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#### They don’t specific their agent – that’s a voter

#### 1. Poor decision-making – we don’t learn how the government actually works – outweighs because decision-making is the only portable impact

#### 2. Education – 90% of the plan is implementation

Elmore 80, Professor of Public Affairs at University of Michigan, Polysci Quarterly Pages 79-80

Analysis of Policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood. In the Normal Case, it was about 10%, leaving 90% in the realm of Implementation.

### 1nc

#### Financial incentives must disburse federal funds for energy production—mandates and regulations are indirect incentive—that crushes limits

#### Webb 93 (Sessional lecture – Faculty of Law @ University of Ottawa, ’93 (Kernaghan, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501)

One of the obstacles to intelligent discussion of this topic is the tremendous potential for confusion about what is meant by several of the key terms involved. In the hopes of contributing to the development of a consistent and precise vocabulary applying to this important but understudied area of regulatory activity, various terms are defined below. In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean **disbursements18** **of** **public** **funds** or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of **grants, contributions**, repayable contributions, **loans, loan guarantees and** insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and **tax expenditures.19** Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

**For is a term of exclusion – requiring direct action upon**

US CUSTOMS COURT 39 AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, Protest 912094-G against the decision of the collector of customs at the port of New York UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT, THIRD DIVISION 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35 The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8] supra. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows: Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* . The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted. Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary: For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*. d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of. Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes.

#### Contextually Feed in tariffs are indirect and distinct from financial incentives – prefer this evidence because it is comparative

Joanna **Lewis and** Ryan **Wiser** – Gtown STIA Prof / LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY – November 20**05**, Fostering a Renewable Energy Technology Industry: An International Comparison of Wind Industry Policy Support Mechanisms, <http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/emp/reports/59116.pdf>

Policy measures to support wind industry development can be grouped into two categories: direct and indirect measures. Direct measures refer to policies that specifically target local wind manufacturing industry development, while indirect measures are policies that support wind power utilization in general and therefore indirectly create an environment suitable for a local wind manufacturing industry (by creating sizable, stable markets for wind power). The discussion that follows covers both of these types of measures, and is a summary of the more detailed country case studies provided in Lewis and Wiser (2005). **4.1. Direct Support Mechanisms** Policies that directly support local wind turbine or components manufacturers can be crucial in countries where barriers to entry are high and competition with international leaders is difficult. A variety of policy options exist to directly support local wind power technology manufacturing, and several policy options have proven effective, as demonstrated in a number of countries (Table 4). These various policy mechanisms do not all target the same goal; some provide blanket support for both international and domestic companies to manufacture locally, while others provide differential support to domestically-owned wind turbine or components manufacturers. Most countries have employed a mix of the following policy tools. 13 Table 4. Policy Measures to Support Wind Power, Country Comparison Direct Policies Primary Countries Where Implemented Local content requirements Spain, China, Brazil, Canadian provinces Financial and tax incentives Canada, Australia, China, US states, Spain, China, Germany, Denmark Favorable customs duties Denmark, Germany, Australia, India, China Export credit assistance Denmark, Germany Quality certification Denmark, Germany, USA, Japan, India, China Research and development All countries to varying degrees; notable programs in Denmark, Germany, US, Netherlands Local Content Requirements The most direct way to promote the development of a local wind manufacturing industry is by requiring the use of locally manufactured technology in domestic wind turbine projects. A common form of this policy mandates a certain percentage of local content for wind turbine systems installed in some or all projects within a country. Such policies force wind companies interested in selling to a domestic market to look for ways to shift their manufacturing base to that country or to outsource components used in their turbines to domestic companies. Unless the mandate is specifically targeted to domestically owned companies, it will have the blanket effect of encouraging local manufacturing regardless of company nationality. Local content requirements are currently being used in the wind markets of Spain, Canada, Brazil and China. Spanish government agencies have long mandated the incorporation of local content in wind turbines installed on Spanish soil; the creation of Gamesa in 1995 can be traced in part to these policies. Even today, local content requirements are still being demanded by several of Spain’s autonomous regional governments that “see local wealth in the wind”—in Navarra alone, it is estimated that its 700 MW of wind power has created 4000 jobs (WPM, October 2004:45). Other regions, including Castile and Leon, Galicia and Valencia, insist on local assembly and manufacture of turbines and components before granting development concessions (WPM, October 2004:6). The Spanish government has clearly played a pro-active role in kickstarting a domestic wind industry, and the success of Gamesa and other manufacturers is very likely related to these policies. At least one provincial government in Canada—Quebec—is pursuing aggressive local content requirements in conjunction with wind farms developed in its region. In May 2003, Hydro-Quebec issued a call for tenders for 1000 MW of wind for delivery between 2006 and 2012 which included a local content requirement; this 1000 MW call was twice the size initially planned by the utility, but it was doubled by the Quebec government with the hope of contributing to the economic revival of the Gaspe Peninsula (WPM, May 2003:35; WPM, April 2004:41). The government also insisted that Quebec’s wind power development support the creation of a true provincial industry that included local manufacturing and job creation by requiring that 40% of the total cost of the first 200 MW be spent in the region—a proportion that rises to 50% for the next 100 MW and 60% for the remaining 700 MW (WPM, May 2003:35; April 2004:41). In addition, the government stipulated that the turbine nacelles be assembled in the region, and that project developers include in their project bidding documents a statement from a turbine manufacturer guaranteeing that it will set up assembly facilities in the region (WPM, May 2003:35). GE was selected to provide the turbines for a total of 990 MW of proposed projects 14 upon its agreement to meet a 60% local content requirement, and is currently establishing three manufacturing facilities in Canada (WPM, June 2005:36). In October 2005, another call for tenders was released, this time for 2000 MW to be installed between 2009-2013. This call requires that 30% of the cost of the equipment must be spent in the Gaspe region and 60% of the entire project costs must be spent within Quebec Province (Hydro-Quebec, 2005). The Brazilian government has also pursued policies governing wind farm development that include stringent local content requirements, primarily through the recent Proinfa legislation (the Incentive Program for Alternative Electric Generation Sources) that offers fixed-price electricity purchase contracts to selected wind projects. Starting in January 2005, the Proinfa legislation requires 60% of the total cost of wind plant goods and services to be sourced in Brazil; only companies that can prove their ability to meet these targets can take part in the project selection process. In addition, from 2007 onwards, this percentage increases to 90% (Cavaliero and DaSilva, 2005). China has also been using local content requirements in a variety of policy forms. China’s 1997 “Ride the Wind Program” established two Sino-foreign joint venture enterprises to domestically manufacture wind turbines; the turbines manufactured by these enterprises under technology transfer arrangements started with a 20 percent local content requirement and a goal of an increase to 80 percent as learning on the Chinese side progressed (Lew, 2000). China’s recent large government wind tenders, referred to as wind concessions, have a local content requirement that has been increased to 70% from an initial 50% requirement when the concession program began in 2003. Local content is also required to obtain approval of most other wind projects in the country, with the requirement recently increased from 40% to 70%. Local content requirements require a large market size in order to lure foreign firms to undertake the significant investments required in local manufacturing. If the market is not sufficiently sizable or stable, or if the local content requirements are too stringent, then the advantages of attracting local manufacturing may be offset by the higher cost of wind equipment that results. Some concerns of this nature have already been raised in Brazil, where only one wind turbine manufacturer appears currently able to meet the local content requirements. The potential negative impact of local content requirements on turbine costs has also been raised in Canada and China. These experiences suggest that local content requirements can work, but should generally be applied in a gradual, staged fashion and only in markets with sufficient market potential. Financial and Tax Incentives Preference for local content and local manufacturing can also be encouraged without being mandated through the use of both financial and tax incentives. Financial incentives may include awarding developers that select turbines made locally with low-interest loans for project financing, or providing financial subsidies to wind power generated with locally-made turbines. Tax incentives can be used to encourage local companies to get involved in the wind industry through, for example, tax credits or deductions for investments in wind power technology manufacturing or research and development. Alternatively, a reduction in sales, value-added-tax (VAT), or income tax for buyers or sellers of domestic wind turbine technology (or production) can increase the competitiveness of domestic manufacturers. In addition, a tax deduction could be permitted for labor costs within the local wind industry. Tax or financial incentives can also be applied to certain company types, such as joint ventures between foreign and local companies, in 15 order to promote international cooperation and technology transfer in the wind industry, and to specifically encourage some local ownership of wind turbine manufacturing facilities. Germany’s 100MW/250MW program provided a 10-year federal generation subsidy for projects that helped to raise the technical standard of German wind technology, and over twothirds of the total project funding for this subsidy went to projects using German-built turbines (Johnson and Jacobsson, 2003). Regional support for German industrial efforts with a bias towards local wind manufacturers have been reported as well (Connor, 2004). A further German policy that may have preferentially supported German turbine technology was the large-scale provision of “soft” loans (loans that are available significantly below market rates) for German wind energy projects. Canada has implemented a tax credit on wages paid out to local labor forces in an attempt to encourage large wind turbine manufacturers to shift jobs to Canada. To provide a further incentive for local manufacturing, a Quebec provincial government program also offers a 40% tax credit on labor costs to wind industries located in the region, and a tax exemption for the entire manufacturing sector through 2010 (WPM, June 2003:40). Spain’s production tax credit on windpowered electricity (supplemented by incentives offered in at least one province) is granted only to turbines that meet local content requirements (WPM, February 2001:20). In India, the excise duty is exempted for parts used in the manufacture of electric generators (Rajsekhar et al., 1999). Australia (at the national and provincial levels), China, and a number of US states have also employed a variety of different tax incentives to encourage localization of wind manufacturing. China provides a reduced VAT on joint venture wind companies to encourage technology transfer (NREL, 2004). China has also used financial incentives to promote domestic wind industry development since its 1997 “Ride the Wind Program,” which allocated new technology funds to two government-facilitated joint venture enterprises to domestically manufacture wind turbines. The Danish Government’s Wind Turbine Guarantee also offered long-term financing of large projects using Danish-made turbines and guaranteed the loans for those projects, significantly reducing the risk involved in selecting Danish turbines for a wind plant. Favorable Customs Duties Another way to create incentives for local manufacturing is through the manipulation of customs duties to favor the import of turbine components over the import of entire turbines. This creates a favorable market for firms (regardless of ownership structure) trying to manufacture or assemble wind turbines domestically by allowing them to pay a lower customs duty to import components than companies that are importing full, foreign-manufactured turbines. Customs duties that support local turbine manufacturing by favoring the import of components over full turbines have been used in Denmark, Germany, Australia, India, and China (Rajsekhar et al., 1999; Liu et al., 2002). This type of policy may be challenged in the future, however, as it could be seen to create a trade barrier and therefore be illegal for WTO member countries to use against other member countries. Export Credit Assistance Governments can support the expansion of domestic wind power industries operating in overseas markets through export credit assistance, thereby providing differential support to locally-owned manufacturers. Though such assistance may also come under WTO’s fire, export assistance can be in the form of low-interest loans or “tied-aid” given from the country where the turbine manufacturer is based to countries purchasing technology from that country. Export credit 16 assistance or development aid loans tied to the use of domestic wind power technology have been used by many countries, but most extensively by Germany and Denmark, encouraging the dissemination of Danish and German technology, particularly in the developing world. For example, the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) has offered direct grants and project development loans to qualified importing countries for use of Danish turbines. Quality Certification A fundamental way to promote the quality and credibility of an emerging wind power company’s turbines is through participation in a certification and testing program that meets international standards. There are currently several international standards for wind turbines in use, the most common being the Danish approval system and ISO 9000 certification. Standards help to build consumer confidence in an otherwise unfamiliar product, help with differentiation between superior and inferior products and, if internationally recognizable, are often vital to success in a global market. Denmark was the first country to promote aggressive quality certification and standardization programs in wind turbine technology and is still a world leader in this field; quality certification and standardization programs have since been used in Denmark, Germany, Japan, India, the USA, and elsewhere, and are under development in China. They were particularly valuable to Denmark in the early era of industry development when they essentially mandated the use of Danish-manufactured turbines, since stringent regulations on turbines that could be installed in Denmark made it very difficult for outside manufacturers to enter the market. Research and Development (R&D) Many studies have shown that sustained public research support for wind turbines can be crucial to the success of a domestic wind industry, and such efforts can and typically do differentially support locally owned companies. R&D has often been found to be most effective when there is some degree of coordination between private wind companies and public institutions like national laboratories and universities (Sawin, 2001; Kamp, 2002). For wind turbine technology, demonstration and commercialization programs in particular can play a crucial role in testing the performance and reliability of new domestic wind technology before those turbines go into commercial production. R&D funding has been allocated to wind turbine technology development by every country mentioned in this paper, with the success of R&D programs for wind technology seemingly more related to how the funding was directed than the total quantity of funding. Although the US has put more money into wind power R&D than any other country, for example, an early emphasis on multi-megawatt turbines and funding directed into the aerospace industry are thought (in retrospect) to have rendered US funding less effective in the early years of industry development than the Danish program (the same has been said about early German and Dutch R&D programs). Denmark’s R&D budget, although smaller in magnitude than some other countries, is thought to have been allocated more effectively among smaller wind companies developing varied sizes and designs of turbines in the initial years of industry development (Sawin, 2001; Kamp, 2002). 17 **4.2. Indirect Support Mechanisms** Earlier we demonstrated that success in a domestic market may be an essential foundation for success in the international marketplace, and that fundamental to growing a domestic wind manufacturing industry is a stable and sizable domestic market for wind power. Achieving a sizable, stable local market requires aggressive implementation of wind power support policies. The policies discussed below aim to create a demand for wind power at the domestic level. Feed-in Tariffs Feed-in tariffs, or fixed prices for wind power set to encourage development (Lauber, 2004; Rowlands, 2005; Sijm, 2002; Cerveny and Resch, 1998), have historically offered the most successful foundation for domestic wind manufacturing, as they can most directly provide a stable and profitable market in which to develop wind projects. The level of tariff and its design characteristics vary among countries. If well designed, including a long term reach and sufficient profit margin, feed-in tariffs have been shown to be extremely valuable in creating a signal of future market stability to wind farm investors and firms looking to invest in long-term wind technology innovation (Sawin, 2001; Hvelplund, 2001). As discussed earlier, Germany, Denmark and Spain have been the most successful countries at creating sizable, stable markets for wind power; all three of these countries also have a history of stable and profitable feed-in tariff policies to promote wind power development. The early US wind industry was also supported by a feed-in tariff in the state of California, though this policy was not stable for a lengthy period. Among the twelve countries emphasized in this paper, the Netherlands, Japan, Brazil, and some of the Indian and Chinese provinces have also experimented with feed-in tariffs, with varying levels of success.
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**C. Prefer our interpretation**

**1. Limits - Broad definitions could include 40 different mechanisms**

Moran, 86 **-** non-resident fellow at the Center for Global Development and holds the Marcus Wallenberg Chair at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University(Theodore, Investing in Development: New Roles for Private Capital?, p. 29 - googlebooks) Guisinger finds that if “incentives” are broadly defined to include tariffs and trade controls along with tax holidays, subsidized loans, cash grants, and other fiscal measures, they comprise more than forty separate kinds of measures. Moreover, the author emphasizes, the value of an incentive package is just one of several means that governments use to lure foreign investors. Other methods—for example, promotional activities (advertising, representative offices) and subsidized government services—also influence investors’ location decisions. The author points out that empirical research so far has been unable to distinguish the relative importance of fundamental economic factors and of government policies in decisions concerning the location of foreign investment—let alone to determine the effectiveness of individual government instruments.

2. **Ground – They do not spend federal money, this eliminates key ground on spending, politics, and trade-off debates – it also allows them to have highly specific evidence about their mechanism – they acquire additional solvency.**

**D. Topicality is a voting issue – if it were not the affirmative could run the same case year after year or unbeatable truths like sexual discrimination is harmful.**

### 1nc

#### **Immigration reform will pass, but capital’s key**

Star-Telegram 2/2 [“Finally, a bipartisan approach to immigration policy”, http://www.star-telegram.com/2013/02/02/4595720/finally-a-bipartisan-approach.html]

With leadership from the president, both political parties and both houses of Congress, comprehensive immigration reform -- one of the most divisive issues in the nation for a generation -- appears to be on a fast track for approval. Of course, that doesn't mean that grand plans offered back-to-back by a bipartisan group of senators and President Obama won't be sidetracked, as anything can happen in a politically polarized nation and on such a volatile subject. But the fact that Republicans and Democrats are in agreement that something has to be done, and that the two newly unveiled plans for immigration overall have similar objectives, it would be regrettable if Congress botched this opportunity.

#### Plan saps capital

Stokes 13 (Leah C., Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “The Politics of Renewable Energy Policies: The Case of Feed-in-Tariffs in Ontario Canada”) Energy Policy

However, there are also clear drawbacks associated with using FIT policies, many of which are political. First, governments have historically struggled with subsides for energy technologies, with prominent examples including the Synthetic Fuels Corporation and the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (Cudahy, 1995; Lesser and Su, 2008). Policymaking is difﬁcult, particularly when interest groups lobby for speciﬁc policy designs and price schedules. Early FITs seemed to set the price too low, leading to an increase in the tariff over time, rather than the decrease we would expect under innovation (International Energy Agency, 2008). This may occur because governments promoting a new policy are interested in seeing short-term success, and therefore favor an initially higher price (Stokes and Lee, 2012). Second, there is increasing evidence of political risk associated with FIT policies. Cost escalation can undermine public support for the policies (Frondel et al., 2008; Couture et al., 2010). In addition, FITs have a transparent cost structure opening them up to criticisms compared to other more opaque energy subsidies, for example those that come through tax breaks. While international support for renewable energy was $88 billion in 2011, fossil fuel subsidies were nearly 6 times at large, at $523 billion (International Energy Agency (IEA), 2012). As this suggests, FIT policies are typically small compared to other energy subsidies, however they are highly visible and may be disproportionately targeted.

**Reform expands skilled labor – spurs relations and growth in China and India**

Los Angeles Times, 11/9/20**12** (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see **expansion of skilled labor visas**," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a **fivefold increase** in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a **significant shot in the arm for India and China**." There is **widespread consensus among economists and academics** that skilled migration **fosters new trade and business relationships** between countries and **enhances links to the global economy**, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

**U.S.-India relations key to avert South Asian war**

**Schaffer 2** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can **benefit by closer cooperation**. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a **stronger position** from which to help **calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region**. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a **prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India**. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

#### Extinction

Hundley 12 (Tom Hundley is senior editor at the [Pulitzer Center on Crisis Reporting](http://pulitzercenter.org/). This article for Foreign Policy is part of the Pulitzer Center's [Gateway project](http://pulitzercenter.org/going-nuclear) on nuclear security. [Race to the End](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/race_to_the_end) http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/race\_to\_the\_end?page=0,3)

The arms race could make a loose nuke more likely. After all, Pakistan's assurances that its nuclear arsenal is safe and secure rest heavily on the argument that its warheads and their delivery systems have been uncoupled and stored separately in heavily guarded facilities. It would be very difficult for a group of mutinous officers to assemble the necessary protocols for a launch and well nigh impossible for a band of terrorists to do so. But that calculus changes with the deployment of mobile battlefield weapons. The weapons themselves, no longer stored in heavily guarded bunkers, would be far more exposed. Nevertheless, military analysts from both countries still say that a nuclear exchange triggered by miscalculation, miscommunication, or panic is far more likely than terrorists stealing a weapon -- and, significantly, that the odds of such an exchange increase with the deployment of battlefield nukes. As these ready-to-use weapons are maneuvered closer to enemy lines, the chain of command and control would be stretched and more authority necessarily delegated to field officers. And, if they have weapons designed to repel a conventional attack, there is obviously a reasonable chance they will use them for that purpose. "It lowers the threshold," said Hoodbhoy. "The idea that tactical nukes could be used against Indian tanks on Pakistan's territory creates the kind of atmosphere that greatly shortens the distance to apocalypse." Both sides speak of the possibility of a limited nuclear war. But even those who speak in these terms seem to understand that this is fantasy -- that once started, a nuclear exchange would be almost impossible to limit or contain. "The only move that you have control over is your first move; you have no control over the nth move in a nuclear exchange," said Carnegie's Tellis. The first launch would create hysteria; communication lines would break down, and events would rapidly cascade out of control. Some of the world's most densely populated cities could find themselves under nuclear attack, and an estimated 20 million people could die almost immediately. What's more, the resulting firestorms would put 5 million to 7 million metric tons of smoke into the upper atmosphere, according to a [new model](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=local-nuclear-war) developed by climate scientists at Rutgers University and the University of Colorado. Within weeks, skies around the world would be permanently overcast, and the condition vividly described by Carl Sagan as "nuclear winter" would be upon us. The darkness would likely last about a decade. The Earth's temperature would drop, agriculture around the globe would collapse, and a billion or more humans who already live on the margins of subsistence could starve. This is the real nuclear threat that is festering in South Asia. It is a threat to all countries, including the United States, not just India and Pakistan. Both sides acknowledge it, but neither seems able to slow their dangerous race to annihilation.
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#### The fifty states should establish a feed-in tariff that requires electricity utilities to purchase wholesale electricity from wind and solar power producers through long-term contracts at a fixed premium above the wholesale market price of electricity.

