### 1st Off

#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should should substantially increase financial incentives for the production of solar and wind power in the United States by converted domestic defense contractors.

#### State financial incentives solve – generate federal and private investment

EPA, “State Planning and Incentive Structure” In EPA’s, Clean Energy-Environment Guide to Action, April 2006.

States are achieving significant energy and cost sav­ ings through well-designed, targeted funding and incentives for clean energy technologies and services. Key types of financial incentives programs states offer include: • Loans • Tax incentives • Grants, buy-downs, and generation incentives • Nitrogen oxide (NOx) set-asides • Energy performance contracting • Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) States have achieved additional savings by coordinat­ ing financial incentives with other state programs and by leveraging utility-based clean energy programs. Over the past three decades, states have diversified their programs from grants or loans into a broader set of programs targeted at specific markets and customer groups. This diversification has led to port­ folios of programs with greater sectoral coverage, a wider array of partnerships with businesses and com­ munity groups, and an overall reduced risk associated with programmatic investments in energy efficiency and clean supply options. Objective State-provided funding and incentives meet the public purpose objectives of supporting technolo­ gies and products that are new to the market and encouraging and stimulating private sector invest­ ment. Funding and incentives can also reduce mar­ ket barriers by subsidizing higher “first costs,” increasing consumer awareness (the programs are often accompanied by education campaigns and the active promotion of products to help achieve a state’s energy efficiency goals), and encourage or “jump-start” private sector investment. Benefits States provide funding and incentives through a combination of sources (i.e., state and federal funds, utility programs, and ratepayers), to support a broad range of cost-effective clean energy tech­ nologies, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, and combined heat and power (CHP). State funding and incentive programs, some of which are self-sustaining (e.g., revolving loan funds), deliver energy and cost savings for governments, business­ es, and consumers. Program results vary depending on the configuration of funding and incentives used by each state. In Texas, the revolving loan fund has resulted in $152 million in savings since 1989 on an investment of $123 million (DOE 2005). In Oregon, more than 12,000 tax credits worth $243 million have been issued since 1980, which save or generate energy worth about $215 million per year (Oregon DOE 2005b). Providing funding and incentives for clean energy can offer the following environmental, energy, and economic benefits: • Reduces energy costs by supporting cost-effective energy efficiency improvements and onsite gener­ ation projects. • Ensures that clean energy is delivered, specifies which technologies are used, and offers incentives to install technologies. Providing funding and incentives also accelerates the adoption of clean energy technologies by improving the project eco­ nomics and offsets market, institutional, or regula­ tory barriers until those barriers can be removed. • Establishes a clean energy technology or project development infrastructure to continue stimulat­ ing the market after the incentives are no longer in effect. • Leverages federal incentives and stimulates private sector investment by further improving the eco­ nomic attractiveness of clean energy. A small investment may lead to broad support and adop­ tion of a clean energy technology or process. • Stimulates clean energy businesses and job cre­ ation within the state. • Supports environmental protection objectives, such as improving air quality.

### 2nd Off

#### Compromise bill gave Obama power to take hard stand on upcoming debt ceiling and spending cuts – that’s key

WSJ, Authors Janet Hook, Corey Boles, and Siobhan Hughes, “Congress Passes Cliff Deal,” Wall Street Journal, 1/1/2013

Congress broke a rancorous stalemate Tuesday to pass legislation designed to avert the so-called fiscal cliff. But the compromise bill, which blocked most impending tax increases and postponed spending cuts largely by raising taxes on upper-income Americans, left a host of issues unresolved and guaranteed continued budget clashes between the parties.¶ The bill represented the largest tax increase in the past two decades and was passed over opposition from conservative Republicans in the House who objected to the fact that it contained no long-term spending cuts of any significance.¶ The House voted 257-167, with 172 Democrats joining 85 Republicans in supporting the measure. Voting against the bill were 151 Republicans, and the GOP leadership split over the issue: House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R., Va.) voted against it, while House Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) voted for it. Also supporting the bill was Rep. Paul Ryan (R., Wis.) the GOP vice presidential nominee who has been an ardent opponent of increasing taxes.¶ The bill now goes to President Barack Obama for his signature, ending a tortured drive by Congress to avert the fiscal cliff, a journey that ended up technically breaching the Jan. 1 deadline.¶ The far-reaching agreement will have lasting implications for the tax code, future budget battles and the balance of power in Washington. It raises income-tax rates for the first time in almost two decades and fulfills Mr. Obama's signature campaign promise to prevent rates from rising on the middle class. Not since 1991 has a Republican in Congress supported such a move—a challenge to its brand as the antitax party.¶ In policy terms, it permanently codifies most of the tax rates that were set only temporarily in the Bush era. After years of failed efforts, the bill permanently keeps the middle class from being hit by the alternative minimum tax, a 1960s edifice intended only for America's wealthiest.¶ At the same time, the bill defers some of America's toughest spending problems—in particular the ballooning cost of health care—and it doesn't come close to the kind of $4 trillion deficit-reduction deal the country's leaders had hoped to negotiate. By some estimates, it would cut the deficit by $600 billion over 10 years.¶ "The bill before us is not the Grand Bargain," said Rep. David Dreier (R., Calif.) as the House opened debate. "But we are working hard to pull ourselves back from the cliff."¶ The compromise dodges one cliff, but it sends Congress barreling toward another. In two months, the delayed $110 billion in spending cuts will again kick in. At the same time, the U.S. will face the need to increase its borrowing limit, a change that can only be made by Congress. That sets up another rancorous fight, one with potentially more damaging consequences. Republicans want to use the debt ceiling to extract spending cuts. Mr. Obama has said he won't negotiate.¶ The failure to grapple with the biggest budget questions disappointed business leaders who had hoped for a comprehensive budget agreement that could tackle the deficit and diminish what for some has been a debilitating policy uncertainty.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Wind and solar incentives sap capital – republican opposition, fossil fuel interests, and Solyndra scandal

