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Restrictions on production must mandate a decrease in the quantity produced—

Anell 89. Chairman, WTO panel. "To examine, in the light of the relevant GATT provisions, the matter referred to the

CONTRACTING PARTIES by the United States in document L/6445 and to make such findings as will assist the CONTRACTING PARTIES in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in Article XXIII:2." 3. On 3 April 1989, the Council was informed that agreement had been reached on the following composition of the Panel (C/164): Composition Chairman: Mr. Lars E.R. Anell Members: Mr. Hugh W. Bartlett Mrs. Carmen Luz Guarda CANADA - IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON ICE CREAM AND YOGHURT Report of the Panel adopted at the Forty-fifth Session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES on 5 December 1989 (L/6568 - 36S/68) [<http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/88icecrm.pdf>]

The United States argued that Canada had failed to demonstrate that it effectively restricted domestic production of milk. The differentiation between "fluid" and "industrial" milk was an artificial one for administrative purposes; with regard to GATT obligations, the product at issue was raw milk from the cow, regardless of what further use was made of it. The use of the word "permitted" in Article XI:2(c)(i) required that there be a limitation on the total quantity of milk that domestic producers were authorized or allowed to produce or sell. The provincial controls on fluid milk did not restrict the quantities permitted to be produced; rather dairy farmers could produce and market as much milk as could be sold as beverage milk or table cream. There were no penalties for delivering more than a farmer's fluid milk quota, it was only if deliveries exceeded actual fluid milk usage or sales that it counted against his industrial milk quota. At least one province did not participate in this voluntary system, and another province had considered leaving it. Furthermore, Canada did not even prohibit the production or sale of milk that exceeded the Market Share Quota. The method used to calculate direct support payments on within-quota deliveries assured that most dairy farmers would completely recover all of their fixed and variable costs on their within-quota deliveries. The farmer was permitted to produce and market milk in excess of the quota, and perhaps had an economic incentive to do so. 27. The United States noted that in the past six years total industrial milk production had consistently exceeded the established Market Sharing Quota, and concluded that the Canadian system was a regulation of production but not a restriction of production. Proposals to amend Article XI:2(c)(i) to replace the word "restrict" with "regulate" had been defeated; what was required was the reduction of production. The results of the econometric analyses cited by Canada provided no indication of what would happen to milk production in the absence not only of the production quotas, but also of the accompanying high price guarantees which operated as incentives to produce. According to the official publication of the Canadian Dairy Commission, a key element of Canada's national dairy policy was to promote self-sufficiency in milk production. The effectiveness of the government supply controls had to be compared to what the situation would be in the absence of all government measures.

The plan changes how energy is produced, rather than restricting how much is produced.

Vote Negative

Allowing regulations and economic impediments in the topic explodes limits by allowing cosmetic changes to law and undermines preparedness for all debates. There infinite ways to make production easier or faster-limits cases to removing statutory restrictions is key to in-depth research and clash.
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Text: The United States federal government should fully fund and support international cooperation on the research and deployment of atmospheric aerosol injection and carbon air capture and storage with the goal of stabilizing global climate change at pre-industrial levels by 2050. Support for international cooperation should include compensation for parties harmed by geoengineering.

Research funding causes a cooperative international expansion of geoengineering.

Brand 9—Lifetime environmentalist, President of the Long Now Foundation and author of the Whole Earth Catalog which won the National Book award in 1972, Stewart, Whole Earth Discipline, pg 294-5

Because the cost of some geoengineering schemes is so low, Victor predicts, "A lone Greenfinger, self-appointed protector of the planet and working with a small fraction of the Gates bank account, could force a lot of geoengineering on his own." The way to head off unilateral geoengi­neering and premature treaties, Victor suggests, is with a growing body of norms rather than rules:

Meaningful norms are not crafted from thin air. They can have effect if they make sense to pivotal players and when they become socialized through practice. . . . Useful norms could arise through an intensive process of research and assessment that is probably best organized by the academies of sciences in the few countries with the potential to geoengineer. . . .

Most likely . . . is that the impacts of global climate change will have reached such a nasty state by the time societies deploy large-scale geoengineering that some side effects will be tolerated. The . . . systems they deploy will not be a silver bullet but rather many interventions deployed in tandem—one to focus on the central disease and others to fix the ancillary harms.

To my mind, a useful role for Greenfinger entrepreneurs might be to jump-start serious geoengineering research while national academies of science are spending years making up their minds to act. Then the privately funded researchers could bring real data to the "transnational assessment process," where the norms and best practices emerge. This is a planetary hack we're talking about. It has to be totally transparent and highly collaborative. Everyone's first preference is to not deploy it at all, but if it has to be used, it must be done effectively and minimally, and if possible, for a limited period. Like abortion, geoengineering should be "safe, legal, and rare."

That still leaves the question of who runs things—"whose hands will be allowed on the thermostat," as David Victor puts it. The task can be divided between the operators and an oversight body. In one previous piece of planet craft—the total eradication of smallpox in the 1970s—the World Health Organization provided oversight and funding, and the Smallpox Eradication Unit, led by Donald Henderson, did the work.

In Victor's formulation, norms and leadership for geoengineering will emerge from an intensifying sequence of conferences, research projects, data sharing, and brainstorming. The most effective early players will determine the play, and funding will determine the pace. Geoengineering is government-scale infrastructure; it will need government-scale money. Once one nation commits, I suspect, other nations will join in, lest they be left out. If China says, "We're going to geoengineer," the United States, Russia, the European Union, Japan, Brazil, and India are not going to say, "Fine, let us know how it works out." They'll start their own programs. With luck, an ad hoc standards-setting body similar to the Internet Engi­neering Task Force ("rough consensus and running code") will emerge. That kind of governance was required in order to have one universal Inter­net. The planet's one universal climate requires something similar.

Geo-engineering solves warming.

Lenton and Vaughan 9—T . M. Lenton, School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, and N. E. Vaughan, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, UK, The radiative forcing potential of different climate geoengineering options, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 5539–5561, 2009

Abstract. Climate geoengineering proposals seek to rectify the Earth’s current and potential future radiative imbalance, either by reducing the absorption of incoming solar (shortwave) radiation, or by removing CO2 from the atmosphere and transferring it to long-lived reservoirs, thus increasing outgoing longwave radiation. A fundamental criterion for evaluating geoengineering options is their climate cooling effectiveness, which we quantify here in terms of radiative forcing potential. We use a simple analytical approach, based on energy balance considerations and pulse response functions for the decay of CO2 perturbations. This aids transparency compared to calculations with complex numerical models, but is not intended to be deﬁnitive. It allows us to compare the relative effectiveness of a range of proposals. We consider geoengineering options as additional to large reductions in CO2 emissions. By 2050, some land carbon cycle geoengineering options could be of comparable magnitude to mitigation “wedges”, but only stratospheric aerosol injections, albedo enhancement of marine stratocumulus clouds, or sunshades in space have the potential to cool the climate back toward its pre-industrial state. Strong mitigation, combined with global-scale air capture and storage, afforestation, and bio-char production, i.e. enhanced CO2 sinks, might be able to bring CO2 back to its pre-industrial level by 2100, thus removing the need for other geoengineering. Alternatively, strong mitigation stabilising CO2 at 500 ppm, combined with geoengineered increases in the albedo of marine stratiform clouds, grasslands, croplands and human settlements might achieve a patchy cancellation of radiative forcing. Ocean fertilisation options are only worthwhile if sustained on a millennial timescale and phosphorus addition may have greater long-term potential than iron or nitrogen fertilisation. Enhancing ocean upwelling or downwelling have trivial effects on any meaningful timescale. Our approach provides a common framework for the evaluation of climate geoengineering proposals, and our results should help inform the prioritisation of further research into them.
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Fiscal Cliff averted for two months – Obama needs polcap to avert total meltdown

Mahn 1-3 (Kevin, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/advisor/2013/01/03/fiscal-cliff-deal-4-tax-provisions-handled-1-hiked-still-work-to-be-done/)

A last minute fiscal cliff deal/compromise was reached in Washington to avert the initial stages of a potential economic meltdown that was received warmly by the markets given the extent of the relief rally that we have experienced thus far on the first trading day of the New Year.¶ However, I don’t believe that we are anywhere close to signaling “all clear” on the Fiscal Cliff front and that the deal in question—while it averted some of the feared, short-term draconian tax increases associated with going over the cliff—did nothing to address the longer term, more encompassing budget issues as the compromise delayed any decisions on spending cuts for another two months.¶ The compromise also did not deal with the impending Debt Ceiling debate, which promises to have both political parties digging in on their ideological heels.¶ Removing some uncertainty from the markets, what has been addressed in the deal/compromise were changes to the revenue side of the fiscal budget equation primarily dealing with tax rates and income levels associated with these tax rates.¶ As I understand it at this point in time, based primarily upon a recent The Wall Street Journalarticle entitled, “Summary of Bill’s Tax Provisions,” here are some of the major provisions of the deal that were agreed to by the White House, Senate and House of Representatives—and one noteworthy tax that was not addressed in the deal.¶ 1. The personal income tax rate for families with incomes above $450,000 (individuals with incomes above $400,000 and heads-of-households with incomes above $425,000) will increase. Any excess income above these levels will now be taxed at 39.6%. This represents the largest income tax rate increase in nearly two decades. The tax rates for families, individuals and heads-of households with income below these thresholds will not change and will remain at their existing Bush-era tax bracket levels.¶ 2. The tax rate on capital gains and dividendswill rise to 20% from 15% for incomes above the levels described in (1) above. These tax rates will remain at 15% for all other applicable taxpayers below these thresholds. Avoiding the tax treatment of dividend income at ordinary income rates, as opposed to the agreed upon tax rates of 15% or 20%, is viewed as a major positive for investors–especially those with dividend oriented investment strategies in their portfolios.¶ 3. The estate tax will be increased from a top tax rate of 35% to 40% with a $5 million exemption level. This threshold will be indexed to inflation going forward.¶ 4. The Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) was patched to avoid raising taxes, through the AMT, on more middle-class Americans by raising the income exemption from $33,750 (individuals) and $45,000 (married couples filing jointly), as it would have reverted to for the tax year 2012, to $50,600 (individuals) and $78,750 (married couples filing jointly) respectively. The exemption amounts will be indexed going forward as well.¶ 5. The deal did not address payroll taxes. As a result, the rate of payroll taxes for workers used to fund Social Security will increase from 4.2% (which was in place for the previous two tax years) to 6.2% as of January 1, 2013. According to The Tax Policy Center, approximately 77% of American households will face higher federal taxes in 2013—not just income tax increases on wealthier American households but payroll tax increases on middle and low income American households as well.¶ While the details of the “first Fiscal Cliff deal,” addressing revenue (i.e. taxes), show that the compromises reached helped to lessen the initial taxable impact that would have been experienced by many taxpayers and investors if no deal had been reached at all, I remain concerned with the lack of any type of deal on spending cuts at this time.¶ A “second Fiscal Cliff deal,” addressing spending cuts, would need to be reached within the next two months according to the outtakes of the first Fiscal Cliff deal. If an agreement between the two political parties on spending cuts cannot be reached in that timeframe, the Debt Ceiling debate would then return to the front burner as more debt would thus be needed (potentially involving another increase to the Debt Ceiling) to fund the existing Federal balance sheet imbalance.¶ Judging from past experience, I would anticipate that any agreement on a second Fiscal Cliff deal will probably come down to the wire, if not get postponed again, and that market volatility will likely continue to increase as we get closer to the new deadline.