#### State action solves

Fulton, 12 -- Deutsche Bank Climate Change advisers

[Mark, and Reid Capalino, “Ramping up Renewables: Leveraging State RPS Programs amid Uncertain Federal Support,” http://uspref.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Ramping-up-Renewables-Leveraging-State-RPS-Programs-amid-Uncertain-Federal-Support-US-PREF-White-Paper1.pdf, accessed 2-7-13, mss]

Don’t forget about wholesale distributed generation: CLEAN and feed-in tariff programs One often neglected market segment is wholesale distributed generation: projects of 1-20 MW in size that – rather than off-setting customer usage (as is the case with residential solar PV) – generate power on the utility-side-of-the-meter and sell at wholesale rates to either a utility or electricity retailer. To the extent that policymakers seek to support growth of this market segment, a promising way to do so is through CLEAN (Clean Local Energy Accessible Now) programs. CLEAN programs (also known as feed-in tariffs) offer standard, fixed price, long-term power purchase agreements; while the offered price in such programs is usually determined up-front, it may then later be adjusted as the market responds. Such programs are particularly promising for promoting the growth of “wholesale distributed generation,” meaning distributed generation of 1-20 MW in size. Following passage of California Senate Bill 32, the CPUC has recently released details of a new CLEAN mechanism in California. The mechanism, known as Renewable Market Adjusting Tariff (Re-MAT) will be available for systems up to 3 MW in size; the Re-MAT programs links payments to owners of renewable energy systems to the weighted average contract price that California’s three investor-owned utilities recorded in their Nov 2011 reverse auction. 39 For more detail on CLEAN programs in general and the specifics of California’s new program in particular, see Appendix VII. In addition, a FERC order in 2011 regarding implementation by the California Public Utilities Commission of a feed-in tariff to support development of combined heat and power generation (134 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2011) (January 20, Order Denying Rehearing) **paves the way** for even greater use of feed-in tariffs to meet state RPS and other policy objectives. In this order FERC found the concept of a multi-tiered avoided cost rate structure to be consistent with the avoided cost rate requirements set forth in the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act (PURPA) and its subsequent regulations. 40 **This ruling affords states greater ability to establish feed-in tariff rates at levels that** would **support private investment, including** in **renewable energy generation**.
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#### Neodymium supplies necessary for wind are limited now but demand is keeping pace – the plan causes massive bottlenecks and price spikes

Cho 9-20 (Cho, analyst and reporter for Phys.org "rare earth metals: will we have enough?" September 20, 2012 phys.org/news/2012-09-rare-earth-metals.html

"To provide most of our power through renewables would take hundreds of times the amount of rare earth metals that we are mining today," said Thomas Graedel, Clifton R. Musser Professor of Industrial Ecology and professor of geology and geophysics at the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. There is no firm definition of rare earth metals, but the term generally refers to metals used in small quantities. Rare earth metals include: rare earth elements—17 elements in the periodic table, the 15 lanthanides plus scandium and yttrium; six platinum group elements; and other byproduct metals that occur in copper, gold, uranium, phosphates, iron or zinc ores. While many rare earth metals are actually quite common, they are seldom found in sufficient amounts to be extracted economically. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, world demand for rare earth metals is estimated to be 136,000 tons per year, and projected to rise to at least 185,000 tons annually by 2015. With continued global growth of the middle class, especially in China, India and Africa, demand will continue to grow. High-tech products and renewable energy technology cannot function without rare earth metals. Neodymium, terbium and dysprosium are essential ingredients in the magnets of wind turbines and computer hard drives; a number of rare earth metals are used in nickel-metal-hydride rechargeable batteries that power electric vehicles and many other products; yttrium is necessary for color TVs, fuel cells and fluorescent lamps; europium is a component of compact fluorescent bulbs and TV and iPhone screens; cerium and lanthanum are used in catalytic converters; platinum group metals are needed as catalysts in fuel cell technology; and other rare earth metals are essential for solar cells, cell phones, computer chips, medical imaging, jet engines, defense technology, and much more. Ads by Google Donate Car to Make-A-Wish - Donate Your Car to Help NC Kids Free Towing & Maximum Tax Deduction - WheelsForWishes.org/Make-A-Wish Wind power has grown around 7 percent a year, increasing by a factor of 10 over the last decade, noted Peter Kelemen, Arthur D. Storke Memorial Professor of Geochemistry at the Earth Institute's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. "Every megawatt of electricity needs 200 kilograms of neodymium—or 20 percent of one ton," he said. "So if every big wind turbine produces one megawatt, five turbines will require one ton of neodymium. If wind is going to play a major part in replacing fossil fuels, we will need to increase our supply of neodymium." A recent MIT study projected that neodymium demand could grow by as much as 700 percent over the next 25 years; demand for dysprosium, also needed for wind turbines, could increase by 2,600 percent. China currently supplies 97 percent of global rare earth metal demand, and 100 percent of heavy rare earth metals such as terbium and dysprosium, used in wind turbines. In 2005, it began restricting exports to preserve resources and protect the environment, causing prices to soar. Today, the United States is 100 percent dependent on imports for rare earth metals. From the mid-1960s through the 1980s, however, Molycorp's Mountain Pass mine in California was the world's main source of rare earth metals. As the U.S. share of rare earth metal production declined, China used government support, research and development, training programs, cheap labor and low prices to develop its supply chain, increasing its share of rare earth metal production from 27 percent in 1990 to 97 percent in 2011. In March, the U.S., Japan and the European Union lodged a complaint with the World Trade Organization over China's limits on rare earth exports. In response, China announced that it will export 30,996 more metric tons of rare earth metals in 2012 than it did in 2011.

#### An increase in demand for wind turbines triggers the link – government incentives distort the market

GCC 12 (Green Car Congress, report based on MIT Research "MIT study finds shift to green energy sources could mean crunch in supply of key rare earth elements" 9 March, 2012 www.greencarcongress.com/2012/03/ree-20120309.html)

A large-scale shift from coal-fired electric power plants and gasoline-fueled cars to wind turbines and electric vehicles could increase demand for two already-scarce rare earth elements (REE)—dysprosium and neodymium, available almost exclusively in China—by 600-2,600 percent over the next 25 years, according to a new study published in the ACS journal Environmental Science & Technology. The study by researchers at MIT also points out that production of the two metals has been increasing by only a few percentage points per year. ...the availability of REEs appears to be at risk based on a number of factors. Of particular significance, one country (China) controls 98% of current supply (production). Historically, much lower levels of market concentration have harmed manufacturing firms. For example, in 1978 Zaire controlled 48% of the cobalt supply and yet political unrest in Zaire resulted in a disruption to global supply that became known as the “Cobalt Crisis”. Another contributor to supply risk for REEs is the fact that they are comined; individual REEs are not mined separately. REEs are found together in geological deposits, rendering mining of individual elements economically inefficient. The supply of any individual REE depends on the geology of the deposits, the costs of the extraction technology employed, and the price of the basket of rare earths (RE). Finally, REEs have come under global scrutiny due to the environmental and social conditions under which they are mined, further increasing their supply risk. —Alonso et al. While the literature contains a number of reports that evaluate different aspects of RE availability, Randolph E. Kirchain, Ph.D., and colleagues evaluated future potential demand scenarios for REEs with a focus on the issue of comining. They analyzed the supply of lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium, neodymium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, terbium, dysprosium and yttrium under various scenarios, and projected the demand for these 10 rare earth elements through 2035. In particular, they estimated resource requirements for electric vehicles and windturbines (revolutionary demand areas for REEs) from performance specifications and vehicle sales or turbine deployment projections. Future demand was estimated for a range of scenarios including one developed by the International Energy Agency (IEA) with adoption of electric vehicles and wind turbines at a rate consistent with stabilization of CO2 in the atmosphere at a level of 450 ppm. In one scenario, demand for dysprosium and neodymium could be higher than 2,600 and 700 percent respectively. To meet that need, production of dysprosium would have to grow each year at nearly twice the historic growth rate for rare earth supplies. The applications that will be most negatively affected by constraints in these REEs (i.e., increased costs) will be those dependent upon high performance magnets. Applications such as petroleum refining, which depend on elements whose supply is projected to exceed demand, may be positively affected if primary producers increase overall production to meet the higher demand for specific elements. If a secondary market emerges to meet the higher demand for specific elements (i.e., recycling of magnets, but not catalysts), then, given that the portfolio of recycled REEs would be significantly different from the portfolio of primary supply, the overall supply portfolio of REEs could change. ...In the end, prices are not the only forces that will influence the REE markets. Government intervention in this market is prevalent. Also, corporate social responsibility policies may influence some firm’s decisions to use REE unless environmental concerns around their mining are addressed. These issues should be considered carefully by interested stakeholders and future research on this topic.

#### A supply bottleneck causes War with China

Anthony 12/30/12 (Lead editor at Ziff Davis, Inc. Owner at SA Holdings Past Columnist at Tecca Editor at Aol (Weblogs, Inc) Educationm University of Essex, http://www.extremetech.com/extreme/111029-rare-earth-crisis-innovate-or-be-crushed-by-china/2)

 The doomsday event that everyone is praying will never come to pass, but which every Western nation is currently planning for, is the eventual cut-off of Chinese rare earth exports. Last year, 97% of the world’s rare earth metals were produced in China — but over the last few years, the Chinese government has been shutting down mines, ostensibly to save what resources it has, and also reducing the amount of rare earth that can be exported. Last year, China produced some 130,000 tons of rare earths, but export restrictions meant that only 35,000 tons were sent to other countries. As a result, demand outside China now outstrips supply by some 40,000 tons per year, and — as expected — many countries are now stockpiling the reserves that they have. Almost every Western country is now digging around in their backyard for rare earth-rich mud and sand, but it’ll probably be too little too late — and anyway, due to geochemistry, there’s no guarantee that explorers and assayers will find what they’re looking for. The price of rare earths are already going up, and so are the non-Chinese-made gadgets and gizmos that use them. Exacerbating the issue yet further, as technology grows more advanced, our reliance on the strange and magical properties of rare earths increases — and China, with the world’s largest workforce and a fire hose of rare earths, is perfectly poised to become the only real producer of solar power photovoltaic cells, computer chips, and more. In short, China has the world by the short hairs, and when combined with a hotting-up cyber front, it’s not hard to see how this situation might devolve into World War III. The alternate, ecological point of view, is that we’re simply living beyond the planet’s means. Either way, strategic and logistic planning to make the most of scarce metals and minerals is now one of the most important tasks that face governments and corporations. Even if large rare earth deposits are found soon, or we start recycling our gadgets in a big way, the only real solution is to somehow lessen our reliance on a finite resource. Just like oil and energy, this will probably require drastic technological leaps. Instead of reducing the amount of tantalum used in capacitors, or indium in LCD displays, we will probably have to discover completely different ways of storing energy or displaying images. My money’s on graphene.

#### Extinction

#### Wittner 11 (11/30/11 Dr. Lawrence, Prof of History Emeritus at SUNY Albany, “Is a Nuclear War with China Possible?”)

But what would that "victory" entail? An attack with these Chinese nuclear weapons would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a "nuclear winter" around the globe -- destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction. Moreover, in another decade the extent of this catastrophe would be far worse. The Chinese government is currently expanding its nuclear arsenal, and by the year 2020 it is [expected](http://www.nukestrat.com/china/Book-35-125.pdf) to more than double its number of nuclear weapons that can hit the United States. The U.S. government, in turn, has [plans](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/oct/30/nuclear-powers-weapons-spending-report) to spend hundreds of billions of dollars "modernizing" its nuclear weapons and nuclear production facilities over the next decade.

### 1nc

#### Next off is the wind pic –

#### The United States Federal Government should establish a feed-in tariff that requires electricity utilities to purchase wholesale electricity from solar power producers through long-term contracts at a fixed premium above the wholesale market price of electricity.

#### Increased wind turbine production causes massive environmental damage – habitat destruction, erosion, species loss

Rosenbloom 6 (Eric, Writer and Science Editor for Wind Watch Online, “A Problem With Wind Power”)

 (Building on peat bogs is recognized as a serious disruption of an important carbon sink; the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds opposes wind development on the Scottish island of Lewis because the turbines would take 25 years to theoretically save the amount of carbon that their construction will release from the peat (not to mention the threat to birds—see below). Clearing forests for facilities on mountain ridges is an analogous situation. Such mountaintop clearing has serious runoff implications as well as documented at the Meyersdale plant in Pennsylvania.) FPL Energy also says, “although construction is temporary [a few months], it will require heavy equipment, including bulldozers, graders, trenching machines, concrete trucks, flatbed trucks, and large cranes.” Getting all the equipment, as well as the huge tower sections and rotor blades, into an undeveloped area requires the construction of wide straight strong roads. Many existing roads, particularly in hilly areas, are inadequate. For the Buffalo Mountain project, curves were widened, switchbacks were eliminated, and portions were repaved. The weight of the material has damaged existing roads. Many an ancient hedgerow in England has been sacrificed for access to project sites. The destructive impact that such construction would have, for example, on a wild mountain top, is obvious. Erosion, disruption of water flow, and destruction of wild habitat and plant life would continue with the presence of access roads, power lines, transformers, and the tower sites themselves. For better wind efficiency, each tower requires trees to be cleared. Vegetation would be kept down with herbicides, further poisoning the soil and water. Each tower should be at least 5–10 times the rotor diameter from neighboring towers and trees for optimal performance. For a tower with 35-meter rotors, that is 1,200–2,400 feet, a quarter to half of a mile. A site on a forested ridge would require clearing 50–100 acres per tower to operate optimally (although only 4–6 acres of clearance per tower, the towers spaced every 500–1,000 feet, is typical, making them almost useless when the wind is not a perfect crosswind). The Danish grid operator Eltra has found that a turbine can decrease the production of another turbine 5 kilometers (3.1 miles) away. The proposed 45-square-mile facility on the Scottish island of Lewis represents 50 acres for each megawatt of rated capacity. FPL Energy says it requires 40 acres per installed megawatt, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) says 60 acres is likely. Facilities worldwide generally use 30–70 acres per megawatt, i.e., about 120–280 acres for every megawatt of likely average output (25% capacity factor).

**Interconnectedness guarantees extinction -**

**MSNBC 4** (9/4/04 “Study sees far deeper species extinction http://209.85.141.104/search?q=cache:qk-JkBCtr\_0J:www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5951649/+species+extinction+environment+single&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us)

Study co-author Heather Proctor, of Canada’s University of Alberta, said in a statement that "**what we found is that with the extinction of a bird, or a mammal or a plant, you aren’t just necessarily wiping out just one, single species. We’re also allowing all these unsung dependent species to be wiped out as well.” The team used a mathematical model to look at what's termed "coextinction,"** adding **the study marked the first time the phenomenon had been quantitatively estimated. Not just mites, lice In many cases, species facing coextinction tend to be things like mites and lice. But some others are more likely to be missed by humans, such as a type of butterfly from Singapore that disappeared after the vines that had provided food for its larvae became extinct. Overall, the researchers said, the loss of one species when a different one becomes extinct shows how interconnected the world is. “What we wanted to learn was, if the host goes extinct, how many other species will go with it**,” Proctor said. “It **would be easy if there were always a one-to-one relationship with a host and its affiliate; however, not all parasites, for example, are restricted to a single host species**,” Proctor said. “The trick was in trying to determine how many other species could act as hosts and factoring that degree of dependence into the study.” Beetles, butterflies at risk, too **Using their model the group calculated that extinction of the 6,279 plants listed as threatened or endangered by the International Union for Conservation of Nature would also result in the loss of 4,672 species of beetles and 136 types of butterfly. Loss of the 1,194 threatened birds could also mean disappearance of 342 species of lice and 193 types of mites. If the 114 endangered primates were to go extinct, they said, there could also be the loss of 20 types of nematodes, 12 lice and nine fungi to depend on the primates.** "While coextinction may not be the most important cause of species extinctions, " the researchers concluded, "it is certainly an insidious one."

**Biodiversity collapse threatens human extinction**

**Schlickeisen 2k (**Rodger, President of Defenders of Wildlife and the Natural Resources Defense Council, **May 24**, Federal News Service

A 1998 survey by the American Museum of Natural History confirmed that a majority of scientific experts believe that we are in the midst of a mass extinction of living things. These scientists agree that: the loss of species will pose a major threat to human existence in this century; during the next 30 years as many as one-fifth of all species alive today could become extinct; this so-called "sixth extinction" is the fastest in the Earth's 4.5 billion-year history, but unlike prior mass extinctions, is primarily the result of human activity and not natural causes; biodiversity loss is a greater threat than the depletion of the ozone layer, global warming or pollution and contamination.

### warming

**No extinction from warming**

**Barrett 7**, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, **climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species**.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) **will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust.** “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, **abrupt climate change** (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, **is unlikely to be ruinous.** Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. **Even in a worse case scenario**, however, global **climate change is not the equivalent of the** Earth being hit by **mega-asteroid.** Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### Turn – warming helps marine ecosystems despite acidification

Carter et.al ‘11(Carter Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) [“Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report,” September, Science and Environmental Policy Project, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change)

 Another reason to doubt Pelejero et al.‘s forecast of falling pH levels is that high rates of aquatic photosynthesis by marine micro- and macro-algae, which have been shown to be stimulated and maintained by high levels of atmospheric CO2—see, for example, Wu et al. (2008), Fu et al. (2008), and Egge et al. (2009)—can dramatically increase the pH of marine bays, lagoons, and tidal pools (Gnaiger et al., 1978; Santhanam et al., 1994; Macedo et al., 2001; Hansen, 2002; Middelboe and Hansen, 2007) and significantly increase the surface-water pH of areas as large as the North Sea (Brussaard et al., 1996). Thus it is logical to presume anything else that enhances marine photosynthesis, such as nutrient delivery to the waters of the world‘s coastal zones (i.e., eutrophication), may increase pH as well. Thinking along these lines, Borges and Gypens (2010) employed an idealized biogeochemical model of a river system (Billen et al., 2001) and a complex biogeochemical model describing carbon and nutrient cycles in the marine domain (Gypens et al., 2004) ―to investigate the decadal changes of seawater carbonate chemistry variables related to the increase of atmospheric CO2 and of nutrient delivery in the highly eutrophied Belgian coastal zone over the period 1951–1998.‖ The findings of the two researchers indicate, as they describe it, that ―the increase of primary production due to eutrophication could counter the effects of ocean acidification on surface water carbonate chemistry in coastal environments,‖ and ―changes in river nutrient delivery due to management regulation policies can lead to stronger changes in carbonate chemistry than ocean acidification,‖ as well as changes that are ―faster than those related solely to ocean acidification.‖ And to make these facts perfectly clear, they add, ―the response of carbonate chemistry to changes of nutrient delivery to the coastal zone is stronger than ocean acidification.‖

#### Impact’s overstated

Carter et.al ‘11(Carter Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) [“Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report,” September, Science and Environmental Policy Project, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change)

 Lastly, Rodolfo-Metalpa et al. (2010) worked with bryozoans or ―moss animals‖—a geologically important group of small animals that resemble corals and are major calcifiers, found on rocky shores in cool-water areas of the planet, where they comprise a significant component of the carbonate sediments in shallow sublittoral habitats, and where they form long-lived, three-dimensional structures that provide attachment sites for numerous epifauna and trap sediment and food for a variety of infauna—in what they describe as ―the first coastal transplant experiment designed to investigate the effects of naturally acidified seawater on the rates of net calcification and dissolution of the branched calcitic bryozoan Myriapora truncata.‖ They did this by transplanting colonies of the species to normal (pH 8.1), high (pH 7.66), and extremely high (pH 7.43) CO2 conditions at gas vents located just off Italy‘s Ischia Island in the Tyrrhenian Sea, where they calculated the net calcification rates of live colonies and the dissolution rates of dead colonies by weighing them before and after 45 days of in situ residence in May–June (when seawater temperatures ranged from 19 to 24°C) and after 128 days of in situ residence in July–October (when seawater temperatures ranged from 25–28°C). Throughout the first and cooler observation period, ―dead M. truncata colonies dissolved at high CO2 levels (pH 7.66), whereas live specimens maintained the same net calcification rate as those growing at normal pH,‖ the researchers write. At the extremely high CO2 level, however, the net calcification rate of the live specimens was reduced to only about 20 percent of what it was at normal pH, but life continued. Throughout the second and warmer observation period, on the other hand, calcification ceased in both the normal and high CO2 treatments,and in the extremely high CO2 treatment, the transplants died. Based on these findings the five scientists concluded, ―at moderate temperatures,‖ such as those to which they are currently adapted, ―adult M. truncata are able to up-regulate their calcification rates and survive in areas with higher levels of pCO2 than are predicted to occur due to anthropogenic ocean acidification, although this ability broke down below mean pH 7.4.‖ This latter level, however, is below what even the IPCC predicts will occur in response to continued burning of fossil fuels, and far below what the more realistic analysis of Tans (2009) suggests.

#### Ice age coming now – co2 key prevent end of civilization

Marsh ‘12 (Gerald E. Marsh, Retired Physicist from the Argonne National Laboratory and a former consultant to the Department of Defense on strategic nuclear technology and policy in the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administration, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>, 2012)

CHICAGO — Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age. What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt. Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization. One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder. The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was followed by the extinction of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland. Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come. By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze. Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization. There were very few Ice Ages until about 2.75 million years ago when Earth’s climate entered an unusual period of instability. Starting about a million years ago cycles of ice ages lasting about 100,000 years, separated by relatively short interglacial periods, like the one we are now living in became the rule. Before the onset of the Ice Ages, and for most of the Earth’s history, it was far warmer than it is today. Indeed, the Sun has been getting brighter over the whole history of the Earth and large land plants have flourished. Both of these had the effect of dropping carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere to the lowest level in Earth’s long history. Five hundred million years ago, carbon dioxide concentrations were over 13 times current levels; and not until about 20 million years ago did carbon dioxide levels dropped to a little less than twice what they are today. It is possible that moderately increased carbon dioxide concentrations could extend the current interglacial period. But we have not reached the level required yet, nor do we know the optimum level to reach. So, rather than call for arbitrary limits on carbon dioxide emissions, perhaps the best thing the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the climatology community in general could do is spend their efforts on determining the optimal range of carbon dioxide needed to extend the current interglacial period indefinitely. NASA has predicted that the solar cycle peaking in 2022 could be one of the weakest in centuries and should cause a very significant cooling of Earth’s climate. Will this be the trigger that initiates a new Ice Age? We ought to carefully consider this possibility before we wipe out our current prosperity by spending trillions of dollars to combat a perceived global warming threat that may well prove to be only a will-o-the-wisp.