NYT, New York Times, “End of Clean Energy Subsidies?” May 5, 2012

The federal government has given generously to the clean energy industry over the last few years, funneling billions of dollars in grants, loans and tax breaks to renewable power sources like wind and solar, biofuels and electric vehicles. “Clean tech” has been good in return. ¶ During the recession, it was one of the few sectors to add jobs. Costs of wind turbines and solar cells have fallen over the last five years, electricity from renewables has more than doubled, construction is under way on the country’s first new nuclear power plant in decades. And the United States remains an important player in the global clean energy market. ¶ Yet this productive relationship is in peril, mainly because federal funding is about to drop off a cliff and the Republican wrecking crew in the House remains generally hostile to programs that threaten the hegemony of the oil and gas interests. The clean energy incentives provided by President Obama’s 2009 stimulus bill are coming to an end, while other longer-standing subsidies are expiring. ¶ If nothing changes, clean energy funding will drop from a peak of $44.3 billion in 2009 to $16 billion this year and $11 billion in 2014 — a 75 percent decline. ¶ This alarming news is contained in a new report from experts at the Brookings Institution, the World Resources Institute and the Breakthrough Institute. It is a timely effort to attach real numbers to an increasingly politicized debate over energy subsidies. While Mr. Obama is busily defending subsidies, the Republicans have used the costly market failure of one solar panel company, Solyndra, to indict the entire federal effort to encourage nascent technologies.

#### Sequestration kills aerospace – threat of cuts stifles investment essential to the industry.

Kristen Leigh Painter, Denver Post, “Sequestration deal delayed, leaving Colorado aerospace industry up in air”, 1/4/2013

The budget agreement passed by the U.S. Congress and supported by President Barack Obama to avert the "fiscal cliff" provides tax-rate clarity for individual Americans, yet failed to find a solution to the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration — leaving Colorado's large aerospace industry in limbo.¶ Congress pushed back the deadline to March 1 from the Jan. 1 deadline set in place by the Budget Control Act of 2011. This is neither good news nor bad for an industry facing huge cuts should Congress default on a decision.¶ "The plan did add some certainty to citizens, but nothing to industry," said Fred Doyle, vice president and group leader of defense and intelligence at Ball Aerospace & Technologies in Boulder. "If we had clarity on sequestration, we would be hiring more people to meet the demands of our customers."¶ Aerospace leaders applauded Washington's agreement for coming to some semblance of a tax compromise and for temporarily preventing the sequester from occurring. However, they are now pleading for a comprehensive solution that allows certainty for their industry as well.¶ "Until sequestration is permanently eliminated, there will be an overhang on our industry that stifles investment in plant, equipment, people, and future research and development essential to the future health of our industry," said Lockheed Martin in a statement to The Denver Post.¶ Defense Secretary Leon Panetta released a statement regarding the sequestration delay on Wednesday. He began by thanking Congress and the Obama administration for stalling the cuts, but then turned around to warn those same leaders that they "cannot continue to just kick the can down the road."¶ "Congress has prevented the worst possible outcome by delaying sequestration for two months," Panetta said in a news release. "Unfortunately, the cloud of sequestration remains."¶ That cloud includes hiring freezes or slowdowns, budget-planning uncertainty and stalled growth.¶ "As nimble as companies like to be, it is still difficult for them to plan in a federal environment that is not taking a long-term view," said Patty Silverstein, an economist at Colorado-based Development Research Partners.¶ Vicky Lea, aviation and aerospace industry manager at Denver Metro Economic Development Corp., points out that a lack of long-term planning is especially challenging for aerospace businesses that, by nature, must operate on longer planning cycles to accommodate research and development.¶ "From Colorado's perspective, the impacts of sequestration will be on both Department of Defense and non-Department of Defense, and it will be felt across our three pillars of aerospace — civil, commercial and military space," Lea said.¶ Even without sequestration — which would cut $500 billion from the defense budget over the next 10 years — the department has already been ironing out $487 billion in spending reductions.¶ "This department is doing its part to help the country address its deficit problem," Panetta said. "The specter of sequestration has cast a shadow over our efforts."

#### Aerospace industry is key to space exploration

**Thompson 9** (David, President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis)

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth.

#### Next, we have to go to space now – famine, scarcity, wars, and ultimate extinction are inevitable. only moving off the rock while we still have the resources prevents our demise and guarantees a peaceful, sustainable life on earth and across the galaxy

Engdahl 2003

[Sylvia, “Space and Human Survival: My Views on the Importance of Colonizing Space,” November 3, 2003, www.sylviaengdahl.com/space/survival.htm//tjc]

