictions** between the two countries.¶ “I think U.S.-China relations are about to go into a period as difficult as we’ve seen since the early 1990s, when we were in the throes of almost constant tension with the Japanese,” said David Rothkopf, head of the international advisory firm Garten Rothkopf.¶ Rothkopf, a former Commerce Department official under President Clinton, said analysts have a tendency to dismiss the campaign rhetoric as “par for the course.” But he added, “What may make it different is that if we’re in a slow economy for a protracted period of time, as seems likely, and we’re not creating jobs in the way we would like to … we could be entering a period where we’re seeing not just U.S.-China tension but we may well see much broader trade tension in the world.”¶ One irony of the campaign-trail sparring over China is that Romney is actually running to the left of Obama on this issue. Romney has accused the president of being a “doormat” on China, leading Obama to fire back by accusing Romney of helping to ship jobs to China through his former role as head of the private-equity firm Bain Capital. The pledge to slap the currency-manipulator label on China is popular with union workers and has found more favor among Democratic lawmakers than Republicans. House Speaker John Boehner has opposed legislation to penalize China over its currency, saying it could lead to a “dangerous” trade war. Boehner’s worries echo those of many in the business community. Although numerous manufacturers would like to see a stronger push on the yuan, large retailers and other companies benefit from trade. Many experts worry that protectionism could worsen the global economy’s woes.¶ In response to Romney’s attacks on China’s currency, the official Xinhua News agency has called his plans foolish and said they would lead to a trade war.¶ Obama’s Treasury Department has so far declined to label China a currency manipulator. It has another chance to do so on Oct. 15, when a report on the currency is due. But the administration could decide to postpone the report until after the election.¶ China ended its fixed peg for the yuan, also known as the renminbi, in 2005. Under pressure from the United States, it allowed the yuan to rise gradually during the later years of the Bush administration and during the Obama administration. But U.S. officials still consider the currency undervalued.¶ Despite Romney’s pledge to label China a currency manipulator, some analysts remain doubtful he would follow through, especially given the business community’s concerns.¶ “Time and again, we’ve seen that what candidates say about China on the campaign trail bears virtually no resemblance to what they do once they’re in office,” said Elizabeth Economy, a China expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Whatever political lift they get from scapegoating China on the economic front disappears once the task of governing becomes paramount.”¶ Still, Romney has hammered the currency theme repeatedly, and on his website he lists his vow to label the country a currency manipulator as one of his top priorities. It would be hard for him to back down if he wins the White House.¶ “When a candidate makes a promise as many times as he has made that one, I believe he would have to do it,” said Bonnie Glaser, a senior fellow with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. But Glaser said that the currency-manipulator label would do nothing to create a more level playing field with China. “It’s a feel-good measure. It doesn’t really get us anywhere,” she said.

#### That causes full-scale war

Landy 7 [Ben Landy, Director of Research and Strategy at the Atlantic Media Company, publisher of the Atlantic Monthly, National Journal, and Government Executive magazines April 3, 2007, <http://chinaredux.com/2007/04/03/protectionism-and-war/#comments>,]

The greatest threat for the 21st century is that these economic flare-ups between the US and China will not be contained, but might spill over into the realm of military aggression between these two world powers. Economic conflict breeds military conflict. The stakes of trade override the ideological power of the Taiwan issue. China’s ability to continue growing at a rapid rate takes precedence, since there can be no sovereignty for China without economic growth. The United States’ role as the world’s superpower is dependent on its ability to lead economically. As many of you will know from reading this blog, I do not believe that war between the US and China is imminent, or a foregone conclusion in the future. I certainly do not hope for war. But I have little doubt that protectionist policies on both sides greatly increase the likelihood of conflict–far more than increases in military budgets and anti-satellite tests**.**

### 1NC Water

#### No risk of resource wars---historical evidence all concludes neg---cooperation is way more likely and solves

Jeremy Allouche 11 is currently a Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex. "The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade" Food PolicyVolume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Pages S3-S8 Accessed via: Science Direct Sciverse

Water/food resources, war and conflict

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change **and greater inputs of capital** have **dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture.** More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries **humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable**.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an **instrumental purpose**; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none **of these declarations have been followed up by military action**.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None **of the** various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, **more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale** (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 ([FAO, 1978] and [FAO, 1984]).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however **no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict**. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example [Allouche, 2005], [Allouche, 2007] and [Rouyer, 2000]). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians ([Dinar and Dinar, 2005] and [Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006]).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity **does not make much sense in the light of the recent** historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict ([Brauch, 2002] and [Pervis and Busby, 2004]). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, **the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin** ([Barnett and Adger, 2007] and [Kevane and Gray, 2008]).

#### No water wars

Katz 11—Director of the Akirov Institute for Business and Environment at Tel Aviv University. PhD (David, Hydro-Political Hyperbole, Global Environmental Politics, 11; 1; Feb 2011)

A number critiques have been leveled against both the theory and the empirical evidence behind the water wars hypothesis. One critique of the environmental security literature, of which much of the published material on water wars is guilty, is that warnings and threats of future violence are often considered as evidence.28 Statements from the 1980s that the next war in the Middle East will be over water have already proven false. Research has shown, however, that even the more general predictions of imminent water wars that are based on comments by officials may be suspect. Leng, for instance, found no correlation between the frequency of threats of war and the onset of war.29 Examining conflict and cooperation over water resources, Yoffe and colleagues noted over 400 incidents of water-related verbal exchanges by political figures between 1948 and 1999 that were conflictual in nature, but only 37 instances of violent conflict of varying levels of intensity. Thirty of these were from the Middle East, none were [End Page 15] more recent than 1970, none were all-out wars, and in none was water the central cause of conflict.30

Proponents of water war scenarios often premise their dire conclusions on the fact that water is essential for life and non-substitutable.31 Yet water for basic needs represents a small share of total water use, even in arid countries.32 Economists and others point out that over 80 percent of world freshwater withdrawals are for the agricultural sector, a relatively low-value use and one in which large gains in efficiency could be made by changes in irrigation techniques and choice of crops. Thus, economic critiques of the water war hypothesis stress that the value of water that would be gained from military conflict is unlikely to outweigh the economic costs of military preparation and battle, much less the loss of life.33

Some authors have even questioned the empirical basis for the conclusion that freshwater is increasingly scarce, 34 an assumption on which the water war hypothesis relies. Such a “cornucopian” view claims that people adapt to scarcity through improvements in technology, pricing, and efficiency—rendering water less scarce, not more so.

Perhaps the strongest case against the likelihood of water wars is the lack of empirical evidence of precedents. Wolf found only one documented case of war explicitly over water, and this took place over 4500 years ago.35 Moreover, he could document only seven cases of acute conflict over water. Yoffe and colleagues also find that armed conflict over water resources has been uncommon.36 They found that cooperation was much more common than conflict, both globally and in all world regions except the Middle East/North Africa. This pattern may explain why only a limited number of case studies of water conflict are presented in the water wars literature.

Analysts have criticized environmental security arguments that are based on case studies because such works tend to have no variation in the dependent variable.37 Many large sample statistical studies have attempted to address such shortcomings, however, in several cases these studies too have come under fire. For instance, a number of large-sample statistical studies find correlations between water-related variables and conflict, however, few, if any, provide convincing support for causal relationships. Moreover, several studies found that water availability had no impact on the likelihood of either domestic or international conflict, 38 including at least one study that attempted to replicate earlier studies [End Page 16] that claimed to have found such correlations.39 Moreover, the results of several studies that do find correlations between water and conflict are either not robust or are contrasted by other findings. For instance, Raleigh and Urdal find that the statistical significance of water scarcity variables is highly dependent on one or two observations, leading them to conclude that actual effects of water scarcity “are weak, negligible or insignificant.”40 Jensen and Gleditsch find that the results of Miguel and colleagues are less robust when using a recoding of the original dataset.41 Gleditsch and colleagues found that shared basins do predict an increased propensity for conflict, but found no correlation between conflict and drought, the number of river crossings, or the share of the basin upstream, leading them to state that “support for a scarcity theory of water conflict is somewhat ambiguous.”42

#### tech and adaptation solves---any empirical evidence is anecdotal at best

Thomas Bernauer et al 10 is a professor of political science at ETH Zurich, \*\*Ms. Anna Kalbhenn is PhD candidate at the Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS), Zurich \*\*\*Vally Koubi is a senior fellow at the Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich \*\*\*\* Gabriele Ruoff is postdoctoral researcher in the “International Political Economy” group of Thomas Bernauer at the Center for Comparative and International Studies, Climate Change, Economic Growth, and Conflict climsec.prio.no/papers/Climate\_Conflict\_BKKR\_Trondheim\_2010.pdf

Other scholars, commonly referred to as cornucopians or resource optimists, do not share this pessimistic view. They acknowledge that environmental degradation may negatively affect human wellbeing. But they argue that **humans can** adapt to resource scarcity by using market mechanisms (pricing), technological innovation, and other means (Lomborg 2001; Simon 1998). Simon (1998) for instance notes that, although population growth can lead to shortages or increased economic burdens in the short run, **the ability of society to respond** to such circumstances by improvements in technology and efficiency **usually** outstrips the constraints imposed by an increasing population**.**

The neo-Malthusian argument has also been criticized for being **overly complex and deterministic**, and for **ignoring important economic and socio-political factors** (e.g. Gleditsch 1998; de Soysa 2002a,b; Barnett and Adger 2007; Salehyan 2008). Critics have argued that scarcity of renewable resources is just one of the factors in the overall relationship between climate change and conflict. Buhaug et al. (2008:20) note that “climate change may increase the risk of armed conflict only under certain conditions and in interaction with several socio-political factors”. They reject the idea that climate change has a direct effect on the likelihood of conflict and propose several causal pathways through which economic and political instability, social fragmentation, and migration could increase the probability of climate change leading to armed conflict.