### glut

#### No impact to the Chinese economy

**Blackwill 9** – former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning (Robert, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf, WEA)

Next, China. Again, five years from today. **Did the recession undermine the grip of the Chinese Communist Party** on the People’s Republic of China (PRC)? **No**. Again, as Lee Kuan Yew stressed in the same recent speech, “**China has proven itself to be pragmatic, resilient and adaptive. The Chinese have survived severe crises—the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution—few societies have been so stricken**. **These are reasons not to be pessimistic**.” Did the crisis make Washington more willing to succumb to the rise of Chinese power because of PRC holdings of U.S. Treasury Bonds? No. **Did it alter China’s basic external direction** and especially its efforts, stemming from its own strategic analysis, to undermine the U.S. alliance system in Asia? **No. Did it cause the essence of Asian security to transform? No.**

#### Collapse inevitable

Dickson 12 (Micah Dickson, SeekingAlpha, Investor Trading Online News, “The Cracks In The Great Economic Wall Of China”, November 27, 2012)

China has just gone through their once in a decade power transition. While the transition of power has appeared to have gone smoothly, it does not mean that the challenges facing China have diminished at all. Xi Jinping and his regime face a host of challenges. These challenges vary from economic to societal in nature. The current course China is on is utterly unsustainable. The question is, can the new Chinese leadership make the necessary reforms to keep the country from a political and economic collapse? Investors must consider the size and scope of the challenges facing China as they make decisions on where to allocate their assets for the coming year. Economic Challenges Any true economic growth is based upon investors and consumers acting on information. The accuracy of that information can decide if that economic growth is sustainable or not. Many of the basic economic numbers coming from China have largely been called into question. Li Kepiang, possible future premier of China, said in 2012 that the GDP figures were "man-made". There has also been documented cases of the growth in many Chinese industries being quite different from the overall GDP numbers that are reported. Unfortunately, China's state owned enterprises are becoming a prime example of the failure of accurate information from China itself. State owned enterprises are filled with Communist Party leaders who use them to bolster the Party's power. Included in the list of state owned enterprises are banks that provide loans to businesses. These businesses include other non-financial state owned enterprises. These loans are given at lower interest rates and in unlimited amounts. This incestuous relationship gives state owned enterprises an advantage over other smaller enterprises inside the country. Besides being incredibly corrupt, this system has led to what has been referred to as "zombie companies". These are companies that should be going bankrupt because they are unable to repay their debt. The Chinese government is not allowing these companies to go bankrupt. Instead the state owned banks are being forced to continue to lend money to the enterprises despite their inability to repay the debt. Matthew Boesler from the Business Insider commented on the effects of these practices in this way, "This is causing a deterioration in asset quality on banks' balance sheets, and increases the chances that the government will have to bail them out down the road". Some estimate that the debt to equity ratio of many state owned enterprises exceed 230%. This is a staggering figure. Even with all of these negative developments, the "official" amount of non-performing loans in the Chinese banking sector is only 0.9%. This obvious contradiction is why so many of the numbers out of China are deceptions. The banking sector numbers are not the only numbers that are troubling. The state owned enterprises have been showing weakness for a while. These enterprises make up 40% to 50% of GDP. From 2001 to 2009, these state owned enterprises made 5.8 trillion Renminbi (RMB). This would equal $931.1 billion in the United States. Normally, this would be a tale of their success. But if you remove the government subsidies for that same time period, the real average return on equity for the state owned enterprises would be a negative 6.29%. These problems are compounded by a growing real estate bubble. Part of China's growth has come from the government's investment in the building of infrastructure. Robin Banerji and Patrick Jackson of the BBC describe the expansion like this, "The country is said to have built the equivalent of Rome every two months in the past decade". The problem with this rapid expansion is that supply is beginning to overtake demand. Satellite images are showing entire Chinese cities empty many years after their construction. The World Bank's Holly Krambeck gave a frightening example of this in the city of Chenggong. She says, "In Chenggong, there are more than 100,000 new apartments with no occupants". This is becoming the story all over China as new buildings, office spaces, and other projects are lying empty due to the lack of occupants able to fill these empty structures. These factors should cause investors to be cautious about their positions in China. A red flag to any investor should be the inability for Chinese companies to be audited by firms outside of China. If these large economic challenges are not addressed, China may see anemic economic growth as Japan did in the 1990s or worse, an economic catastrophe that could rock the world markets as investors begin to move their capital to other parts of the world. This could be hastened by the growing perception of many in the United States, China's largest customer, that companies that do business there are hurting American workers. Political Turmoil China is currently finishing their once in a decade transition of political leadership. This however has not come without serious hiccups in the road. There is serious tension inside the Chinese hierarchy which is beginning to reveal itself. As Dean Cheng reported about the 2012 National People's Congress session, "As this year's session came to a close, outgoing Premier Wen Jiabao warned of the potential for chaos and cited the Cultural Revolution of 1966-1976". This statement immediately preceded the ousting of Chongqing Party Secretary Bo Xilai from the Communist Party. Bo, his wife, and many extended family members were also charged with a variety of crimes including corruption, murder, and adultery. His populist tone and rising star in the Communist Party made him an attractive candidate for higher office and many reports say he was campaigning for a position on the CCP Politburo Standing Committee. This committee is the most important and power part of the Chinese leadership. Bo's rising star quickly extinguished after his former police chief tried to defect to the United States. Because of how common corruption is inside the Party, many find it strange that Bo Xilai was ousted and charged so quickly and publicly. Dean Cheng makes this comment regarding the scandal: "Such major developments-occurring in the midst of one of China's most public political events-suggest that Chinese politics are in major turmoil." While the event with Bo Xilai is scandalous, it is an extension of the ongoing concern of many inside the Party of the increasing corruption and the deterioration of the perceived legitimacy of the Party. Premier Wen, who is exited his position during this most recent transition has even publicly called for the power of the Communist Party to be reduced. In the 2011 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, Premier Wen was quoted as saying: A ruling Party's most important duty is to follow the constitution and the law, and restrict its activities within the constitution and the law…. This requires changes in the use of the Party as a substitute for the government and in the phenomenon of over-concentration of power. For this, we need to reform the leadership system of the Party and the country. But these reforms will be close to impossible to carry out as the 70 wealthiest members of the National People's Congress are ten times wealthier than the top 660 government officials here in the United States. This is due to the fact that state owned enterprises are run by members of the National People's Congress or by a close relative of those members. Any reforms would mean these members would have to give up their sources of wealth and power. As we've seen in many cases, economic troubles can strain political relations even further. If China does not make changes, the corruption and decadence in the ruling Communist Party could become the scapegoat for any "hard landing" China experiences. If China experiences a hard landing, it would lead to the second largest economy in the world falling into political chaos. This would create uncertainty that would trump the uncertainty experienced from the problems in the European Union. Societal Challenges The political problems in China are compounded by the fact that there is growing unrest among the average citizen in China. The largest problem is that of forced evictions by the Chinese government. After the Financial Crisis of 2008, the Chinese government began implementing an extremely large stimulus package. The main thrust of the stimulus package is to build up infrastructure across the country. In order to do this, many Chinese cities are forcibly and violently evicting citizens who live on land that is going to be used for new government building projects. The stories of these forced evictions have caused outrage throughout the Chinese population. An example of how outraged many citizens are is the Chinese fishing village of Wukan. The citizens of the village became fed up with land grabs from the government. In response, they rushed the offices of the local government during a protest. After the protest, one of the protest leaders died while in custody. This led to the village ousting the Communist Party leadership in the village and democratically electing local leaders. While this rebellion is an extreme example, what caused the outrage is still there and is becoming prevalent among the Chinese people. Land grabs are not the only problems, income disparity, working conditions, and many more social ills are beginning to bubble over. In 2010, China experienced 180,000 protests, riots, and mass demonstration. This is staggering. Unfortunately, many of the complaints are too narrow to begin a nationwide movement that will cause sweeping reforms inside China. That will not last for long. More and more of the protest leaders admit that the underlying problem with the country is the one party system that has dominated the government for so long. This growing public anger combined with the political turmoil inside the country could combine to create a deadly chemical reaction. Conclusion The Chinese model is quickly becoming a potential Chinese nightmare. While it has created incredible wealth inside China, it has created a monster that does not seem to be able to make the necessary changes. China has to go back to the path of reforms that Deng began in 1970s in which their economy becomes freer. Unfortunately, the incredible corruption that has sprang up from China's economic growth is beginning to insulate itself. Communist Party leaders have shown hostility toward any change. Investors must consider these factors when looking toward China for the growth that is missing in the United States. While that growth may be advantageous in the short to medium term, it could be an incredibly risky bet in the long term. If China does not address its economic, political, and societal challenges, the Great Wall that is the rising Chinese economy may have a mighty fall.

#### Economic recovery in China now –

Reuters 2/8/13 (“China Trade, Loan Surge Boosts Economy, Inflation Lurks”) http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/08/us-china-economy-idUSBRE91702T20130208

China's exports and imports surged and new lending soared in January as the first hard data of the year signaled not only a solid recovery in domestic and overseas demand, but also the risk that inflationary pressures are building. Exports grew 25 percent from a year earlier versus a forecast of 17 percent in a Reuters poll. Imports surged 28.8 percent to comfortably beat a consensus call of 23.3 percent and the resulting $29.2 billion trade surplus topped a market expectation of $22 billion. New lending by China's [banks](http://www.reuters.com/sectors/industries/overview?industryCode=128&lc=int_mb_1001) in January beat expectations at 1.07 trillion[yuan](http://www.reuters.com/subjects/yuan?lc=int_mb_1001) ($172 billion) and more than doubled from December. Total social financing - a broad measure of liquidity in the [economy](http://www.reuters.com/finance/economy?lc=int_mb_1001) - leapt to 2.54 trillion yuan, well ahead of December's 1.63 trillion yuan. Economists were cautious about reading too much into one month's data undeniably distorted by the timing of Lunar New Year holidays, which fall in February this year but were in January in 2012. Still, the consensus view suggested an economic recovery that started in late 2012 was strengthening. "Overall this says there is no need to worry about the strength of China's recovery," Sun Junwei, [China](http://www.reuters.com/places/china) economist at HSBC in Beijing, told Reuters. "These were very strong numbers, particularly total social financing. This means to me that beyond the rebound in bank lending there is strong demand for credit in the [economy](http://www.reuters.com/finance/economy?lc=int_mb_1001)," Sun said, predicting upside surprises to data ahead.

#### Too many alt causes to China’s exporting crisis – Eurozone an other US solar restrictions

Epoch Times 2/7/13 (Barbara Gay, Staff Writer, “Chinese Provinces Reduce Export Targets for 2013”)

Jiangsu’s foreign trade with its major export markets—the European Union (EU), United States, and Japan—accounts for 50 percent of its yearly trade volume, but “the three markets are suffering from a slow economy,” according to the Economic Information Daily, citing Ma Minglong, the director of Jiangsu Business Hall. Solar panels, shipping, information technology, and textiles account for roughly half of the exports in Jiangsu, but because of U.S. and EU anti-dumping and anti-subsidy actions, solar panel exports from Jiangsu decreased by 5 percent. Zhejiang Province achieved an export growth rate of 3.8 percent in 2012, lower than the national average of 4.1 percent. Although Zhejiang has not released its target for 2013, experts predict it will also be reduced. “Zhejiang’s decrease in export growth is the result of several factors, most notably the EU debt crisis, since the EU is a comparatively large market for Zhejiang,” Zhang Handong, Director of Zhejiang International Economic and Trade Research Center, told Economic Information Daily.

#### China is increasing domestic demand to make up for the glut – proves the status quo solves the advantage

Xinhua News 2/6/13 (“Hazy But Hopeful Outlook for China’s Solar Industry”) http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90778/8122946.html

However, a variety of PV trade investigations were initiated against China in 2012,plaguing an industry that has seen its profit margins squeezed by significantovercapacity. Orders for Chinese PV equipment slumped 80 percent in 2012 from a year ago,according to the China PV industry Alliance. As much as 90 percent of Chinesepolysilicon makers halted production and 80 percent of solar panel producers shutdown or sharply reduced output, it said. To offset shrinking overseas demand, the Chinese government has stepped up supportive measures since last fall to reshape the oversupplied sector and reorient it towards the vastly untapped domestic market. The incentives include encouraging mergers and restructuring in the industry, boosting distributed solar power generation and paving the way for a more market-oriented on-grid solar electricity pricing scheme. The policies will surely be a boon for the cash-strapped solar industry, said XuChongqing, an energy expert at the Shandong Academy of Sciences. "They will help compensate PV companies' lost share in the foreign market," Xu said.Big companies will have more time to adjust their business models and enhanceresearch and development, while outdated capacity will be phased out throughmergers. "Uncompetitive players may begin to exit the market this year," said Liu Jianli, marketingdirector of the Shandong Linuo Power Group. Spurred by the government's support policies, the sector is expected to register asteady growth rate of 10 percent in 2013. Other business insiders agreed that the industry may begin to show signs of recovery in 2013. However, uncertainties related to a trade investigation in the EU may cast ashadow over the rally.

#### Alt causes to social unrest in China – urbanization

The Wall Street Journal 2/8/13 (“China’s Urbanization Risk: Magnified Unrest”) http://blogs.wsj.com/chinarealtime/2013/02/08/chinas-urbanization-risk-magnified-unrest/

China’s new leaders seem to be placing their hopes for economic growth on urbanization. They see an upsurge in demand for a whole range of services – from housing to schooling and health care as the rural population is increasingly pulled into the urban economy. But high urbanization has its costs, argues a new report from Beijing Anbound Information, a private think tank that advises a number of local governments around China. Chief among those costs, the report says, is the magnification of social problems – and in a country with a considerable amount of social friction, that certainly is something to consider. Anbound contends that once urbanization reaches 50%, the potential for social unrest rises considerably. China has already crossed that line, having reached 51.27% at the end of 2011, according to data from the National Bureau of Statistics. “An urbanization rate of 50% is correlated with rising social risks in urban areas,” Anbound said. “It is a significant level.”

#### Chinese economic decline inevitable

Charles Recknagel, The Atlantic, 11/15/12, China's Power Transition: Massive Challenges for a Massive Economy, www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/11/chinas-power-transition-massive-challenges-for-a-massive-economy/265320/

But today the economic news from China is less upbeat. The government announced this month that the growth rate slowed to 7.6 percent in the third quarter of 2012 -- the lowest rate since the global financial crisis that began in 2008. Beijing has set its target for GDP growth this year at just 7.5 percent, after years of an 8 percent goal that it often exceeded. Many experts say the biggest economic problem China faces now is the very nature of its state-driven economic system. That system worked well when global demand for Chinese-manufactured products was high but it now looks unbalanced when the global economy is weak. Duncan Innes Ker, a China expert at the London-based Economics Intelligence Unit, says the key to future growth will be to boost the private sector. "At the moment the banking sector essentially serves to finance the state-owned part of the economy and essentially starves the private sector of capital in favor of the state sector, which is a big problem, given that the state sector tends to be less productive, less jobs-generative, and overall less efficient than the private sector," Innes Ker says. China's leaders have long said they want to foster economic growth in the coming years by growing the private sector, boosting domestic consumption, and diversifying exports. All are seen as keys to providing future growth and jobs. But change has proved hard to make due to the vested interests within China's one-party, state-enterprise-heavy system. Innes Ker says that China's new leadership has yet to reveal its priorities publicly. But it appears to favor a conservative approach. "The balance does seem to be quite firmly in favor of conservatives so it is possible that we may actually get a relatively timid approach to reform of the state sector and continuing [state] dominance of the commanding heights of the economy," Innes Ker says. "In that sort of circumstance, it may be that China's growth rates in the medium term might be even significantly lower than the 7 percent that we are expecting at the moment." The current reliance on state-enterprises -- which dominate their sectors with little or no competition -- helps to create another drag on China's economy: corruption. Anger at Corruption Outgoing Chinese President Hu Jintao, speaking at the Communist Party Congress that ushered in a new leadership team, warned starkly that failure to tame corruption could lead to the "collapse of the party and the fall of the state." Rod Wye, an expert on Chinese politics at Chatham House in London, says China's leaders are well aware of the public anger that corruption generates and that is why they have begun talking about it. But taking effective action is another matter. "Corruption, as the Chinese leaders themselves say, is a life-and-death matter for the Chinese Communist Party. But the fact is that it is pretty endemic in China and it is not going to be easy to root it out in any short period of time," Wye says. One example is China's railway system. Beijing has invested hundreds of billions of dollars in recent years to build a high-speed rail network across the country. Yet an investigation into the crash of one of its fast new trains in July last year, which killed 40 people, revealed massive amounts wasted due to corruption. In just one small case, a big state-owned company paid a $16 million commission to an intermediary to secure contracts to work on the rail projects. China faces a host of other challenges that could slow its economic growth in the future. One is the dramatic aging of the Chinese population, accompanied by the shrinking of the country's workforce beginning in 2015. That is partly a consequence of the one-child policy adopted by the Communist Party in 1979 to stem population growth. Kenneth Pomeranz, a professor of history at the University of Chicago, says changing demographics will soon present the Chinese leadership with some stark choices. "Everybody can see that the very, very rapid graying of China's population -- already under way in part because they have had 40 years now of a very low birthrate -- is going to cause big problems," Pomeranz says. "They are going to make a pretty sudden transition from a society with a very high percentage of its population in the labor force to a society with a much lower percentage of the population in the labor force and more people who need to be supported." That means China increasingly will have to find ways to work more efficiently with less people as the days of cheap mass labor end.

### distributed energy

#### Data disproves heg impacts

Fettweis 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### Zero challengers

Bremmer and Gordon 11 (Ian Bremmer is president of Eurasia Group and author of “The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?” David F. Gordon, former director of policy planning at the State Department, is head of research at Eurasia Group, “An Upbeat View of America's 'Bad' Year”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/28/opinion/an-upbeat-view-of-americas-bad-year.html?pagewanted=all>, December 27, 2011,

Among global big thinkers, never a bashful crowd, the notion of a United States in decline has become conventional wisdom. In late 2011, this narrative has crescendoed, with experts arguing that China has surpassed the United States economically, Niall Ferguson declaring that we are at “the end of 500 years of Western predominance” and The National Interest proclaiming “the end of the American era.” Even the National Intelligence Council’s coming Global Trends 2030 study reportedly assumes an America in decline. As 2011 draws to a close, the U.S. military’s exit from Iraq and challenges in Afghanistan along with American vulnerability to the European crisis provide further confirmation of the decline narrative. We agree with some of these views. The United States has neither the willingness nor the capability to provide the kind of global leadership that it has provided in the past several decades, and other countries are increasingly less willing to follow America’s lead. But the conventional wisdom obscures as much as it reveals. Specifically, the declinists overlook the inconvenient truth that global power is relative. And comparing America’s year to that of our present and potential adversaries paints an interesting picture: 2011 was not the year when the United States fell off the wagon. Instead, a look back at the past 12 months suggests that **U.S. power is more resilient than the narrative of inevitable decline portrays.** Take Al Qaeda, our most consistent adversary (by their definition and ours) since the 9/11 attacks. Despite some severe missteps, we have in 10 years degraded Al Qaeda’s capabilities to the point that they are having difficulty mounting attacks against significant targets. In 2011, the United States killed Al Qaeda’s most effective propagandist, Anwar al-Awlaki; its operating chief, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman; and of course its founder, chief executive and spiritual leader, Osama bin Laden. Moreover, the Arab Spring undercut the notion that political change in the Middle East requires the violent jihad that Bin Laden spent his career espousing. The fight against extremist Islam is an impossible one in which to declare success. Yet the fact remains that while Al Qaeda began the War on Terror with a horrific assault on the foremost symbols of U.S. economic and military power, it leaves 2011 effectively leaderless, rudderless and reduced to boasting about kidnapping defenseless U.S. aid workers. Iran’s leaders also exit 2011 in worse shape than they entered it. Early in the year, they viewed the demise of Middle Eastern potentates as accelerating their rise to regional dominance. Turkish anger over the Mavi Marmara incident continued to draw Ankara closer to Tehran. Saudi anger at the perceived lack of U.S. support for Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak seemed to threaten a permanent rupture in the U.S. relationship with a key ally, and Iran assumed that it would be the beneficiary of declining American influence in the Arab World. But the Arab Spring has unfolded very differently. Iran’s closest, most vital, and in some ways only Arab ally, Syria’s Bashar al-Assad, ends the year leading an embattled, isolated regime facing a combination of civil war and economic sanctions that his government is unlikely to survive. Iran’s relationship with Turkey has deteriorated sharply, and, along with Saudi Arabia, Ankara has in fact drawn closer to the United States. Indeed, the nascent U.S.-Turkey-Saudi troika is one of the most important but least noticed trends of the past few months. Combined with another year without nuclear weapons — the program apparently thwarted significantly by covert operations — and a tightening vise of economic sanctions, these events have left Iran’s leaders disoriented. After years of growing consensus, Iran’s elites are now increasingly fragmented and at one another’s throats. Moreover, Tehran spent the past few months engaged in a stunning series of blunders: plotting with Mexican drug dealers to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and allowing regime supporters to storm the British Embassy in Tehran, the combination of which has re-energized global efforts to squeeze Iran financially. The assumption that Iran is the emerging regional power has shattered. China, which most of the declinists identify as America’s greatest future rival, has likewise had a difficult 2011. With U.S. willingness to lead receding, the international spotlight has fallen on Beijing. And on every issue — the euro zone crisis, climate change and rebalancing the global economy — China has declined to take the lead, to criticism and dismay at home and abroad. Beijing has failed to reconcile rising domestic nationalism with assuaging its neighbors’ increasing alarm over Chinese economic sustainability and strategic hegemony. China’s miscalculations in Northeast and Southeast Asia have allowed the United States to reassert traditional alliances in the region (with Japan and South Korea), establish new beachheads (placing a permanent U.S. Marine Corps presence in Australia), and create a process and institutions (the Trans-Pacific Partnership) for a balanced Asia–Pacific regional architecture, rather than one dominated by the Middle Kingdom. Compared to this, 2011 has not been a bad year for America. It is a stretch to call the Iraq war a victory, but the endgame in the Afghan quagmire is slowly coming into focus. And for all our fiscal problems, global funding has to flow somewhere, and our capital markets are still unparalleled. China won’t internationalize the renminbi, the euro is fragile and gold is not a country. As a result, the dollar remains the world’s reserve currency, and U.S. Treasury bills the global financial safe haven. This will inevitably change in the long term, but not for quite some time. The unipolar moment is over. But for 2011 at least, the world order has remained the United States and the rest.