A more urgent cause for concern is the need not to “put all our eggs in one basket,” in case the worst happens and we blow up our own planet, or make it uninhabitable by means of nuclear disaster or perhaps biological warfare. We would all like to believe this won’t happen, yet some people are seriously afraid that it will—it’s hardly an irrational fear. Peace with Russia may have drawn attention from it, yet there are other potential troublemakers, even terrorists; the nuclear peril is not mere history. Furthermore, there is the small but all-too-real possibility that Earth might be struck by an asteroid. We all hope and believe our homes won’t burn down, and yet we buy fire insurance. Does not our species as a whole need an insurance policy?¶ Even Carl Sagan, a long-time opponent of using manned spacecraft where robots can serve, came out in support of space colonization near the end of his life, for this reason; see his book Pale Blue Dot. And in an interview with Britain’s newspaper Daily Telegraph, eminent cosmologist Stephen Hawking said, “I don’t think that the human race will survive the next thousand years unless we spread into space. There are too many accidents that can befall life on a single planet.” Hawking is more worried about the possibility of our creating a virus that destroys us than about nuclear disaster. However, he said, “I’m an optimist. We will reach out to the stars.” (For the full article, see the link section below.)¶ My novel The Far Side of Evil (Atheneum, 1971; updated version Walker, 2003) is based on the concept of a “Critical Stage” during which a species has the technology to expand into space, but hasn’t yet implemented it, and in which that same level of technology enables it to wipe itself out. The premise of the book is that each world will do one or the other, but not both. I have believed this since the early 50s, when there was real danger of nuclear war but no sign of space travel. When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, my reaction was overwhelming joy and relief, because I thought that at last our energies were going to be turned toward space exploration. I felt that way through the era of Apollo. Since Apollo, as public support of the space program has waned, my fears have grown again; because I don’t believe that a world turned in on itself can remain peaceful. A progressive species like ours has a built-in drive to move forward, and that energy has to go somewhere. Historically, when it was not going into mere survival or into the exploration and settlement of new lands—which is the adaptive reason for such a drive—it has gone into war.¶ This is the price we pay for our innate progressiveness. I know that it is now fashionable to deride the concept of progress, and certainly we cannot say that progress is inevitable. It surely doesn’t characterize all change in all areas of human endeavor. Nevertheless, overall, the human race as a whole advances; if it did not we would still be cavemen. This is what distinguishes our species from all others. And like it or not, this drive is inseparable from the drive toward growth and expansion. Many successful species colonize new ecological niches; this is one of the fundamental features of evolution. When a species can’t find a new niche, and the resources of the old one are no longer sufficient, it dies out. If the resources do remain sufficient, it lives, but is unchanging from era to era. There are no cases in biology of progressive evolution unaccompanied by expansion. ¶ Colonies or Settlements?¶ The question of resources raises an even more crucial reason for expansion into space than the danger of Earth’s destruction. It’s obvious that this planet cannot support an expanding population forever. Most people who recognize this fact advocate population control to the extent of “zero population growth.” I do not; I believe it would be fatal not only for the reason explained above, but because if it could be achieved it would result in stagnation. I do not want a world in which there can be no growth; growth leads to intellectual and artistic progress as well as to material survival. Furthermore, I do not believe it could be achieved. The built-in desire for personal descendants is too strong; that is why our species has survived this long, why it has spread throughout the entire world. Moreover, the biological response to threatened survival is to speed up reproduction, as we can see by the number of starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ would reduce the population all right; we would decimate it. That may be “survival” but it’s surely not the future we want.¶ We do not want even the present restriction on resources. Currently, some nations live well while others are deprived, and it’s asserted that even those with the best access to resources should stop using them up—the underdeveloped nations, under this philosophy, are not given the hope of a standard of living commensurate with the level our species has achieved. Will the Third World tolerate such a situation forever? I surely wouldn’t blame them for not wanting to. And neither do I want the rest of the world reduced to a lower level of technology. Even if I had no other objection to such a trend, the plain fact is that a low level of technology cannot support the same size population as a high level; so if you want to cut back on technology, you have to either kill people outright or let them starve. And you certainly can’t do anything toward extending the length of the human lifespan. This is the inevitable result of planning based on a single-planet environment.¶ If there is pessimism in Earthbound science fiction (which its most outstanding characteristic), these truths are the source of it. I have not seen any that denies any of them; pop-culture SF reveals that what people grasp mythopoeically about such a future involves catastrophic war, cut-throat human relationships in overcrowded cities, and a general trend toward dehumanization. Apart from the major films with which my course dealt (e.g. Bladerunner), Soylent Green postulates cannibalism and Logan’s Run is based on the premise that everybody is required to die at the age of 30. The destruction of the world’s ecology is a basic assumption—which is natural, since in a contest between a stable biosphere and personal survival, humans will either prevail or they will die.¶ Myths showing these things are indeed part of the response to a new perception of our environment: the perception that as far as Earth is concerned, it is limited. A basic premise of my course was that all myth is a response of a culture to the environment in which it perceives itself to exist.] But at the rational level, people do not want to face them. They tell themselves that if we do our best to conserve resources and give up a lot of the modern conveniences that enable us to spend time expanding our minds, we can avoid such a fate—as indeed we can, for a while. But not forever. And most significantly, not for long enough to establish space settlements, if we don’t start soon enough. Space humanization is not something that can be achieved overnight.¶ I have called this stage in our evolution the “Critical Stage.” Paul Levinson [the Director of Connected Education] uses different terminology for the same concept. He says that we have only a narrow window to get into space, a relatively short time during which we have the capability, but have not yet run out of the resources to do it. I agree with him completely about this. Expansion into space demands high technology and full utilization of our world’s material resources (although not destructive utilization). It also demands financial resources that we will not have if we deplete the material resources of Earth. And it demands human resources, which we will lose if we are reduced to global war or widespread starvation. Finally, it demands spiritual resources, which we are not likely to retain under the sort of dictatorship that would be necessary to maintain a “sustainable” global civilization.¶ Because the window is narrow, then, we not only have to worry about immediate perils. The ultimate, unavoidable danger for our planet, the transformation of our sun, is distant—but ¶ if we don’t expand into space now, we can never do it. Even if I’m wrong and we survive stagnation, it will be too late to escape from this solar system, much less to explore for the sake of exploring.¶ I realize that what I’ve been saying here doesn’t sound like my usual optimism. But the reason it doesn’t, I think, is that most people don’t understand what’s meant by “space humanization.” Some of you are probably thinking that space travel isn’t going to be a big help with these problems, as indeed, the form of it shown in today’s mythology would not. Almost certainly, you’re thinking that it won’t solve the other problems of Earth, and I fear you may be thinking that the other problems should be solved first.¶ One big reason why they should not is the “narrow window” concept. The other is that they could not. I have explained why I believe the problem of war can’t be solved without expansion. The problem of hunger is, or ultimately will be, the direct result of our planet’s limited resources; though it could be solved for the near-term by political reforms, we are not likely to see such reforms while nations are playing a “ zero-sum game” with what resources Earth still has. Widespread poverty, when not politically based, is caused by insufficient access to high technology and by the fact that there aren’t enough resources to go around (if you doubt this, compare the amount of poverty here with the amount in the Third World, and the amount on the Western frontier with the amount in our modern cities). Non-contagious disease, such as cancer, is at least partially the result of stress; and while expansion won’t eliminate stress, overcrowding certainly increases it. The problem of atmospheric pollution is the result of trying to contain the industry necessary to maintain our technology within the biosphere instead of moving it into orbit where it belongs.¶ In short, all the worldwide problems we want to solve, and feel we should have solved, are related to the fact that we’ve outgrown the ecological niche we presently occupy. I view them not as pathologies, but as natural indicators of our evolutionary stage. I would like to believe that they’ll prove spurs to expansion. If they don’t, we’ll be one of evolution’s failures.