Qualitative case studies (e.g. Baechler et al. 1996) provide some, albeit **anecdotal evidence** that climate change induced environmental degradation (such as water scarcity, soil degradation, or deforestation) has contributed to conflict in some parts of the world (e.g. the Sahel region**). But it remains unclear to what extent these case specific findings can be generalized**. Large-N studies have, so far, not been able to provide conclusive evidence. One part of this variance in empirical evidence is certainly due to the use of different measures of climate change and environmental degradation, data problems, and different sample sizes and time periods. Another part, we submit, is due to the fact that past research has focused on identification of a direct link between climatic conditions and conflict. Conditional effects that stem from key factors such as economic development and the political system characteristics may thus have been overlooked.

### 1NC Warming

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve---no tipping point or “1% risk” args

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### Tech and adaptive advances prevent all climate impacts---warming won’t cause war

Dr. S. Fred Singer et al 11, Research Fellow at The Independent Institute, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a Member of the International Academy of Astronautics; Robert M. Carter, Research Professor at James Cook University (Queensland) and the University of Adelaide (South Australia), palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than thirty years professional experience; and Craig D. Idso, founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, and Association of American Geographers, et al, 2011, “Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report,” online: <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/FrontMatter.pdf>

Decades-long empirical trends of climate-sensitive measures of human well-being, including the percent of developing world population suffering from chronic hunger, poverty rates, and deaths due to extreme weather events, reveal dramatic improvement during the twentieth century, notwithstanding the historic increase in atmospheric CO2 concentrations.

The magnitude of the impacts of climate change on human well-being depends on society's adaptability (adaptive capacity), which is determined by, among other things, the wealth and human resources society can access in order to obtain, install, operate, and maintain technologies necessary to cope with or take advantage of climate change impacts. The IPCC systematically underestimates adaptive capacity by failing to take into account the greater wealth and technological advances that will be present at the time for which impacts are to be estimated.

Even accepting the IPCC's and Stern Review's worst-case scenarios, and assuming a compounded annual growth rate of per-capita GDP of only 0.7 percent, reveals that net GDP per capita in developing countries in 2100 would be double the 2006 level of the U.S. and triple that level in 2200. Thus, even developing countries' future ability to cope with climate change would be much better than that of the U.S. today.

The IPCC's embrace of biofuels as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions was premature, as many researchers have found "even the best biofuels have the potential to damage the poor, the climate, and biodiversity" (Delucchi, 2010). Biofuel production consumes nearly as much energy as it generates, competes with food crops and wildlife for land, and is unlikely to ever meet more than a small fraction of the world's demand for fuels.

The notion that global warming might cause war and social unrest is not only wrong, but even backwards - that is, global cooling has led to wars and social unrest in the past, whereas global warming has coincided with periods of peace, prosperity, and social stability.

#### Warming will be slow, there’s no impact, and adaptation solves

William Yeatman 9, Energy Policy Analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, February 3, 2009, “Global Warming 101: Science,” online: <http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/02/03/global-warming-101-science/>

A “planetary emergency—a crisis that threatens the survival of our civilization and the habitability of the Earth”—that is how former Vice President Al Gore describes global warming. Most environmental groups preach the same message. So do many journalists. So do some scientists.

In fact, at the 2008 annual meeting of Nobel Prize winners in Lindau, Germany, **half the laureates** on the climate change panel disputed the so-called consensus on global warming.

You have probably heard the dire warnings many times. Carbon dioxide (CO2) from mankind’s use of fossil fuels like coal, oil, and natural gas is building up in the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas—it traps heat that would otherwise escape into outer space. Al Gore warns that global warming caused by carbon dioxide emissions could increase sea levels by 20 feet, spin up deadly hurricanes. It could even plunge Europe into an ice age.

Science does not support these and other scary predictions, which Gore and his allies repeatedly tout as a “scientific consensus.” Global warming is real and carbon dioxide emissions are contributing to it, but it is not a crisis. Global warming in the 21 st century is **likely to be modest**, and the net impacts may well be beneficial in some places. **Even in the worst case**, humanity will be much better off in 2100 than it is today.

The following is a summary of key points:

Average Annual Heat-Related Mortality: People will not drop like flies from heat waves in a warming world. Heat-related mortality will continue to decline as the world warms.

Far more people die each year from excess cold than from excess heat.

Global warming will not make air pollution worse.

Global warming will not lead to malaria epidemics in Northern Hemisphere countries.

Contrary to Gore, no “strong, new scientific consensus is emerging” that global warming is making hurricanes stronger.

Global Death & Death Rates Due to Extreme Events, 1900-2004: Since the 1920s, death rates related to extreme weather declined by more than 98 percent globally. The impression conveyed by An Inconvenient Truth—that global warming is making the world a more dangerous place—is false.

Gore’s warning that global warming could shut down the Atlantic branch of the oceanic thermohaline circulation (THC) and plunge Europe into an ice age is **science fiction**.

Gore’s warning that sea levels could rise by 20 feet is science fiction. Sea level rise in the 21 st century is likely to be measured in inches, not in feet.

The world warmed at a rate of 0.17°C per decade since 1978, according to the temperature record compiled by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Since most climate models predict that warming will occur at a constant—that is, non-accelerating—rate, it is reasonable to expect that global warming in the 21 st century will be **close to the low end** of the IPCC’s forecast range, of 1.4°C to 5.8°C.

The actual warming rate may be only **half the 0.17°C per decade** rate implied in the IPCC temperature record, because the IPCC has not adequately filtered out the **warming biases** from local factors like urbanization and improper management of monitoring equipment.

A warming near the low end of the IPCC range would produce both benefits—**longer growing seasons, more rainfall, fewer cold deaths**—and harms—more heat waves, more drought, some acceleration of sea level rise—but nothing resembling catastrophe.

Even in the IPCC high-end warming forecasts, human welfare would improve dramatically over the next 100 years. In the IPCC fossil-fuel-intensive development scenario, per capita GDP in developing countries increases from $875 per year in 1990 to $43,000 per year in 2100—even after taking into account an additional 110 years of global warming. **Even in the IPCC worst-case scenario**, global warming is **not the civilization-ending catastrophe** Al Gore purports it to be.

### 1NC Solvency

#### SQ regs wreck the aff

Rysavy et al 9 Charles F, partner with the law firm of K&L Gates LLP and has over 15 years of legal experience with the nuclear industry, Stephen K. Rhyne is a partner with the law firm of K&L Gates LLP, Roger P. Shaw is a scientist with the law firm of K&L Gates LLP, has over 30 years of experience with the nuclear industry, and is the former Director of Radiation Protection for the Three Mile Island and Oyster Creek Nuclear Plants, "SMALL MODULAR REACTORS", December, apps.americanbar.org/environ/committees/nuclearpower/docs/SMR-Dec\_2009.pdf

Most SMRs are not merely scaled down versions of large-scale reactors, but rather new in design, siting, construction, operation and decommissioning. Appropriately, the legal and regulatory issues these units will generate will not merely be scaled down versions of the issues faced by their much larger brethren. The NRC’s new reactor licensing regulations in 10 C.F.R. Part 52 are designed to provide a more streamlined process for new generation large-scale reactors. Some facets of this new process will be equally advantageous to SMRs, while **others will range from awkward to nearly unworkable when applied to the licensing, construction, and operation of SMRs**. Creative navigation of the existing regulations by both the NRC and licensees will solve some problems, but **others can be solved only by amending the regulations**. ¶ For example, the **NRC’s annual fee** to operate each licensed nuclear reactor is $4.5M under 10 C.F.R. Part 171, **which would** likely **pose problems for the operation of many SMRs**. In March 2009, the NRC published an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking that contemplates a variable fee structure based on thermal limits for each power reactor. 74 Fed. Reg. 12,735 (March 25, 2009). This or a similar change will be necessary to make SMRs financially viable. Likewise, the size of the decommissioning fund, insurance, and other liability issues could make SMRs uneconomical if not tailored to the smaller units. Moreover, the form of the combined operating and construction license (COL) must take into consideration that certain sites are likely to start out with a single SMR but later add multiple small reactors as needs evolve. Flexibility is one of the SMR’s primary benefits, and the governing regulatory structure must allow (and preferably embrace) that flexibility, while simultaneously ensuring the safety of these reactors. Another issue to consider is that the current Emergency Planning Programs require a 10-mile Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) for all reactors, based on the size of existing large-scale reactors. Emergency Plans, 10 C.F.R. § 50.47 (2009). This requirement is almost certainly unjustifiable for a SMR. These smaller reactors are much less powerful, and in many cases the actual containment/reactor system will be placed underground.