#### Either collapse is inevitable from the economy, or it solves the internal link

Kaplan 11, senior fellow – Center for a New American Security, and Kaplan, frmr. vice chairman – National Intelligence Council

(Robert D and Stephen S, “America Primed,” *The National Interest*, March/April)

But in spite of the seemingly inevitable and rapid diminution of U.S. eminence, to write America’s great-power obituary is beyond premature. The United States remains a highly capable power. Iraq and Afghanistan, as horrendous as they have proved to be—in a broad historical sense—are still relatively minor events that America can easily overcome. The eventual demise of empires like those of Ming China and late-medieval Venice was brought about by far more pivotal blunders. Think of the Indian Mutiny against the British in 1857 and 1858. Iraq in particular—ever so frequently touted as our turning point on the road to destruction—looks to some extent eerily similar. At the time, orientalists and other pragmatists in the British power structure (who wanted to leave traditional India as it was) lost some sway to evangelical and utilitarian reformers (who wanted to modernize and Christianize India—to make it more like England). But the attempt to bring the fruits of Western civilization to the Asian subcontinent was met with a violent revolt against imperial authority. Delhi, Lucknow and other Indian cities were besieged and captured before being retaken by colonial forces. Yet, the debacle did not signal the end of the British Empire at all, which continued on and even expanded for another century. Instead, it signaled the transition from more of an ad hoc imperium fired by a proselytizing lust to impose its values on others to a calmer and more pragmatic empire built on international trade and technology.1 There is no reason to believe that the fate of America need follow a more doomed course. Yes, the mistakes made in Iraq and Afghanistan have been the United States’ own, but, though destructive, they are not fatal. If we withdraw sooner rather than later, the cost to American power can be stemmed. Leaving a stable Afghanistan behind of course requires a helpful Pakistan, but with more pressure Washington might increase Islamabad’s cooperation in relatively short order. In terms of acute threats, Iran is the only state that has exported terrorism and insurgency toward a strategic purpose, yet the country is economically fragile and politically unstable, with behind-the-scenes infighting that would make Washington partisans blanch. Even assuming Iran acquires a few nuclear devices—of uncertain quality with uncertain delivery systems—the long-term outlook for the clerical regime is itself unclear. The administration must only avoid a war with the Islamic Republic. To be sure, America may be in decline in relative terms compared to some other powers, as well as to many countries of the former third world, but in absolute terms, particularly military ones, the United States can easily be the first among equals for decades hence. China, India and Russia are the only major Eurasian states prepared to wield military power of consequence on their peripheries. And each, in turn, faces its own obstacles on the road to some degree of dominance. The Chinese will have a great navy (assuming their economy does not implode) and that will enforce a certain level of bipolarity in the world system. But Beijing will lack the alliance network Washington has, even as China and Russia will always be—because of geography—inherently distrustful of one another. China has much influence, but no credible military allies beyond possibly North Korea, and its authoritarian regime lives in fear of internal disruption if its economic growth rate falters. Furthermore, Chinese naval planners look out from their coastline and see South Korea and a string of islands—Japan, Taiwan and Australia—that are American allies, as are, to a lesser degree, the Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand. To balance a rising China, Washington must only preserve its naval and air assets at their current levels. India, which has its own internal insurgency, is bedeviled by semifailed states on its borders that critically sap energy and attention from its security establishment, and especially from its land forces; in any case, India has become a de facto ally of the United States whose very rise, in and of itself, helps to balance China. Russia will be occupied for years regaining influence in its post-Soviet near abroad, particularly in Ukraine, whose feisty independence constitutes a fundamental challenge to the very idea of the Russian state. China checks Russia in Central Asia, as do Turkey, Iran and the West in the Caucasus. This is to say nothing of Russia’s diminishing population and overwhelming reliance on energy exports. Given the problems of these other states, America remains fortunate indeed. The United States is poised to tread the path of postmutiny Britain. America might not be an empire in the formal sense, but its obligations and constellation of military bases worldwide put it in an imperial-like situation, particularly because its air and naval deployments will continue in a post-Iraq and post-Afghanistan world. No country is in such an enviable position to keep the relative peace in Eurasia as is the United States—especially if it can recover the level of enduring competence in national-security policy last seen during the administration of George H. W. Bush. This is no small point. America has strategic advantages and can enhance its power while extricating itself from war. But this requires leadership—not great and inspiring leadership which comes along rarely even in the healthiest of societies—but plodding competence, occasionally steely nerved and always free of illusion.

**Zero impact to grid failures**

Douglas **Birch 10-1**, former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy, 10/1/12, “Forget Revolution,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full

Government officials sometimes describe a kind of Hieronymus Bosch landscape when warning of the possibility of a cyber attack on the electric grid. Imagine, if you will, that the United States is blindsided by an epic hack that interrupts power for much of the Midwest and mid-Atlantic for more than a week, switching off the lights, traffic signals, computers, water pumps, and air conditioners in millions of homes, businesses, and government offices. Americans swelter in the dark. Chaos reigns! Here's another nightmare scenario: An electric grid that serves two-thirds of a billion people suddenly fails in a developing, nuclear-armed country with a rich history of ethnic and religious conflict. Rail transportation is shut down, cutting off travel to large swathes of the country, while many miners are trapped underground. Blackouts on this scale conjure images of civil unrest, overwhelmed police, crippled hospitals, darkened military bases, the gravely injured in the back of ambulances stuck in traffic jams. The specter of what Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has called a "digital Pearl Harbor" led to the creation of U.S. Cyber Command, which is tasked with developing both offensive and defensive cyber warfare capabilities, and prompted FBI Director Robert Mueller to warn in March that cyber attacks would soon be "the number one threat to our country." Similar concerns inspired both the Democrats and Republicans to sound the alarm about the cyber threat in their party platforms. But are cyber attacks really a clear and present danger to society's critical life support systems, capable of inflicting thousands of casualties? Or has fear of full-blown cybergeddon at the hands of America's enemies become just another feverish national obsession -- another of the long, dark shadows of the 9/11 attacks? Worries about a large-scale, devastating cyber attack on the United States date back several decades, but escalatedfollowing attacks on Estonian government and media websites during a diplomatic conflict with Russia in 2007. That digital ambush was followed by a cyber attack on Georgian websites a year later in the run-up to the brief shooting war between Tbilisi and Moscow, as well as allegations of a colossal, ongoing cyber espionage campaign against the United States by hackers linked to the Chinese army. Much of the concern has focused on potential attacks on the U.S. electrical grid. "If I were an attacker and I wanted to do strategic damage to the United States...I probably would sack electric power on the U.S. East Coast, maybe the West Coast, and attempt to cause a cascading effect," retired Admiral Mike McConnell said in a 2010 interview with CBS's 60 Minutes. But the scenarios sketched out above are not solely the realm of fantasy. This summer, the United States and India were hit by **two massive electrical outages** -- caused not by ninja cyber assault teams but by force majeure. And, for most people anyway, the results were **less terrifying than imagined.** First, the freak "derecho" storm that barreled across a heavily-populated swath of the eastern United States on the afternoon of June 29 knocked down trees that crushed cars, bashed holes in roofs, blocked roads, and sliced through power lines. According to an August report by the U.S. Department of Energy, 4.2 million homes and businesses lost power as a result of the storm, with the blackout stretching across 11 states and the District of Columbia. More than 1 million customers were still without power five days later, and in some areas power wasn't restored for 10 days. Reuters put the death tollat 23 people as of July 5, all killed by storms or heat stroke. The second incident occurred in late July, when 670 million people in northern India, or about 10 percent of the world's population, lost power in the largest blackout in history. The failure of this huge chunk of India's electric grid was attributed to higher-than-normal demand due to late monsoon rains, which led farmers to use more electricity in order to draw water from wells. Indian officials told the media there were no reports of deaths directly linked to the blackouts. But this cataclysmic event **didn't cause widespread chaos** in India -- indeed, for some, it didn't even interrupt their daily routine. "[M]any people in major cities barely noticed the disruption because localized blackouts are so common that many businesses, hospitals, offices and middle-class homes have backup diesel generators," the New York Timesreported. The most important thing about both events is what didn't happen. Planes didn't fall out of the sky. **Governments didn't collapse**. Thousands of people weren't killed. Despite disruption and delay, harried public officials, emergency workers, and beleaguered publics mostly muddled through. The summer's blackouts strongly suggest that a cyber weapon that took down an electric grid even for several days could turn out to be little more than a weapon of mass **inconvenience**. That doesn't mean the United States can relax. James Lewis, director of the technology program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, believes that hackers threaten the security of U.S. utilities and industries, and recently penned an op-ed for the New York Times calling the United States "defenseless" to a cyber-assault. But he told Foreign Policy the recent derecho showed that even a large-scale blackout **would not** necessarily **have catastrophic consequences.**

**Grid is resilient and sustainable**

**Clark 12**, MA candidate – Intelligence Studies @ American Military University, senior analyst – Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/’12

(Paul, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University)

In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred – trees shorted a power line and caused a fault – that had a cascading effect and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis 2010). This singular occurrence has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and subject to severe disruption through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars, brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the 2003 blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), is a **worst case scenario** and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context¶ of the **robustness** of the electrical grid.¶ When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command Rear Admiral Samuel Cox stated that an attack was¶ unlikely to succeed because of the “**huge amounts of resiliency** built into the [electrical] system¶ that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult” (Capaccio 2012). This optimistic view¶ is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be **robust in the face of large natural**¶ **catastrophes**. Complex systems like the electrical grid in the U.S. are prone to failures and the¶ U.S. grid fails frequently. Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. Power outages that affect more than 50,000 people have occurred steadily over the last¶ 20 years at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, the effect is mitigated by policies¶ and procedures that are meant to **restore services as quickly as possible**. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management Assistance Compact, a legally binding¶ agreement allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to a catastrophic¶ disaster such as power outages following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes that cause blackouts, the economy is¶ affected but does not collapse and even after massive damage like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, **national security is not affected** because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security¶ challenge” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). In response to the threat Congress is¶ crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security (Brito and Watkins 2012) and the Department of¶ Homeland Security budget for cyber-security has been significantly increased (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

#### democratic norms and civil society check genocide

Dickinson 4, associate professor of history – UC Davis

(Edward, Central European History, 37.1)

In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakable. Both are instances of the “disciplinary society” and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different strategic and local dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes. Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism. Above all, again, it has nowhere developed the fateful, radicalizing dynamic that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic that leads from economistic population management to mass murder. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce “health,” such a system can —and historically does— create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, there are political and policy potentials and constraints in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of self-direction and participation that is functionally incompatible with authoritarian or totalitarian structures. And this pursuit of biopolitical ends through a regime of democratic citizenship does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies, and to have generated a “logic” or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.90

Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufé cient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic coné guration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of “liberty,” just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics, the only end point of the logic of social engineering.

This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not “opposites,” in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept “power” should not be read as a universal stiè ing night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively “the same.” Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, “tactically polyvalent.” Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create “multiple modernities,” modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.91

#### Distributed generation without grid improvement undermines grid reliability

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, 2003 [“Prospects for Distributed Electricity Generation.” Congressional Budget Office. September 2003. ttp:// www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=4552&type= 0&sequence=0]

Threats to the Performance of Electric Systems Without adequate upgrades to the electricity supply network, widespread adoption of distributed generation could adversely affect regional electricity distribution systems. For example, with many customers switching their generators on and off, the quality of the power and the reliability of the systems could be degraded. Moreover, because utilities could have difficulty pinpointing the sources of the degradation, they might not be able to allocate to the owners of distributed generators the costs of preventive actions. It may be difficult to develop economically sound policies on how to pay for any required upgrades in the utility infrastructure to protect against those risks. Experts generally agree that the current risks to the distribution system from the parallel operation of small generators, representing only a small fraction of a local distribution network's capacity, are usually manageable.(12) But the cumulative effects of many generators would be another matter. The utility network might require significant upgrades and additional protective devices to manage distributed generators that could use a large fraction of the local distribution network's capacity.

#### Distributed generation can’t solve – multiple technical and civic barriers

Christopher **Flavin**, Researcher at the Worldwatch Institute **2001** [State of the World 2000 ed by L Brown. Cha 7 “Sizing up Micropower” http://www.worldwatch.org/node/1039

Additional policies are required to prevent utilities from unfairly blocking micropower development. Rules preventing access to the network must be rewritten, and utilities should be required to offer straightforward “power purchase” contracts for micropower systems, rather than discouraging them with unnecessarily dense legal documents. Additional fees, used by utilities to penalize customers who reduce their purchases of grid power, need to be minimized. The state of Massachusetts, for example, has reduced “stranded cost” charges, which fund the retirement of uneconomic plants, for customers who use on-site systems.60 Other obstacles to micropower stem from siting, permitting, and emissions regulations that were designed before micropower became an option. Small-scale electricity is not accounted for in most building, electrical, and safety regulations, nor do local code and zoning officials tend to be familiar with the technology. U.S. homeowner associations concerned about lower property values often retain restrictions on modifications—such as solar roofing— well after developments have been finished. Land use planning and zoning laws favor the right to build over the “solar access” of neighboring property owners. Environmental regulations in many nations need to be revamped to credit the reduced pollution that results from deploying efficient small-scale systems.61

### solvency

#### FITs fail

Cooler Planet 9 (Feed-in-Tariffs, Solar Boon or Boondoggle”) http://blog.coolerplanet.com/2009/07/28/feed-in-tariffs-solar-boon-or-boondoggle/

As report co-author Karlynn Cory notes, RPS policies set the goal and let the market figure out the path, so the choice between RPS and Fits doesn’t have to be an either-or. A third NREL report focusing on FiT best practices will be issued later this year. Ron Kenedi, vice president at Sharp Solar Energy Solutions Group, makes the either-or argument moot by noting that America doesn’t need feed-in tariffs to drive solar energy. In fact, Kenedi sees the lack of feed-in tariffs as a strength, allowing the U.S. solar industry – which is still taking shape, and likely won’t explode until 2012 – to “grow naturally” into its full solar potential, rather than being forced into a particular shape by legislation. In the end, it may simply come down to government’s ability to legislate FiTs based on the type of technology, application (rooftop vs. ground installation), and size. However, doing this across the board in the U.S. – for 3,100 public utilities, 2,100 non-utility power producers, five independent system operators, and a transmission system that has only recently begun adapting to renewables – may represent the greatest challenge in setting prices and contract lengths. In short, FiTs, for all their dynamism, may not fit.
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### UQ – AT: New Supplies

#### No new supply influx for rare-earth metals – no mines will be ready soon enough

Adams 10 (Mike, Editor of Natural News Online, “Global Supply of Rare Earth Elements Could be Wiped out by 2012”)

China isn't the only geographic region where these rare earth elements are found, but constructing mines to pull these elements out of the ground takes many years. Some mines are under construction right now in other countries that could help fill the demand for REEs, but making them operational is "five to ten years away," says Lifton. That means these other mines won't really be operational until 2015 - 2020. Meanwhile, China could cut off its supply in 2012. That leaves a 3-7 year gap in which these rare earth elements will be in disastrously short supply. This brings up a couple of very important realizations related to investments:

### Link

#### Neodymium supply is stable now – but increased renewables production causes a supply crunch

Sharma 12 (Krishna, A Tutorial About Neodymium, Rare Earth Metal Markets, “Analysts Predict a Neodymium Supply Crunch in 2015”)

As a decisive component of Neodymium-Iron-Boron (NdFeB) magnets, Neodymium plays an important role in a number of clean technology industries such as electric bicycles, hybrid cars, wind turbines, hard disk drives and a number of other energy efficient appliances. IMARC Group, one of the world’s leading research and advisory firms, expects that a critical supply shortage of Neodymium in the coming years can completely jeopardize the future growth of these clean technology industries. Findings from the report suggest that China currently has a monopolistic position in this market accounting for around 97% of the total 20,783 metric tons of Neodymium production in 2010. With an expected opening of a number of non-Chinese mines, the production of Neodymium is expected to become more diversified and increase at a CAGR of 11% during 2010-2015. Despite this increased production, the demand of Neodymium driven by an increasing market penetration of electric drive vehicles and permanent magnet wind turbines will significantly outpace supply in the coming years. IMARC’s new report “The Global Rare Earth Elements Market 2011-2015: Is the Hype Justified?” gives a deep insight into the rare earth elements market. The research study serves as an analytical as well as a statistical tool to understand the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, market trends, geographical structure, competitive structure and the outlook of the rare earth elements market till 2015. This report can serve as an excellent guide for investors, researchers, consultants, marketing strategists, and all those who are planning to foray into the rare earth elements market in some form or the other.

## glut

### no impact

#### China can take a hit

**Global Insight 8** (“Momentum of Chinese Growth Proves Resilient to Natural Disasters, Global Risks”, 7-17,

http://www.globalinsight.com/SDA/SDADetail13363.htm)

**Growth in the Chinese economy** moderated in the first half of the year, but **proved** **durable in the face of cataclysms** at home and an increasingly grim outlook for external demand. **Although momentum moderated, the Chinese economy showed resilience** in the first half of 2008 in the face of a string of natural disasters and mounting downside risks in the global economic outlook. Data released by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) today revealed that the economy expanded by 10.4% y/y in the first half of the year, after expanding by 10.1% in the second quarter. In the three months through March, the economy expanded by 10.6%. Severe snowstorms at the beginning of the year, the huge earthquake in Sichuan province in May, and recent flooding in other areas had been expected to rob growth of some traction, compounded by reversals in U.S.-led global demand. The second-quarter outturn marked the slowest rate of growth since 2005, but also the 14th consecutive quarter of double-digit growth.

#### More ev

**Asia Times 2** (Francesco Sisci, “China and the Global Security We”, 7-25, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/DG25Ad01.html)

Furthermore, growth in the past 20 years in **China has proved not only buoyant but resilient. In spite of crisis** in one year or another, **the economy has never plunged into a real recession**, and the nation has forfeited the whole socialist welfare system in a matter of a couple of years. Education and health assistance are now organized on a strictly profit bases, without state support, housing has been privatized and jobs are no longer for life. These changes would have caused more than one revolution in any other country, but in China they were digested without major uprisings. Therefore in the future **China can well be expected to carry on with economic reforms** that appear modest compared with the ones it has already achieved, **and continue its high growth.**

### collapse inevitable

#### Most qualified economist agree – our guy is the Nate Silver of economic predictions since the 70s – don’t trust contrarian economic reports

Droke 12 (Clif Droke is the editor of the daily Gold & Silver Stock Report. Published daily since 2002, the report provides forecasts and analysis of the leading gold, silver, uranium and energy stocks from a short-term technical standpoint. He is also the author of numerous books, including 'How to Read Chart Patterns for Greater Profits’, 12/20, “The Coming China Economic Crisis”, http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article38147.html, Dec 20, 2012)