### 3rd Off

#### Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### Second, the Impact—consumption focus is the only way to solve for overconsumption and misconsumption that threaten human survival

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

A strictly ecological interpretation takes consumption as perfectly ‘‘natural.’’ To survive, all organisms must consume— that is, degrade resources. This interpretation of a given consumption act is background consumption. It refers to the normal, biological functioning of all organisms, humans included. Every act of background consumption by an individual alters the environment, the total environmental impact being a function of aggregate consumption of the population. Individuals consume to meet a variety of needs, physical and psychological, both of which contribute to the ability of the individual to survive and reproduce. From this limited, asocial, nonethical interpretation of consumption, all consumption patterns and consequences are natural, including population explosions and crashes and irreversibilities caused by the expansion of one species at the expense of other species. If, however, the interpretation is modified to include human concern for population crashes, species extinctions, permanent diminution of ecosystem functioning, diminished reproductive and developmental potential of individuals, and other irreversible effects, then ‘‘problematic consumption’’ becomes relevant. Two interpretive layers are overconsumption and misconsumption. Overconsumption is the level or quality of consumption that undermines a species’ own life-support system and for which individuals and collectivities have choices in their consuming patterns. Overconsumption is an aggregate-level concept. With instances of overconsumption, individual behavior may be perfectly sensible, conforming either to the evolutionary dictates of fitness or to the economically productive dictates of rational decision making. Collective, social behavior may appear sensible, too, as when increased consumption is needed in an advanced industrial economy to stimulate productive capacity and compete in international markets. But eventually the collective outcome from overconsuming is catastrophe for the population or the species. From a thermodynamic and ecological perspective, this is the problem of excessive throughput. 21 The population or species has commanded more of the regenerative capacity of natural resources and more of the assimilative capacity of waste sinks than the relevant ecosystems can support. And it is an ethical problem because it inheres only in populations or species that can reflect on their collective existence. What is more, for humans it becomes a political problem when the trends are toward collapse, power differences influence impacts, and those impacts generate conflict. The second interpretive layer within problematic consumption is misconsumption, which concerns individual behavior. The problem here is that the individual consumes in a way that undermines his or her own well-being even if there are no aggregate effects on the population or species. Put differently, the long-term effect of an individual’s consumption pattern is either suboptimal or a net loss to that individual. It may or may not, however, undermine collective survival. Such consumption can occur along several dimensions.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion our selves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