#### This card ends the debate---incentives cannot solve---neg on presumption

Lovins 10 AMORY B. LOVINS is Chair and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute "Nuclear Socialism" Weekly Standard, VOL. 16, NO. 06 Oct 25 www.weeklystandard.com/articles/nuclear-socialism\_508830.html?page=1

With such juicy incentives, why won’t private investors finance reactors? In 2005-08, with the strongest subsidies, capital markets, and nuclear politics in history, why couldn’t 34 proposed reactors raise any private capital? Because there’s no business case. As a recent study by Citibank U.K. is titled “New Nuclear—the Economics Say No.” That’s why central planners bought all 61 reactors now under construction worldwide. None were free-market transactions. Subsidies can’t reverse bleak fundamentals. A defibrillated corpse will jump but won’t revive.

American taxpayers already reimburse nuclear power developers for legal and regulatory delays. A unique law caps liability for accidents at a present value only one-third that of BP’s $20 billion trust fund for oil-spill costs; any bigger damages fall on citizens. Yet the competitive risks facing new reactors are uninsured, high, and escalating.

Since 2000, as nuclear power’s cost projections have more than tripled, its share of global electricity generation has fallen from 17 percent to 13 percent. That of cogeneration (making electricity together with useful heat in factories or buildings) and renewables (excluding big hydropower projects) rose from 13 percent to 18 percent.

These bite-sized, modular, quickly built projects—with financial risks, costs, and subsidies generally below nuclear’s and declining​—now dominate global power investments. Last year, renewables (wind, water, solar, geothermal), excluding large hydroelectric dams, attracted $131 billion of private capital and added 52 billion watts. Global nuclear output fell for the past three years, capacity for two.

#### Empirics go neg---billions have been sunk into projects that failed abysmally

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

U.S. Energy Technology Policy

The energy sector has long been an object of industrial boosterism. While policymakers have had some successes, the history of the Department of Energy's (DOE) RD&D projects has been checkered since the early 1970s. For example, after the first Mideast oil shock in 1973, various alternative fuel programs were proposed. They proved problematic. President Carter and Congress, for example, created the Synthetic Fuels Corporation that was envisaged to spend up to $88 billion ($200 billion in 2007 prices) and to produce an ambitious two million barrels a day by 1992.9 Some plants were completed at a cost of $9 billion (2007 dollars) but they never operated commercially.10 The Clinch River breeder reactor project cost taxpayers $1.7 billion. It was abandoned in 1983; none of the subsidized reprocessing plants became commercial operations. Some more recent federal efforts to fund energy technology have seen similar failures and false starts. For example, from 2004 to 2008 the federal government sank $ 1.2 billion into hydrogen vehicle programs that so far have resulted in no commercial deliverables.12

#### Nuclear won’t take off unless it’s forced to sink or swim

Taylor 8 Jerry Taylor, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, “Nuclear Energy: Risky Business,” October 22, https://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=9740

There's nothing new about today's rhetoric about the supposed "nuclear renaissance." Back in 1954, GE maintained: "In five years-certainly within 10-a number of them (nuclear plants) will be operating at about the same cost as those using coal. They will be privately financed, built without government subsidy." Now, 54 years later, the talk of "renaissance" is back-as are promises about the imminent economic competitiveness of nuclear.

Those who favor nuclear power should adopt a policy of tough love. Getting this industry off the government dole would finally force it to innovate or die-at least in the United States. Welfare, after all, breeds sloth in both individual and corporate recipients. The Left's distrust of nuclear power is not a sufficient rationale for the Right's embrace of the same.

#### Loan guarantees prop up a failing industry and result in rampant taxation and economic distortion

Nayak & Taylor 3 Navin Nayak is an environmental advocate with U.S. Public Interest Research Group. Jerry Taylor is director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute.,“No Corporate Welfare for Nuclear Power,” June 21, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=3134

The most egregious proposal in the energy bill has the federal government providing loan guarantees covering 50 percent of the cost of building 8,400 Megawatts of new nuclear power, the equivalent of six or seven new power plants. The Congressional Research Service estimated that these loan guarantees alone would cost taxpayers $14 to $16 billion. The Congressional Budget Office believes "the risk of default on such a loan guarantee to be very high -- well above 50 percent. The key factor accounting for the risk is that we expect that the plant would be uneconomic to operate because of its high construction costs, relative to other electricity generation sources." But that's not all. The bill also authorizes the federal government to enter into power purchase agreements wherein the federal government would buy back power from the newly built plants -- potentially at above market rates.

#### Nuclear is overwhelmingly uncompetitive even with loan guarantees

Lovins 10 AMORY B. LOVINS is Chair and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute "Nuclear Socialism" Weekly Standard, VOL. 16, NO. 06 Oct 25 www.weeklystandard.com/articles/nuclear-socialism\_508830.html?page=1

Yet nuclear subsidies to some of the world’s largest corporations have become shockingly large. A Maryland reactor’s developer reckoned just its requested federal loan guarantee would transfer $14.8 billion of net present value, comparable to its construction cost, from American taxpayers to the project’s 50/50 owners—Électricité de France (EDF), 84 percent owned by the French government, and a private utility 9.5 percent owned by EDF. The project’s builder, AREVA, is 93 percent owned by the French state, yet has been promised a $2 billion U.S. loan guarantee for a fuel plant competing with an American one. EDF just booked a billion-euro loss provision, mainly over the Maryland plant’s deteriorating prospects. AREVA’s construction fiascoes in Finland and France have “seriously shaken” confidence, says EDF’s ex-chairman, and four nations’ safety regulators have criticized the design. Meanwhile, the chairman of Exelon, the top U.S. nuclear operator, says cheap natural gas will postpone new nuclear plants for a decade or two. Slack electricity demand and unpriced carbon emissions further weaken the nuclear case. Markets would therefore charge a risk premium. But U.S. nuclear power evades market discipline​—or did until October 8, 2010, when the Maryland promoter shelved the project because, for its $7.5 billion federal loan guarantee, it would have to have paid an “unworkable” $0.88 billion fee, or 11.6 percent, to cover the default risk to taxpayers.

#### Loan guarantees fail (but cap and trade solves it)

Brailsford 12 BEATRICE BRAILSFORD is program director of the Snake River Alliance, “Nuclear Loan Guarantees: Good Energy Policy?” Aug 2012 http://snakeriveralliance.org/?p=2687

No nuclear loan guarantees have been finalized. Federal loan guarantees have not led to any new nuclear build. On the other hand, no nuclear project has been stopped solely because the DOE refused to guarantee a loan. Though nuclear power's economic survival continues because of a whole host of subsidies, the policy goal of the 2005 Energy Policy Act - innovative technologies producing low-carbon electricity - has not been met. But the program hasn't stalled because of the difficulties reaching agreement on loan terms, though those have clearly been substantial. Low natural gas prices and lower electricity demand have challenged all new generating capacity.

Nuclear power faces additional obstacles, and the nuclear road might just be too steep. We've spent decades trying to surmount some of nuclear power's endemic flaws: it has long project gestation time and high capital costs, its technology can lead to nuclear weapons proliferation, and nuclear pollution is very difficult to remediate. So far, no country on earth has fully resolved how to dispose of nuclear power's most dangerous waste. At the start of what nuclear proponents hoped would be a renaissance, a price on carbon seemed to be a realistic expectation. The Fukushima disaster shook confidence in nuclear power, as it should have. In the short term, at least, a recent court decision about waste disposal put new and renewing licenses on hold.

But the answer is not for the federal government to take a hands-off approach. What's at stake is too important: energy is a fundamental public good. But the answer isn't to make it easier to get nuclear loan guarantees, either. Though we've focused more here on the nuclear loan guarantee program, it's undeniable that the technology itself is the largest single challenge to renewed deployment of nuclear power. The answer may therefore be to back winning horses instead, technologies that reduce carbon and enhance US energy production.

General Electric promised subsidy-free nuclear power half a century ago. In July, its CEO, Jeff Immelt, acknowledged, "It's just hard to justify nuclear, really hard. Gas is so cheap and at some point, really, economics rule. So I think some combination of gas, and either wind or solar...that's where we see most countries around the world going."

#### No chance of SMRs ever being commercially viable---negative learning means problems and cost overruns will only cascade and get worse---magnified by the lack of a price on carbon

Thomas B. Cochran 12, member of the Department of Energy's Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, consultant to the Natural Resources Defense Council, was a senior scientist and held the Wade Greene Chair for Nuclear Policy at NRDC, and was director of its Nuclear Program, 5/30/12, “NRDC’s Perspectives on the Economics of Small Modular Reactors,” http://www.ne.doe.gov/smrsubcommittee/documents/NRDC%20Presentation%205-30-12.pptx

BROAD CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS ON SMRs

In formulating conclusions and recommendations, there must be a full account of the wide range of unknowns and uncertainties, and difficult questions posed that require further analysis and resolution before large public sums are committed to an SMR industrialization strategy.

The history of DOE is littered with DD&E programs for reactors that never found a home in the commercial marketplace, and thus there was never a return on the investment for US taxpayers or humanity at large.

Our presentation has focused on the sensitivity of the U. of Chicago EPIC model’s projected SMR economic viability in the US context to modest variations in assumptions for industrial learning rates, LEAD unit direct costs, required contingency funds, and the future levelized cost of natural gas combined cycle generation.