The plan costs capital—

Budnick ‘11, Andew Budnick, et al., the Princeton Task Force on Chinese Investment in the United States, “Economic Patriotism: How to Deal with Chinese Investment,” Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs, Princeton University, December [http://www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/Princeton\_Task\_Force\_Report\_Final\_2011]

For one, Chinese companies are predominately state-controlled. In many countries, a company’s investment in the U.S. would be a purely commercial decision. When the state owns a controlling interest in a variety of FDI-seeking companies, however, it is easy to suspect that these companies are acting to fulfill strategic, rather than profit-maximizing, goals. Some American politicians, such as former Republican Senate candidate Christine O’Donnell, have suggested that Chinese firms, on orders from the Chapter : Introduction Communist regime, are bent on buying up America and pushing U.S. firms out of their own market in a bid for strategic dominance.

When viewed alongside China’s status as a military rival of the United States, the issue turns into a hot political topic. Unlike Japan, which has been an ally since 1945, the People’s Republic of China (PRC) has always grated against the ideals of the U.S. with its communist ideology. In light of the possibility of future conflict, American policymakers are increasingly concerned about the motivation behind Chinese FDI and about what leverage these investments could provide a rival government.

Key senators oppose the plan – they want to protect US industries

Platts 11/7

[Democrat win in US Senate indicates new leader on energy policy. Platts. 11/7/12. http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/NaturalGas/8893313]

Democrats retained control of the US Senate in Tuesday's election, paving the way for a potential opponent of natural gas exports and vocal critic of commodity market speculation to take over a key energy committee. Senator Ron Wyden, an Oregon Democrat, is expected to take over as chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee when the 113th Congress convenes in January. Senator Jeff Bingaman, a New Mexico Democrat and the committee's current chairman, did not seek re-election this year. The US House of Representatives remained in the hands of the Republican Party, suggesting differences will remain between the two chambers on energy, the environment and other issues. In the Senate, Wyden, 62, has indicated he would be open to reconsidering revenue sharing for states in offshore gas and oil drilling, but he has also expressed concerns that large-scale LNG exports would raise domestic gas prices and hurt the US economy. This spring he said at a public event in Washington that the US government should impose a "timeout" on approving LNG exports until their effects can be better gauged Last week, Wyden wrote to Energy Secretary Steven Chu asking him to explain the "decision-making criteria" that the Department of Energy will use in determining whether to approve all "pending and future applications" to export LNG. Wyden has also become an outspoken critic of commodity market speculation, which, he said, has influenced energy prices and increased volatility in markets. Wyden was part of a small, but vocal group of Senate Democrats who criticized the Commodity Futures Trading Commission's perceived delay in imposing federal limits on petroleum, natural gas and other commodity contracts. "There's no sense of urgency [from the CFTC]," Wyden said last year following a Capitol Hill meeting with CFTC Chairman Gary Gensler. "We think this should have been addressed a long time ago." The agency's position limits rule, which was scheduled to take effect last month, has been overturned by a federal judge following an industry lawsuit. In a September report for clients, the Rapidan Group and Goldwyn Strategies said there would be "tonal," if not substantive, changes in energy policy coming to the Senate, due to Wyden taking over as chairman. "Senator Wyden is more publicly critical of the oil and gas industry than outgoing Senator Bingaman, and his voting history on the Energy and Finance committees demonstrates this," the report said. "However, as a coastal-state member, Wyden may be more willing to make deals to expand offshore oil-and-gas access and include revenue-sharing measures than his predecessor." Last month, Wyden introduced legislation aimed at protecting US clean-energy manufacturers from Chinese competition and last year he introduced a bill to sell part of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to offset the costs of research on non-petroleum fuels and advanced vehicles.

Current deal isn’t enough – lack of a full deal will cause a full collapse, flipping the econ impact

Delamaide 1-3 (Darrell, Marketwatch, “Tactical deal on “cliff” risks permanent damage,” http://www.marketwatch.com/story/tactical-deal-on-cliff-risks-permanent-damage-2013-01-03?link=MW\_latest\_news)

The bill passed with so much drama converted the temporary George W. Bush-era tax cuts into the permanent Obama tax cuts. As hard as it may be to not extend tax cuts that are due to expire, it’s much harder politically to actually raise tax rates.¶ The tax rates, originally adopted in response to a surging government surplus and then extended to avoid fiscal contraction during a recession, have now been set at a permanently low level, which could hinder the country from achieving its future economic and social goals.¶ This was the thrust of the argument made by one of the 16 Democratic congressmen who voted against the bill.¶ “We have concretized revenue at an extraordinarily low rate,” Rep. Jim Moran said Wednesday on MSNBC.¶ Moran, who represents some of the Washington suburbs in northern Virginia, said the tax rates enshrined in the legislation now signed into law by President Barack Obama meant “we will never bring in more than 15% of GDP.” But, he added, the U.S. has never enjoyed a robust economy without government spending of at least 20% of gross domestic product.¶ Moran, beginning his 12th term in Congress this week, noted the deal’s immediate consequences of leaving several ugly fiscal battles to fight in the coming weeks — raising the debt ceiling, disarming the “sequester” of automatic spending cuts, and passing a budget that enables the government to continue operating.¶ But the real issue is the long-term problem of starving the beast, with Obama at his moment of maximum leverage getting only $620 billion in added tax revenue over 10 years — instead of the $1.6 trillion he sought in earlier proposals.¶ “I wanted [Obama] to have a legacy he could be proud of,” Moran said, including investments in education and training to keep the country competitive economically. “I doubt that can be done with the limited resources we voted [Tuesday] night.”
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The 1ac leaves unchallenged the referent object of security - not only is the impact extinction, but this makes warfare, threat construction and human insecurity inevitable, turning the aff. Be suspect of their specific scenarios - national security is a ploy used by security elites to leave citizens in a constant state of fear.

Lal 7 - Master of Arts in International Relations (Preerna, 2007, http://gwu.academia.edu/PrernaLal/Papers/646118/Critical\_Security\_Studies\_Deconstructing\_the\_National\_Security\_State)