¶ The ¶ aim ¶ of ¶ this ¶ paper, ¶ however, ¶ is ¶ not ¶ to ¶ present ¶ a ¶ thorough ¶ analysis ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ notion ¶ of ¶ an ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence. ¶ Several ¶ such ¶ analyses ¶ have ¶ appeared ¶ in ¶ recent ¶ times ¶ (after ¶ years ¶ of ¶ unfortunate ¶ scholarly ¶ neglect), ¶ and ¶ much ¶ of ¶ this ¶ emerging ¶ commentary ¶ is ¶ very ¶ probing ¶ and ¶ insightful.12 ¶ But ¶ this ¶ is ¶ not ¶ the ¶ time ¶ to ¶ focus ¶ on ¶ furthering ¶ that ¶ critical ¶ discussion ¶ or ¶ even ¶ providing ¶ a ¶ comprehensive ¶ literature ¶ review ¶ of ¶ it. ¶ Instead, ¶ after ¶ providing ¶ a ¶ brief ¶ exposition ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ ethics, ¶ this ¶ paper ¶ will ¶ undertake ¶ to ¶ actually ¶ apply ¶ the ¶ idea ¶ of ¶ an ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence ¶ to ¶ a ¶ particular ¶ subject ¶ of ¶ ethical ¶ concern, ¶ namely, ¶ to ¶ our ¶ role ¶ as ¶ ‘consumers’ ¶ in ¶ the ¶ context ¶ of ¶ First ¶ World ¶ overconsumption. ¶ This ¶ is ¶ an ¶ area ¶ that ¶ raises ¶ ethical ¶ questions ¶ concerning ¶ how ¶ we ¶ ought ¶ to ¶ live ¶ for ¶ two ¶ main ¶ reasons: ¶ firstly, ¶ due ¶ to ¶ the ¶ impact ¶ Western-­‐style ¶ consumers ¶ are ¶ having ¶ on ¶ the ¶ natural ¶ environment; ¶ and ¶ secondly, ¶ due ¶ to ¶ the ¶ continued ¶ existence ¶ of ¶ poverty ¶ amidst ¶ plenty. ¶ There ¶ is, ¶ however, ¶ another ¶ perspective ¶ to ¶ consider ¶ also. ¶ A ¶ large ¶ body ¶ of ¶ sociological ¶ and ¶ psychological ¶ literature ¶ now ¶ exists ¶ indicating ¶ that ¶ Western-­‐style ¶ consumption ¶ practices ¶ are ¶ often ¶ failing ¶ to ¶ provide ¶ meaning ¶ and ¶ fulfillment, ¶ even ¶ to ¶ those ¶ who ¶ have ¶ ‘succeeded’ ¶ in ¶ attaining ¶ a ¶ high ¶ material ¶ standard ¶ of ¶ living.13 ¶ These ¶ three ¶ consumption-­‐related ¶ issues ¶ – ¶ ecological ¶ degradation, ¶ poverty ¶ amidst ¶ plenty, ¶ and ¶ consumer ¶ malaise ¶ – ¶ provide ¶ ample ¶ grounds ¶ for ¶ thinking ¶ that ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ a ¶ proper ¶ subject ¶ for ¶ ethical ¶ engagement, ¶ in ¶ the ¶ Foucauldian ¶ sense ¶ of ¶ ethics ¶ as ¶ ‘the ¶ self ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self.’ ¶ If ¶ it ¶ is ¶ the ¶ case ¶ that ¶ our ¶ individual ¶ identities ¶ have ¶ been ¶ shaped, ¶ insidiously ¶ perhaps, ¶ by ¶ a ¶ social ¶ system ¶ that ¶ celebrates ¶ and ¶ encourages ¶ consumption ¶ without ¶ apparent ¶ limit ¶ – ¶ and ¶ it ¶ would ¶ not ¶ be ¶ unfair ¶ to ¶ describe ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ in ¶ these ¶ terms14 ¶ – ¶ then ¶ it ¶ may ¶ be ¶ that ¶ ethical ¶ practice ¶ today ¶ calls ¶ for ¶ a ¶ rethinking ¶ of ¶ our ¶ assumptions ¶ and ¶ attitudes ¶ concerning ¶ consumption, ¶ which ¶ might ¶ involve ¶ a ¶ deliberate ¶ reshaping ¶ of ¶ the ¶ self ¶ by ¶ the ¶ self. ¶ ¶ ¶ This ¶ paper ¶ will ¶ explore ¶ the ¶ possibility ¶ of ¶ such ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ in ¶ the ¶ following ¶ ways. ¶ First, ¶ by ¶ explaining ¶ how ¶ neoclassical ¶ economics, ¶ which ¶ is ¶ arguably ¶ the ¶ most ¶ influential ¶ paradigm ¶ of ¶ thought ¶ in ¶ the ¶ world ¶ today, ¶ conceptualizes ¶ consumption ¶ as ¶ something ¶ that ¶ benefits ¶ both ¶ ‘self’ ¶ and ¶ ‘other’ ¶ and, ¶ therefore, ¶ as ¶ something ¶ that ¶ should ¶ be ¶ maximized. ¶ To ¶ the ¶ extent ¶ that ¶ modern ¶ consumers ¶ have ¶ internalized ¶ this ¶ conception ¶ of ¶ consumption, ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ might ¶ involve ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self ¶ for ¶ the ¶ purpose ¶ of ¶ changing ¶ the ¶ self ¶ and ¶ creating ¶ something ¶ new. ¶ The ¶ second ¶ way ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ will ¶ be ¶ explored ¶ will ¶ be ¶ through ¶ an ¶ examination ¶ of ¶ the ¶ theory ¶ and ¶ practice ¶ of ¶ ‘voluntary ¶ simplicity,’ ¶ a ¶ term ¶ that ¶ refers ¶ to ¶ an ¶ oppositional ¶ living ¶ strategy ¶ or ¶ ‘way ¶ of ¶ life’ ¶ with ¶ which ¶ people, ¶ somewhat ¶ paradoxically, ¶ perhaps, ¶ seek ¶ an ¶ increased ¶ quality ¶ of ¶ life ¶ through ¶ a ¶ reduction ¶ and ¶ restraint ¶ of ¶ one’s ¶ level ¶ of ¶ consumption.15 ¶ The ¶ paradox, ¶ so-­‐ called, ¶ consists ¶ in ¶ the ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ live ¶ ‘more ¶ with ¶ less.’ ¶ Since ¶ voluntarily ¶ living ¶ simply ¶ means ¶ heading ¶ in ¶ the ¶ opposite ¶ direction ¶ to ¶ where ¶ most ¶ people ¶ in ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ (and ¶ increasingly ¶ elsewhere) ¶ seem ¶ to ¶ want ¶ to ¶ go, ¶ one ¶ would ¶ expect ¶ living ¶ simply ¶ to ¶ require ¶ a ¶ fundamentally ¶ creative ¶ engagement ¶ with ¶ life ¶ and ¶ culture, ¶ especially ¶ in ¶ contemporary ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ that ¶ seem ¶ to ¶ be ¶ predicated ¶ on ¶ the ¶ assumption ¶ that ¶ ‘more ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ always ¶ better.’ ¶ This ¶ need ¶ for ¶ a ¶ fundamentally ¶ creative ¶ engagement ¶ with ¶ life ¶ is ¶ what ¶ prompted ¶ the ¶ present ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ elucidate ¶ the ¶ idea ¶ of ¶ ‘voluntary ¶ simplicity ¶ as ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence,’ ¶ and ¶ it ¶ is ¶ this ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ infuse ¶ Foucauldian ¶ ethics ¶ with ¶ an ¶ emerging ¶ post-­‐consumerist ¶ philosophy ¶ of ¶ life ¶ that ¶ constitutes ¶ the ¶ original ¶ contribution ¶ of ¶ this ¶ paper. ¶ It ¶ is ¶ hoped ¶ that ¶ this ¶ practical ¶ application ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ ethics ¶ might ¶ also ¶ prompt ¶ others ¶ to ¶ consider ¶ how ¶ ethical ¶ engagement ¶ might ¶ produce ¶ new ¶ ways ¶ of ¶ being ¶ that ¶ are ¶ freer, ¶ more ¶ fulfilling, ¶ and ¶ yet ¶ less ¶ resource-­‐intensive ¶ and ¶ damaging ¶ than ¶ the ¶ modes ¶ of ¶ being ¶ which ¶ are ¶ dominant ¶ in ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ today. ¶ Could ¶ it ¶ be, ¶ for ¶ example, ¶ that ¶ the ¶ ‘Death ¶ of ¶ Man,’ ¶ to ¶ use ¶ Foucault’s ¶ phrase, ¶ was ¶ actually ¶ the ¶ first ¶ (and ¶ a ¶ necessary) ¶ phase ¶ in ¶ the ¶ demise ¶ of ¶ what ¶ one ¶ might ¶ call ¶ ‘homo ¶ consumicus’? ¶ And ¶ what ¶ forms ¶ of ¶ life, ¶ what ¶ modes ¶ of ¶ being, ¶ would ¶ or ¶ could ¶ materialize ¶ with ¶ the ¶ voluntary ¶ emergence ¶ of ¶ ‘homo ¶ post-­‐consumicus’? ¶ These ¶ are ¶ the ¶ large ¶ questions ¶ that ¶ motivated ¶ this ¶ study ¶ and ¶ in ¶ the ¶ following ¶ pages ¶ a ¶ preliminary ¶ attempt ¶ is ¶ made ¶ to ¶ grapple ¶ with ¶ them. ¶ The ¶ aim, ¶ however, ¶ is ¶ not ¶ to ¶ legitimate ¶ ‘what ¶ is ¶ already ¶ known,’16 ¶ since ¶ that ¶ would ¶ not ¶ be ¶ a ¶ very ¶ Foucauldian ¶ endeavor; ¶ rather, ¶ the ¶ aim ¶ is ¶ to ¶ explore ¶ whether ¶ or ¶ to ¶ what ¶ extent ¶ it ¶ is ¶ possible ¶ to ¶ ‘free ¶ thought ¶ from ¶ what ¶ it ¶ silently ¶ thinks,’17 ¶ in ¶ the ¶ hope ¶ that ¶ this ¶ might ¶ open ¶ up ¶ space ¶ to ¶ ‘think ¶ differently,’18 ¶ to ¶ think ¶ otherwise.