But the range of SMR uncertainties extends well beyond variations in this narrow set of modeled parameters, and includes the following 12 issues:

Not all learning curve cost reductions derive from the same source, or occur uniformly over time. They are both time dependent and technology specific, and thus difficult to forecast accurately unless the details of the technology and production processes involved are already well understood. Early in the production cycle, sharp cost reductions can be expected going from the early LEAD units comprising the first plant to the next 6-12 FOAK plants built on an assembly line. But after these reductions, the rate of cost improvements could well decelerate or even disappear altogether, not only because of the law of diminishing returns to further capital investment at a given level of production, but also because “learning” works both ways, sometimes uncovering design or production defects that require increased costs to remedy.

The “negative learning” evident in the highly centralized and relatively standardized French nuclear program, is most likely the result of increased knowledge of, and required attention to, nuclear safety and quality control issues with each succeeding large LWR variant. A similar pattern could recur with SMRs.

Another source of uncertainty is the reliability of component supplier and system vendor cost projections – the well known problem in noncompetitive markets of companies offering “buy-in” prices to the government and any commercial customers to get them “hooked,” in the belief that either prices can be raised later, or costs recovered through the sale of larger numbers of components and systems than are actually represented in the forecast market demand.

Will international competition at the system vendor level help or inhibit the kind of dramatic cost reductions that are needed to make SMR’s a viable factor in mitigating global climate change? If several significantly different SMR designs, each with their own customized supply chains, are dividing-up limited domestic and international markets, how does any one vendor reach the stage of “commoditizing” production of the various constituent components in its plant, thereby significantly reducing its cost?

This process of wringing out cost in the production of components in turn requires reductions in the cost of the capital equipment needed to mass produce these commodity components, which reduction (in required capital cost per unit output) has been the real source of final product cost reductions in the electronics and solar PV and many other industries. What evidence is there that SMR reactor vessels, for instance, will cost less to produce per kilowatt of capacity than those produced for large LWR’s?

Is significant price competition among suppliers of key components, each susceptible of incorporation in multiple SMR designs – in place of a unique supply chain for each design -- also needed to achieve long term economies in the manufacture of SMR components.

What is the evidence for the proposition that nuclear-safety-grade steel forgings, concrete, pumps, piping, welds, wiring, and instrumentation will be appreciably cheaper in the future than they are now, and if not, what does the alleged cost-reducing “learning” actually consist of? The argument appears to be that the direct labor costs of integrating these components will be less, and achieved more rapidly, in a factory environment than at a construction site. But even if this is assumed to be true to some extent, given that the direct materials costs-per-kilowatt must increase when you build five or six reactors to achieve the same output as one large one, what evidence is there that the required labor-hours-per-kilowatt-of-capacity will go in the opposite direction, and far enough to more than offset the increased materials costs per kilowatt?

What is the evidence that staffing and O&M will be cheaper for six 200 MW units rather than one 1200 MW unit, and if it is not cheaper, where will the necessary offsetting cost reductions be found, such that the levelized SMR electricity cost is within an acceptable price range for future low carbon resources

Are current SMR vendor cost projections predicated on implicit assumptions linking prospective SMR “passive safety” improvements to streamlining and relaxation of current commercial LWR safety requirements that dictate costly requirements for emergency planning , operator staffing, and maintenance and inspection of safety related systems and components .

Could the longer proposed refueling interval (e.g. five years), intended to reduce O&M costs, create new safety issues in certain accident scenarios and actually add to costs by reducing the total energy output of the reactors?

A key question to consider is whether, in light of the above concerns, a nationally-focused SMR DD&E and deployment effort even makes sense. Is it plausible to believe that working on their own, DOE and a few U.S. vendors can development the SMR hardware, identify a sufficiently large customer base, finance the sale, and economically construct a large fleet of SMRs. As we have noted, at least in the near to medium term, the “coal replacement” market for SMR’s seems implausible in the light of competition from natural gas (although this could change over a longer time period), and the capital costs of constructing reactors in the U.S..

Are there national policies, such as carbon taxation and stricter environmental regulation of natural gas, that are REQUIRED accompaniments of an SMR deployment strategy, the absence of which makes the whole enterprise, at least on a national basis, appear hopeless?

To avoid yet another failed DOE reactor development program that spends a billion or more of the taxpayers money and then grinds to a halt for want of any economically rational deployment strategy, the panel and DOE must seriously consider these questions before committing additional resources in pursuit of SMR development.

#### Negative learning jacks the nuclear industry---they’re going all-in on large LWRs now---switching and eating escalating costs destroys them

Gabriel Nelson 9-24, E&E Reporter, and Hannah Northey, 9/24/12, “DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt,” http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3

The industry's future hangs in the balance. A new U.S. nuclear power plant has not come online since 1996, and the 104 reactors in the U.S. fleet are all scheduled to retire over the next several decades.

Already, the government has lent its support to the AP1000 from Westinghouse, a new design for a large reactor that won approval from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in December, but the design has yet to produce the "nuclear renaissance" sought by the industry. Two reactors in Georgia and two in South Carolina are under construction so far, though more could follow if those power plants are successfully built.

Experts continue to argue whether the small modular reactor approach will really reduce costs, but supporters have won the day for now, and DOE has embraced a statistical model that says the new power plants will get cheaper as more of them are built.

Critics say that is the opposite of what has happened with past nuclear reactors. There's a term for it in the scholarly literature: "negative learning," as one researcher put it when trying to explain why the cost of building a new reactor roughly tripled in France over two decades as the French government devotedly invested more and more into their construction.

"It's an idea. People think it's neat. And they try to think of an excuse for why they should do it," said Edwin Lyman, a senior scientist at the anti-nuclear Union of Concerned Scientists. "But there are a lot of disadvantages. They haven't really come up with a good argument for why moving to smaller reactors would be economical."

To build a large nuclear plant with two reactors that produce more than 1,000 megawatts apiece, a power company now needs about $11.7 billion, according to a paper that Robert Rosner of the Energy Policy Institute at the University of Chicago and Stephen Goldberg of Argonne National Laboratory submitted to DOE late last year.

That is nearly an entire year's revenue for the average U.S. nuclear utility, making it a "bet the farm" risk for any one of these companies, as the credit rating agency Moody's has warned. Historically, most companies that have built a nuclear plant have had their credit downgraded -- sometimes more than once -- during construction.

## 2NC

### CP

#### CP alone solves, plan and perm screw it up

Stavins 12 Robert N. Stavins is the Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government, Director of the Harvard Environmental Economics Program, and Chairman of the Environment and Natural Resources Faculty Group. "Can Market Forces Really be Employed to Address Climate Change?" May 26 2012 www.robertstavinsblog.org/2012/05/26/can-market-forces-really-be-employed-to-address-climate-change/

Harnessing Market Forces by Pricing Externalities

The pricing of externalities can promote cost-effective abatement, deliver efficient innovation incentives, avoid picking technology winners, and ameliorate, not exacerbate, government fiscal conditions.

By pricing carbon emissions (or, equivalently, the carbon content of the three fossil fuels – coal, petroleum, and natural gas), the government provides incentives for firms and individuals to identify and exploit the lowest-cost ways to reduce emissions and to invest in the development of new technologies, processes, and ideas that can mitigate future emissions. A fairly wide variety of policy approaches fall within the concept of externality pricing in the climate-policy context, including carbon taxes, cap-and-trade, and clean energy standards.

What About Conventional Regulatory Approaches?

In contrast, conventional approaches to environmental protection typically employ uniform mandates to protect environmental quality. Although uniform technology and performance standards have been effective in achieving some established environmental goals and standards, they tend to lead to non-cost-effective outcomes in which some firms use unduly expensive means to control pollution.

In addition, conventional technology or performance standards do not provide dynamic incentives for the development, adoption, and diffusion of environmentally and economically superior control technologies. Once a firm satisfies a performance standard, it has little incentive to develop or adopt cleaner technology. Indeed, regulated firms may fear that if they adopt a superior technology, the government will tighten the standard.

Given the ubiquitous nature of greenhouse gas emissions from diverse sources, it is virtually inconceivable that a standards-based approach could form the centerpiece of a truly meaningful climate policy. The substantially higher cost of a standards-based policy may undermine support for such an approach, and securing political support may require weakening standards and lowering environmental benefits.

How About Technology Subsidies?

Government support for lower-emitting technologies often takes the form of investment or performance subsidies. Providing subsidies for targeting climate-friendly technologies entails revenues raised by taxing other economic activities. Given the tight fiscal environment throughout the developed world, it is difficult to justify increasing (or even continuing) the subsidies that would be necessary to change significantly the emissions intensity of economic activity.

Furthermore, by lowering the cost of energy, climate-oriented technology subsidies can actually lead to excessive levels of energy supply and consumption. Thus, subsidies can undermine incentives for efficiency and conservation, and impose higher costs per ton abated than cost-effective policy alternatives.

In practice, subsidies are typically designed to be technology specific. By designating technology winners, such approaches yield special-interest constituencies focused on maintaining subsidies beyond what would be socially desirable. They also provide little incentive for the development of novel, game-changing technologies.