When Bert Dohmen talks, smart investors listen. In 2007 when most investment analysts and economists were downplaying the developing credit market troubles, Bert warned investors that the probability was very high that the troubles would escalate into full-blown crisis and would produce a crash of historic proportions. He chronicled the developing credit crisis in the pages of his newsletter and also published a book in early 2012 entitled, The Coming China Crisis, which provided his insightful views on the emerging crisis in depth. Dohmen writes the widely read Wellington Letter and China Boom-Bust Analyst investment advisories. His Wellington Letter has provided top-notch forecast and analysis of U.S. and global financial and economic trends since January 1977. His newsletter has received many #1 ratings by the top ratings services and has forecasted every bear market using sophisticated technical analysis. Bert also frequently appears as a guest on financial television, including CNN's Moneyline, CNBC and FOX News. Over the last 30 years he has been a favorite speaker at the largest investment conferences. On December 18, I spoke with Bert concerning his forecast of the coming China crisis, the global economy, the U.S. "fiscal cliff" and the likelihood of another worldwide financial crisis. Following is a transcript of that interview. Q: You just returned from a trip to China. What can you tell us about it? Dohmen: I learned something that just confirmed what I already knew. You can learn a lot more from a country from your desk using the Internet than you can visiting a country and being wined and dined. I spoke with hedge fund managers, institutional investors, heads of corporations, etc. The first story they give you is that 'everything is wonderful in China' and that the country is only experiencing a short-term lull with the economy. But when they find out you know more, they open up and give you the true story: 'We're stagnating, the economy is weakening, etc.' Q: In your book, The Coming China Crisis, you mentioned that your work strongly indicates China is now going through what the U.S. did in 2007-2008. Dohmen: Yes they are, but it will be a different kind of crisis because China's institutions are different. What we experienced was a financial crisis where institutions went out of business or had to be bailed out. The repercussions were actually a downturn in the U.S. economy. In my opinion, the next crisis will be an economic crisis for the U.S. and globally where all the stimulus that has been put into system is wearing off and has less and less effect in helping the economy. I see signs that it's being counterproductive. Q: Please elaborate. Dohmen: The Fed's monetary policy is destructive if you look behind the scenes. It gives the central banks no way out. The Chinese government is doing everything it can to keep its banks afloat. For instance, the banks in China have 21 trillion dollars worth of loans. That's a huge amount considering there are only 3 trillion in China's reserves. It's estimated by accounting firms that bad loans on banks' books is as much as 40-50 percent of total loans. That's 10 trillion in bad loans on the books total and it's unsustainable. This could cause a huge crisis. The Chinese government may not be able to continue these bailouts eventually. In the future that will be the limiting factor. Emerging markets like China have always been a problem when money starts flowing out. Foreign capital flows out and then the problems begin. We saw this late last year and earlier this year and discussed it in our China Boom-Bust Analyst newsletter. Foreign direct investment has since gone from largely positive to negative. Money is flowing out of China. For emerging markets that's always the first big warning sign of an approaching crisis. China has more foreign currency reserves than others; it will delay the problem but not cancel out an eventual crisis. When China goes into severe contraction, the world economy will suffer. Q: Chinese industrial demand obviously influences the price levels of major commodities. Where do you see commodity prices headed in 2013? Dohmen: Raw material prices will be on the weak side. China will start new stimuli for various sectors. But they can only build infrastructure that use raw materials and they don't use enough of it. They have huge stockpiles of copper and steel and are still producing but unable to sell it. Many larger cities have populations of more than 1 million people. These cities have steel mills and are large employers. Governments of these cities hesitate to shut down because they don't want unemployment, so they keep producing. When you're analyzing China don't look at production numbers, look at sales numbers which are much harder to get. There's a big difference between steel production and steel sales. For instance, a big headline a few months ago was that car sales hit new records in the U.S. But the fine print is that these sales are by manufacturers which stuff the cars into retail channel and sell to auto shops. The retailers were screaming, 'Stop sending us these cars, we can't unload them!' It's called channel stuffing in the U.S. and they do it in other countries, too. These are the numbers you see reported, not the actual numbers. Q: Can China become truly great under its present Communist regime? Dohmen: A year-and-a-half ago we wrote that the Great Leap Forward had hit the Great Wall of Communism. For China the easy stuff is over, such as low labor rates and wages. They were able to get all this wonderful Western technology free of charge. The Western multinationals all signed over the details of their patents to their Chinese partners. That's gone now. China got about 100 years of development in the West for free. Now there's a point in the lifecycle of any country where entrepreneurs would be taking over and helping develop, but in China they don't have freedom. In China you see it every step of the way; everything is controlled by the government. Unless China finds someone like Gorbachev to dismantle the Communist regime, China will languish and its growth will decelerate. The private sector is over there is already in recession. The GDP numbers which they advertise at 7 percent is totally phony. The government says people shouldn't use it as being accurate, but as a 'guideline' [laughs]. It's being overstated and the numbers are unreliable. To measure what's really happening we use private sector numbers like electrical consumption, which has declined for 1 ½ years. How can this be if China's economy is growing? Q: How big is the real estate bubble in China and has it burst? Dohmen: Yes. People are still talking about Beijing apartment prices being sky high, but the rest of country has had big declines. Development companies have been selling units and dropping prices 30-50 percent. This makes prior buyers angry and they want to cancel sales. There are no land sales in China because only government can own land. They're 50 year leases, long-term leases. Recently there have been very big new leases at record rates. These are also phony. Companies take lands and lease to developers, which gives them 50% revenues to run hospitals, fire departments and other municipal services. In the real estate plunge last year developers weren't buying anymore and municipalities lack of income. So they make deals with developers. The lease rates has to be at new highs so people get enthused and think real estate is rising. It's another form of market manipulation. Q: On page 119 of your book you noted that the growth rate in China's money supply had declined from a hefty 30% annual rate of growth to around 12.5% in late 2011. What does China's current money supply growth rate look like? Dohmen: I don't have the numbers in front of me right now but it continues to decline, money velocity is declining. Everything is ratcheting down. The only entities getting bank loans are State Owned Enterprises (SOEs). The 'princelings' in China are the children of high party officials, and it's only they who get the loans. It's total corruption. Small entrepreneurs have a difficult time competing with larger companies and can't get these favorable bank loans or any loans. When they start encroaching on SOE territory, the SOEs have a way of getting them out of business. Credit lines get cut. They're better connected and can eliminate competition easily. You can't have a growing economy with this going on. Q: Recently there have been signs of a Chinese economic rebound. Do you see this as being a temporary "dead cat bounce" or can this reversal be sustained? Dohmen: The head of the Communist Party Congress will manipulate a bounce with statistics, as we said last month in our Wellington Letter. When you compile the numbers you can make the economy do whatever you want. The real economy doesn't respond to that, however. In March 2013 China will have a new 5-year plan. Until then things will look rosier, then reality will hit. You just have to look at free market numbers like freight indices. The Baltic Dry Freight Index is a good one to look at. That is now scraping at the bottom of 2008 crisis. In 2008 that index collapsed 93 percent. Freight rates dropped by that much. You could rent a large 1,000 foot carrier at that time for the same cost of a 35-foot boat on Lake Tahoe in 2008! When goods aren't being shipped they're not being used. Freight rates are a much better indicator than GDP numbers. Q: If China goes into a major recession, what effects will this have on the U.S.? Dohmen: This will be like a tsunami going through the economies of the globe. China has been the big locomotive for the world economy. China's stimulus was four times the size per GDP than that of the U.S. They were four times as aggressive as the U.S. Fed in stimulating their economy. This caused a commodities rebound, stock market rebound, etc. Australia was also affected by China's demand for commodities. Looking forward, I can't understand where any good news is going to come from. We have our analysis and scenarios we go through and every day we review everything and ask if anything has changed that would make us wrong in our predicdtions or confirm our analysis. Today we found out that China has cancelled a 300 ton soybeans order from the U.S. What does it mean? Does China have too many soybeans? Are the Chinese people not hungry? Are prices too high? Another factor is that we have some proverbial 'canaries in the mine' in that China is trying to conserve foreign currency outflows. When China buys goods from West they pay in foreign currency, not renminbi. Are they starting to conserve foreign currencies because they're being depleted of all that's leaving the country? We're seeing cancellations and reductions in China left and right. One of our clients sells high grade seafood to China. He told us recently that a big order from a major client from China was cancelled because they couldn't get dollars, foreign currency, from their bank. So when demand from China goes down it effects the global economy. You don't see this in the daily newspapers or on TV. You don't get this information from a visit to China, either. The China bulls are always touting the fact that China has 1.3 billon people and those numbers will supposedly translate into obscene riches. But the number of people doesn't necessarily mean the country in question will have a beautiful economy. Q: Before we go I have to ask you the question of the hour. What are your views on the U.S. "fiscal cliff"? Dohmen: In our Wellington Letter for December we discussed that. Nobody knows if there's going to be an agreement among the Democrats and Republicans. The popular view is that there will be a compromise by year end. But as you know, the popular view is usually wrong. I can see a situation where there's a lot to be gained by Democrats by letting the country go over the cliff and then blaming the Republicans. 'The Republicans made us do it' will be the excuse. I just don't see why so many analysts are bullish on 2013. Companies are going to be hit by huge new costs for employees. There have already been huge price increases for restaurants, etc., with prices up 20-30% in the last six months. I think we'll continue to see inflation in supermarket prices and deflation in good we can do without, durable goods. For instance I've noted that Costco has made price increases of 25 to 35 percent recently. How will the Federal Reserve deal with this? A trillion dollars next year they'll put into the system. It's nothing to them. This new stimulus, how are they ever going to exit this policy of zero percent interest rates? Someday the market will put an end to that and paper money will become worthless and the market will know it. Right now we have 80 to 90 percent of Treasury securities purchases being conducted by Fed through their stimulus. When the Treasury finances all their expenditures with freshly printed money, you can see in history how this will end. There will be no happy ending to this. Can you imagine when you see real inflation rising, could be 10% or higher, what will people say? Finally they'll have to stop inflation. When there's the smallest sign that the Fed is reversing course you'll see a collapse in financial markets. Whenever it comes, be it next year, 5 years or more; it's coming.

## distributed energy

### no impact to heg

#### Their laundry list of vague impacts is academic junk – conflicts can’t just emerge

Fettweis 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

Assertions that without the combination of U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return to Europe and the Pacific Rim are usually rendered in rather vague language. If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “the world will become a more dangerous place and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 From where would this danger arise? Who precisely would do the fighting, and over what issues? Without the United States, would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack mainland China again, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace? With one exception, these questions are rarely addressed. That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese regional, must less global, political expansion. Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before. Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination. Overestimating Our Importance One of the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential upon their behavior as we perceive them to be. A great deal of experimental evidence exists to support the notion that people (and therefore states) tend to overrate the degree to which their behavior is responsible for the actions of others. Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both of which would seem to be especially relevant in the U.S. case.55 First, believing that we are responsible for their actions gratifies our national ego (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders. If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States. Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might, it is not possible to fully understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective. The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57 It is natural, therefore, for U.S. policymakers and strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, we are probably not as important to them as we think. The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly overrated. In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it can only be falsified, never proven. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, with or without the United States.

#### Even if heg is good, the US won’t deploy – offshore balancing and nukes solve the impact

Adams 11, Professor U.S. Foreign Policy Program – American University, Distinguished Fellow – Stimson Center

(Gordon, “A Leaner and Meaner Defense,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90 Iss. 1, January/February)

Some people point to China as a successor to the Soviet Union and cite it as a reason why preventing and preparing for nuclear or large-scale conventional war should remain priority missions. They highlight the risk of a U.S.-Chinese conflict over Taiwan or the possibility that China will deny the U.S. military access to the western Pacific. Of course, China is a rising power that is making increasingly substantial investments in defense. But it is important not to overreact to this fact. Focusing on China's military capabilities ought not replace a broader strategy. As the United States determines how to engage China and how to protect its interests in Asia generally, it must balance the diplomatic, economic, and financial, as well as the military, elements of its policy. Most defense analysts estimate that China's military investments and capabilities are decades behind those of the United States, and there is very little evidence that China seeks a conventional conflict with the United States. There is substantial evidence that China's economic and financial policy is a more urgent problem for the United States, but one of the best ways for the United States to respond to that is to get its fiscal house in order. The prospect of a major war with other states is even less plausible. Defense planning scenarios in the 1990s were built around the possibility of two conflicts. The one involving Iraq is now off the table. A conflict with North Korea was the second, but although that country's military is numerically impressive, South Korea's state-of-the-art armed forces can manage that challenge without needing the assistance of U.S. troops. The United States can now limit its contribution to strategic nuclear deterrence, air support, and offshore naval balancing in the region. The prospect of a conventional war with Iran is not credible. Iran's vast size, to say nothing of the probability that the population would be hostile to any U.S. presence there, means that anything more than U.S. air strikes and Special Forces operations targeting Iranian nuclear capabilities is unlikely. Given the stakes, some hedging for these exceedingly low-probability risks is reasonable. But even a smaller U.S. force and budget than today's would be ample because many of these risks are less likely than ever and the United States' allies now enjoy unprecedented military and strategic advantages. The most vexing missions are those at the heart of the Quadrennial Defense Review: counterinsurgency, nation building, and the building of other countries' security sectors, among others. And these, alongside competition with China, are motivating Gates and other planners at the Pentagon, despite Gates' acknowledgment in this magazine last spring that "the United States is unlikely to repeat a mission on the scale of those in Afghanistan or Iraq anytime soon -- that is, forced regime change followed by nation building under fire." Such planned missions are based on a misguided premise: that the U.S. campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq foreshadow the need for a large U.S. military force to increasingly intervene in failing states teeming with insurgents and terrorists. But Gates' effort to nonetheless tailor U.S. military capabilities to such tasks suggests that there is still significant support for them in the Pentagon. According to General George Casey, the army chief of staff, for example, the United States is in an "era of persistent conflict." Yet the United States is very unlikely to embark on another regime-change and nation-building mission in the next decade -- nor should it. Indeed, in the wake of its operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, the demand for the United States to act as global policeman will decline. Pakistan is often cited as a state that might require such an intervention. Clearly, it is the case that Gates had in mind when he worried about "a nuclear-armed state [that] could collapse into chaos and criminality." But even if Pakistan collapsed, the U.S. government would probably not send in massive forces for fear of facing widespread popular opposition and an armed resistance in the more remote parts of the country. More likely, the U.S. government would resort to air power and Special Forces in order to secure Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. After the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, it is clear that U.S. forces are not suited to lengthy occupations, especially when they involve a stabilization mission, governance reform, and economic development.

### no challengers

#### No challengers

Kaplan 11, senior fellow – Center for a New American Security, and Kaplan, frmr. vice chairman – National Intelligence Council,

(Robert D and Stephen S, “America Primed,” *The National Interest*, March/April)

But in spite of the seemingly inevitable and rapid diminution of U.S. eminence, to write America’s great-power obituary is beyond premature. The United States remains a highly capable power. Iraq and Afghanistan, as horrendous as they have proved to be—in a broad historical sense—are still relatively minor events that America can easily overcome. The eventual demise of empires like those of Ming China and late-medieval Venice was brought about by far more pivotal blunders. Think of the Indian Mutiny against the British in 1857 and 1858. Iraq in particular—ever so frequently touted as our turning point on the road to destruction—looks to some extent eerily similar. At the time, orientalists and other pragmatists in the British power structure (who wanted to leave traditional India as it was) lost some sway to evangelical and utilitarian reformers (who wanted to modernize and Christianize India—to make it more like England). But the attempt to bring the fruits of Western civilization to the Asian subcontinent was met with a violent revolt against imperial authority. Delhi, Lucknow and other Indian cities were besieged and captured before being retaken by colonial forces. Yet, the debacle did not signal the end of the British Empire at all, which continued on and even expanded for another century. Instead, it signaled the transition from more of an ad hoc imperium fired by a proselytizing lust to impose its values on others to a calmer and more pragmatic empire built on international trade and technology.1 There is no reason to believe that the fate of America need follow a more doomed course. Yes, the mistakes made in Iraq and Afghanistan have been the United States’ own, but, though destructive, they are not fatal. If we withdraw sooner rather than later, the cost to American power can be stemmed. Leaving a stable Afghanistan behind of course requires a helpful Pakistan, but with more pressure Washington might increase Islamabad’s cooperation in relatively short order. In terms of acute threats, Iran is the only state that has exported terrorism and insurgency toward a strategic purpose, yet the country is economically fragile and politically unstable, with behind-the-scenes infighting that would make Washington partisans blanch. Even assuming Iran acquires a few nuclear devices—of uncertain quality with uncertain delivery systems—the long-term outlook for the clerical regime is itself unclear. The administration must only avoid a war with the Islamic Republic. To be sure, America may be in decline in relative terms compared to some other powers, as well as to many countries of the former third world, but in absolute terms, particularly military ones, the United States can easily be the first among equals for decades hence. China, India and Russia are the only major Eurasian states prepared to wield military power of consequence on their peripheries. And each, in turn, faces its own obstacles on the road to some degree of dominance. The Chinese will have a great navy (assuming their economy does not implode) and that will enforce a certain level of bipolarity in the world system. But Beijing will lack the alliance network Washington has, even as China and Russia will always be—because of geography—inherently distrustful of one another. China has much influence, but no credible military allies beyond possibly North Korea, and its authoritarian regime lives in fear of internal disruption if its economic growth rate falters. Furthermore, Chinese naval planners look out from their coastline and see South Korea and a string of islands—Japan, Taiwan and Australia—that are American allies, as are, to a lesser degree, the Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand. To balance a rising China, Washington must only preserve its naval and air assets at their current levels. India, which has its own internal insurgency, is bedeviled by semifailed states on its borders that critically sap energy and attention from its security establishment, and especially from its land forces; in any case, India has become a de facto ally of the United States whose very rise, in and of itself, helps to balance China. Russia will be occupied for years regaining influence in its post-Soviet near abroad, particularly in Ukraine, whose feisty independence constitutes a fundamental challenge to the very idea of the Russian state. China checks Russia in Central Asia, as do Turkey, Iran and the West in the Caucasus. This is to say nothing of Russia’s diminishing population and overwhelming reliance on energy exports. Given the problems of these other states, America remains fortunate indeed. The United States is poised to tread the path of postmutiny Britain. America might not be an empire in the formal sense, but its obligations and constellation of military bases worldwide put it in an imperial-like situation, particularly because its air and naval deployments will continue in a post-Iraq and post-Afghanistan world. No country is in such an enviable position to keep the relative peace in Eurasia as is the United States—especially if it can recover the level of enduring competence in national-security policy last seen during the administration of George H. W. Bush. This is no small point. America has strategic advantages and can enhance its power while extricating itself from war. But this requires leadership—not great and inspiring leadership which comes along rarely even in the healthiest of societies—but plodding competence, occasionally steely nerved and always free of illusion.

### 2NC – Grid – AT: Cyberattacks

#### We don’t have to prove that a cyber attack is impossible, just that high costs will cause enemies to seek alternatives

Rid, reader in war studies – King's College London, and McBurney, professor – Agents and Intelligent Systems Group – Department of Informatics @ King's College, ‘12

(Thomas and Peter, “Cyber-Weapons,” *The RUSI Journal* Volume 157, Issue 1, p. 6-13)

A thorough conceptual analysis and a detailed examination of **the empirical record corroborates our hypothesis**: developing and deploying potentially destructive cyber-weapons against hardened targets will require significant resources, hard-to-get and highly specific target intelligence, and time to prepare, launch and execute an attack. Attacking secured targets would probably require the resources or the support of a state actor; terrorists are unlikely culprits of an equally unlikely cyber-9/11. The scant empirical record also suggests that the greatest benefit of cyber-weapons may be using them in conjunction with conventional or covert military strikes, as Israel did when it blinded the Syrian air defence in 2007. This leads to a second conclusion: the cost-benefit payoff of weaponised instruments of cyber-conflict may be far more questionable than generally assumed: target configurations are likely to be so specific that a powerful cyber-weapon may only be capable of hitting and acting on one single target, or very few targets at best. The equivalent would be a HARM missile that can only destroy one unique emitter, not a set of targets emitting at the same frequency. But in contrast to the missile – where only the seeker needs to be specifically reprogrammed and the general aviation and propulsion systems remain functional – the majority of modular components of a potent cyber-weapon, generic and specific, would have a rather short shelf-life after discovery. Two findings contravene the debate's received wisdom. One insight concerns the dominance of the offence. Most weapons may be used defensively and offensively. But the information age, the argument goes since at least 1996, has ‘offence-dominant attributes’.37 A 2011 Pentagon report on cyberspace again stressed ‘the advantage currently enjoyed by the offense in cyberwarfare’.38 But when it comes to cyber-weapons, the offence has higher costs, a shorter shelf-life than the defence, and a very limited target set.39 All this **drastically reduces the coercive utility of cyber-attacks.** Any threat relies on the offender's credibility to attack, or to repeat a successful attack. Even if a potent cyber-weapon could be launched successfully once, it would be highly questionable if an attack, or even a salvo, could be repeated in order to achieve a political goal. At closer inspection cyber-weapons do not seem to favour the offence. A second insight concerns the risk of electronic arms markets. One concern is that sophisticated malicious actors could resort to asymmetric methods, such as employing the services of criminal groups, rousing patriotic hackers, and potentially redeploying generic elements of known attack tools. Worse, more complex malware is likely to be structured in a modular fashion. Modular design could open up new business models for malware developers. In the car industry, for instance,40 modularity translates into a possibility of a more sophisticated division of labour. Competitors can work simultaneously on different parts of a more complex system. Modules could be sold on underground markets. But if our analysis is correct, potential arms markets pose a more limited risk: the highly specific target information and programming design needed for potent weapons is unlikely to be traded generically. To go back to our imperfect analogy: paintball pistols will continue to be commercially available, but probably not pre-programmed warheads of smart missiles.

#### Their authors conflate threats

Clark 12 MA candidate – Intelligence Studies @ American Military University, senior analyst – Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/

(Paul, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University)

This increased focus on cyber-security has led to concern that the perceived risk is greater than the actual risk, a situation that has resulted in an imbalance between security and privacy and civil liberties (American Civil Liberties Union 2012). In 1993 a Rand Corporation paper predicted that “cyberwar is coming” and **twenty years later the prediction is the same** and critics argue that cyber-war is “more hype than hazard” (Rid 2012). A review of high profile cyberattacks shows that, with the exception of Stuxnet and the limited Israeli disruption of Syrian air defense networks, **most cyber-attacks are** categorized as **information theft,** network compromise, **or website defacement** (Lewis 2012). Even the high profile threat of an “Electronic Pearl Harbor” (Bronk 2009), despite being repeated by senior government officials like U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta (Rid 2012) , has been found to be only a slight possibility (Wilson 2005). There is no doubt that cyber-security is important. Businesses recognize this importance and spent more than $80 billion on computer network security in 2011 (Johnson 2012) and the federal government is expected to be spending $10.5 billion per year by 2015 (Brito and Watkins 2012). This response is appropriate when data shows that the vast majority of cyber-attacks are focused on espionage and the theft of intellectual property. It is not clear why senior government officials and corporate executives focus on high-impact low-probability events and engage in “alarmist rhetoric” (Brito and Watkins 2011) that skews the public perception of risk and creates an atmosphere of fear. The danger of an inappropriate response in reaction to an inflated threat and prevalence of misinformation is exemplified by the politicized intelligence that led to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 (Brito and Watkins 2011). Understanding how information on the risk posed by cyber-attacks is poorly communicated and the public reaction to an increased perception of risk – fear – is important in identifying when the perceived risk is greater than the actual risk; when risk is more hype than threat. Critics of current cyber-security policy believe that **threats are being conflated**; this results in a threat appearing larger than it is (Brito and Watkins 2012). In essence, a wide variety of cyber-activity – political and social activity, criminal activity for profit, espionage, and offensive cyber-attack – are treated as presenting the same level of threat. There is a wide divide between easily mounted and easily defended denial of service attacks on public websites and high-potential cyber-weapons capable of severely disrupting or destroying critical infrastructure (Rid and McBurney 2012). The rise of automated tools that allow for low-level cyber-attacks to be easily mounted has caused a significant increase in the number of cyber-attacks, **a statistic often cited as proof of increased risk**, but qualified cyber-security organizations have discarded the number of cyber-attacks as a metric and consider it to be meaningless as a method of assessing the scope and effects of cyber-attacks (Wilson 2005). Without differentiating between generic malicious software and highly specialized and targeted offensive cyber-attacks, the risk of cyber-attacks on critical infrastructure systems like the electrical grid **cannot be properly assessed.**

## warming

### no warming impact

#### Previous temperature spikes disprove the impact

Singer 11, PhD physics – Princeton University and professor of environmental science – UVA, consultant – NASA, GAO, DOE, NASA, Carter, PhD paleontology – University of Cambridge, adjunct research professor – Marine Geophysical Laboratory @ James Cook University, and Idso, PhD Geography – ASU

(S. Fred, Robert M. and Craig, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

Research from locations around the world reveal a significant period of elevated air temperatures that immediately preceded the Little Ice Age, during a time that has come to be known as the Little Medieval Warm Period. A discussion of this topic was not included in the 2009 NIPCC report, but we include it here to demonstrate the existence of another set of real-world data that do not support the IPCC‘s claim that temperatures of the past couple of decades have been the warmest of the past one to two millennia. In one of the more intriguing aspects of his study of global climate change over the past three millennia, Loehle (2004) presented a graph of the Sargasso Sea and South African temperature records of Keigwin (1996) and Holmgren et al. (1999, 2001) that reveals the existence of a major spike in surface air temperature that began sometime in the early 1400s. This abrupt and anomalous warming pushed the air temperatures of these two records considerably above their representations of the peak warmth of the twentieth century, after which they fell back to pre-spike levels in the mid-1500s, in harmony with the work of McIntyre and McKitrick (2003), who found a similar period of higher-than-current temperatures in their reanalysis of the data employed by Mann et al. (1998, 1999).