# Climate ethics

#### 1st, no warming scenario:

#### Warming not real/anthropogenic- IPCC predictions fail and rely on faulty computer models – even if they win that the earth is warming, the rate is too slow to trigger their impacts

Bast & Taylor ‘11

[Joseph and James, CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools, Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care, Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism, Education & Capitalism, Climate Change Reconsidered, and The Patriot’s Toolbox, and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelor degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8.2.11., http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //wyo-hdm]

How Much Warming? NASA satellite data recorded since 1979 allow us to check the accuracy of claims that the past three decades have been warming at an alarming rate. The data show a warming rate of 0.123 degrees C per decade. This is considerably less than what land-based temperature stations report during the same time period, and which are relied on by the IPCC (Christy, 2009). If the Earth’s temperature continues to rise at the rate of the past three decades, the planet would see only 1.23 degrees C warming over the course of an entire century. Most climate scientists, even “skeptics,” acknowledge that rising CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere would, all other things held constant, cause some small amount of warming. Alarmists claim that small amount will trigger increases in the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, which in turn will cause further warming. But other scientists have found no evidence of rising levels of moisture in those areas of the atmosphere where the models claim it should be found. Without this “amplification,” there is no global warming crisis (Singer, 2011). While the global climate warmed slightly during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not warmed at all since 2000, and there is some evidence that a cooling trend has begun (Taylor, 2007). This contradicts the predictions of the IPCC and poses a challenge to the theory that CO2 concentrations play a major role in global temperature trends. It confirms the views of many less-politicized climate scientists who acknowledge that the global climate is always warming or cooling (Michaels, 2005; Christy, 2006). The scientific community’s lack of certainty about future climate trends is rooted in the shortcomings of computer models. These models are the centerpiece of the IPCC’‘s reports, yet it is widely recognized that they fail to account for changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds that are likely to occur in a warmer world. It is a case of “garbage in, garbage out.” If we cannot predict how much warming will occur, how can we claim that continued human emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful?

#### No risk of impact- impacts won’t take hold for several centuries and in order to kill off the planet they would have to occur within one lifespan

Lomborg 8

[Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School

Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>]

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

# \*\*\*A2 Warming

#### No species snowball – Ecosystems are resilient

Sedjo, 00

Roger A Sedjo 2k, Sr. Fellow, Resources for the Future, Conserving Nature’s Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics & economics, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, p 114