#### Economists all support the CP

Hsu 11 Shi-Ling Hsu Professor, Florida State University College of Law, "The Case for a Carbon Tax: Getting Past Our Hang-ups to Effective Climate Policy" Island Press, 2011 myweb.fsu.edu/shsu/HSU\_carbon\_tax\_precis4.pdf

Incentivizing innovation will require a broad price signal that ripples throughout the economy in order to take advantage of as many greenhouse gas reduction opportunities as possible. The strength of a carbon tax is it creates a broad, economy-wide price signal. Greenhouse gas reduction opportunities are diverse, and the only way to tap into all of them is to have a broad price signal. Pricing greenhouse gas emissions into energy prices sends a price signal that ripples throughout the entire economy, scrambling every single business in a search for a lower carbon footprint in the hopes that it can gain a price advantage over competitors.

Furthermore, because of the nature of regulating point sources of emissions, regulation of greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act can only be applied to a handful of facilities. Although this handful of facilities accounts for most of the greenhouse gas emissions, they are a small fraction of the number of facilities that emit. By regulating under the Clean Air Act, we miss the opportunity to tap into the entrepreneurial energies of that vast majority of emitting facilities.

Four: Deeper and steadier incentives to innovate. Many have already made the argument that command-and-control regulation is inefficient and ineffective. The most fundamental flaw of regulating greenhouse gas emissions command-and-control style under the Clean Air Act is that the price signal favoring low-carbon or non-carbon alternatives is one generated by an administrative process, rather than a market process. I do not revisit those arguments. The economists have won the debate, and almost everyone accepts that a price on carbon dioxide emissions is needed.

### AT: Perm---2NC

#### Obviously links to all of our offense---the gov needs to set targets without picking winners---specific incentives undermine the purpose of a tech-neutral regime---the CP alone causes effici

Epstein 8 Max, “In Defense of Carbon Pricing: Why Clean RD&D Isn't Enough,” 7/21, http://www.thebreakthrough.org/blog/2008/07/guest\_post\_in\_defense\_of\_carbo.shtml

I once heard more money changes hands on global capital markets in a day than all the world's governments spend in a year. This illustrates, if not the inherent futility, at least the foolishness of trying to take on such a major and multifaceted investment exclusively with public sector financing. While public funds for deployment may spur private capital to some extent, it wouldn't do so nearly as much as further investments in research or infrastructure. Furthermore, the most effective way to motivate private capital to invest in both clean R&D and deployment is to set a price on carbon. A price on carbon literally makes pollution abatement a marketable asset. The 1990 SO2 Cap & Trade regime provides a valuable empirical example on the power of capitalist innovation in achieving emissions reduction goals. Ultimately, it shows that in achieving emissions reductions, government should set the target, but allow the market to find the means of getting there. The 1990 Acid Rain program achieved reductions in sulfur dioxide at far lower cost than even optimistic predictions. How? In large part due to two factors. First, before the program coal was classified as 'high sulfur' or 'low sulfur;' afterwards the sulfur content was rated with much more detail, as it got factored into the price of the coal itself (inverse relationship: low sulfur became more valuable). This allowed plenty of firms to make simple, relatively inexpensive reductions just by switching to a lower sulfur coal, and only to the extent that they needed (or extra if they felt they could profit by saving allowances and selling them). Flue gas scrubbers, the traditional means of sulfur dioxide mitigation, saw significant efficiency gains as well. First, increased competition drove down prices because they now had to compete with other emissions reductions methods, like low-sulfur coal, to stay in business. Second, scrubbers were able to be manufactured to remove fewer emissions, but at far lower cost. This led to more efficiency in reductions per dollar spent. Such a change developed specifically because every marginal reduction had a monetary value, i.e. because there was a price on pollution. The SO2 program holds real lessons for designing a carbon reduction policy. The solutions of tomorrow will not be simple linear improvements on the technologies of today. No one predicted that the acid rain problem would be solved by a new classification system for coal, and scrubbers that actually did less scrubbing. Then as now, we had proven emissions reductions technology available that the government could have mandated or deployed. Luckily, a market based solution was chosen instead. Picking winners, whether it's Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS), or targeted tax credits by technology, is a bad idea. It seems now like "investing in tomorrow's solutions," but it’s just as likely to actually bias the market against taking tomorrow's best solutions, which we likely haven't thought of yet. The competition point from scrubbers is especially relevant. RPS standards insulate listed renewable technologies from competition with cogeneration/CHP, Demand-Side Management (DSM), and again, the things we haven't thought of yet. Shellenberger and Nordhaus write in their criticism of Cap & Trade that we didn't get the PC revolution by regulating away typewriters. Aside from the obvious distinction that typewriters did not pose serious externalities to society, its important to note that we didn't achieve the PC revolution by subsidizing mass deployment of the IBM 5150 PC either. To bring the point closer to home, you don't get a breakthrough like Concentrated Solar Power (CSP) by mass deployment of more PV panels. The government should stick to targets and let the market figure out how to achieve them. Government action should be targeted to address specific market failures. Carbon pricing is the obvious and necessary first step due to its externality cost for society. Research and development is another role for government based on a similar dynamic - since research inevitably yields benefits that accrue to other firms beyond what the researcher can capture for profit, it provides an externality benefit for society. Thus, research would be undersupplied if left to individual profit-seeking firms. Ditto for large scale demonstration projects, which feel out technical, regulatory and supply stream issues, the resolutions of which benefit all firms that come afterwards.

### DA

#### The CP solves the case, their methodology is suspect, and the plan’s winner picking will cause a fannie and Freddie explosion in the energy sector

Boskin 12 Michael J. Boskin, is Professor of Economics at Stanford University and Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, and a former chairman of the US President's Council of Economic Advisers. "PICKING LOSERS, KILLING WINNERS" www.stanford.edu/~boskin/Publications/boskin%20wsj%2002%2015%202012%20industrial%20policy%20-%20long.pdf

Firms make mistakes and markets are not perfect, but it's a deeply dangerous conceit for anyone to conclude they can pick technology, firm, and industry winners and losers more successfully than the market. And a possible market failure won't necessarily be improved by government intervention. We must compare the imperfect government policies likely to be implemented with imperfect market outcomes; will they improve the situation AND merit the cost? Government failure, including crony capitalism, rent-seeking and dispensing, pork, and regulatory capture, is as pervasive as market failure due to monopoly, externalities, or information problems.

America certainly has energy security and potential environmental needs to diversify sources by type and by geography. The shale gas hydraulic fracturing revolution -credit due to Halliburton and Mitchell Energy; the government's role was minor is rapidly providing a piece of the intermediate-term solution.

Government should set sensible goals and enact even-handed policies to achieve them, then let entrepreneurs, investors, and consumers decide how best to do so. It should fund applicable, pre-competitive generic scientific and technological research, eliminate specific subsidies and lower tax rates for all with the proceeds.

The arguments mustered to promote industrial policy - infant industries; benefits of clustering and learning; and jobs, do not stand up to serious research and historical evidence. Echoing 1980s Japan-fear and envy, some claim we must enact industrial policies because other countries, e.g. China, do. Presidents Johnson and Nixon wanted the U.S. to build a supersonic transport (SST) plane because the British and French were doing so. The troubled Concorde was shut down after a brief run of subsidized travel for wealthy tourists and Wall Street types.

Our response instead should be 1) remove our own major competitive obstacles, e.g. more competitive corporate tax rates; more sensible regulation, improved K-12 education, and better job training for commercially demanded skills; (Mr. Obama's green jobs training program - added on top of four dozen federal training programs -- spent hundreds of millions; 3% of enrollees had the targeted jobs six months later). 2) Base policies on sound economics. If another country has a comparative cost advantage, we gain from exchanging such products for those we produce relatively more efficiently. If we tried to produce everything in America, our standard of living would plummet. 3) Pursue rapid redress for illegal subsidization and protectionism in appropriate venues, e.g. the WTO, and strengthen those processes.

Fortunately, there is some promising news. Ethanol subsidies and tariffs (but not the increasing use mandate) expired in the New Year and there is a growing consensus to kill California's high-speed rail boondoggle. The state-appointed High Speed Rail Authority recommended against the program, as cost projections tripled to almost $100 billion, ridership projections plummeted and potential startup delayed a decade or more. Yet Mr. Obama offers subsidies to induce Governor Brown to add funds the state doesn't have for a first stage between Fresno and Bakersfield that Californians don't want enough to pay for.

So pervasive is this new government intervention in so many sectors that a vast array of unsubsidized firms are competing for capital and customers with government-subsidized firms forced to make non-commercial decisions. The end result cannot be good; witness the damage wrought by Fannie and Freddie.

Industrial policy failed miserably in the 1970's and 1980's. Letting governments rather than marketplace competition pick specific winners and losers is just as bad an idea today.