### AT: Agriculture

#### Warming will not hurt agriculture- consensus of warrants prove

**Singer 7** (Singer, distinguished research professor at George Mason and Avery, director of the Center for Global Food Issues at the Hudson Institute, 2007 (S. Fred, Dennis T, “Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years” Pages 120-124)

FIVE REASONS NOT TO FEAR FAMINE DURING GLOBAL WARMING First: Lessons of History Human food production, historically, has prospered during the global warmings. We have seen in the earlier chapters the flourishing of human society during the Roman Warming and the Medieval Warming. Food production increased during previous historic warmings primarily because warming climates provided more of the things plants love: sunlight, rainfall, and longer growing seasons. During warmings there are also less of the things plants hate: late spring frosts and early fall frosts that shorten the growing season, and hailstorms that destroy fields of crops. Jorgen Olesen of the Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences predicts that Europe's overall food production will increase with warming, even though some southern European regions will have crops reduced by aridity." Second: What Science Says about Food and the Modern Warming Sunshine: Richard Willson of Columbia University (and NASA) has measured an increase in the sun's radiance of 0.05 percent per decade for the past two decades. He says the upward trend in sunlight may well have been going on longer than that. Earlier, we didn't have the precision instruments to measure that small but vital trend, but every bit of it encourages the growth of food crops.: The increased temperatures of the Modern Warming may have some negative impact on crops in the southern mid-latitudes-through drier summers, for example-in places such as southern Romania, Spain, and Texas. At the same time, however, stronger sunlight will importantly increase the productivity of farmland in the northern mid-latitudes, such as Germany, Canada, and Russia. The increased food production in the very extensive northern plains would far outweigh the negative impact of slightly more arid conditions in the southern mid-latitudes. Rainfall: Increased heat means more precipitation, as more moisture evaporates from the oceans and then falls as rain or snow. NASA says global rainfall increased 2 percent in the twentieth century compared with the tailend of the Little Ice Age in the nineteenth century. Most of the increased moisture fell in the mid- and high-latitudes where much of the world's most productive cropland is located. We can expect this to continue through the \Iodern Warming. Higher CO2 Levels: Another reason food production has tended to increase during the past 150 years is that CO2 levels in the atmosphere have increased. The oceans give up CO2 when they warm. The increased CO2 not only fertilizes the plants, but enables them to use water more efficiently. Researchers at the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1997 grew wheat in a long plastic tunnel, varying the CO2 levels for the grain plants from the Ice Age CO2 level of about 200 parts per million (ppm) at one end of the tunnel to the late-1980s level of 350 ppm at the other.' The findings? An extra 100 ppm of CO2 increased the wheat production by 72 percent under well-watered conditions, and by 48 percent under semidrought conditions. That meant an average crop yield gain of 60 percent. These results are consistent with a wide variety of CO2 enrichment studies done in more than a dozen countries on many different crops. Third: Farming Technology Human food production today depends far more on farming technology than on modest climate changes. We are no more doomed to famine by the Modern Warming than we are doomed to malaria in the era of pesticides and window screens. In fact, the food abundance the world has increasingly enjoyed since the eighteenth century is primarily due to scientific and technological advances. In 1500, Britain could feed less than one million people. By 1850, thanks to knowledge of crop rotations and improved farm machines such as the seeder and reaper, Britain fed more than 16 million people. Today, Britain has nearly 60 million people, fed mainly from its own fields. Todau'e "Climate-Secure" Agriculture Industrial nitrogen fertilizer is one of the biggest farming advances in human history. Before 1908, farmers could only maintain their soil nutrient levels by adding livestock manure or by growing more green-manure crops, such as clover. Both of those strategies require lots of land. In 1908, however, the Haber-Bosch Process began taking nitrogen from the air, which is 78 percent nitrogen. Today's farmers apply about 80 million tons of industrial nitrogen per year to maintain their soils' fertility and it doesn't cost a single acre ofland. To get 80 million tons per year of nitrogen from cattle manure, the world would require nearly eight billion additional cattle, plus five acres or so of forage land per beast. We'd thus have to eliminate half the people, clear all the forests, or use some combination of those strategies. The Green Revolution of the 1960s tripled the crop yields across Europe and much of the Third World. • More powerful seeds, many of them with resistance to drought and pests, made better use of the complete roster of plant nutrients (nitrogen, phosphate, and potash-plus twenty-six trace mineral elements) that soil-testing modern farmers apply to their fields. • Irrigation assures ample moisture, often even in semiarid areas. • Insecticides and fungicides protect the high yields of the crops both during the growing season and in storage. In America, where high-yield farming started earlier, diaries of early settlers in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley indicate that wheat yields around 1800 were only six to seven bushels per acre. The valley's farmers today often get ten times that yield. U.S. corn yields by the 1920s had risen to about twentyfive bushels per acre. Today, the national average is more than 140 bushels, and still rising. The same story of soaring yields and more certain harvests is playing out today over most of the world. The African Exception Africa is the only place in the world where per capita food production has not been increasing in recent decades. Africa's food production has been severely hampered by its ancient soils, frequent droughts, and abundant insects and diseases. There has also been a lack of adequate research for its specific soils, microcJimates, and pests-and an equally damaging lack of stable governance and infrastructure on that continent. Two recent research developments are now particularly helpful for Africa . • Quality-protein (QP) maize, bred in Mexico's International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, not only has higher yields but also provides more lysine and tryptophan, two amino acids that are critical for human nutrition but are lacking in most corn varieties. The QP maize is able by itself to cure many Afncan children of malnutrition . • Rice breeders have successfully wide-crossed the African native rice species with Asian rice varieties, to create a family of more vigorous and higher-yield new rice varieties. More such breakthroughs for Africa's farmers can be expected if more research investments are made for and in that continent. Better roads and bridges (and better national security) would also make farm inputs less expensive and higher crop yields more marketable no matter what happens to its climate. Today s high-yield agriculture is also the most sustainable in history, thanks t,) fertilizers, soil testing, and a twentieth-century farming system called "con-crvation tillage." Conservation tillage controls weeds with cover crops and cncmical herbicides instead of by plowing, which invites soil erosion. The ..:,)nservation farmer just discs up the top two or three inches of topsoil along \\ ith the stalks and residue from the previous crop. This process creates trili ions of tiny dams that prevent wind or water erosion. The little dams also encourage water to infiltrate the root zone of the field, instead of running off mto the nearest stream. Conservation tillage cuts soil erosion by 65 to 95 percent and often doubles the soil moisture in the field. It encourages far more soil bacteria and earthworms, both because of the constant heavy supply of crop residues for them to eat and because they hate being plowed, as they are in conventional and organic farmers' fields. Through the expanded use of conservation tillage across the United States, Canada, South America, Australia and, most recently, South Asia, hundreds of millions of acres are now sustainably more productive than ever before in history. Another fruitful use of technology and increased sustainability will be more efficient irrigation. Primitive flood irrigation systems in the Third World use water at less than 40 percent efficiency. Center-pivot irrigation systems with trailing plastic tubes to deliver water right at the roots (minimizing evaporation) and computer-controlled to apply just the right amount of moisture to each part of the field, can approach 90 percent water efficiency. World farmers currently use about 70 percent of the fresh water humanity "uses up." As water becomes more valuable, the capital investments in high-efficiency irrigation systems will be justified. Fourth: The Future and Biotechnology Today's crop yields are the product of more than two hundred years of conventional trial-and-error science. But, by 2050 the world will have some seven billion affluent humans demanding the high-quality diets that only about one billion people are able to afford today. We'll also have to feed far more pets. That means world food demand will more than double, and we're already farming half of the Earth's available land. Additional sources of higher crop and livestock yields will be needed. The world is already using plant breeding, fertilizers, irrigation, and pesticides. However, the world is only beginning to use biotechnology, our new-found understanding of Nature's genetic codes. The first broad application of biotechnology in agriculture has been to make plants tolerant of synthetic herbicides, so we could use the environmentally safest herbicides to protect our crops more effectively from weed competition. As a result we have somewhat raised crop yields and lowered food costs in many countries. It also happens that one of Africa's worst endemic pests is a parasitic weed called witchweed. It invades corn and sorghum plants through their roots, and the farmer never knows it's there until his crop stalk suddenly sprouts a bright red witch weed flower instead of an ear of grain. Genetically engineered herbicide-tolerant seeds could have solved the problem. With the seed soaked in herbicide, the witchweed would have been killed as it invaded the plant roots, and the grain would have thrived. Unfortunately, activists and European governments threatened retaliation against any African government that allowed the planting of biotech-modified crops. Now, researchers have done a genetically researched end run around the biotech Luddites. Pioneer Hi-Bred identified corn seeds with a natural tolerance for the herbicide imazopyr, and donated the germ plasm to the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) in Mexico. CIMMYT, in turn, has bred the herbicide tolerance into African corn varieties. Corn yields are four times as high. The technology is low cost and easy for even Africa's small farms to use. Biotechnology (BT) has also allowed plant researchers to put an ultra-safe natural insecticide found in soils into such crop plants as corn and cotton. Because of these pest-resistant plants, millions of pounds of pesticide no longer have to be sprayed into the environment or pose hazards to beneficial insects. BT cotton and corn are being planted by millions of small farmers, especially in China and India. An important second-generation benefit of biotechnology is finding wild natural genes that can improve our crop plants. We already have one such important breakthrough. Plant explorers nearly fifty years ago found a relative of the wild potato that was resistant to the infamous late blight virus that caused the Irish potato famine in the 1840s. Unfortunately, plant breeders were never able to successfully cross that blight resistance gene into an edible, productive domestic potato. Now, three different universities have spliced the blight resistance gene into new potato varieties. This will be especially important for densely populated parts of Asia and Africa (such as Rwanda and Bangladesh) that have become more dependent on the potato's ability to produce more food per acre than any other crop. Black Sigatoka, a new bacterial disease of bananas and plantains (important staples in much of Africa) has been spreading worldwide. Unfortunately, bananas are especially difficult to cross-breed. Fortunately, biotechnology has now produced plants resistant to Black Sigatoka, protecting the tenuous food security of tropical and subtropical Africa. Plant ,esea,che" alsn bel;eve that b;ntechnnlogy is the most J;kely path towaed drought-tolemnt c,ops, wh;ch would be hugely ;mponant;n deal;ng witf any long-te'm d,ought p'oblems brought by the Modem Waeming. Egypt has al,eady ;nsened a drought-tolemnce gene from the barley plant into wheat, produe;ng vaeieHes that need only a single ;"igat;on per crop instead of eight. The drought-tol"ant wheat wil! not only take less wal". but wil! sha'ply ;educe sa];n;zaHnn of the ;";gated land on wh;ch it's grown. It should also be a boon on large areas of good quality land where rainfall is scarce. Fifth: Modern Transportation The biggest technical advantage of the modem world in dealing with weather famines is modern transportation. In the Coming warming centuries, we will undoubtedly be able to produce enough food from the land that gets good weather in any given yea; to supply all of the world's food needs. Equally important, We will be able to store food safely from years of plenty to ensure food abundance in lean years, all it takes are inexpensive concrete silos and modern pesticides to keep the rats and bugs from feasting on Our food reserves before We need to draw on them.

### at: sea level rise

#### Adaptation solves sea level rise

Dale 7 (Dale, Deputy Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Director of the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, 2007 (Helle Dale, “Skeptics Needed.” http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed101007d.cfm)

It makes the case that while global warming is real, it shows no sign of leading to the apocalypse, and that the money and effort invested in limiting the emission of greenhouse gases could be far better spent on saving human lives from other environmental threats. Mr. Lomborg estimates that the $180 billion spent on the Kyoto Protocol each year will delay the effects of global warming by four days by the end of this century. If the United States had signed on and every signatory nation had lived up to its treaty commitments (which they don't), the delay by the end of this century would be five years. And the consequences in terms of sea level would not even be that hard to live with. While European politicians now go on to pilgrimages to Greenland to pay homage to the supposedly melting glaciers, it seems to be the case that only some glaciers are melting, and that while the Arctic might be seeing some melting, the Antarctic is seeing **its icecap grow**. The rise in sea level by the end of this century, according to the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, will be about one foot. Other estimates are as low as three inches. This increase in sea level is something that economically prosperous nations can easy deal with, argues Mr. Lomborg. In fact, we have seen a one-foot rise in sea levels over the past century, which the world has managed to survive.

#### No sea level rise and warming’s not the cause

Knappenberger 11 **(**9/7/11 - is the Administrator of the World Climate Report (Chip, “Rapid Sea Level Rise? To the Contrary, Nature Says” <http://www.masterresource.org/2011/09/rapid-sea-level-rise-nature-no/>)

“The short-term rate of global sea level rise has decreased by about 25% since the release of the AR4—and a new paper shows that some 15% of the observed rise comes not from global warming, but instead from global dewatering…. [R]ather than raising its projections of sea level rise, perhaps the IPCC ought to consider lowering them once again.” The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is under pressure to revisit its projections of the expected amount of sea level rise by the year 2100. Many rather influential types are pushing for the IPCC to dramatically increase its central estimate by some 2-3 times above the value given in the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). Not so fast! Nature speaks with a contrary voice, political agendas aside. The short-term rate of global sea level rise has decreased by about 25% since the release of the AR4—and a new paper shows that some 15% of the observed rise comes not from global warming, but instead from global dewatering. In light of all this, rather than raising its projections of sea level rise, perhaps the IPCC ought to consider lowering them once again (as it did from its from its First Assessment Report to its Second, and from its Second to its Third). Nature Intervenes There are at least three things that nature is telling us that I think the IPCC ought to pay attention to. First off, the decadal rate of sea level rise has been decreasing. Some may be quick to argue that looking at the rate of sea level rise for such a short period of time is not instructive, but to such people I would respond that the IPCC apparently found that it was instructive enough to include in the high profile Summary For Policymakers (SPM) section of the AR4 in which they had the following to say: “Global average sea level rose at an average rate of 1.8 [1.3 to 2.3] mm per year over 1961-2003. The rate was faster over 1993 to 2003: about 3.1 [2.4 to 3.8] mm per year. Whether the faster rate for 1993 to 2003 reflects decadal variability or an increase in the longer-term trend is unclear.” So if the 3.1 mm per year from 1993 to 2003 were interesting enough to be included in the SPM, then, keeping up with the decadal rate of change should be high on the IPCC’s to-do list. And just in case they have let this slip, I include Figure 1 which shows the progression of the decadal rate of sea level rise as measured by the same source used by the IPCC, from the inception of the data in 1993 through the present. Figure 1. The trend in the decadal rate of sea level rise as measured by the satellite-borne altimeters from 1993 through March 2011. Note that these data have been revised since the IPCC AR4 such that the rates of sea level rise do not correspond exactly to those reported by the IPCC in its AR4 (data source and information about the data revisions: University of Colorado Sea Level Research Group) A picture is worth a thousand words. The rate of sea level rise for the most recent 10-yr period is 2.37mm/yr—a drop of nearly 25% from the value last reported by the IPCC. On to number 2. A fair proportion of the sea level rise is not from global warming, but instead is from global dewatering. What am I calling “global dewatering”? The pumping of groudwater for human use, the bulk of which finds it way into the global oceans instead of back into the aquifers where it came from. A new paper by Leonard Konikow of the U.S. Geological Society puts the total annual groundwater removal during the 2000s as ~145 cubic kilometers per year, which subsequently contributes about 0.40mm per year of sea level rise. And Konikow finds this amount to be on the rise (i.e., contributes an ever-growing amount to the rate of global sea level rise). So of the 2.37mm/yr of observed sea level rise, ~0.40mm/yr—or about 15%—comes not from “global warming” but instead from our consumptive water use. Which leaves only about 2mm/yr from climate change—a value which falls comfortably in the range of sea level rise which characterizes the behavior during the 20th century. In other words—evidence for a recent acceleration of sea level rise is entirely lacking. Which brings me to my third point for the IPCC to consider: there is a huge disconnect between current rates of sea level rise and the rate necessary to get to 1 meter by the year 2100. If the global sea level is going to be 1 meter (or more) higher in 89 years, it better get going. As of now, it needs to average 11.23 mm/yr or a rate that is about 5.7 times greater than the current rate to get to a meter by 2100. But, as with most catastrophic climate change projections, there always seems to be an “out” when it comes to trying to use actual observations against wild projections. In Hansen’s “multi-meter sea level rise this century” paper, he helpfully includes the figure below (Figure 2), to explain why most of us will be dead before knowing whether he was right or not—instead of a linear increase in the rate of sea level rise, he suggests that it more likely will be exponential and all sneak up on us during the last few decades before 2100. Figure 2. Hansen’s caption: “Five-meter sea level change in 21st century under assumption of linear change and exponential change (Hansen, 2007), the latter with a 10-year doubling time.” The good old “exponential rise”—an alarmist’s dream. Well, if Hansen is right, hopefully we’ll have figured out a way to deal with it by then. And if he is wrong, then business-as-usual seems to be plenty sufficient to handle what is to come. (Note: in the real world, exponential changes are usually not sustainable). All this to say that the IPCC has its job cut out for it when it comes to reassessing its projections of 21st century sea level rise.

### 2NC Impact Run

#### Ice age is the terminal impact- negative 100 degrees Celsius means everyone dies- not a question of who turns who

#### Outweighs all impacts

**Whitehouse 12** – science adviser to the Global Warming Policy Foundation (David, 01/11, “Could rising CO2 levels help prevent the next ice age?” http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/1338/could-rising-co2-levels-help-prevent-the-next-ice-age)

That the trees no longer completely canopy this land is due to mankind as we cleared the forests. That the ice is no longer here is due to global warming. Without doubt, we live in an interglacial period – a warm time between ice ages. There have been many during the current great glaciation. Some have these periods have been warmer than today, many shorter than our current interglacial's duration. The return of the ice would, short of a giant meteor strike, be the biggest disaster to face humanity. Vast swathes of the northern Hemisphere would be frozen. Northern Europe, Asia, Canada and the United States would have extensive regions rendered uninhabitable. Mankind would have to move south. There would be no choice as no technology could stop the ice or allow our high populations to life amongst it. Some believe the return of the ice will not happen for thousands of years, other that the signs could be visible within decades. But could it be that the greenhouse gasses being pumped into the atmosphere, that many believe are responsible for a recent warming of the planet, might counteract the forces bringing us a new glaciation? Could it be that greenhouse gasses might actually stave off the return of the ice and save the lives of tens of millions, if not civilisation itself? A recent study by scientists at Cambridge University and published in the Journal Nature Geoscience suggests that the carbon dioxide might extend the current interglacial until carbon dioxide levels fall. They believe that the atmospheric concentration of CO2 must be about 240 parts per million before glaciation could start. Currently, it is about 390 ppm. In a 1999 essay, Sir Fred Hoyle said: "The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world's major food-growing areas inoperable and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. We must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating."

#### It’ll happen quickly and soon

**Scotsman 8** – Edinburgh news, cites the German Research Centre for Geosciences (08/01, “Last Ice Age happened in less than year say scientists,” http://www.scotsman.com/news/international/last-ice-age-happened-in-less-than-year-say-scientists-1-1083252)

THE last ice age 13,000 years ago took hold in just one year, more than ten times quicker than previously believed, scientists have warned. Rather than a gradual cooling over a decade, the ice age plunged Europe into the deep freeze, German Research Centre for Geosciences at Potsdam said. Cold, stormy conditions caused by an abrupt shift in atmospheric circulation froze the continent almost instantly during the Younger Dryas less than 13,000 years ago – a very recent period on a geological scale. The new findings will add to fears of a serious risk of this happening again in the UK and western Europe – and soon. Dr Achim Brauer, of the GFZ (GeoForschungs Zentrum) German Research Centre for Geosciences at Potsdam, and colleagues analysed annual layers of sediments, called "varves", from a German crater lake. Each varve records a single year, allowing annual climate records from the region to be reconstructed.

#### Turns their war impacts by 2014

**Aym 10** – Salem-News Contributor based in Chicago, cites The Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory (Terrance, 12/06, “Earth may be entering a new Ice Age, Food shortages may lead to regional warfare,” http://www.iceagenow.com/Earth\_may\_be\_entering\_a\_new\_Ice\_Age.htm)

6 Dec 10 - Astrophysicist Habibullo Abdussamatov, head of space research at St. Petersburg's Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory in Russia, recently pronounced his belief that Earth will enter a little Ice Age as early as 2014, says this article by Terrence Aym. Such a period of cooling could last as long as two centuries and be ruinous, Aym warns. "Whereas global warming would be a good thing, a mini-Ice Age could be disastrous: growing seasons would be shortened, more energy must be extended to stay warm, and food shortages may lead to breakouts of regional warfare." The last little ice age occurred between 1650 and 1850 and "accounted for many crop failures, outbreaks of famines and mass migrations," says Aym.

### 2NC Link Run

#### Every Co2 particle is a life

Watts ’12 (Anthony Watts, American meteorologist, president of IntelliWeather Inc., editor of the blog, Watts Up With That?, and founder of the Surface Stations Project, “Increased CO2 Emissions Will Delay Next Ice Age”, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/01/08/increased-co2-emissions-will-delay-next-ice-age/>, January 8, 2012)

Sir Fred Hoyle Vindicated (Via Dr. Benny Peiser of the GWPF) According to new research to be published in Nature Geoscience (embargoed until 1800 GMT/10AM PST, Sunday 8 January 2012), the next ice age could set in any time this millennium were it not for increases in anthropogenic CO2 emissions that are preventing such a global disaster from occurring. The new research confirms the theory developed by the late Sir Fred Hoyle and Professor Chandra Wickramasinghe in the 1990s that without increased levels of CO2 emissions into the atmosphere ‘the drift into new ice-age conditions would be inevitable.’ [...] The problem for the present swollen human species is of a drift back into an ice-age, not away from an ice-age. Manifestly, we need all the greenhouse we can get, even to the extent of the British Isles becoming good for the growing of vines…. The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world’s major food-growing areas inoperable, and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. Since bolide impacts cannot be called up to order, we must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating.