Under the lens of critical theory, there are many problems with the current framework of national security. First, security is a paradox for the more we add to the national security agenda, the more we have to fear. As Barry Buzan (1991, 37) points out in People, States and Fear, the security paradox presents us with a cruel irony in that to be secure ultimately, would mean “being unable to escape.” Thus, to secure oneself, one would need to be trapped in a timeless state, for leaving this state would incur risks. The current neo-realist realization of national security is quite narrow and does not take into account threats to human welfare, health, social problems, and domestic sources of insecurity. However, in Security: A New Framework of Analysis, several CSS theorists put forward the case for widening the field of security studies and separating these into five different sectors under state control: military, politics, environment, society and economy (Buzan, De Wilde and Waever 1998, 21-23). But, since these wideners leave the referent object of security as the state, widening the field of security studies becomes even more troubling because it risks more state control over our lives, the militarization of social issues such as drugs and crime, which would further legitimize and justify state violence, leaving us all the more insecure. Accordingly, it becomes clear that a mere re-definition of “security” away from its current neo-realist framework does not solve the security dilemma if the referent object of security is left unchanged. This goes to prove that it is the state as the referent object that requires questioning in terms of its supposed provision of security rather than the problems with widening the field of security. Without a state-centric concept of security, there would be no national security agenda left to widen, as our security concerns would be human-centered, hence, the paradox of security would dissipate. A second part of the security paradox is that security and insecurity are not binary opposites. On a micro-level, if security is the state of being secure, than insecurity should be the state of not being secure. However, what we do feel secure about is neither part of the national security agenda nor a conscious thought or feeling. The state of being secure is thus, not conceptualized as an absence of insecurity. On a policymaking level, Robert Lipschutz (1995, 27), Associate Professor of Politics at University of California, Santa Cruz, notes in On Security that our desire to achieve security through the acquisition of arms and a national missile “defense” system, serves to insecure those whom we label and treat as threats. This encourages the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and offensive posturing by those we wish to secure ourselves against, causing us to feel more insecure as the end result of our search for security. More recently, when George W. Bush included North Korea in his illogical “Axis of Evil” and named it as a threat to the United States, the peripheral state had no nuclear capability and would never have thought to use the threat of weapons of mass destruction to blackmail Western powers into giving aid. However, alarmed at the thought of being the next Afghanistan or Iraq, North Korea retaliated within a year by revealing its nuclear arsenal. The United States watched helplessly as one more previously benign nation became a real security problem. As a consequence, imagined enemies become real threats due to the ongoing threat construction by the state, and this poses the security dilemma of creating self-fulfilling prophecies in the current framework of security. Our notion of security is what the state says it is, rather than what we feel it is. Yet, this entrenched view of security is epistemologically flawed, which is our second dilemma; meaning that our knowledge of security as it is defined is based in certain realist assumptions that do not hold up under scrutiny. Our perception of what and from whom we need to be secured is not based on the actual threats that exist, but on the threats that we are told to perceive by the state. Thus, terrorists, drugs, illegal immigrants, “Third World” dictators, rogue states, blacks, non-Christians, and the Other, are considered as threats to the national security apparatus, and consequently, as threats to the individual American. This state construction of threats pervades our minds, causing a trickle-down effect that encourages a culture of fear, where the only limit to the coming danger is our imagination. Lipschutz (2000, 44-45) concludes in After Authority: War, Peace, and Global Politics in the 21st Century, “the national security state is brought down to the level of the household, and each one arms itself against the security dilemma posed by its neighbor across the hedge of fence.” Lipschutz seems to be saying that it is national security that eventually encourages the creation of a dichotomy between the self and the Other in our everyday lives. Indeed, it is the discourse of security by the rulers and elites, which creates and sustains our bipolar mindset of the world. A final dilemma presented by the current security framework is that security is ontologically unstable, unable to exist on its own, requiring the creation of certain conditions and categories, specifically, the creation of the Other. James Der Derian (1995, 25), Associate Professor of Political Science at U Mass (Amherst), notes in On Security that we are taught to consider security as “an a priori argument that proves the existence and necessity of only one form of security because there currently happens to be a widespread belief in it.” Yet, national security is a highly unstable concept and changes over time, with the construction of new threats and enemies. Due to its unstable nature, security can then, be considered as a constant fluid that is constructed and re-defined by the discourse of the state and security elites. Ole Waever, a senior researcher at the Center for Peace and Conflict Research, contends that the very act of uttering “security” places it on the security agenda, thereby giving the state and its elite, power over the issue. In On Security, he notes that “in naming a certain development a security problem, the state can claim a special right, one that in the final instance, always be defined by the state and its elites” (1995, 55). This process is termed as “securitization,” which simply means treating an event or issue as a problem of national security rather than first questioning whether it should even be treated as a security issue. Such an act serves the interests of the state and its elites, starting with security discourse by the state, which constructs and perpetuates state identity and existence.

**The affirmative’s discussion of policy is based on a positivist mode of “knowing” China. China is not something that we stand back and observe- this constructs a mode of thought that can only relate to China as a threat.**

Pan, PhD degree in Political Science and International Relations from the Australian National University, 2K4 [Chengxin, The "China Threat" in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, Vol. 29, 2004]

 China and its relationship with the United States has long been a fascinating subject of study in the mainstream U.S. international relations community. This is reflected, for example, in the current heated debates over whether China is primarily a strategic threat to or a market bonanza for the United States and whether containment or engagement is the best way to deal with it. (1) While U.S. **China scholars argue** fiercely over "**what China precisely is,**" their debates have been underpinned by some common ground, **especially in terms of a positivist epistemology**. Firstly**, they believe that China is** ultimately **a knowable object**, **whose reality can be**, and ought to be, empirically **revealed by scientific means**. For example, after expressing his dissatisfaction with often conflicting Western perceptions of China, David M. Lampton, former president of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, suggests that "**it is** time to step back and look at where China is today, where it might be going, and what consequences that direction will hold for the rest of the world." (2) Like many other China scholars, Lampton views his **object of study as essentially "something we can stand back from and observe with clinical detachment**." (3) Secondly, associated with the first assumption, it is commonly believed that China scholars merely serve as "disinterested observers" and that their studies of China are neutral, passive descriptions of reality. And thirdly, in pondering whether China poses a threat or offers an opportunity to the United States, they rarely raise the question of "what the United States is." That is, the meaning of the United States is believed to be certain and beyond doubt. I do not dismiss altogether the conventional ways of debating China. It is not the purpose of this article to venture my own "observation" of "where China is today," nor to join the "containment" versus "engagement" debate per se. Rather, I want to contribute to a novel dimension of the China debate by questioning the seemingly unproblematic assumptions shared by most China scholars in the mainstream IR community in the United States. To perform this task, I will focus attention on a particularly significant component of the China debate; namely, the "China threat" literature. More specifically, I want to argue that **U.S. conceptions of China as a threatening other are** always intrinsically **linked to how U.S. policymakers**/mainstream China specialists **see themselves (as representatives** **of the** indispensable, **security-conscious nation**, for example). As such, **they are not value-free,** objective **descriptions** **of an independent, preexisting Chinese reality out there, but are** better **understood as a** kind of **normative**, meaning-giving **practice that** often **legitimates power politics in** U.S.-China **relations and helps transform the "China threat" into social reality**. In other words, **it is self-fulfilling in practice, and is always part of the "China threat" problem it purports merely to describe.** In doing so, I seek to bring to the fore two interconnected themes of self/other constructions and of theory as practice inherent in the "China threat" literature--themes that have been overridden and rendered largely invisible by those common positivist assumptions. These themes are of course nothing new nor peculiar to the "China threat" literature. They have been identified elsewhere by critics of some conventional fields of study such as ethnography, anthropology, oriental studies, political science, and international relations. (4) Yet, so far, the China field in the West in general and the U.S. "China threat" literature in particular have shown remarkable resistance to systematic critical reflection on both their normative status as discursive practice and their enormous practical implications for international politics. (5) It is in this context that this article seeks to make a contribution.

The 'threats' are not 'out there' as the 1AC wants you to believe - they are right here. Our alternative is grass-roots citizen activism - we must make the people, not the state, the referent object of security.

Lal 7 - Master of Arts in International Relations (Preerna, 2007, http://gwu.academia.edu/PrernaLal/Papers/646118/Critical\_Security\_Studies\_Deconstructing\_the\_National\_Security\_State)

Throughout this paper, we have seen cases of how national security is an antonym for human security. With this essential realization, Booth (2005, 33) gives three reasons for why the state should not be the referent object of security: “states are unreliable as primary referents because while some are in the business of security some are not; even those which are producers of security represent the mans and not the ends; and states are too diverse in their character to serve as the basis for a comprehensive theory of security.” Additionally, the cases of South Africa and Afghanistan prove how the national security state is merely an elite tool, which causes human insecurity at home and abroad. The state treats security as a problem that comes from the outside, rather than as a problem that can arise from domestic issues. The end result of state-centric security is that humans are alienated from discussions about their own security and welfare. The most compelling reason is provided by Hayward Akler (2005, 191) in Critical Security Studies and World Politics, in which he states that “economic collapse, political oppression, scarcity, overpopulation, ethnic rivalry, the destruction of nature, terrorism, crime and disease provide more serious threats to the well-being of individuals and the interest of nations.” Thus, to millions of people, it is not the existence of the Other across the border that poses a security problem, but their own state that is a threat to security. The question that arises next is how to put critical theory into practice and deconstruct the national security state. Critical theory does not offer simple one-shot solutions to the problems created by the neo-realist state and elitist conception of security. To give simple answers would be a performative contradiction, especially after criticizing realism for being intellectually rigid for believing in objective truth. In other words, there are no alternatives; just alternative modes of understanding. However, using the poststructuralist Foucaultian analysis that discourse is power, we can move towards deconstructing the power of the state and elites to securitize using their own tool: discourse. The elites who control the meaning of security and define it in terms that are appropriate to their interests hold tremendous power in the national security state. As Foucault astutely observed, “the exercise of power is always deeply entwined with the production of knowledge and discourse” (Dalby 1998, 4). For too long, language has been used against us to create our reality, thereby obfuscating our lens of the world, depriving us from an objective search for truth and knowledge. The history of colonized people shows how the construction of language defined and justified their oppressed status. In a way, we are colonized through discursive practices and subjected to the reality that the state wants us to see. However, definitions belong to the definer, and it is high time that we questioned and defined our own reality. Thus, citizen action is critical to questioning and deconstructing the national security state and taking away its power to define our security. In On Security, Pearl Alice Marsh (1995, 126) advances the idea of a grassroots statecraft that is defined as “challenging foreign policy of government through contending discursive and speech acts.” This calls for pitting the values of civil society against the state establishment and challenging the American statecraft’s freedom to cast issues and events in a security or militarized framework. The United States has not always been a national security state and neither does it have to maintain that hegemonic and oppressive status in order to exist. It is critical to remember that fundamental changes in our institutions and structures of power do not occur from the top; they originate from the bottom. History is case in point. Citizen action was critical to ending the Red Scare and the Vietnam War, as the American people realized the ludicrousness of framing Vietnam as a security issue, which led to the fall of the Second New Deal, the deaths of thousands of American soldiers and a financial cost that we are still shouldering. In the end, what they need to be secured from and how, is a question best left up to individual Americans and subsequently, civil society. Thus, grassroots citizen action performatively makes individuals the referent subject of security as people would call for the demilitarization and desecuritization of issues that are contrary and irrelevant to human security. There is hope for the future and practical application of critical theory in international relations. As Robert Lipschutz (2000, 61) concludes in After Authority: War, Peace, and Global Politics in the 21st Century, “it was the existence of the Other across the border that gave national security its power and authority; it is the disappearance of the border that has vanquished that power.” Britain, France and Germany set aside their historical enmities and became part of a European community, which has formed a new collective identity and security across borders. Cold War rivals that almost annihilated the world are now friends in the “war against terror.” The apartheid regime in South Africa did collapse eventually. In the past two years, India and Pakistan have been moving towards a more peaceful future that also includes fighting the “war against terror” together. While nation-states that were previously hostile to each other have united to be hostile towards other states, it is not overly idealist to suggest that with each new friendship and alliance, there is one less foe and one less Other. The world is not stable and stagnant, existing in an anarchic, nasty and brutish framework in which states have to endlessly bargain for their self-interest, as realists would like us to believe. On the contrary, international relations and the boundaries constructed by the state are subject to change and ever-transitioning, which presents a compelling case for critical theory as a more realistic framework through which we can view international relations. Therefore, our ultimate search for security does not lie in securing the state from the threat of the enemy across the border, but in removing the state as the referent object of security and moving towards human emancipation.