#### This ensures error replication and market failure

Taylor 8 Jerry, CATO, Powering the Future, 8/22, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=9609>

Before you confidently hold forth about the future of energy markets, you really ought to pick up a copy of Vaclav Smil's 2005 book, "Energy at the Crossroads," and direct your attention to Chapter 4. There you will find a thorough review of the most prominent energy forecasts that have been offered over the last several decades by various blue-ribbon commissions, government forecasting agencies, top-flight academics, energy trade associations, think tanks, policy advocates and energy corporations. **One can't help but conclude that drunk monkeys would be just as reliable** as "the best and the brightest" when it comes to soothsaying about the future of technology, market share or price. The point here is that we don't know what the energy future may hold and we should accordingly treat the periodic energy crazes that sweep the political landscape more skeptically than we have in the past. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. If you need any proof that unleashing government to plan our energy future is like giving car keys to drunken teenagers (to paraphrase P.J. O'Rourke), you need look no further than President Bush's 2002 "Freedom CAR" initiative. First, it was charged with delivering us into the hydrogen age. But then the president discovered switch grass; fuel cells were henceforth "out" and cellulosic ethanol was "in." Now it turns out that 200-proof grain alcohol is not the fuel of the future; electricity delivered via plug-in electric-gasoline hybrids is. And Freedom CAR is but one example of many that one could marshal; whole books have been written about the myriad economic disasters and quiet taxpayer waste associated with our ongoing practice of energy planning in post-World War II America. The problem isn't that ignorant or venal people are charged with making our collective energy decisions. The problem is that we can no more sensibly plan the energy economy than we can centrally plan any other sector of the economy, particularly given the fact that political decisions are inevitably made primarily on their political merits, not on their economic or environmental merits. Markets will provide the lowest-cost energy possible because energy producers compete mightily with one another for profit. The argument we frequently hear that "we need every source of energy in the future to meet our staggering energy needs" is ridiculous. Some energy — such as nuclear fusion and grid-connected solar energy — is simply too expensive to produce now, which is to say, it costs more to generate than it is worth. Subsidies and mandates to get "every energy source to market" simply force us to generate and consume energy that costs more than it is worth. In an ideal world, we would strip the energy market of all subsidies; liberate the energy industry to exploit resources on federal lands; leave prices alone so that they deliver accurate information to investors about wealth-creating opportunities and to consumers about relative scarcity; allow energy companies to structure themselves in any manner they like; and fully embrace free trade in energy markets, which keeps prices down. I don't disagree that we have a responsibility to police the public environmental commons. But the best way to do that is to set emission rules or regulations that apply fairly to all emitters in all sectors of the economy and that have some relationship to the harms being addressed. Once that's done, market actors will order their affairs efficiently to produce the lowest-cost energy possible and do a better job picking "winners" than would-be central planners.

#### Just in case that explanation is not crystal clear, here’s our 1NC link author to make the same argument

Robinson 8 Colin, Institute of Economic Affairs “Climate Change Policy: Challenging the Activists,” http://www.iea.org.uk/files/upld-book440pdf?.pdf

One policy response would be direct action by governments to promote energy sources and technologies that reduce carbon emissions compared with the present. The two main candidates are nuclear fission power and renewable forms of energy, such as wind, solar, wave and hydro power. Many governments in developed countries have in recent years been wary of permit- ting nuclear investment, partly because of the long history of over-optimistic costs forecasts for nuclear power (Robinson and Marshall, 2006), but principally because of the potential adverse effects associated with nuclear fuel use and storage that have made nuclear power unpopular with electorates. In the face of climate change fears, however, there are signs of a revival of interest in nuclear generation.

Renewable sources are already being favoured by governments. The British government, for example, is providing large subsidies for wind power in the hope of reaching a target of 10 per cent of electricity generated from renewables by 2010, with an ‘aspira- tion’ to reach 20 per cent by 2020.5 The European Union is setting even more ambitious targets that would involve member states increasing the share of renewables in their energy (not electricity) supplies to 20 per cent by 2020. Another form of direct govern- ment action, but on the demand rather than the supply side, is to try to persuade consumers to use less energy by subsidising home insulation and other means of ‘conservation’. All manners of restrictions on people’s freedom to choose fuels and technolo- gies are now being imposed, with five-year ‘carbon budgets’ in the background (under a proposed new Climate Change Act), in an attempt to influence consumers to change their ways in directions that governments think desirable.

The problem with direct promotional action by government is that it does not address the basic property rights issue that is at the root of the apparent climate change problem. Instead, it involves government in the difficult process of ‘picking winners’, whether that ‘winner’ is nuclear power, some form of renew- able energy, ‘clean coal’ technology or energy conservation. Past attempts at picking winners have been notoriously unsuccessful (e.g. Myddelton, 2007), not just because of specific failings of particular ministers but for much deeper reasons of principle involving inherent information failures and the influence of pressure groups.

Most analyses of climate change policy are silent on these issues of principle. The Stern Review, for example, ignores completely the economic analysis of government action, exem- plified in the ‘public choice’ theory that has been brought to such prominence by James Buchanan, Gordon Tullock and others,6 and the Hayekian view of competitive markets.

The Hayekian critique of government action, as explained earlier, emphasises the role of markets as discovery processes that produce information and embody powerful incentives to solve incipient problems which governments cannot match. It is complemented by the public choice critique, which suggests that the chances are low that governments will improve welfare by attempts to pick winners. Governments are not disinterested servants of the public good: they are, for example, susceptible to the influence of pressure groups (unmentioned and apparently unrecognised in the Stern Review), which are likely to be very influential in pushing their own interests when governments are known to be searching for technologies to support. As explained earlier, governments face the most serious problem of central planners – that they cannot gather the information they need, which is essentially decentralised and would have been produced by markets had it not been suppressed by government intervention. Into the vacuum come pressure groups that supply information that supports their causes. ‘Blinding with science’ is a common approach by pressure groups faced by governments short of the relevant knowledge on which to judge their proposals.

Direct action by governments is part of the Stern prescription. If we rule it out, for the reasons just suggested, we are left with an approach that is more appealing to most economists. That is to apply standard microeconomic theory by introducing some general economic instrument that will take into account the externality and will then allow the market to adjust without being constrained by the views of the government about which energy sources are most acceptable and how much energy should be conserved (Marshall, 2005).

One such instrument would be a ‘carbon tax’ – a tax on fuel that varies according to the carbon emissions produced when the fuel is burned. Since the optimal tax cannot be calculated, the tax rate would have to be determined by government and so government failure would be involved in applying the economic principle. Another instrument, instead of directly putting a price on carbon by applying a tax, is a carbon trading scheme under which permits to emit specified amounts of carbon are allocated and trading of those permits encourages efficiency in reducing emissions; such a scheme would allow a price of carbon to emerge.

### S

#### No chance of SMRs ever being commercially viable---negative learning means problems and cost overruns will only cascade and get worse---magnified by the lack of a price on carbon

Thomas B. Cochran 12, member of the Department of Energy's Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, consultant to the Natural Resources Defense Council, was a senior scientist and held the Wade Greene Chair for Nuclear Policy at NRDC, and was director of its Nuclear Program, 5/30/12, “NRDC’s Perspectives on the Economics of Small Modular Reactors,” http://www.ne.doe.gov/smrsubcommittee/documents/NRDC%20Presentation%205-30-12.pptx

BROAD CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS ON SMRs

In formulating conclusions and recommendations, there must be a full account of the wide range of unknowns and uncertainties, and difficult questions posed that require further analysis and resolution before large public sums are committed to an SMR industrialization strategy.

The history of DOE is littered with DD&E programs for reactors that never found a home in the commercial marketplace, and thus there was never a return on the investment for US taxpayers or humanity at large.

Our presentation has focused on the sensitivity of the U. of Chicago EPIC model’s projected SMR economic viability in the US context to modest variations in assumptions for industrial learning rates, LEAD unit direct costs, required contingency funds, and the future levelized cost of natural gas combined cycle generation.

But the range of SMR uncertainties extends well beyond variations in this narrow set of modeled parameters, and includes the following 12 issues:

Not all learning curve cost reductions derive from the same source, or occur uniformly over time. They are both time dependent and technology specific, and thus difficult to forecast accurately unless the details of the technology and production processes involved are already well understood. Early in the production cycle, sharp cost reductions can be expected going from the early LEAD units comprising the first plant to the next 6-12 FOAK plants built on an assembly line. But after these reductions, the rate of cost improvements could well decelerate or even disappear altogether, not only because of the law of diminishing returns to further capital investment at a given level of production, but also because “learning” works both ways, sometimes uncovering design or production defects that require increased costs to remedy.

The “negative learning” evident in the highly centralized and relatively standardized French nuclear program, is most likely the result of increased knowledge of, and required attention to, nuclear safety and quality control issues with each succeeding large LWR variant. A similar pattern could recur with SMRs.

Another source of uncertainty is the reliability of component supplier and system vendor cost projections – the well known problem in noncompetitive markets of companies offering “buy-in” prices to the government and any commercial customers to get them “hooked,” in the belief that either prices can be raised later, or costs recovered through the sale of larger numbers of components and systems than are actually represented in the forecast market demand.

Will international competition at the system vendor level help or inhibit the kind of dramatic cost reductions that are needed to make SMR’s a viable factor in mitigating global climate change? If several significantly different SMR designs, each with their own customized supply chains, are dividing-up limited domestic and international markets, how does any one vendor reach the stage of “commoditizing” production of the various constituent components in its plant, thereby significantly reducing its cost?

This process of wringing out cost in the production of components in turn requires reductions in the cost of the capital equipment needed to mass produce these commodity components, which reduction (in required capital cost per unit output) has been the real source of final product cost reductions in the electronics and solar PV and many other industries. What evidence is there that SMR reactor vessels, for instance, will cost less to produce per kilowatt of capacity than those produced for large LWR’s?