#### Best studies go neg

**Amos ‘12** (Jonathon Amos, Science correspondent, BBC News, “CO2 'drove end to last ice age',” <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-17611404>, April 4, 2012)

A new, detailed record of past climate change provides compelling evidence that the last ice age was ended by a rise in temperature driven by an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. The finding is based on a very broad range of data, including even the shells of ancient tiny ocean animals. A paper describing the research appears in this week's edition of Nature. The team behind the study says its work further strengthens ideas about global warming. "At the end of the last ice age, CO2 rose from about 180 parts per million (ppm) in the atmosphere to about 260; and today we're at 392," explained lead author Dr Jeremy Shakun. "So, in the last 100 years we've gone up about 100 ppm - about the same as at the end of the last ice age, which I think puts it into perspective because it's not a small amount. Rising CO2 at the end of the ice age had a huge effect on global climate." The study covers the period in Earth history from roughly 20,000 to 10,000 years ago. This was the time when the planet was emerging from its last deep chill, when the great ice sheets known to cover parts of the Northern Hemisphere were in retreat. The key result from the new study is that it shows the carbon dioxide rise during this major transition ran slightly ahead of increases in global temperature. This runs contrary to the record obtained solely from the analysis of Antarctic ice cores which had indicated the opposite - that temperature elevation in the southern polar region actually preceded (or at least ran concurrent to) the climb in CO2. This observation has frequently been used by some people who are sceptical of global warming to challenge its scientific underpinnings; to claim that the warming link between the atmospheric gas and global temperature is grossly overstated. But Dr Shakun and colleagues argue that the Antarctic temperature record is just that - a record of what was happening only on the White Continent. By contrast, their new climate history encompasses data from all around the world to provide a much fuller picture of what was happening on a global scale. This data incorporates additional information contained in ices drilled from Greenland, and in sediments drilled from the ocean floor and from continental lakes. These provide a range of indicators. Air bubbles trapped in ice, for example, will record the past CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. Past temperatures can also be inferred from ancient planktonic marine organisms buried in the sediments. That is because the amount of magnesium they would include in their calcite skeletons and shells was dependent on the warmth of the water in which they swam. "Our global temperature looks a lot like the pattern of rising CO2 at the end of the ice age, but the interesting part in particular is that unlike with these Antarctic ice core records, the temperature lags a bit behind the CO2," said Dr Shakun, who conducted much of the research at Oregon State University but who is now affiliated to Harvard and Columbia universities. "You put these two points together - the correlation of global temperature and CO2, and the fact that temperature lags behind the CO2 - and it really leaves you thinking that CO2 was the big driver of global warming at the end of the ice age," he told BBC News.

# 1nr

### impact calc

#### Escalation is highly probable

Geller 5 (Daniel S. – Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Wayne State University, The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry, Ed. T. V. Paul, p. 99)

In fact, both the May-July 1999 military engagement between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and the crisis of December 2001-June 2002 after the terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament mirrored the conflict escalation pattern for nuclear-armed states. Each side initiated troop mobilization and general military alerts, coupled with the evacuation of civilians from border-area villages. However, the outcome of the future confrontations for India and Pakistan may not adhere to the pattern established by other nuclear dyads. Elements are present in this dyad that were largely absent between other nuclear-armed antagonists and that make the escalation of war more probable. Among those factors are the presence of a contiguous border between India and Pakistan, a history of multiple wars, and an ongoing territorial dispute. These factors, among others,79 increase the likelihood that an Indo-Pakistani dispute will turn violent and that the violence will escalate to war irrespective of the presence of nuclear weapons.

#### That escalation has a high probability of being nuclear

Raghavan, Fall-Winter **200**1 (Lieutenant General V. R. – former Director General of Military Operations for India, Limited War and Nuclear Escalation in South Asia, The Nonproliferation Review, p. 1)

The status of India and Pakistan as declared nuclear powers with growing nuclear arsenals has raised the risks of a nuclear exchange between them, if the two countries engage in a large military conflict. The political leadership in both countries does not seem to have fully grasped the implications of nuclear weapons in relation to the ongoing conflict in Jammu and Kashmir. This conflict could lead to a limited war, as it has triggered three wars in the past. The risks involved in fighting a limited war over the Kashmir issue and the potential for such a war to escalate into a nuclear exchange are at best inadequately understood, and at worst brushed aside as an unlikely possibility. Despite this official stance, however, a close examination of Indian and Pakistani military and nuclear doctrine reveals elements that could contribute to the rapid escalation of a limited war to include nuclear weapons. Strikingly, India and Pakistan have not revealed warfighting doctrines for the post-1998 condition of nuclear weapons readiness. It is not clear, for example, what threats to its security would compel India to declare a state of war with Pakistan. There is also no indication of the circumstances that would induce Pakistan to seek a larger war with India. The political objectives that a limited war might seek to achieve have also not been articulated in official and public discourse in the two countries. This article examines the possibility of limited war between India and Pakistan, and the potential of such a conflict triggering a nuclear war. It examines the considerations that could push each of the two countries to fight a limited war. It discusses how such a war might be waged and the circumstances that would likely precipitate an escalation to a nuclear exchange. The doctrinal beliefs and decisionmaking processes of the two countries are examined to trace the likely escalatory spiral towards a nuclear war. The article concludes that the probability of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan is high in the event the two countries engage in a direct military conflict.

### uniqueness run

#### Reform will pass now – Obama has put it on the fast track in both houses, but Congress can still botch it if a politically divisive issue comes up – that’s the Star-Telegram evidence – here are more warrants

#### Top Dems

Reuters 2/3 ["Reid predicts Congress will pass immigration legislation" -- news.yahoo.com/reid-predicts-u-congress-pass-immigration-legislation-172812947.html]

The top Senate Democrat on Sunday predicted that Congress will pass and send to President Barack Obama legislation overhauling the U.S. immigration system, saying "things are looking really good."¶ Obama last week expressed hope Congress can get a deal done on immigration, possibly in the first half of the year.¶ The president is proposing to give the roughly 11 million U.S. illegal immigrants - most of whom are Hispanics - a pathway to citizenship, a step that many Republicans have long fought.¶ Obama's fellow Democrats control the Senate, but Republicans control the House of Representatives.¶ Appearing on the ABC program "This Week," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid was asked whether immigration legislation can win House passage.¶ "Well, it's certainly going to pass the Senate. And it would be a bad day for our country and a bad day for the Republican Party if they continue standing in the way of this. So the answer is yes," Reid said.¶ Obama choose Reid's home state of Nevada, with a sizable Hispanic population, as the site for a major speech last Tuesday pushing Congress to pass an immigration bill.¶ Hispanic voters were crucial in helping Obama beat Republican nominee Mitt Romney - who advocated "self-deportation" of illegal immigrants - in Nevada in November.¶ "It has to get done," Reid said of immigration legislation.¶ "It's really easy to write principles. To write legislation is much harder. And once we write the legislation, then you have to get it passed. But I think things are looking really good," Reid added.¶ After years on the back burner, immigration reform has suddenly looked possible as Republicans, chastened by the fact that more than 70 percent of Hispanic voters backed Obama in the November election, appear more willing to accept an overhaul.

#### Urgency and momentum

Seldin 2/6 [Jeff, journalist, "Battle for US immigration reform gathers steam" Voice of America -- www.voanews.com/content/battle-for-us-immigration-reform-moves-on-ahead-of-state-of-the-union/1598101.html]

U.S. President Barack Obama is expected to make immigration reform a priority in his State of the Union Address. But already, talk of tackling this controversial issue is gaining momentum.¶ There are an estimated 11-million illegal immigrants in the United States with more still hoping to cross the border.¶ Claudia Hernandez came here as a child, and like many in her situation, she feels she belongs in the U.S. ¶ "I have been here more than half of my life, and I respect the United States. This is my country," she said.¶ Only days into his second term, President Obama began the push for change.¶ "The time has come for common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform," he stated. "The time is now."¶ Already, Congress has begun to hold hearings.¶ And a bipartisan group of senators, including former Republican presidential candidate John McCain, is pushing ahead with a plan of its own.¶ "We have been too content for too long to allow individuals to mow our lawn, serve us food, clean our homes and even watch our children while not affording them any of the benefits that make our country so great," McCain said.¶ The bi-partisan plan calls for tighter border controls as well as a path to citizenship, something President Obama insists upon.¶ That worries Jim Gilchrist. He founded the Minuteman Project, a citizen's group that helps guard the border.¶ "If we are going to grant amnesty to 15 to 30-million people, who are here illegally now, we are going to be granting amnesty to 300 million," he added. "Who will follow them over the next several decades."¶ Other activists and lawmakers say proposals to secure the borders don't go far enough - even though the United States spends more money on immigration enforcement than on all other federal law enforcement activities combined.¶ In the meantime, the pressure is on - both President Obama and Congress.¶ Janet Murguia heads La Raza, the largest U.S. Hispanic civil rights and advocacy group. "The reality is that Hispanic and Latin voters went to the polls on election day with the economy on their minds, but with immigration reform in their hearts," she said.¶ With the State of the Union address as a platform, advocates on all sides of the issue are hoping something gets done, all too aware such hopes have been dashed before.

they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### GOP getting on board

Merrills and Coffey 24 [Andrew, Justin, lawyers @ Ogletree Deakins, "Post-election immigration reform - What's at issue?" Lexology -- www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=fec318c5-d79a-4a70-8b8d-3ed17e59f65d]

The prospect of comprehensive immigration reform appears to be gaining momentum. On January 28, a bipartisan group of eight senators announced a broad proposal for immigration reform. Meanwhile, a similar bipartisan effort is underway in the House and, as this issue was going to press, it was expected that President Obama would announce his proposal for comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The Senate Proposal¶ The Senate proposal has four basic elements: (1) a path to legalization for illegal immigrants; (2) increased border security; (3) increased employer verification requirements; and (4) increased employment-based immigration. Illegal immigrants would pay monetary penalties to legalize but would not be eligible for permanent resident status until other enforcement-related measures are in place (such as increased border security).¶ The proposal would also increase certain types of employment-based immigration and allow individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from a U.S. university to obtain permanent resident status. The proposal includes increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers.¶ Highlights of the proposal include:¶ Increased border security (additional unmanned drones, surveillance equipment, and border agents);¶ Entry-exit system to monitor visa overstays;¶ A commission to provide a recommendation as to whether increased border security measures have been completed;¶ A government registry for illegal immigrants who must pass background checks, pay fines, and back taxes in order to obtain temporary legal status (when increased border security measures are completed they can apply for permanent resident status behind others who have already applied);¶ A quicker path to legalization for foreign nationals that were brought to the United States as children;¶ A reduction in the immigrant visa backlogs for both family-based and employment-based immigration;¶ Permanent resident status for individuals who have an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics from U.S. universities;¶ Electronic verification of employment authorization and identity for new hires;¶ Increased fines and criminal penalties for employers that knowingly employ unauthorized workers;¶ Increased employment-based immigration where it can be demonstrated that employment of a foreign national would not displace U.S. workers;¶ Creation of an agricultural worker program;¶ Increased or decreased immigration for lower-skilled workers as needed depending on economic conditions; and¶ Permanent resident status for long-term employees who have contributed to the community and to the workplace.¶ Reaction from the White House¶ Initial reaction from the White House to the Senate’s proposal has been positive; and with a similar bipartisan effort underway in the House, the prospect of comprehensive immigration reform seems a possibility. President Obama has made comprehensive immigration reform a priority, referencing the idea in recent speeches including his inaugural address.¶ With approximately 70 percent of Latinos voting for Obama in the past election, Republicans appear to have become more receptive to a comprehensive overhaul of immigration laws. Latinos accounted for approximately 11 percent of the electorate in 2012 (up from eight percent in 2008) and this community has been especially important in key swing states, such as Florida, Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico. More than two-thirds of exit polls were in favor of comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The perception is that Republicans have alienated the Latino community, the fastest-growing demographic group in the country, on the immigration issue. Immigration policy, largely overlooked during President Obama’s first term, has now re-emerged as a key issue as Republicans scurry to rebound from their election performance, motivated by the need to repair the electoral damage through comprehensive immigration reform.¶ The fact that Latinos cast significantly fewer votes for Mitt Romney than they had for previous Republican presidential candidates has led to an ostensible shift in the GOP’s position on immigration, forcing Republicans to reconsider their opposition to reform. In fact, following the election, many Republican Congressional Leaders (including House Speaker John Boehner), well aware of the election results, the polls, and demographic trends, have stepped forward to show support for comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Predictive ev

Rusling 2/6 [Matthew, Special Correspondent at Xinhua, "Chances for US immigration reform good, but pitfalls remain" Philippines News Agency -- lexis]

The chances of passing U.S. immigration reform are high, but the devil is in the details, and those finer points could be a stumbling block for cooperation in a bitterly divided Congress. ¶ The long-simmering debate over fixing the nation's broken immigration system kicked off Tuesday with a House hearing after President Barack Obama vowed last week to take action in his second term.¶ While former President George W. Bush tried his hand at reform with a bill that ultimately failed, experts said conditions this time are ripe for Congress to hammer out a deal.¶ "For the first time in many years, members of both parties have political incentives to reform our broken immigration system," said Darrell M. West, director of governance studies at the Brookings Institution.¶ "With the poor showing of Republicans in the 2012 elections, they need to address the immigration issues that are at the top of the political agenda for most Latino voters," he said, referring to the Republican Party's loss of more than 70 percent of the Latino vote and that party's need, by its own admission, to cast off the image of a party of old, white males.¶ Citing polls showing 70 percent of Americans want immigration reform, Democratic Strategist Joe Trippi expressed hope Monday during a Fox News panel that Congress could come to an agreement.

#### Top of agenda – bill within weeks.

Murphy 2-6. [Sandra, reporter, "Hopes for Irish in US as Obama puts citizenship first" Irish Daily Mail -- lexis]

'This policy package proposes to add visas to the system to clear out backlog and update the family system.¶ 'Without respect of nationality - nobody gets a different set of rules because of where they come from… it's about equity.¶ 'It is to incorporate folks from all over the world.' Her comments came as the Tánaiste announced he will hold a series of discussions with key US senators to push for comprehensive reform.¶ The need for a resolution of the situation would be raised in ongoing contacts with the US Administration and Congress, Eamon Gilmore said in a written reply to TDs.¶ 'The prospects for such reform have advanced in the wake of President Obama's re-election.' He said he raised the issue with former secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, on December 6. The Taoiseach also mentioned the matter when he spoke with President Obama on his re-election and wrote to him last month to thank him for the priority being attached by the US administration to the issue, he noted.¶ Ms Muñoz confirmed that Obama was keen to overhaul immigration laws within the first year of his term.¶ 'It is hoped that a bill could be introduced within the next month or six weeks - and he expects the debate to be moving in the Senate this spring.' Insisting the reforms were a top priority for President Obama's second term, she said they wanted a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

#### Signed by June.

The Hill 1-30-13. thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/280249-obama-expects-immigration-reform-bill-as-early-as-june

President Obama said Wednesday he expects an immigration reform bill will be signed into law by year’s end, and possibly as early as June.¶ “I’m hopeful that this can get done, and I don’t think that it should take many, many months,” Obama said in an interview with Telemundo. “I think this is something we should be able to get done certainly this year and I’d like to see if we could get it done sooner, in the first half of the year if possible.”¶ Telemundo is the second-largest Spanish-language television network in the U.S. Obama also gave an interview Wednesday to Univision, the largest Spanish-language network in the nation.¶ Obama gave a campaign-style address in Nevada on Tuesday, a place where Hispanics have turned the state blue in the last two presidential elections. He urged Congress to seize political momentum and act quickly on a comprehensive overhaul of the nation’s immigration laws that would include a pathway to citizenship for the nation’s estimated 11 million illegal immigrants.

### at: winners win

**Winners lose – taking a hard line fails**

**Page 1-15** [Susan, Washington Bureau Chief, "How Obama can avoid the second-term curse" USA Today -- www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/01/14/obama-second-term-curse/1834765/]

2. **Pick a priority**¶ The president can do something in his second term, the veterans say, but not everything. **Fighting too many battles could mean winning none.**¶ Obama has said his major goals for his second term include enacting a comprehensive immigration bill and energy legislation, and he has added gun control to the list since the December shooting rampage at a Newtown, Conn., elementary school that left 26 children and educators dead. In the next few months, he also faces the need to raise the debt ceiling and deal with automatic spending cuts that are poised to take effect.¶ Some veterans say his list is unrealistically long. "It's still not clear to me what they really want to do," Perino says.¶ The hard line Obama has drawn with Republicans on the debt ceiling risks sapping his political capital and leaving scars that will make prevailing on the other issues more difficult, Fagen says. "If he spends this year fighting with Republicans on the debt ceiling and the fiscal cliff, yeah, (House Speaker) John Boehner may lose the hand on that," she says, but Obama "is the one who is going to be harmed the most long-term."¶ After carrying 49 states in his re-election, Reagan focused on overhauling the tax code, and succeeded. Bush also picked a clear second-term priority — adding private investment accounts to Social Security — only to see it crash in Congress. His next proposal, to overhaul immigration, also failed.¶ Bush told reporters after his re-election that he had "earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it." To his dismay, he apparently hadn't earned enough capital to push through such divisive proposals.¶ Obama made a similar point at his news conference Monday when asked about a pending showdown with Republicans over raising the debt ceiling. "They've got a particular view of what government should do and should be," he said. "And, you know, that view was rejected by the American people when it was debated during the presidential campaign."¶ **Obama needs to be realistic about not "misinterpreting the size of his victory**," Fagen says. "That is a recipe for having a very long and cantankerous legislative session with little accomplished."

\*\*\* GW Bush’s press secretary Dana Perino, Sara Taylor Fagen, political adviser in Bush's second term

**Winners don’t win in the second term – short timeframe, midterms, pc limited**

**Nicholas 1-27** [Peter, White House Correspondent, "Republicans Bristle at Obama's New Roster" Wall Street Journal -- online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323644904578268232471085850.html]

Ken Duberstein, who served as chief of staff in Ronald Reagan's second term, said Mr. Obama might rethink his approach and find ways to compromise. "He has to do it if he is to accomplish his broad agenda," he said. "**You can't just do it by sticking your finger in people's eyes**."¶ Mr. Obama has four more years in office. But in practical terms, he needs to move quickly to advance his domestic agenda. A re-elected president has finite political capital and a compressed period to act before Congress is diverted by the midterm elections and then the next presidential election.

### at: pc not key

#### Framing argument – immigration reform will pass only if Obama uses capital – overcomes all current roadblocks

Des Moines Register 1-22-13 www.desmoinesregister.com/article/20130122/OPINION03/301220049/0/NEWS/?odyssey=nav%7Chead&nclick\_check=1

Taken as an agenda for his second term, Monday’s inaugural address included references to immigration, climate change, gay rights, voting rights and safe schools. Achieving those things will require the president mounting his bully pulpit to put heat on Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform, protections for the rights of gays and lesbians, gun control, environmental regulation and expansion of renewable forms of energy.¶ President Obama again demonstrated his gift of oratory on Monday. He delivered a well-crafted inaugural address with inspiring themes woven throughout and a call to action for our generation to achieve the ideals of previous generations.¶ But Obama should have learned in his first term that it is not enough to state lofty goals in great speeches. It takes hard work, perseverance and tough-mindedness to deal with members of Congress who may not want him to succeed.

**Capital key to keep pressure on the House – empirics**

**Brownstein 2-4** [Ronald, Editorial Director, "Bush's immigration failure offers Obama a lesson" National Journal -- www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/immigration/bush-s-immigration-failure-offers-obama-a-lesson-20130204]

Already many of the same dynamics are developing, with President Obama stamping immigration reform as a **top priority**, a bipartisan Senate coalition reassembling, a broad outside alliance of support groups coalescing—and most House Republicans rejecting anything that hints at “amnesty” for illegal immigrants. Yet the contrasts between now and 2006, particularly in the political climate, are also significant. Understanding both the similarities and the differences will be critical for reform advocates if they are to avoid replicating the disappointment they suffered under Bush.¶ **Presidential interest** was then, as it is now, **critical in elevating immigration reform**. Since his days as Texas governor, Bush had courted Hispanics, and—even during the 2000 GOP presidential primary campaign—he strikingly defended illegal immigrants as “moms and dads” trying to make a better life for their children. Together with his political “architect,” Karl Rove, Bush saw comprehensive reform that coupled a path to citizenship with tougher enforcement as an opportunity to consolidate the beachhead that allowed him to capture more than 40 percent of Hispanic voters in his 2004 reelection.¶ But Bush largely looked away when Republicans who controlled the House channeled that impulse in a very different direction. In December 2005, they passed an enforcement-only bill drafted by Judiciary Committee Chairman Jim Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, that, for the first time, designated all undocumented immigrants as felons. (Previously, illegal presence in the U.S. had been a civil, not criminal, violation.)¶ Initially, debate in the GOP-controlled Senate drifted. Majority Leader Bill Frist, considering a 2008 presidential bid, pushed his own enforcement-only bill. But amid the backdrop of huge public rallies against Sensenbrenner’s proposal, Sen. Arlen Specter unexpectedly joined with three other Republicans and all eight Judiciary Committee Democrats in late March to approve a comprehensive plan, including a path to citizenship, that followed a blueprint negotiated by Sens. Edward Kennedy and John McCain.¶ When broader Senate agreement teetered over the terms of legalization, Republican Sens. Chuck Hagel and Mel Martinez devised a compromise that divided illegal immigrants into three categories, requiring those here less than two years to leave but allowing those with deeper roots to eventually earn citizenship by paying fines and learning English. After Bush finally delivered a national address on immigration, a bill embodying that plan cleared the Senate with 62 votes, including support from 23 Republicans.¶ House Republicans immediately signaled their disinterest by refusing to appoint a conference committee and instead scheduled hearings in border communities to highlight security lapses. “Border security reigned supreme,” recalls Ron Bonjean, the communications director for then-Speaker Dennis Hastert. “I remember being in a meeting with … the leadership where pollsters came in and said border security was the key to our reelection.”¶ Even in 2006, something like the Senate plan likely could have attracted 218 votes in the House—but not a majority of Republicans. Faced with a collision between his two political imperatives—courting Hispanics and mobilizing conservatives—Bush blinked, allowing House leaders to replace the Senate bill with enforcement-only legislation, which he signed that fall. These choices began the GOP’s slide among Hispanics that continues unabated: Hispanic support for Republican House candidates plummeted from 44 percent in 2004 to just 29 percent in 2006, presaging Mitt Romney’s disastrous 27 percent showing among those voters in 2012.¶ That slippage is one of the two most important differences in the political environment around immigration between 2006 and today. Back then, as Bonjean notes, hardly any House Republicans argued that the GOP needed to pass a plan attractive to minorities. But many GOP leaders now see that as self-preservation. “The political imperative has shifted the tectonic plates,” says Frank Sharry, a key player in the 2006 debate who remains central as executive director of America’s Voice, which backs full citizenship for immigrants. “Immigration was viewed as a wedge issue for Republicans in 2006. Now it’s viewed as a wedge issue for Democrats.”¶ The “Gang of Eight” proposal released this week makes it likely that, as in 2006, the Senate will eventually pass a bipartisan immigration bill. Once again, there are probably 218 House votes for such a plan, but not a majority of the majority Republicans. That raises another key difference from 2006: Hastert faced little pressure to consider the Senate bill, because Bush bit his tongue when the speaker buried it. If House Republicans shelve another bipartisan Senate plan in 2013, they should expect much more public heat, because Obama won’t be as deferential.