As an intellectual, you must reject the specific policies which embody the security paradigm.

Burke 02 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Alternatives 27)

 It is perhaps easy to become despondent, but as countless struggles for freedom, justice, and social transformation have proved, a sense of seriousness can be tempered with the knowledge that many tools are already available - and where they are not, the effort to create a productive new critical sensibility is well advanced. There is also a crucial political opening within the liberal problematic itself, in the sense that it assumes that power is most effective when it is absorbed as truth, consented to and desired - which creates an important space for refusal. As Colin Gordon argues, Foucault thought that the very possibility of governing was conditional on it being credible to the governed as well as the governing. This throws weight onto the question of how security works as a technology of subjectivity. It is to take up Foucault's challenge, framed as a reversal of the liberal progressive movement of being we have seen in Hegel, not to discover who or what we are so much as to refuse who we are . **Just as security rules** subjectivity **as both a totalizing and individualizing blackmail** and promise, **it is at these levels** that **we can intervene**. We can **critique the** machinic **frameworks of possibility represented by** law, **policy**, economic regulation, and diplomacy, **while challenging the way these institutions** **deploy language** **to draw individual subjects into their** consensual **web**. This suggests, at least provisionally, a dual strategy. The first asserts the space for agency, both in challenging available possibilities for being and their larger socioeconomic implications. Roland Bleiker formulates an idea of agency that shifts away from the lone (male) hero overthrowing the social order in a decisive act of rebellion to one that understands both the thickness of social power and its "fissures," "fragmentation," and "thinness." **We must**, he says, "**observe how an individual may be able to escape the discursive order and influence its** shifting **boundaries** ... by doing so, **discursive terrains of dissent** all of a sudden **appear where forces of domination** previously **seemed invincible**." **Pushing** **beyond security requires tactics that can work at many levels** - **that empower individuals to** **recognize the larger** social, cultural, and economic **implications of the everyday forms of desire,** subjection, **and discipline** they encounter, **to challenge** and rewrite **them, and that** in turn **contribute to collective efforts to transform the larger structures of being, exchange, and power that sustain** (and have been sustained by) **these forms**. As Derrida suggests, this is to open up aporetic possibilities that transgress and call into question the boundaries of the self, society, and the international that security seeks to imagine and police. The second seeks new ethical principles based on a critique of the rigid and repressive forms of identity that security has heretofore offered. Thus writers such as Rosalyn Diprose, William Connolly, and Moria Gatens have sought to imagine a new ethical relationship that thinks difference not on the basis of the same but on the basis of a dialogue with the other that might allow space for the unknown and unfamiliar, for a "debate and engagement with the other's law and the other's ethics" - an encounter that involves a transformation of the self rather than the other. Thus while the sweep and **power** of security must be acknowledged, it must also be refused: at the simultaneous levels of individual identity, social order, and macroeconomic possibility, it would entail another kind of work on "ourselves" - a political refusal of the One, the imagination of an other that never returns to the same. **It would be to ask if there is a world after security, and what its** shimmering **possibilities might be**.

### Solvency

You don’t solve your AFF the president cited NATIONAL SECURITY risks when Chinese investment was proposed the FIRST time.

Pace ‘12. Julie, Associated Press 9-28-12, Stephen Braun and Ted Bridis and Tim Fought in Portland, Ore., contributed to this report. “OBAMA BLOCKS CHINESE PURCHASE OF US WIND FARMS” [http://m.kitsapsun.com/news/2012/sep/28/obama-blocks-chinese-purchase-of-us-wind-farms/]

WASHINGTON (AP) — Citing national security risks, President Barack Obama on Friday blocked a Chinese company from owning four wind farm projects in northern Oregon near a Navy base where the U.S. military flies unmanned drones and electronic-warfare planes on training missions.

It was the first time in 22 years that a U.S. president has blocked such a foreign business deal.

Obama's decision was likely to be another irritant in the increasingly tense economic relationship between the U.S. and China. It also comes against an election-year backdrop of intense criticism from Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney, who accuses Obama of not being tough enough with China.

In his decision, Obama ordered Ralls Corp., a company owned by Chinese nationals, to divest its interest in the wind farms it purchased earlier this year near the Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility in Boardman, Ore.

The case reached the president's desk after the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, known as CFIUS, determined there was no way to address the national security risks posed by the Chinese company's purchases. Only the president has final authority to prohibit a transaction.

The administration would not say what risks the wind farm purchases presented. The Treasury Department said CFIUS made its recommendation to Obama after receiving an analysis of the potential threats from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Morrow County planner, Carla McLane, said the projects had won county approval and construction was under way until CFIUS issued an order in July that halted construction. She said she does not know what the security concerns were.

Each of the four projects consists of five turbines, each with a two-megawatt capacity, for a total of 10 megawatts per project, or a total of 40 for the four. As the crow flies, McLane said, the projects are about 10 miles from the bombing range — as it's known locally.

The military has acknowledged that it used the Oregon Naval facility to test unmanned drones and the EA-18G "Growler." The electronic warfare aircraft accompanies U.S. fighter bombers on missions and protectively jams enemy radar, destroying them with missiles along the way.

At the Oregon site, the planes fly as low as 200 feet and nearly 300 miles per hour.

The last time a president used the law to block a transaction was 1990, when President George H.W. Bush voided the sale of Mamco Manufacturing to a Chinese agency.

In 2006, President George W. Bush approved a CFIUS case involving the merger of Alcatel and Lucent Technologies.

The Treasury Department said in a statement that Obama's decision is specific to this transaction and does not set a precedent for other foreign direct investment in the U.S. by China or any other country.

China's trade advantage over the U.S. has emerged as a key issue in the final weeks of the presidential campaign. Romney accuses Obama of failing to stand up to Beijing, while the president criticizes the GOP nominee for investing part of his personal fortune in China and outsourcing jobs there while he ran the private equity firm Bain Capital.

Both campaigns are running ads on China in battleground states, especially Ohio, where workers in the manufacturing industry have been hard-hit by outsourcing.

Obama, in an interview Wednesday with The Plain Dealer of Cleveland, said the U.S. must push hard against Beijing but "not go out of our way to embarrass" China.

"We're not interested in triggering an all-out trade war that would damage both economies," Obama said.

The president has the power to void foreign transactions under the Defense Production Act. It authorizes the president to suspend or prohibit certain acquisitions of U.S. businesses if there is credible evidence that the foreign purchaser might take action that threatens to impair national security.

CFIUS is chaired by the treasury secretary. The secretaries of state, defense, commerce, energy and homeland security are also on the committee. The director of national intelligence is a non-voting member.

Earlier this month, Ralls sued the national security panel, alleging CFIUS exceeded its authority when it ordered the company to cease operations and withdraw from the wind-farm developments it bought. Ralls asked for a restraining order and a preliminary injunction to allow construction at the wind farms to continue. The firm said it would lose the chance for a $25 million investment tax if the farms were not operable by Dec. 31.

In a statement Friday, Tim Kia, a lawyer for Ralls, said the project posed no national security threat and said "the President's order is without justification, as scores of other wind turbines already operate in the area."

Ralls dropped its request for a preliminary injunction this week after CFIUS allowed the firm to resume some pre-construction work. With the lawsuit, continuing, the firm's lawyers were expected to react quickly to the administration decision, said a person familiar with the lawsuit who insisted on anonymity because of the sensitive legal repercussions.

Ralls' legal team includes Paul Clement and Viet Dinh, two top law veterans of President George W. Bush's administration. Both men were key players in Bush's aggressive national security operation.

Clement, who was solicitor-general and argued administration positions before the Supreme Court, has since opposed the Obama administration's health care plan and defended the Defense of Marriage Act before the top court.

Dinh, a former assistant attorney general who was the main architect of the Bush administration's anti-terror USA Patriot Act, has lately served as a director and legal adviser to Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation.

A second Chinese firm stymied by CFIUS urged U.S. authorizes this week to investigate their firm to quell fears of ties to China's military. Huawei Technologies Ltd. announced in early September that it would unwind its purchase of U.S.-based computer firm 3Leaf Systems after the deal was rejected by CFIUS.

Huawei, one of the world's largest producers of computer network switching gear, has repeatedly struggled to convince U.S. authorities that they can be trusted to oversee sensitive technology sometimes used in national security work. In 2008, CFIUS concerns led Huawei and private equity firm Bain Capital to abandon an $2.2 billion deal to buy a firm that produces anti-hacking software for the U.S. military.