As a critical input into the existence of humans and of life on earth, biodiversity obviously has a very high value (at least to humans). But, as with other resource questions, including public goods, biodiversity is not an either/or question, but rather a question of “how much.” Thus, we may argue as to how much biodiversity is desirable or is required for human life (threshold) and how much is desirable (insurance) and at what price, just as societies argue over the appropriate amount and cost of national defense. As discussed by Simpson, the value of water is small even though it is essential to human life, while diamonds are inessential but valuable to humans. The reason has to do with relative abundance and scarcity, with market value pertaining to the marginal unit. This water-diamond paradox can be applied to biodiversity. Although biological diversity is essential, a single species has only limited value, since the global system will continue to function without that species. Similarly, the value of a piece of biodiversity (e.g., 10 ha of tropical forest) is small to negligible since its contribution to the functioning of the global biodiversity is negligible. The global ecosystem can function with “somewhat more” or “somewhat less” biodiversity, since there have been larger amounts in times past and some losses in recent times. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to indicate that small habitat losses threaten the functioning of the global life support system, the value of these marginal habitats is negligible. The “value question” is that of how valuable to the life support function are species at the margin. While this, in principle, is an empirical question, in practice it is probably unknowable. However, thus far, biodiversity losses appear to have had little or no effect on the functioning of the earth’s life support system, presumably due to the resiliency of the system, which perhaps is due to the redundancy found in the system. Through most of its existence, earth has had far less biological diversity. Thus, as in the water-diamond paradox, the value of the marginal unit of biodiversity appears to be very small.

#### historic warming trends occurred without CO2 emissions- roman era proves

Waugh ‘12

[Rob, Columnist Archive for MailOnline, “Tree-rings prove climate was WARMER in Roman and Medieval times than it is now - and world has been cooling for 2,000 years”, 11.7.12., Mail Online, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2171973/Tree-ring-study-proves-climate-WARMER-Roman-Medieval-times-modern-industrial-age.html>> //wyo-hdm]

Rings in fossilised pine trees have proven that the world was much warmer than previously thought - and the earth has been slowly COOLING for 2,000 years. Measurements stretching back to 138BC prove that the Earth is slowly cooling due to changes in the distance between the Earth and the sun. The finding may force scientists to rethink current theories of the impact of global warming. It is the first time that researchers have been able to accurately measure trends in global temperature over the last two millennia. Over that time, the world has been getting cooler - and previous estimates, used as the basis for current climate science, are wrong. Their findings demonstrate that this trend involves a cooling of -0.3°C per millennium due to gradual changes to the position of the sun and an increase in the distance between the Earth and the sun. ‘This figure we calculated may not seem particularly significant,’ says Esper, ‘however, it is also not negligible when compared to global warming, which up to now has been less than 1°C. 'Our results suggest that the large-scale climate reconstruction shown by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) likely underestimate this long-term cooling trend over the past few millennia.’ The finding was based on semi-fossilised tree rings found in Finnish lapland. Professor Dr. Jan Esper's group at the Institute of Geography at JGU used tree-ring density measurements from sub-fossil pine trees originating from Finnish Lapland to produce a reconstruction reaching back to 138 BC. In so doing, the researchers have been able for the first time to precisely demonstrate that the long-term trend over the past two millennia has been towards climatic cooling. ‘We found that previous estimates of historical temperatures during the Roman era and the Middle Ages were too low,’ says Esper. ‘Such findings are also significant with regard to climate policy, as they will influence the way today's climate changes are seen in context of historical warm periods.’ The annual growth rings in trees are the most important witnesses over the past 1,000 to 2,000 years as they indicate how warm and cool past climate conditions were.

#### CO2 PROVIDES AN INSURANCE POLICY AGAINST ABRUPT CLIMATE CHANGE ENSURING THAT RAPID SHIFTS WONT HAPPEN

CO2 Science Magazine 03

(Center for the study of carbon dioxide and global exchange [www.co2science.org](http://www.co2science.org), “Rapid Climate Changes” Reviewed 22 January 2003  
<http://www.co2science.org/journal/2003/v6n4c1.htm> WYO/jr)

Although much is made of the role of models in studying "the complex interplay between Dansgaard-Oeschger warm phases and Heinrich cold events," Bard correctly reports that "at present, models coupling the atmosphere, ocean, and ice sheets are still unable to correctly simulate that variability on all scales in both time and space," which suggests we do not fully understand the dynamics of these rapid climate changes.  Indeed, he forcefully notes that "all the studies so far carried out fail to answer the crucial question: How close are we to the next bifurcation [which could cause a rapid change-of-state in earth's climate system]?"  In this regard, he also notes that "an intense debate continues in the modeling community about the reality of such instabilities under warm conditions [our italics]," which is a particularly important point, seeing that all dramatic warming and cooling events have been observed in either full glacial or transitional periods between glacials and interglacials.

This latter real-world fact clearly suggests we are unlikely to experience any dramatic warming or cooling surprises, as long as the earth does not beginning drifting towards glacial conditions, which is but another reason to not be concerned about the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content.  Indeed, it suggests that more CO2 in the atmosphere and its potential for modest warming are actually to be preferred as a preventive measure or "insurance policy" against unexpected abrupt climate changes.  Interglacial warmth seems to inoculate the planet against climatic instabilities, allowing only the mild millennial-scale climatic oscillation that alternately brings the earth slightly warmer and cooler conditions typical of the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age.  Hence, and in light of the fact that the four preceding interglacials were able to tolerate temperatures fully 2°C *warmer* than those of the current interglacial ([Petit *et al*., 1999](http://www.co2science.org/journal/1999/v2n12c1.htm)), without any adverse climatic consequences, humanity would probably be wise to not surrender the atmospheric CO2 insurance policy we worked so hard to put in place over the course of the Industrial Revolution.