Is significant price competition among suppliers of key components, each susceptible of incorporation in multiple SMR designs – in place of a unique supply chain for each design -- also needed to achieve long term economies in the manufacture of SMR components.

What is the evidence for the proposition that nuclear-safety-grade steel forgings, concrete, pumps, piping, welds, wiring, and instrumentation will be appreciably cheaper in the future than they are now, and if not, what does the alleged cost-reducing “learning” actually consist of? The argument appears to be that the direct labor costs of integrating these components will be less, and achieved more rapidly, in a factory environment than at a construction site. But even if this is assumed to be true to some extent, given that the direct materials costs-per-kilowatt must increase when you build five or six reactors to achieve the same output as one large one, what evidence is there that the required labor-hours-per-kilowatt-of-capacity will go in the opposite direction, and far enough to more than offset the increased materials costs per kilowatt?

What is the evidence that staffing and O&M will be cheaper for six 200 MW units rather than one 1200 MW unit, and if it is not cheaper, where will the necessary offsetting cost reductions be found, such that the levelized SMR electricity cost is within an acceptable price range for future low carbon resources

Are current SMR vendor cost projections predicated on implicit assumptions linking prospective SMR “passive safety” improvements to streamlining and relaxation of current commercial LWR safety requirements that dictate costly requirements for emergency planning , operator staffing, and maintenance and inspection of safety related systems and components .

Could the longer proposed refueling interval (e.g. five years), intended to reduce O&M costs, create new safety issues in certain accident scenarios and actually add to costs by reducing the total energy output of the reactors?

A key question to consider is whether, in light of the above concerns, a nationally-focused SMR DD&E and deployment effort even makes sense. Is it plausible to believe that working on their own, DOE and a few U.S. vendors can development the SMR hardware, identify a sufficiently large customer base, finance the sale, and economically construct a large fleet of SMRs. As we have noted, at least in the near to medium term, the “coal replacement” market for SMR’s seems implausible in the light of competition from natural gas (although this could change over a longer time period), and the capital costs of constructing reactors in the U.S..

Are there national policies, such as carbon taxation and stricter environmental regulation of natural gas, that are REQUIRED accompaniments of an SMR deployment strategy, the absence of which makes the whole enterprise, at least on a national basis, appear hopeless?

To avoid yet another failed DOE reactor development program that spends a billion or more of the taxpayers money and then grinds to a halt for want of any economically rational deployment strategy, the panel and DOE must seriously consider these questions before committing additional resources in pursuit of SMR development.

## 1NR

### Warming

#### Oceans wrong

Craig Idso et al 12, founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, and Association of American Geographers; Sherwood Idso, research physicist with the USDA's Agricultural Research Service at the US Water Conservation Laboratory and adjunct professor at the ASU Office of Climatology; and Keith Idso, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, July 11, 2012, “The Potential for Adaptive Evolution to Enable the World's Most Important Calcifying Organism to Cope with Ocean Acidification,” CO2 Science, Vol. 15, No. 28

In an important paper published in the May 2012 issue of Nature Geoscience, Lohbeck et al. write that "our present understanding of the sensitivity of marine life to ocean acidification is based primarily on **short-term experiments**," which often depict negative effects. However, they go on to say that phytoplanktonic species with short generation times "may be able to respond to environmental alterations through adaptive evolution." And with this tantalizing possibility in mind, they studied, as they describe it, "the ability of the world's single most important calcifying organism, the coccolithophore Emiliania huxleyi, to evolve in response to ocean acidification in two 500-generation selection experiments."

Working with freshly isolated genotypes from Bergen, Norway, the three German researchers grew them in batch cultures over some 500 asexual generations at three different atmospheric CO2 concentrations - ambient (400 ppm), medium (1100 ppm) and high (2200 ppm) - where the medium CO2 treatment was chosen to represent the atmospheric CO2 level projected for the beginning of the next century. This they did in a multi-clone experiment designed to provide existing genetic variation that they said "would be readily available to genotypic selection," as well as in a single-clone experiment that was initiated with one "haphazardly chosen genotype," where evolutionary adaptation would obviously require new mutations. So what did they learn?

Compared with populations kept at ambient CO2 partial pressure, Lohbeck et al. found that those selected at increased CO2 levels "exhibited higher growth rates, in both the single- and multi-clone experiment, when tested under ocean acidification conditions." Calcification rates, on the other hand, were somewhat lower under CO2-enriched conditions in all cultures; but the research team reports that they were "up to 50% higher in adapted [medium and high CO2] compared with non-adapted cultures." And when all was said and done, they concluded that "contemporary evolution could help to maintain the functionality of microbial processes at the base of marine food webs in the face of global change [our italics]."

In other ruminations on their findings, the marine biologists indicate that what they call the swift adaptation processes they observed may "have the potential to affect food-web dynamics and biogeochemical cycles on timescales of a few years, thus surpassing predicted rates of ongoing global change including ocean acidification." And they also note, in this regard, that "a recent study reports surprisingly high coccolith mass in an E. huxleyi population off Chile in high-CO2 waters (Beaufort et al., 2011)," which observation is said by them to be indicative of "across-population variation in calcification, in line with findings of rapid microevolution identified here."

#### Can’t sever their reps---allows aff conditionality and causes argumentative irresponsibility that jacks negative ground---their language uses are a strategic choice that they should have to defend

Trennel 6 Paul, Ph.D of the University of Wales, Department of International Politics, “The (Im)possibility of Environmental Security”

With the understanding of security as a performative rather than descriptive act in place the debate over environmental security takes on a new character. As Ole Waever has detailed, under the speech act conception of security, the “use of the security label does not merely reflect whether a problem is a security problem, it is also a political choice, that is a decision for conceptualization a special way. **When an issue is ‘securitized’ the act itself tends to lead to certain ways of addressing it**” (Waever, 1995: 65). Therefore, **the focus shifts** **from the question of whether the environment is in reality a threat to human well being** – the question which underpinned the early work on the topic by those such as Mathews and Ullman – **and onto the issue of whether the conditions invoked by applying the security tag are desirable** for addressing the issue at hand. As Huysmans has said “One has to decide…if one wants to approach a problem in security terms or not…the is-question automatically turns into a should-question” (1998: 234, 249). The response to the should-question of environmental security is dependent on whether or not the way in which security organizes social relations can be seen as beneficial to the attempt to develop effective environmental policy.

#### The alt cannot incorporate environmental threat construction---rethinking has to come before policy deliberation to ensure the new politics of the alt are effective

Dalby 99 Simon, Asst Prof Intl Affairs @ Carleton, Contested Grounds*,* p158-9

But there is much more than an academic research agenda involved in these discussions. The debate about environmental security is about how politics will be rethought and policy reoriented after the Cold War. Conflating this and the academic agenda often simply causes confusion.8 The use of the term by the U.N. Development Program and the Commission on Global Governance suggests clearly a political exercise about whose issues are part of the international policy agenda. It is also to be expected that policymakers and institutions with specific political interests will attempt to co-opt advocates of positions and arguments that they find useful. The military can sometimes be “green” when it suits its institutional purpose, and intelligence agencies may also seek roles in monitoring environmental trends.9

In this process it is not surprising that broad generalizations proliferate along with assumptions of common global interests among all peoples. But global or universal political claims often have a nasty habit of turning out to be parochial concerns dressed up in universalist garb to justify much narrower political interests. This chapter argues that much of the policy literature linking environmental issues and security (broadly defined) is in danger of overlooking important political issues unless analysts are alert to the persistent dangers of the traditional ethnocentric and geopolitical assumptions in Anglo-American security thinking.10 Security thinking is only partly an academic discourse, it is, as recent analysts have made clear much more importantly part of the process of international politics and the formation of American foreign policy in particular. This suggests that if old ideas of security are added to new concerns about the environment the policy results may not be anything like what the original advocates of environmental security had in mind.

There are a number of very compelling arguments already in print that suggest some considerable difficulties with the positing of environmental security as a "progressive" political discourse.12 While the argument in this chapter\*acknowledges the efficacy of the case against environmental security as a policy focus, the point of departure takes seriously the political desire to fundamentally rethink the whole concept of security as a strategy to reorient political thinking and extend definitions of security, of who and what should be rendered secure, and also who would be the political agents providing these new forms of security. While these “progressive” ideas may be a minority concern on the political landscape, they are interesting both because they shed light on conventional thinking and because they suggest possibilities for rethinking conventional state-dominated political concepts and practices.

Examining the environmental security literature in the light of these arguments suggests some fundamental critiques of the global order that has been in part "secured" by a: geopolitical understanding of American national security through the Cold War period. Further, and of primary concern to this chapter, this is especially clear when the environmental security discourse is confronted by the issues of global justice in terms of a "Southern critique" of the double standards and inequities in some high profile Northern environmentalist policies. These lines of argument suggest that unless the term security is understood in substantially different ways in the new circumstances of the 1990s, it is quite possible that “environmental security” may turn out to be just another addition to the traditional Cold War American policy concerns with national and international security that usually operated to maintain the global political and economic status quo.