### Trade War

Protectionism Inevitable – US already blocking Chinese industries

Xinhau News Service 9-30 (2012, “The Alarm Bell of US Protectionism Rings Loud,” <http://www.china.org.cn/business/2012-09/30/content_26681566.htm>)

A recent decision by U.S. President Barack Obama to block a Chinese-led corporation from owning American wind farms exposes the weakness of the U.S. claim that it is the most open market in the world. Obama on Friday issued a rare presidential order to bar the Ralls Corp., a company owned by Chinese nationals, from purchasing four wind farm projects, fearing that Ralls "might take action that threatens to impair national security." Obama's decision was based on a report by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) that claimed that the purchased wind farm sites are all within or near restricted airspace at an naval training base. Ralls offered another side of the picture, saying that only one of the four sites was in restricted airspace and there were other foreign wind farms in the same area. It is not the first time that Chinese companies have fallen prey to American claims of causing national security risks. A 2005 plan by a Chinese oil giant to bid for the Unocal Corp. was aborted due to an administrative order by the Bush administration that also cited national security risks. Another recent case featured Huawei and ZTE, the Chinese telecom companies that were accused of stealing American trade secrets through backdoors in equipment sold by both companies.

No trade war – both sides know it’s not economical

Yiqi 8-24 (Yan, China Daily USA, “Win the battle, don't fight the war”,<http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/weekly/2012-08/24/content_15702298.htm>)

Trade disputes unlikely to grow into large-scale conflicts, analysts say Despite the tit-for-tat skirmishes between China and its major trade partners the United States and the European Union, analysts say full-scale trade wars are unlikely as no one will benefit, especially considering the world's fragile economic situation. On Aug 20, China's Ministry of Commerce ruled that some policies the US had adopted to support its renewable energy industry contravene World Trade Organization anti-subsidy rules, and it called on the US to rectify those policies. On the same day, the China Alcoholic Drinks Association asked the ministry to launch an investigation into wine imports from the EU, accusing them of dumping. These actions are considered China's responses to the US' and the EU's probes into China's renewable energy goods, and had led some to believe that a large-scale trade war between China and its two largest trading partners is in the offing. However, experts believe everyone would lose in that situation. Feng Zhongping, director of the Institute of European Studies at China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, says the intensifying trade disputes are largely related to the worsening global economy. "China is fighting back against the trade protectionism adopted by other countries. The EU and the US have been more aggressive in launching probes into Chinese goods in recent years, because of the current economic circumstances. Both regions have the economic crisis to deal with, and they are trying to protect their own markets and local companies, which is a natural reaction," he says. Feng says the trade frictions will continue to be intensified, but a trade war is not likely to happen because it will cost too much. "Negotiation and then compromise on both sides is the most desired solution, and I believe all parts will finally make satisfactory agreements that can maximize their interests," he says. Li Jian, a researcher with the International Trade and Economic Cooperative Research Institute, a think tank under the Ministry of Commerce, says all parties involved in the disputes today are rational enough to solve the friction in a peaceful way.

Enforcing tariffs key to prevent a trade war – plan signals weakness that allows China to manipulate the economy even more

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

If China does take retaliatory action by levying tariffs on U.S. imports or switching to non-U.S. suppliers, U.S. companies could feel a big impact. But wouldn’t allowing China to violate international trade agreements ultimately have an even bigger, and more disastrous, impact on the U.S. economy? Would it not signal that the United States has now reached the point where we are too dependent on and afraid of China to enforce trade rules that Chinese leaders have explicitly agreed to? If so, that is a dangerous position to be in, and it likely would not have a good outcome for the U.S. economy. It is important to remember that the U.S.-China trade relationship is mutual—China is also dependent on and strongly affected by the United States. The fact that Chinese companies and officials are up in arms about the SolarWorld case demonstrates that U.S. trade enforcement actions impose real costs, which is exactly what they were designed to do. If the United States can consistently demonstrate that it is willing and able to impose those costs, then those actions will increase Beijing’s estimates of the risks involved in targeting U.S. markets with WTO-illegal trade policies. And perhaps, consistency in trade enforcement on our side will help convince China to start playing by the rules across all its industries, not just solar manufacturing.

Capitulation erodes the trade relationship even more – a steady hand is key to healthy trade

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

The [Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy](http://coalition4affordablesolar.org/), or CASE, the group of companies who strongly oppose levying tariffs on Chinese solar panels, has repeatedly [called on SolarWorld](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/jigar-shahs-letter-to-gordon-brinser-of-solarworld/) to drop these trade petitions. CASE would prefer to take dispute resolution away from the Commerce Department, and instead have the Obama administration step in to negotiate a mutually agreeable settlement with China. They make a strong case that the Obama administration would be more likely to take the general public interest in getting solar installations to scale, and the potential negative impact of tariffs on those installations, into account and would balance those interests against the impact of Chinese subsidies on the U.S. solar manufacturing sector. As a result of this proposed balancing exercise, CASE expects that a bilateral negotiation would result in much lower tariffs (compared to what the U.S. Department Commerce might impose) or a price floor, possibly in exchange for Chinese promises to reduce or eliminate the contested subsidies. But such a balanced outcome is highly unlikely, either in the case of the solar industry or in the many other cases in which U.S. companies face unfair Chinese trade competition. There is certainly nothing wrong with negotiation, of course. In general, the more the United States and China engage on trade issues and share their concerns, the better. What CASE is calling for, however, is capitulation, not negotiation. One of the biggest barriers to a balanced U.S.-China trade relationship is that so many U.S. companies avoid filing trade petitions due to fears that China will retaliate against them. Many U.S. companies strongly suspect—based on their conversations in China—Chinese officials and enterprises would respond to formal filings with punitive market-access reductions. That risk is too great for companies depending on the China market to keep their businesses afloat, so many U.S. companies keep quiet and put up with short-term problems to protect their longer-term relationship with Beijing. The end result is that the United States winds up tacitly accommodating a wide range of trade violations, eroding our economic competitiveness. U.S. companies already face enough political pressure from Beijing to avoid and drop these trade complaints. We do not want them to face the same pressures here at home. Just as we should protect the rights of individual citizens to use the judicial system to file legal complaints, we should also protect and support the rights of individual companies to use our trade institutions to file trade complaints, even if other sectors of the industry find those complaints inconvenient. It is also important to note that in private conversations with this column’s authors, at least some of the companies lobbying for a negotiated settlement in the SolarWorld case claim that Chinese officials and their Chinese customers are leaning heavily on them to do so by, for instance, threatening to reduce market access for companies who are not visibly and loudly opposing the SolarWorld trade petitions in Washington. Based on those conversations it appears the Chinese government is using U.S. companies as levers to influence Washington’s willingness to take enforcement action, and that is a disturbing trend. The best way to avoid that problem is to keep these decisions where they are now—in the hands of independent investigators at the Department of Commerce, where trade investigations are largely isolated from political pressure and less susceptible to Chinese interference. The bottom line is that a true negotiated agreement with China, if China is indeed violating its trade obligations, would result in the United States extracting some array of promises or concessions from China—ideally promises to remove the policies that caused the trade frictions in the first place. If that is our end goal, then we should let the Commerce Department process play out first. If that process results in very low tariffs, then we can assume that China’s behavior does not warrant high-level political negotiations. But if the tariffs are significant, then we have a clear signal that there is something to negotiate about—and we will subsequently be at a good starting point for negotiations, because the Chinese government will be keen to find a solution less onerous than the high-tariff status quo. The Chinese government will certainly do everything in its power to strengthen its negotiating leverage in bilateral trade disputes. We should do the same.

The EU alt cause outweighs their internal link and decades of disputes disprove their impact

**Reuters, 7/26/12** [China's solar companies warn of trade war with EU, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/26/us-china-solar-eu-idUSBRE86P14220120726>]

 (Reuters) - **China's solar firms warned of a trade war** on Thursday, **calling on the Chinese government to strike back** **against** an anti-dumping complaint filed by rivals in **Europe**, but the Europeans said they would not be put off by retaliation threats.¶ Companies led by Germany's SolarWorld ([SWVG.DE](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=SWVG.DE)) have asked the European Union to investigate claims that Chinese rivals had been selling their products below market value in Europe.¶ The European Commission, which has declined to comment on the issue, has 45 days to decide if it will start an investigation.¶ SolarWorld confirmed on Thursday the submission by the so-called EU ProSun group, which comprises 25 members in [Germany](http://www.reuters.com/places/germany), Spain, Italy and other EU countries. German solar module maker Sovello is also part of the initiative.¶ A similar initiative was spearheaded by SolarWorld in the United States, leading the world's largest economy to impose in May duties of about 31 percent on solar panel imports from [China](http://www.reuters.com/places/china).¶ "**If the EU were to follow the precedent** of the U.S. and launch an anti-dumping investigation on Chinese solar products, **the Chinese solar industry would suffer a** **fatal blow**," Yingli Solar's ([YGE.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=YGE.N)) chief strategy officer, Wang Yiyu, said.¶ "**The investigation would** also **trigger a wholescale trade war** between China and the EU, **which would cause huge losses to both parties**," he said at a briefing by leading Chinese solar companies Yingli, SunTech ([STP.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=STP.N)), Trina ([TSL.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=TSL.N)) and Canadian Solar ([CSIQ.O](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=CSIQ.O)).¶ "We call on the Chinese government to take all necessary and resolute measures to protect the legitimate interests of the Chinese solar industry."¶ **Western solar companies have been at odds with their Chinese counterparts for years**, alleging that they receive lavish credit lines to offer modules at cheaper prices, while European players struggle to refinance.¶ German solar company Q-Cells QCEG.UL became the most prominent victim of an increasingly competitive market, filing for insolvency for April. At least three other German solar companies have filed for insolvency in recent months.¶ EU ProSun, in a visit to meet lawyers handling their case in Brussels, said it would not be deterred by Chinese threats.¶ "A lot of companies who joined our initiative want to stay anonymous because they fear retaliation, but that is not a reason not to act," said Milan Nitzschke, SolarWorld's vice president who is leading the EU ProSun group.¶ "It is a reason to act and defend against those threats," he told Reuters.¶ DIVISION IN EUROPE¶ But not all European solar companies back the complaint and many say Europe should welcome Chinese imports because they make solar power more affordable.¶ Close to 60 percent of China's solar exports, worth $35.8 billion, were shipped to the EU in 2011, the four Chinese companies said. Europe accounted for 74 percent of global solar installations in 2011, according to industry association EPIA.¶ Europeans against SolarWorld's move say the EU ProSun group only represents a fraction of the solar industry.¶ "The majority of the industry would be the losers of an initiative driven by only a few sector representatives," said Till Richter, managing partner at Germany's Richter Solar.¶ "**The backbone of the solar industry**, small and middle-sized local installers, developers, retailers, engineers and maintenance technicians, **would be at stake** **in case of anti-dumping measures being imposed by the EU,**" Richter said in a statement released by the Alliance for Affordable Solar Energy.¶ Nitzschke said EU ProSun did not claim to represent the entire European solar industry, but rather those companies willing to go ahead with a complaint.