### at: pc infinite

**Capital is finite – newest ev**

**Schultz 1-22** [David, professor at Hamline University School of Business, "Obama's dwindling prospects in a second term" MinnPost -- www.minnpost.com/community-voices/2013/01/obamas-dwindling-prospects-second-term]

Additionally, presidential power is temporal, often greatest when one is first elected, and it is contextual, affected by competing items on an agenda. All of these factors affect the political power or capital of a president.¶ **Presidential power also is a finite and generally decreasing product**. The first hundred days in office – so marked forever by FDR’s first 100 in 1933 – are usually a honeymoon period, during which presidents often get what they want. FDR gets the first New Deal, Ronald Reagan gets Kemp-Roth, George Bush in 2001 gets his tax cuts.¶ Presidents lose political capital, support

#### PC is real and finite

The Associated Press 12/13/12 (“The Reset: Obama Spending ‘Political Capital’ Las Vegas Sun)

President Barack Obama is trying to spend what former President George W. Bush called "political capital." That's the good will and clout you get from a re-election victory. Obama's predecessor boasted after his 2004 win that he'd amassed political capital and planned to "spend it" in his second term. Obama is now trying to do the same ting, standing firm with Republicans in negotiations on averting the year-end fiscal cliff and refusing to budge on his insistence that top tax rates \_ not just overall tax revenues\_ go up in any bipartisan fiscal deal. Clearly, his re-election win has given him more leverage. He campaigned on letting Bush-era tax cuts expire for households earning over $250,000 a year. And polls show that if Congress can't agree in the next three weeks and the economy goes over the "fiscal cliff" triggering large automatic spending cuts and tax increases, more voters will blame Republicans than Democrats. Obama met House Speaker John Boehner Sunday for a rare one-on-one talk about the crisis. Otherwise, he's been busy presenting his case elsewhere \_ including Monday's campaign-like visit to Michigan auto workers. Republicans gripe the president should be in Washington negotiating \_ not still out campaigning. Obama says he's mindful of "presidential overreach in second terms" and will proceed cautiously. Still, "I didn't get reelected just to bask in reelection." Of course Bush found he had far less political capital than he'd imagined. He campaigned across the country in early 2005 for a plan to partially privatize Social Security. After months on the road, he realized he couldn't even sell his plan to many members of his own party on Capitol Hill. Right now, Democrats are giving Obama running room. "He gets his way \_ up to a point," said Sen. Sherrod Brown, D-Ohio.

**1NR – Politics Links**

**FITS too controversial- viewed as tax increases**

**Carus, 12** -- Guardian environmental reporter

[Felicity, "Bill Clinton: fan of solar feed-in-tariffs thinks we should “get” the clean energy tattoo," PV Tech, 8-21-12, www.pv-tech.org/editors\_blog/bill\_clinton\_fan\_of\_solar\_feed\_in\_tariffs\_thinks\_we\_should\_get\_the\_clean\_en, accessed 12-31-12, mss]

Feed-in-tariffs are a controversial subject in the US where the energy industry likes to pretend that free market economics applies to this sector. You might expect clean energy antagonists to baulk: "Let the government set the price for electricity — are you crazy? Let the market decide." But **even** clean energy **protagonists are divided** about the true value of FiTs in sustainable markets: "Set the mandated rate too high and we'll have a Spanish boom and bust scenario on our hands. We don't want that." Set it too low, and nobody will want to invest. Palo Alto's Clean Local Energy Accessible Now (CLEAN) programme still has its full 4MW of capacity available and has extended its deadline. Added to which, tariffs also **sound** a bit **like** the dreaded ‘T’ word — taxes. So attempts to introduce them at the distributed commercial level have required a creative rebranding to the dramatically under-descriptive CLEAN programmes designed by the Clean Coalition.

#### FITs lead to utility and fossil fuel lobby backlash

Lynch, 12 -- Salem Financial CEO, Principal Solar, Inc advisor

[J. Peter, 35 years as a Wall Street security analyst, "Why Not? The Case for an American Feed-In Tariff," 10-10-12, www.slideshare.net/rborry/why-not-the-case-for-an-american-feedin-tariff, accessed 2-7-13, mss]

Opposition to FITs: Opposition is Talk, FITs are Fact The number one opponent to FITs is the local electric utility. These utilities argue that FITs work contrary to the market, but most utilities are not driven by the “market” -- they are monopolies, and monopolies, by definition, do not respond to market forces. Positive results in a developed country like Germany show that FITs are far more market-oriented than monopolies. Furthermore, **powerful contributors**, such as utilities and fossil fuel companies, do not want infringement on their businesses, and will **oppose efforts** to kick-start an industry that will compete against them. But, there is no economically valid opposition to FIT’s if the primary consideration is the welfare of the country and the long-term health of the planet.

#### Plan undermines political capital

Dorsi, 12 -- Phillips & Cohen LLP fellow

[Michael, "Clean Energy Pricing and Federalism: Legal Obstacles and Options for Feed-in Tariffs," Environs: Environmental Law & Policy Journal, 35 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 173, Spring 2012, l/n, accessed 2-7-13, mss]

Although potentially challenging in the current Congress, establishing legislative authorization for a feed-in tariff could resolve most of the issues presented in this Article. A federally regulated feed-in tariff may be **politically infeasible**, and would be undesirable because of the variety of state and regional systems where it would need to apply. The need to take into account regional differences within a federal feed-in tariff scheme only adds to the political challenge. Additionally, since state commissions control the administrative infrastructure that implemented avoided cost rates for QFs under PURPA, state commissions could serve well again for feed-in tariffs. A simple legislative option to authorize feed-in tariffs would be to amend PURPA to permit states to set rates above avoided cost for particular units. Federal permission for state regulation carries the strongest defenses against court challenges because it waives the dormant Commerce Clause while displacing any federal preemption. Additionally, because the activity ultimately rests with the state, it does not risk a commandeering challenge. Such legislation would also render moot any utility's opportunity to challenge FERC's decision. If the federal government sought to direct state policy rather than to simply permit states to act, the federal government is limited, but has two primary options. First, the federal government could condition the grant of reasonably related funds to states on implementation of feed-in tariffs. The Court upheld this type of fiscal federalism with regard to highway funds and drinking age laws in South Dakota v. Dole. n125 Given current political conditions, such a policy seems politically challenging. A second option would be a cooperative federalism arrangement similar to the Clean Air Act. n126 Such an arrangement escapes the commandeering challenge by providing a backstop of federal [\*197] implementation should a state elect to not act. n127 Cooperative federalism in the model of the Clean Air Act, which codifies state plans in federal statutes, would also provide the opportunity to seek enforcement in federal courts. n128 However, in those instances where a state does not act, this policy would have the same faults as a federal feed-in tariff. What the federal government cannot do is require states to adopt feed-in tariffs. Given the recent treatment of FERC v. Mississippi, it is unlikely that the Supreme Court would even permit Congress to require that states consider establishing feed-in tariffs. Advocates should not pin their hopes for renewable energy policy on the federal government. Congress, rather than exploring these policies, has recently discussed the possible relaxation or abolition of efficiency standards in order to ensure that customers can continue to purchase incandescent light bulbs. n129 At the same time, states have expanded their support for renewable energy. For example, in April 2011, California Governor Jerry Brown signed new legislation requiring California utilities to obtain a third of their energy from renewable sources. n130 Given the greater promise of state-level commitment to environmental policy, it is worth exploring the options for states to act if the federal government stands still.

#### Plan kills pc and causes a fight– no one supports it

Mulkern 9

[Anne C. March 24th,“Some see daylight at last for U.S. feed-in tariffs” http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/03/24/24greenwire-some-see-daylight-at-last-for-us-feedin-tariff-10271.html?pagewanted=all]

But **feed-in tariffs are controversial**. They are blamed for sharply higher electricity prices in countries where they exist. Some question whether Americans accustomed to comparatively low electricity costs would tolerate paying more. Utility companies also argue that they are not needed, since Congress is poised to pass legislation that would set financial penalties for carbon emissions from traditional power sources. And there might not be a political appetite for a fight over a national tariff. It is sensitive enough that the Solar Energy Industries Association's president and spokeswoman did not want to talk about the question of lobbying for it, except to call the tariff "a heavy lift." But Efird said that when the issue came up at the association's board of directors' meeting last month, there was "pretty much a consensus that the political atmosphere at this point would justify us investing some of our resources in a lobbying effort for a feed-in tariff." Since then, a policy task force has been meeting about twice a week, Efird said, "working on the details of what we think the ideal feed-in tariff should look like." 'New ideas take time' Congress does not appear likely to embrace a feed-in tariff anytime soon, however. "There is no interest on the Energy Committee's part to examine the concept of feed-in tariffs," said Bill Wicker, spokesman for the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the most likely starting place for such discussions. "We believe a better way to accomplish the same goal -- creating a market for renewables -- is with a renewable electricity standard."

### sequencing link

#### Sequencing link – the plan drains PC and destroys agenda prioritization

Cillizza 1-21 [Chris, WaPo political writer, “President Obama’s second term starts today. It ends sooner than you think” Washington Post -- www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/01/21/president-obama-second-term-starts-today-it-ends-in-sooner-than-you-think/]

At the moment, President Obama is at the height of his political influence. He is less than three months removed from a convincing reelection victory and freed from concerns about ever having to run for office again. He is coming off of two straight legislative wins — fiscal cliff and debt ceiling — and has a huge polling edge over his congressional Republican adversaries. That means that now is the time for Obama to move on his major legislative priorities — the first of which appears to be winning some sort of tightening of existing gun laws in the wake of the Newtown, Conn., tragedy. Obama also seems likely to push on immigration. And then there is the triple-headed economic monster: sequestration, a potential government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The president must choose carefully how hard he pushes on each of his priorities — and for how long. Much of his first term — and the political capital he brought into it — was spent on fights over the economic stimulus package and his health-care plan. While both of those legislative initiatives became law, it was at considerable political cost to Obama and his party — and at the expense of other priorities like energy, for example. No matter what pieces of the Obama agenda mentioned above make it through Congress as spring turns to summer in 2014, the attention of the political world will turn away from legislative fights and to the coming midterm campaign. (Prepare to hear a lot about the so-called “six-year itch” election.) In expectation of that election, Congress will avoid any sort of major legislative action from the summer on as both parties seek to avoid exposure as they make their case to voters in the fall. Once the midterms end, the 2016 presidential race, which is already showing signs of getting started, will burst out into the open with a few candidates likely declaring their intent to run by the close of 2014. With the race expected to be open on both sides — assuming Vice President Biden decides not to run — the level of interest in the contest to come will be substantial. (Human nature dictates that we love the next big thing more than the current big thing.) Add it all up and what you get is this: By the start of 2015, Obama’s power to drive his legislative agenda will be significantly less than it is today. What his second term meant (or didn’t) will have already be largely determined by then. The president has 18 months, then — give or take a few months — to build out his political legacy. Which means he needs to get moving as quickly as possible or run the risk of running out of political power before he can get done even most of what he hopes will round out his presidency in this second term.

### Fiscal Discipline – Link Booster

#### Renewables incentives not popular – fiscal discipline concerns.

Von Schirach 12. [Paolo, International Economic Development Consultant, Lecturer on International Affairs, former adjunct professor @ Georgetown, “Grim Prospects For Renewable Energy In The US – Subsidies Politically Unpopular – Natural Gas A Much Cheaper Alternative – USG Should Focus On R&D” Schirach Report – Global Society Monitor -- May 11 -- http://schirachreport.com/index.php/2012/05/11/grim-prospects-for-renewable-energy-in-the-us-subsidies-politically-unpopular-natural-gas-a-much-cheaper-alternative-usg-should-focus-on-rd/]

American enthusiasm for renewable energy, not too deep to begin with, has gone away. In part this has to do with loss of interest in “climate change” and its dire consequences. Unfortunately, climate change has been and is mostly an issue of political belief, rather than upholding science. And as the intensity of the political fervor somehow waned, in large part replaced by more immediate economic fears, so did political support for all the renewable energy technologies that were supposed to create, relatively quickly it was thought, workable alternatives to carbon based energy.¶ Unpopular subsidies¶ An additional reason for waning support is that keeping renewable energy alive means also subsidizing it for a few more years. And this is less and less politically palatable at a time of budgetary constraints at every level. Paying more for electricity simply because this kind is clean looks like an unaffordable luxury, whatever the consequences of burning more (cheaper) fossil fuels may be.

### at: public

#### The public doesn’t vote in Congress – this has absolutely no bearing on the bill’s passage

#### The public will just ignore the plan – empirically proven

Somin 6 – Ilya, George Mason University School of Law, Knowledge About Ignorance, Critical Review, Vol. 18, Nos. 1-3, p. 255-256

More than 40 years after the pioneering work of Philip Converse (1964), political ignorance remains as widespread as ever. According to surveys conducted during the closely contested 2004 presidential election, some 70 percent of Americans were unaware of the passage of President George W. Bush’s prescription drug bill, the most expensive new government program in 40 years and by far the most important domestic legislation of his administration (Somin 2004a, 5–6). Meanwhile, some 58 percent admitted that they had heard little or nothing about the controversial USA Patriot Act, and 61 percent did not realize that there had been increases in domestic spending under the Bush administration that had contributed to the budget deficit (ibid., 6)—even as the Bush administration had presided over spending increases far larger than any that had occurred in decades (Bartlett 2006; Council of Economic Advisers 2006, 376). Such examples—and many others like them1—confirm the continuing validity of Converse’s conclusion that there is a large gap in political knowledge and sophistication “between elites and masses,” one that amounts to a “continental shelf ” separating the two groups ([1964], 2006, 65).

#### Generalizations about public popularity are irrelevant

Dickinson 9. [ Matthew, Professor of Political Science - Middlebury College, “We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research” Presidential Studies Quarterly Volume 39 Issue 4 -- December – p 736-770]

More systematic efforts to test the utility of going public produce mixed empirical results. Again, much of the research employs quantitative analysis and focuses on legislative outcomes as a measure of presidential influence. Some studies claim a positive correlation between increases in aggregate levels of presidential approval and presidential influence in Congress (Brace and Hinckley 1992, Rivers and Rose 1985). But others find a more variable effect, with the impact of presidential approval depending on the legislators' partisan affiliation (Edwards 1989; Bond and Fleisher 1990), and some see no relationship at all (Mouw and MacKuen 1992b; see also Collier and Sullivan 1995). It is not clear, however, whether studies utilizing aggregate levels of presidential popularity are appropriate tests of Neustadt's more nuanced claim regarding the power of a president's public prestige. Neustadt warns that "one rarely finds a one-to-one relationship between appraisals of his general popularity and responses from some public in particular" (1990, 77). Instead, he argues that the relationship between a president's public prestige and bargaining effectiveness varies based on several factors, including the parties involved, the issue saliency and complexity, the affected publics' level of interest and knowledge, and prior presidential statements (78-85). The latest scholarly studies support Neustadt's more textured assessment; they find that rather than a direct correspondence between presidential popularity and legislative outcomes, a president's prestige influences congressional behavior in a more nuanced, less direct fashion. Simple generalizations regarding prestige and power, then, are difficult to make.

### at: pc theory wrong

#### Polarization makes PC more important, not less

Beckmann and McGann 8 (http://jtp.sagepub.com Journal of Theoretical Politics DOI: 10.1177/0951629807085818 2008; 20; 201 Journal of Theoretical Politics Matthew N. Beckmann and Anthony J. McGann Navigating the Legislative Divide: Polarization, Presidents, and Policymaking in the United States, MATTHEW N. BECKMANN is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine. He is currently working on a book-length project that explains and tests a new theory of presidents’ inﬂuence on Capitol Hill, 1953–2004. ANTHONY J. MCGANN is Associate Professor of Political Science at theUni- versity of California, Irvine and Reader in Government at the University of Essex.)

We can generalize these ﬁndings to the case where the president needs to target more than one vote, as would be the case in this example if a super-majority was required. If the president needs n votes to pass measure o1 and C(o, si Þ is linear, then he will need to pay 2n times the cost of a median senator. In this case it is not clear that it is cheaper for the president to get his measure passed in the polarized case; it depends on the number of votes he has to buy. In the polarized case each vote is relatively expensive, so if the president has to buy many votes, it may be more expensive than in a more homogenous case. Polarization’s advantage to the president, after all, was **that it allowed him to concentrate his resources on the few senators who will have a very signiﬁcant effect**. Therefore, polarization generally works to the president’s advantage pro- vided the president is in a situation where winning over a few voters can signiﬁ- cantly change the outcome (i.e. the polarization is distributed around the pivotal voter). If many members are clustered at the pivot point, any additional polariza- tion will limit presidential inﬂuence, produce policy stalemate, and reinforce legislative gridlock. Discussion By all indications, **the partisan and ideological polarization that has come to characterize ofﬁcials in Washington shows no signs of abating.** If anything, it appears that the schism between liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, will only continue to grow. The simple but important question that many have asked is, so what? How does polarization affect the policymaking process and the outcomes that result? While Mayhew’s initial study proved important laws continue to prevail even in the face of divided government and polarization, subsequent research has indicated that partisan and ideological polarization does encourage legislative gridlock, which, in turn, privileges the status quo. This happens partly by germinating partisanship and posturing over negotiation and compromise, and partly by leaving ideologically distant pivotal voters unable to ﬁnd an alternative they prefer even when they seek compromise and negotiate sincerely. By contrast, we theorize that polarization’s impact on US lawmaking **is conditional**. Instead of hypothesizing gridlock monotonically increases with polari- zation, our model predicts polarization’s policymaking impact depends on three elements: the default preference of the pivotal voter, the extent of polarization around the pivotal voter, and the president’s willingness (and ability) to spend his capital to win. Depending on the particular constellation of these factors, predictions range from the familiar one of gridlock on through to a president who not only avoids stalemate, but actually signs into law bills that are closer to his preference than we would otherwise expect. Drawing from this model, then, a more nuanced view of presidential inﬂu- ence emerges. Assuming today’s White House ofﬁcials are eager to promote the president’s legislative agenda, we can now see when **those efforts are likely to pay off – namely, when the president enjoys ample political capital** and confronts a polarized legislature (i.e. one where there are few legislators sitting between the pivotal voter and some point much closer to the president). Con- versely**,** when the president does not get involved or lacks political capital when he does, **all the conventional wisdom about pivotal voters and gridlock holds**. Also, any president promoting his agenda before a homogenous Senate (say, one characterized by a normal distribution of preferences) is highly constrained by its predispositions. Therefore, as future researchers revisit presidents’ potential inﬂuence in Congress, accounting for its conditional nature should provide more discriminating results and permit more judicious inferences.

#### Best studies prove

Beckmann and McGann 8. [Matthew, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine, Anthony, “Navigating the Legislative Divide: Polarization, Presidents, and Policymaking in the United States” Journal of Theoretical Politics Vol 20]

Here we propose a theory that casts some early rays of light onto the policy consequences of polarization in Congress. Building from a simple theoretical model in which the president seeks to promote his preferred policies in the Senate (see Snyder, 1991; Groseclose, 1996), we assess differences in the chamber’s preference distribution – from normal to unanimous to bimodal – as well as the ‘political capital’ at the president’s disposal.2 Results show that absent the president, ideological polarization makes amassing the votes needed to beat the status quo difficult, so gridlock frequently prevails. The same is true when the president lacks political capital to spend. However, when endowed with abundant capital, facing a polarized legislature enables presidents to pass policies closer to their ideal than would have been possible in an assembly characterized by greater ideological homogeneity. Hence the familiar prediction of blanket ‘gridlock’ is overblown. Instead, comparative statics show that the consequences of ideological polarization in Congress are conditional: they depend on the nature of the preference distribution, the involvement of the president, and the political capi- tal at his disposal.

# 2nr

**Warming won’t cause an ice age –**

**It can’t shut down the thermohaline circulation**

**Marsh 8** - Argonne national laboratory scientiest, DoD nuclear technology consultant (Gerald E. , "Climate Stability and Policy: A Synthesis", January 24, http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0801/0801.3830.pdf)//KL

There has been much speculation in both the scientific and popular literature that increased warming as a consequence of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions could lead to an increased flow of fresh water into the north Atlantic that would shut down the thermohaline circulation, known alternately as the meridional overturning circulation or the Atlantic heat conveyor [21]. This in turn it is argued, could initiate a new ice age in Europe. There are two major misconceptions behind such speculation: First, the Gulf Stream is not responsible for the transport of most of the heat that gives Europe its mild climate [22]; and while the shut down of the thermohaline circulation does appear to play an important role in the dramatic drop in temperature due to Heinrich and Dansgaard- Oeschger events [23], such shutdowns can only occur during an ice age. Indeed, Broecker [24], who first linked the thermohaline circulation to the ice ages, now discounts the fear that a shutdown of the thermohaline circulation could trigger an ice age. He has pointed out that for that scenario to work feedback amplification from extensive sea ice is required [25]. The possibility that global warming could trigger an ice age through shutdown of the thermohaline circulation may therefore be discounted.