#### The impact is global wars and violence in the name of environmental and resource protection---you should be skeptical of their epistemology

Kumari 12—Masters in International Relations; educated at University of Nottingham and The University of Birmingham (Parmila, Securitising The Environment: A Barrier To Combating Environment Degradation Or A Solution In Itself?, [www.e-ir.info/2012/01/29/securitising-the-environment-a-barrier-to-combating-environment-degradation-or-a-solution-in-itself/](http://www.e-ir.info/2012/01/29/securitising-the-environment-a-barrier-to-combating-environment-degradation-or-a-solution-in-itself/)) [table omitted]

 “The Dilemma should by now be apparent; securitising environmental issues runs the risk that the strategic/realist approach will coopt and colonise the environmental agenda rather than respond positively to environmental problems.” (Barnett 2001:137)

The realist take on ‘security’ in the post-WWII period still holds a firm grasp today, so that the state is still the referent object of security and it is still its sovereignty which is to be secured against the threat of states. The problem is that, in the context of the environment, this makes no sense because the traditional focus of national security (interstate violence) has nothing to do with the focus of environmental degradation (human impact on the environment). Furthermore, talking of national security is too restrictive because a state’s ecological footprint may cross its sovereign domain. The wealthiest 20% of the world’s population consume 84% of all paper, use 87% of the world’s vehicles and emit 53% of all C0². Yet those least responsible suffer the effects the most. This is because wastes are exported to and resources come from the Southern poorer countries, so that their lands experience resource depletion and extraction (Barnett 2001:13). A focus on national security selects the military, because environmental degradation is viewed as having the potential to destabilise regional balances of power (Hough 2004:13-16). One only wonders how the military alone could prevent the effects of depletion and extraction.

The environmental-conflict literature is a good example where traditional national security concerns have been linked with the environment. The narrative within this discourse is that environment degradation will lead to resource scarcities, which will make the developing countries more militarily confrontational towards the industrialised states (Barnett 2001:38). Conflict over scarce resources undermines the security of the state (Detraz and Betsill 2009:305), so it is the state which is to be protected. Emphasis on such an account is undesirable for many reasons. Firstly, it is untrue that the only consequence of environmental degradation is conflict. Bogardi and Brauch have noted how environmental security involves freedom from want (economic and social security dimensions), freedom from hazard impacts (natural or human-induced hazards as effects of environmental degradation) and freedom from fear (violence and conflict) (Brauch 2008: 17-8). This demonstrates how conflict is but one consequence of degradation. Environmental-conflict literature ignores the root socioeconomic causes and hazard impact dimensions of environmental security; a focus on which would lead to conclusions of undertaking non-military efforts like disaster preparedness, adaptation, mitigation, early warning systems etc (Brauch 2008:17-8), and economic solutions like pricing goods to reflect the costs of their provision (Mathews (1989:172).

Secondly, the assertion that environmental degradation is a primary reason of conflict is purely speculative (Barnett 2003:10). Barnett suggests that the ‘evidence’ provided in support is a collection of historical events chosen to support the conflict-scarcity storyline and reify the realist assumption that eventually humans will resort to violence (Barnett 2001:66). This is as opposed to acknowledging that humans are equally capable of adapting. Thirdly, research shows that it is abundance of resources which drives competition, not scarcity (Barnet 2003:11). This makes sense because any territorial conquest to obtain resources will be expensive. A poor country suffering from resource scarcity would not be able to afford an offensive war (Deudney 1990: 309-11).

The second and third points mean that environmental-conflict literature counteracts any attempts at solving the problem of environmental degradation. The discourse attributes high intentionality to people-because of scarcity they decide to become violent. This ignores the fact that human actions are not intended to harm the environment. The high intentionality given to people prevents them from being seen as victims who need help. Instead they are pictured as threats to state security. This view can exacerbate ethnic tensions as the state uses minority groups as scapegoats for environmental degradation.It also means that only those involved in conflict are relevant to environmental security, not those who are vulnerable (Detraz and Betsill 2009:307-15). In this way the South is scripted as “primeval Other” (Barnett 2001:65), where order can only be maintained by the intervention of the North, rather than by the provision of aid. The North’s agency in creating the environmental problems is completely erased. Instead environmental degradation is seen from the perspective of the individual state, questioning how it could affect the state, i.e. increased migration (Allenby 2000:18) and this leads to the adoption of narrow policies.

Saad has said that securitising the environment in this way allows the North to justify intervening and forcing developing nations to follow policies which encapsulate the North’s norms (Saad 1991:325-7). In this way the powerful become stronger, and the weak weaker. This view may affect the South’s relations with the North. For example, Detraz and Betsill have commented on tensions between the North and South in the 2007 United Nations Security Council debate on climate change. Only 29% of the Southern states compared to 70% of Northern speakers supported the idea of the Security Council being a place to develop a global response to climate change. The reasons for this difference was that shifting decision-making to the Security Council would make Southern states unable to promote efficiently their interests in obtaining resources for climate adaptation and mitigation plans. Furthermore, Egypt and India argued that in suggesting this Northern countries were avoiding their responsibilities for controlling greenhouse gases, by trying to “shift attention to the need to address potential climate-related conflict in the South” (Detraz and Betsill 2009:312). In this way environmental security becomes a barrier because the traditional (realist) concept of security is used to immobilise any action towards dealing with the root causes of environmental degradation.

#### It calls into question the epistemological basis for their harms and solvency---means the alt is a prior question to determine whether the 1ac claims are true---that’s 1NC doremus---it’s the most basic question in environmental policy-making

Doremus 2k Holly Doremus is Professor of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, and co-faculty director of the California Center for Environmental Law and Policy "The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection:Toward a New Discourse" 1-1-2000scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1311&context=wlulr

Rhetoric matters. That is almost too basic to be worth saying, but it bears repeating because sometimes the rhetoric we use to describe problems becomes so ingrained as to be almost invisible. Even if we are unaware of it, though, rhetoric has the very real effect of severely constraining our perception of a problem and its potential solutions. Terminology is one aspect of rhetoric. The words we use to describe the world around us condition our response to that world. Whether we use the word "swamps" or "wetlands," for example, may determine whether we drain or protect those areas.1 Not surprisingly, the battle to control terminology is an important one in the environmental context.2 But there is far more to the rhetoric of law. The way words are put together to form stories and discourses shapes the law and society. Stories, which put a human face on concerns that might otherwise go unnoticed, exert a powerful emotional tug.3 "Discourses," loose collections of concepts and ideas, provide a shared language for envisioning problems and solutions.4

#### Focusing on policy-making first absolves individual contribution and cedes the political---ensures their impacts are inevitable and is an independent reason to vote negative

Trennel 6 Paul, Ph.D of the University of Wales, Department of International Politics, “The (Im)possibility of Environmental Security”

Thirdly, it can be claimed that the security mindset channels the obligation to address environmental issues in an unwelcome direction. Due to terms laid out by the social contract “security is essentially something done by states…there is no obligation or moral duty on citizens to provide security…In this sense security is essentially empty…it is not a sign of positive political initiative” (Dalby, 1992a: 97-8). Therefore, **casting an issue in security terms** puts the onus of action onto governments**, creating a** docile citizenry **who** await instructions from their leaders as to the next step rather than taking it on their own backs to do something about pressing concerns. This is unwelcome because **governments have limited incentives to act on environmental issues**, as their collectively poor track record to date reveals. Paul Brown notes that “at present in all the large democracies the short-term politics of winning the next election and the need to increase the annual profits of industry rule over the long term interests of the human race” (1996: 10; see also Booth 1991: 348). There is no clearer evidence for this than the grounds on which George W. **Bush explained his decision to opt out of the Kyoto Protocol**: “I told the world I thought that Kyoto was a lousy deal for America…It meant that we had to cut emissions below 1990 levels, which would have meant I would have presided over massive layoffs and economic destruction” (BBC: 2006). The short-term focus of government elites and the long-term nature of the environmental threat means that any policy which puts the burden of responsibility on the shoulders of governments should be viewed with scepticism **as this may have the effect of** breeding inaction on environmental issues. Moreover, governmental legislation may not be the most appropriate route to solving the problem at hand. If environmental vulnerabilities are to be effectively addressed “[t]he routine behaviour of practically everyone must be altered” (Deudney, 1990: 465). In the case of the environmental sector it is not large scale and intentional assaults but the cumulative effect of small and seemingly innocent acts such as driving a car or taking a flight that do the damage. Exactly how a legislative response could serve to alter “non-criminal apolitical acts by individuals” (Prins, 1993: 176- 177) which lie beyond established categories of the political is unclear. Andrew Dobson has covered this ground in claiming that the solution to environmental hazards lies not in piecemeal legislation but in the fostering of a culture of ‘ecological citizenship’. His call is made on the grounds that legislating on the environment, forcing people to adapt, does not reach the necessary depth to produce long-lasting change, but merely plugs the problem temporarily. He cites Italian ‘car-free city’ days as evidence of this, noting that whilst selected cities may be free of automobiles on a single predetermined day, numbers return to previous levels immediately thereafter (2003: 3). This indicates that the deeper message underlying the policy is not being successfully conveyed. Enduring **environmental solutions are likely to emerge only when citizens choose to change their ways** because they understand that there exists a pressing need to do so. Such a realisation is unlikely to be prompted by the top-down, state oriented focus supplied by a security framework.