Disputes are inevitable, but they don’t escalate

**Bacchus, 10** [James Bacchus is a former member of Congress and a former chairman of the appellate body of the World Trade Organization. He chairs the global practice of the Greenberg Traurig law firm.Bacchus delivered a version of this piece as testimony to the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission on June 9, 2010 in Washington, D.C. ¶ Diverting A U.S.-China Trade War, Diverting A U.S.-China Trade War¶ ames Bacchus, 06.28.10, 12:10 AM EDT Disputes are inevitable, but conflict is not, <http://www.forbes.com/2010/06/28/china-united-states-exports-law-wto-markets-economy-trade_2.html>]

Chinese exports are surging. American politicians are complaining. **This is not an easy time for trade relations** **between the U**nited **S**tates **and China**. **The** **Great Recession has created great pressures** **in both countries**. **The temptation** in both **is to** yield to these pressures, and to **retreat** from previous commitments **into** the politically appealing refuge of **protectionism** and economic nationalism.¶ For both the United States and China, this would be a mistake. For both countries, by far the best way forward from recession to a lasting recovery is to sustain and strengthen their mutually beneficial economic relationship. Crucial to this relationship will be a continuing commitment in both countries to more open trade, and a continuing commitment in both countries to compliance with WTO rules for trade.¶ During its first decade of membership, China has increasingly become a leader within the WTO. This is as it should be. As a large trading country, China should, like the United States, help lead the WTO, and China should be expected, like the United States, to have many trade disputes with other WTO Members. Like all other WTO Members, **China is bound by the WTO** **treaty to take all of its** treaty-related **disputes** with other Members **to WTO dispute settlement. In compliance with WTO rules, China is doing so.¶ China has profited enormously from the benefit of WTO trade concessions**, **and from the shelter of the WTO's fundamental rules of nondiscrimination**. **China has a considerable stake in the continued success of the multilateral trading system**. The United States has gained, too, from China's entry into the WTO. Understandably, there is a tendency to focus on where China may have fallen short, so far, in reshaping Chinese ways to a full consistency with WTO obligations. This is especially so during this time of economic distress and continuing economic tension. But a focus on how far China still has to go should not blind us to how far China has already come, and in such a short time.¶ Violations of WTO rules by China should not be excused or overlooked. Nor should any WTO violations by the United States. Such violations are rightly the subject of WTO dispute settlement. But as someone who has negotiated, legislated and adjudicated on international trade, my view remains what it has always been: Every effort should always be made to resolve trade disputes by negotiation before resorting to litigation. This is my strong view with respect to trade relations between the United States and China.¶ Obviously, there is considerable concern in the United States, and elsewhere in the world, with how Chinese currency practices affect the terms of trade. Whatever the prospects for a legal case, this is one issue best resolved by negotiation, and not litigation.¶ Counterfeiting, piracy and intellectual property violations of all kinds remain pervasive in China. The Chinese have a clear WTO obligation to enforce IP rights. Negotiation has accomplished all too little where IP rights are concerned. More--and more ambitious--litigation may be needed.¶ There is understandable concern that China's proposed rules for "indigenous innovation" will discriminate against American goods and services in Chinese government procurement. On this issue the position of the United States is weakened considerably by its own domestic actions. How can the United States criticize China for imposing a requirement to "Buy Chinese" when the U.S. Congress is busy enacting "Buy American" laws?¶ The United States and China should both refrain from discriminatory procurement practices, and should work together to make the WTO's Government Procurement Agreement a truly global agreement. China must comply fully with its national treatment and other WTO obligations in trade in services. A key negotiating aim of the United States should be to encourage China to add to its services obligations.¶ A rapidly emerging area of concern is export restrictions on natural resources. Chinese restrictions on exports have already led to one WTO dispute, on raw materials, and may lead to another, on rare earth elements. No one country can be self-sufficient in everything. The United States and China share an interest in making certain that WTO rules ensure a free flow of trade and investment in natural resources.¶ **Barriers to trade with China are increasingly taking forms other than tariffs**. Sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical standards and other technical regulations can sometimes be pretexts for protectionism, imposing restrictions on trade beyond those necessary to achieve legitimate domestic purposes. WTO rules provide remedies that can be effective when used against such nontariff barriers to trade.¶ China is increasingly relying on trade remedies to restrict imports. It has every right to do so under WTO rules. China must comply fully with WTO rules when applying safeguards, antidumping duties and countervailing duties to subsidies. So, too, must the United States.¶ Overall, there continues to be a compelling need for China to enhance transparency and to uphold the rule of law. These are trade obligations, and also essential ingredients of any truly enduring economic success for China. ¶ Certainly the United States and China both have much to gain, in their two-way trade and otherwise, from a successful conclusion of the Doha Development Round of multilateral trade negotiations. Beyond that, new understandings, and perhaps new rules, are needed in such areas as investment and climate change and electronic commerce.¶ The United States and China can work together to address not only their bilateral concerns, but also any number of urgent global concerns. None of our global concerns can be addressed effectively without the engagement and the cooperation of both the United States and China.¶ I worry when I hear other Americans describe China as a "threat" to the United States. Thucydides cautioned us, in his history of the Peloponnesian War, that a belief in the inevitability of conflict can become one of the main causes of conflict.¶ **Trade disputes between the United States and China are inevitable**. **Conflict is not**.

Specific issues don’t collapse overall commitment to international trade norms

**Holwill, 08** [\*No Date cited, but most recent internally referenced date is 2008, US China Trade War? Probably Not, Vice President, Public Policy, Alticor Inc

Richard Holwill is the Vice President of Public Policy at Alticor, located in Washington, DC, where he is in charge of worldwide government affairs efforts for Alticor, the parent company of Amway Corporation. He chairs a trade advisory committee for the U.S. Trade Representative..., <https://www.hightable.com/government/insight/us-china-trade-war-probably-not-10897>]

Trade War – **There has been some speculation that** U.S. Government (**USG) actions to sanction China on specific trade issues will prompt a trade war between the** two countries.  Based on conversations at China’s Ministry of Commerce (MOFCOM), **I believe such fears are unfounded**.  During talks in Beijing, it was clear that working-level MOFCOM **officials fully understand the issues involved** both in the tariffs placed on paper products **and the demand for consultations at the WTO on Intellectual Property Rights** (IPR) **protection**.  **They appear ready and willing to work within the rules-based international trade system to resolve outstanding disputes.**

**Interdependence prevents trade conflict – other tariffs outweigh**

**Deutsche Welle, 12** [7/9/12, Obama starts fight against Chinese import tariffs, [http://www.dw.de/dw/article/0,,16082487,00.html](http://www.dw.de/dw/article/0%2C%2C16082487%2C00.html)]

¶ US President Barack **Obama has brought a case to the WTO about China's increased tariffs on US auto imports**. Yet analysts suggest it is about more than merely trade as such. ¶ Incumbent President Barack Obama is battling it out with Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney over Ohio, a swing state. Traveling on a bus through Ohio on the campaign trail, Obama is emphasizing a fight against Chinese protectionism and for US jobs. Ohio happens to be a state that hosts a large part of the US automobile industry.¶ A few states over in Washington, D.C., White House Speaker Jay Carney announced that the Obama administration has brought a complaint against the Chinese government to the World Trade Organization. As Obama disparaged the Chinese tariff as "unfair," US Trade Representative Ron Kirk called upon the government in Beijing to "play by the rules to which it agreed when it joined the WTO."¶ Chinahas raised its import duty on US cars by as much as 21.5 percent, this for 2.5-liter engines. According to Washington, US carmakers exported 92,000 cars to China last year - which amounts to $3 billion in revenue. Chrysler and General Motors are especially suffering under the Chinese tariffs, Carney claims.¶ ¶ Tit for tat, Kirkegaard said¶ For Jacob Kirkegaard of the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington, the timing of this attack against Chinese protectionism is anything but coincidental. "**The presidential election dictates the timing**," Kirkegaard told DW. Obama is trying to establish himself as an advocate of the US auto industry, Kirkegaard thinks. With the current headlines he's producing, he wants to "show how much he's championing American industry," Kirkegaard said.¶ Doris Fischer, an economist and professor for China Economics and Business at the University of Würzburg in Germany, thinks this will be seen similarly in Beijing. **China "has already complained about the US turning it into an election topic**," she said. The accusations continue to be the same: China isn't sticking to the rules, China is trying to harm the US economy.¶ State help¶ In hiking up its duties, China insists that the US automobile industry is being illegally subsidized, which is making US cars too cheap. In recent years, the US government has provided funding for domestic auto producers to avoid bankruptcy. Since then, Chrysler and GM are back in the black. China sees a direct connection - and this constitutes a distortion of trade relations, it claims.¶ ¶ All large auto manufacturers maintain production in China¶ Kirkegaard agrees that "support for Chrysler or GM in 2009 was very clearly state help." But that's not the real reason for raising the tariff, he thinks. Kirkegaard assumes that China was seeking revenge for other cases when the US refused to allow cheap Chinese imports. For example, "in 2009, when China wanted to sell tires at dumping prices on the American market."¶ Fischer said the accusations from the US keep coming, "that the Chinese are practicing dumping and that they want to sell goods cheaply in America." But now, the Chinese are standing up to this, saying: "If you look closely, the Americans are doing the same," Fischer said.¶ **Beijing and Washington have been fighting for years over cheap exports, protectionist tariffs or compensatory charges. The cycle of retaliation is never-ending.** Kirkegaard described is an attitude of "as you do to me, I will do to you."¶ Manufacturing pain¶ ¶ Idle threats, Fischer said¶ And now, as champion of the US automobile industry and domestic jobs, Obama has taken his case to the WTO. But are jobs really in danger if 92,000 cars get increased import duties? Fischer doesn't think so. She indicated to DW that GM sold 2.5 million vehicles to China last year, but only "several tens of thousands of those were imported."¶ That's because GM produces its vehicles for the Chinese market in Shanghai, where they are not subject to import tariffs. So any "pain inflicted upon the biggest manufacturers is limited," she said.¶ "It's not something that's going to endanger the general health of any big auto manufacturer," Kirkegaard concurs.¶ Saber rattling¶ Any complaint lodged with the WTO follows the same procedure: Both parties have 60 days time to solve the problem in negotiations. If this brings no results, after a period of consultation, the WTO's trade tribunal becomes active. Such a process can last up to two years.¶ But Fischer doesn't think it will come to this. **She sees the US complaint as "a bit of saber-rattling**." **Kirkegaard also believes that a fight between Beijing and Washington will be quietly resolved - by November at the latest, when the US presidential elections take place.¶ Kirkegaard thinks the US has good arguments for calling foul play upon China. But it's not likely to pursue the case: "There's too much at stake for them both to truly endanger their trade relationship."**

**Protectionism won’t collapse trade**

**Guoqiang 9**—director of foreign economic relations research for China's State Council (Long, “Is Protectionism a Threat to the World Economy?,” 6 March 2009, http://www.eeo.com.cn/ens/finance\_investment/2009/03/06/131493.shtml)

I don't think we'll end up with a trade war. Countries mostly adopt protectionist measures within the WTO framework. There are two reasons--the first is that all the countries have something in common in prosting protectionism, second, countries have emphasized corporation at recent top-level meetings. If some country dared to really put up protectionist barriers, it would open up a hornets' nest of criticism against them.

Second, trade retaliation forces parties to weigh the pros and cons before taking protectionist measures. So while protectionism is sure to rise, it would not have a big impact.

Periodic trade disputes will be unavoidable in the near future, but there would be little possibility of trade conflicts. I treat frictional trade rhetoric as a part of the bilateral negotiation process. It just becomes more intense during times of crisis.

**Prefer our claim – We cite government motives**

**Dna 9** (“US does not want protectionism: Clinton,” 19 July 2009, http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report\_us-does-not-want-protectionism-clinton\_1275447,)

Allaying fears about the reported anti-outsourcing stance of the Barack Obama administration, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton today said that America does not want a return to protectionism. "What president Obama has said (is) that we do not want a return to protectionism when Congress passed the provision in our stimulus bill," Clinton, who is on a visit to India, told news channel NDTV 24x7 in an interview. The US government has imposed certain restrictions on companies receiving bailout funds from hiring foreign workers. "... So he (Obama) has really tried to speak against protectionism and to make sure our administration does not in any way give credence to it," she said. Regarding outsourcing, Clinton said that it is a concern for many businesses in the US but should not be affecting the trade flow between the two countries. "Outsourcing is a concern for many community and businesses in my country." "So how we handle that is something that we are very focused on doing ... that it does not disrupt the great flow of trade and services that go between our two countries," she asserted.

Your empirics are constructed prove nothing–

Furchtgott-Roth 9-13-12. Diana Furchtgott-Roth, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and a columnist for RealClearMarkets.com.. Stimulated by Solyndra? : Hope and change is gas and oil. Interview w/ National Review [http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/316710/stimulated-solyndra-interview?pg=1] [MG]

FURCHTGOTT-ROTH: For several years the public has been told that “green energy” will create jobs in America, lots of jobs. And that the federal government must subsidize green energy to make them exist. Many of the 3.1 million so-called green jobs counted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are jobs that already existed, but have been relabeled as “green.” For instance, someone working in a Salvation Army store sorting used clothes has a green job. A trash collector who picks up recycled materials has a green job. These are not necessarily new jobs.

Authentically green jobs, those that conserve energy, reduce toxic residue, or diminish carbon emissions, often are costly. Mandating the use of renewables, such as wind and solar, means that production of wind turbines and solar panels is increasing overseas, in countries with lower labor costs such as China, and not here.

### Relations/Warming Advantage

US-Sino relations are resilient and China bashing never escalates

Xijin, editor in chief of the Global Times, a Chinese newspaper, 3-21-2012 (Hu, Isaac Stone Fish, an associate editor at Foreign Policy, translated this article from the Chinese, “Hollow Threats,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/21/hollow\_threats?page=full)

Mitt Romney has said a lot of tough things about China. But his words haven't troubled the Chinese people. This is because, over the last 20 years, the China policies of U.S. presidents have always been milder than the threats the same men made on the campaign trail. In other words, no one seriously thinks that a candidate will actually implement these tough policies. The Chinese people have already mentally prepared for the possibility of Sino-U.S. relations growing tenser, but this is the result of Sino-U.S. competition rapidly growing fiercer, not the possibility of Romney becoming president. ¶ Romney's tough words toward China sound very empty, as if he's just communicating to the electorate his determination to be faithful to America's national interests. Attacking China on human rights and its political system and describing China as an "opponent" in military and economic areas makes the loyalty he has pledged to the United States seem more real. Barack Obama, as president, cannot directly attack China; Romney, as a candidate, will attack us every chance he gets -- if merely to make the point that Obama is constrained and weak. ¶ Romney's most striking attack line toward China is his stated desire to call China a currency-manipulating country on his first day in the White House. Will he really do this? I don't know. But what's certain is that if he does end up in the White House, he wouldn't dare provoke an all-out trade war between China and the United States. Even if he does call China a currency manipulator, the label will be meaningless because of the hugeness of Sino-U.S. trade. ¶ Sino-U.S. relations and those between the Soviet Union and the United States are completely different. The societies of the United States and the Soviet Union never came in contact with each other; their two countries' top officials decided everything about the relationship. But Sino-U.S. relations revolve around the two countries' robust societal and economic contacts. Their scale and prospects are big enough to trump the values and security interests that usually frame these two countries' relations. ¶ The leaders of the United States and China admittedly can personally affect Sino-U.S. relations, but only in a limited way. They can influence the atmosphere of the relationship and other surface matters, but the two countries' core interests guide Sino-U.S. relations. ¶ These relations could grow tenser in the future because the two countries' respective interests in the relationship have quietly changed since China's rise. If Romney gets elected, even if he doesn't continue to encourage anti-Chinese sentiment, there will be more friction between the two countries than there is today. The next U.S. president must work to limit the mistrust between the two countries and prevent them from exploding with suspicion. ¶ The possibility that the United States will be able to contain China is very small because China's rise is a natural process with many forces behind it. Containing China would be difficult. At best, the United States can dedicate itself to lessening the damage China's rise will have on America's interests and enjoying the opportunities created by China's development. ¶ I can understand America's vigilant attitude toward China. But I believe Americans will not be reckless in trying to contain China. In other words, as long as China doesn't provoke the United States, containing China won't become U.S. policy. ¶ As for the U.S.-China row over things like rare earths, the exchange rate, and even human rights, all these conflicts have been very specific, and they haven't capsized the whole relationship. We believe the person whom the Americans elect to enter the White House will, at the very least, have rational thoughts. Romney won't make the mistake of turning a specific conflict into a showdown with 1.3 billion Chinese people.

Relation’s won’t solve aggression—

TKACIK 2003 – RESEARCH FELLOW CHINA POLICY @ HERITAGE, HERITAGE MEMORANDUM #907, NEEDED: A REALISTIC LOOK AT CHINA POLICY, 12-2

In 2003, China has renewed threats of war against Taiwan, dragged its feet in the war on terrorism, lent moral support to North Korea's nuclear program, continued proliferating dangerous weapons, accelerated its military buildup, been increasingly aggressive in the South China Sea, and cultivated an ever-worsening human rights environment. The Administration and Congress should reexamine their China policy and reconsider why they abandoned the candid, firm, and successful pre-September 11 approach for a policy of conciliation and compromise, which has yielded little beyond rhetoric.

Cooperation solves nothing—

Currie 5-23-10 – Ms. Currie is a senior fellow with the Project 2049 Institute, a Washington-based think tank, Kelley, “Prick the China Policy Bubble”, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704852004575257703318986606.html?mod=WSJ\_latestheadlines

Unfortunately, this high-flying rhetoric has never matched up to the reality of U.S.-China relations. There are serious bilateral structural issues that inhibit real cooperation and long-term stability between the two powers. These include the lack of shared values that stem from the differences between America's democratic system versus China's authoritarian regime, and a lack of common understanding about the causes of and solutions to global problems from Iran to climate change. Chinese leaders also remain ambivalent about the degree to which China is prepared to take on global responsibilities, either directly or in concert with the U.S.

No impact to warming.

Stampf 7—Olaf Stampf, Not the End of the World as We Know It, Der Spiegel, 5-7, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html

The truth is probably somewhere between these two extremes. Climate change will undoubtedly have losers -- but it will also have winners. There will be a reshuffling of climate zones on earth. And there is something else that we can already say with certainty: The end of the world isn't coming any time soon.

Largely unnoticed by the public, climate researchers are currently embroiled in their own struggle over who owns the truth. While some have always seen themselves as environmental activists aiming to shake humanity out of its complacency, others argue for a calmer and more rational approach to the unavoidable.

One member of the levelheaded camp is Hans von Storch, 57, a prominent climate researcher who is director of the Institute for Coastal Research at the GKSS Research Center in Geesthacht in northern Germany. "We have to take away people's fear of climate change," Storch told DER SPIEGEL in a recent interview. "Unfortunately many scientists see themselves too much as priests whose job it is to preach moralistic sermons to people."

Keeping a cool head is a good idea because, for one thing, we can no longer completely prevent climate change. No matter how much governments try to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, it will only be possible to limit the rise in global temperatures to about 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) by the end of the century. But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe.

For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena.

Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf.

Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities.

Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public.

For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

Palm Trees in Germany

There is no doubt that there will be droughts in other parts of the world, especially in subtropical regions. But the widespread assumption that it is developing countries -- that is, the world's poor -- who will, as always, be the ones to suffer is incorrect. According to current predictions, precipitation in large parts of Africa will hardly decrease at all, except in the southern part of the continent. In fact, these same forecasts show the Sahel, traditionally a region beset by drought and famine, actually becoming wetter.

By contrast, some wealthy industrialized nations -- in fact, those principally responsible for climate change -- will likely face growing problems related to drought. The world's new drought zones lie in the southern United States and Australia, but also in Mediterranean countries like Spain, Italy and Greece.

All of this will lead to a major shift within Europe, potentially leading to tough times for southern Spain's mega-resorts and boom times for hotels along the North Sea and Baltic Sea coasts. While the bulk of summer vacationers will eventually lose interest in roasting on Spain's Costa del Sol, Mediterranean conditions could prevail between the German North Sea island of Sylt and Bavaria's Lake Starnberg. The last few weeks of spring in Germany offered a taste of what's to come, as sun-loving crowds packed Berlin's urban beach bars and Munich's beer gardens.

The predicted temperature increase of 3 degrees Celsius would mean that summers in Hamburg, not far from the North Sea coast, would be as warm as they are today in the southwestern city of Freiburg, while conditions in Freiburg would be more like those in Marseille today. Germany will undoubtedly be one of the beneficiaries of climate change. Perhaps palm trees will be growing on the island of Helgoland in the North Sea soon, and German citizens will be saving billions in heating costs -- which in turn would lead to a reduction in CO2 emissions.

But climate change will also have its drawbacks. While German summers will be less rainy, fall and winter rainfall in the country's north will increase by up to 30 percent -- and snow will be a thing of the past. Heavy downpours will also become more common. To avoid flooding, steps will have to be taken to provide better drainage for fields and farmlands, as well as to restore natural flood plains.

Meanwhile, the Kiel Institute for World Economics warns that higher temperatures could mean thousands of heat-related deaths every year. But the extrapolations that lead to this dire prediction are based on the mortality rate in the unusually hot summer of 2003, for which Germans were wholly unprepared. But if hot summer days do become the norm, people will simply adjust by taking siestas and installing air-conditioning.

The medical benefits of higher average temperatures have also been ignored. According to Richard Tol, an environmental economist, "warming temperatures will mean that in 2050 there will be about 40,000 fewer deaths in Germany attributable to cold-related illnesses like the flu.”

Another widespread fear about global warming -- that it will cause super-storms that could devastate towns and villages with unprecedented fury -- also appears to be unfounded. Current long-term simulations, at any rate, do not suggest that such a trend will in fact materialize.

"According to our computer model, neither the number nor intensity of storms is increasing," says Jochem Marotzke, director of the Hamburg-based Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, one of the world's leading climate research centers. "Only the boundaries of low-pressure zones are changing slightly, meaning that weather is becoming more severe in Scandinavia and less so in the Mediterranean."

According to another persistent greenhouse legend, massive flooding will strike major coastal cities, raising horrific scenarios of New York, London and Shanghai sinking into the tide. However this horror story is a relic of the late 1980s, when climate simulations were far less precise than they are today. At the time, some experts believed that the Antarctic ice shield could melt, which would in fact lead to a dramatic 60-meter (197-foot) rise in sea levels. The nuclear industry quickly seized upon and publicized the scenario, which it recognized as an argument in favor of its emissions-free power plants.

But it quickly became apparent that the horrific tale of a melting South Pole was nothing but fiction. The average temperature in the Antarctic is -30 degrees Celsius. Humanity cannot possibly burn enough oil and coal to melt this giant block of ice. On the contrary, current climate models suggest that the Antarctic will even increase in mass: Global warming will cause more water to evaporate, and part of that moisture will fall as snow over Antarctica, causing the ice shield to grow. As a result, the total rise in sea levels would in fact be reduced by about 5 cm (2 inches).

It's a different story in the warmer regions surrounding the North Pole. According to an American study published last week, the Arctic could be melting even faster than previously assumed. But because the Arctic sea ice already floats in the water, its melting will have virtually no effect on sea levels.

'We Still Have Enough Time to React'

Nevertheless, sea levels will rise worldwide as higher temperatures cause the water in the oceans to expand. In addition, more water will flow into the ocean with the gradual thawing of the Greenland ice sheet. All things considered, however, in the current IPCC report climatologists are predicting a rise in sea levels of only about 40 centimeters (16 inches) -- compared with the previous estimate of about one meter (more than three feet). A 40-centimeter rise in sea levels will hardly result in more catastrophic flooding. "We have more computer models and better ones today, and the prognoses have become more precise as a result," explains Peter Lemke of the Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research in the northern German port city of Bremerhaven.

Some researchers do, however, estimate that regional effects could produce an 80-centimeter (31-inch) rise in the sea level along Germany's North Sea coast. This will lead to higher storm surges -- a problem the local population, already accustomed to severe weather, could easily address by building taller dikes.

Another comforting factor -- especially for poorer countries like Bangladesh -- is that none of these changes will happen overnight, but gradually over several decades. "We still have enough time to react," says Storch.

In short, the longer researchers allow their supercomputers to crunch the numbers, the more does the expected deluge dissipate. A rise in sea levels of several meters could only occur if Greenland were largely ice-free, but this is something scientists don't expect to happen for at least a few more centuries or even millennia. This lengthy timeframe raises the question of whether the current prognoses are even reliable.

Warming will be small.

Nature 12—Warming, but not as much, Nature 481, 413 (26 January 2012), http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v481/n7382/full/481413e.html?WT.ec\_id=NATURE-20120126

The climate system may be less sensitive to greenhouse-gas warming than many models have predicted.

Nathan Gillett and his co-workers at Environment Canada in Victoria, British Columbia, analysed how well the latest Canadian Earth System Model tracked temperature changes attributable to volcanoes, man-made aerosols and rising greenhouse-gas emissions. They adjusted the model using temperature records from 1851 to 2010 — 60 years of data more than most previous analyses. The model predicted a short-term increase of 1.3–1.8 °C for a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, which is low in the range of estimates from previous forecasts.

Warming is inevitable.

Gelbspan 7— American writer and activist. He has written two books relating to global warming, Ross, It’s too late to stop climate change, argues Ross Gelbspan — so what do we do now?, Grist, 12-11, http://grist.org/article/beyond-the-point-of-no-return/

But even assuming the wildest possible success of their initiatives — that humanity decided tomorrow to replace its coal- and oil-burning energy sources with noncarbon sources — it would still be too late to avert major climate disruptions. No national energy infrastructure can be transformed within a decade.

All these initiatives address only one part of the coming reality. They recall the kind of frenzied scrambling that is characteristic of trauma victims — a frantic focus on other issues, any other issues — that allows people to avoid the central take-home message of the trauma: in this case, the overwhelming power of inflamed nature.

Within the last two years, a number of leading scientists — including Rajendra Pachauri, head of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), British ecologist James Lovelock, and NASA scientist James Hansen — have all declared that humanity is about to pass or already has passed a “tipping point” in terms of global warming. The IPCC, which reflects the findings of more than 2,000 scientists from over 100 countries, recently stated that it is “very unlikely” that we will avoid the coming era of “dangerous climate change.”

Plan eliminates aerosols—causes faster warming.

Lovelock 9—Consultant of NASA, former president of the [Marine Biological Association](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marine_Biological_Association), and  Honorary Visiting Fellow of [Green Templeton College, Oxford](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Green_Templeton_College%2C_Oxford), James, The Vanishing Face of Gaia: A Final Warning: Enjoy it While You Can, 55-56

In 2004 two IPCC contributors, Peter Cox and Meinrat Andreae, raised the question: What happens to global warming if this pollution haze suddenly disappears? Their paper in Nature warned that if the haze disappeared, global heating would intensify, and dangerous change could be the consequence. In 2008, a group led by Peter Stott, from the Hadley Centre (part of the Meteorological Office), examined this phenomenon in a careful and well-drawn paper in the jour­nal Tellus: "global dimming," they revealed, is complex, even as a purely geophysical problem. According to their calculations the sudden removal of haze could lead to ei­ther a modest or a severe increase of heating. I now begin to see why my wise friend Robert Charlson is so loath to commit himself on pollution aerosols and climate change. Even so, there was little doubt among any of these distin­guished climate scientists that the present pollution haze reduces global heating, or that its sudden removal could have serious consequences. I suspect that we worry less about global heating than about a global economic crash, and forget that we could make both events happen together if we implemented an immediate, global 6o percent reduction of emissions. This would cause a rapid fall in fossil fuel consumption, and most of the particles that make the atmospheric aerosol would within weeks fall from the air. This would greatly simplify prediction and we could at last be fairly sure that global temperature would rise; the removal of the pollution aerosol would leave the gaseous greenhouse unobstructed and free at last to devastate what was left of the comfortable interglacial Earth. Yes, if we imple­mented in full the recommendations made at Bali within a year, far from stabilizing the climate, it could grow hot­ter not cooler. This is why I said in The Revenge of Gaia, "We live in a fool's climate and are damned whatever we do."