# Defense Conversion

### Sustainable

#### First, American hard power remains unmatched in capability and weaponry-no country can go head to head with it and win

Kagan 2012

[Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, The World America Made, 2012 uwyo//amp]

Military capacity matters, too, as early-nineteenthcentury China learned and Chinese leaders know today. As Yan Xuetong recently noted, "Military strength underpins hegemony."86 Here the United States remains unmatched. It is far and away the most powerful nation the world has ever known, and there has been no decline in America's relative military capacity—at least not yet. Americans currently spend roughly $600 billion a year on defense, more than the rest of the other great powers combined.87 They do so, moreover, while consuming around 4 percent of GDP annually, a higher percentage than the other great powers but in historical terms lower than the 10 percent of GDP that the United States spent on defense in the mid-1950s or the 7 percent it spent in the late 19805. The superior expenditures underestimate America’s actual superiority in military capability. American land and air forces are equipped with the most advanced weaponry, are the most experienced in actual combat, and would defeat any competitor in a head-tohead battle. American naval power remains predominant in every region of the world. By these military and economic measures, at least, the United States today is not remotely like Britain circa 1900, when that empire's relative decline began to become apparent. It is more like Britain circa 1870, when the empire was at the height of its power. It is possible to imagine a time when this might no longer be the case, but that moment has not yet arrived.

#### Unipolarity solves Great Power Wars- American hegemony has stewarded 60 years of great power peace in an unprecedented break from history AND the transition won’t be smooth, Roman and British/European collapse destroyed economic systems, institutions, and lead to two World Wars

Kagan 2012

[Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, The World America Made, 2012 uwyo//amp]

We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today—the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic . crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are over a hundred. For four centuries prior to 1950, global gross domestic product (GDP) rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the twentieth century saw' the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past sixty years no great powers have gone to war with one another. Our era is best known for the war that never happened, between the United States and the Soviet Union.1 There's plenty wrong with our world, of course, but from the perspective of thousands of years of recorded history, in which war, despotism, and poverty have been the norm, and peace, democracy, and prosperity the rare exceptions, our own era has been a golden age. Some believe this is the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government—forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there is also another possibility. Perhaps the progress we enjoy was not an inevitable evolution of the human species but rather the product of a unique and perhaps fleeting set of circumstances: a particular arrangement of power in the international system that favors a certain worldview over others. Maybe if those conditions were to change, if power were to shift, then the characteristics of the world order would change, too. Perhaps democracy has spread to over a hundred nations since 1950 not simply because people yearn for democracy but because the most powerful nation in the world since 1950 has been a democracy. Perhaps the stunning global economic growth of the past six decades reflects an economic order shaped by the world's leading free-market economy. Per"haps the era of peace we have known has something to do with the enormous power wielded by one nation. History shows that world orders, including our own, are transient. They rise and fall. And the institutions they erected, the beliefs that guided them, and the "norms" that shaped the relations among nations within them—they fall, too. Every international order in history has reflected the beliefs and interests of its strongest powers, and every international order has changed when power shifted to others with different beliefs and interests. On some occasions, the prevailing world order has simply collapsed into disorder. When the Roman Empire fell, the order it supported fell, too. Not just Roman government and law but an entire economic system stretching from northern Europe to North Africa was disrupted and would take centuries to rebuild. Culture, the arts, even progress in science and technology, were set back for centuries. People lost the recipe for cement. We saw a similar collapse of world order in our own time. The world we know today was erected amid the chaos and destruction following World War II and the collapse of the European-dominated order that had evolved over four centuries. That order was far from perfect: it produced many wars, an aggressive imperialism, and the widespread oppression of nonwhite races, but it also produced the conditions for an era of great human advances. By the late nineteenth century British control of the seas and the balance of great powers on the European continent together had provided the relative security and stability to allow a growth in prosperity, a modest if tenuous expansion of personal freedoms, and a world knit closer by the revolutions in commerce and communication we today call globalization. It kept peace among the great powers for almost four decades after the Napoleonic Wars, and for another four decades after the wars of German unification. It was so successful that many concluded at the dawn of the twentieth century that mankind had reached a summit of evolution and that major war and tyranny had become obsolete. Yet with the outbreak of World War I, the age of settled peace and advancing liberalism—of European civilization approaching its pinnacle—collapsed into an age of hyper-nationalism, despotism, and economic calamity. The once promising spread of democracy and liberalism halted and then reversed course, leaving a handful of outnumbered and besieged democracies living nervously in the shadow of their newly fascist and totalitarian neighbors. Suddenly it was a world filled with predatory leaders sitting atop predatory powers. The collapse of the British and European orders in the twentieth century did not produce a new dark age—though if Nazi Germany and imperial Japan had won the war, it might have—but the cataclysm it did produce was, in its own way, no less devastating.

‘

### Warming

#### Heg solves global warming-leads to species extinction, ecosystem collapse, and the end of the global economy

Brzezinski 2012

[Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, CSIS Counselor and Trustee, 2012, Strategic Vision, uwyo//amp]

Global climate change is the final component of the environmental commons and the one with the greatest potential geopolitical impact. Scientists and policy makers alike have projected catastrophic consequences for mankind and the planet if the world average temperature rises by more than two degrees over the next century. Plant and animal species could grow extinct at a rapid pace, large-scale ecosystems could collapse, human migration could increase to untenable levels, and global economic development could be categorically reversed. Changes in geography, forced migration, and global economic contraction layered on top of the perennial regional security challenges could create a geopolitical reality of unmanageable complexity and conflict, especially in the densely populated and politically unstable areas of Asia such as the Northeast and South. Furthermore, any legitimate action inhibiting global climate change will require unprecedented levels of self-sacrifice and international cooperation. The United States does consider climate change a serious concern, but its lack of both long-term strategy and political commitment, evidenced in its refusal to ratify the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 and the repeated defeat of climate-change legislation in Congress, deters other countries from participating in a global agreement. The United States is the second-largest global emitter of carbon dioxide, after China, with 20% of the world's share. The United States is the number one per capita emitter of carbon dioxide and the global leader in per capita energy demand. Therefore, US leadership is essential in not only getting other countries to cooperate, but also in actually inhibiting climate change. ……Others around the world, including the European Union and Brazil, have attempted their own domestic reforms on carbon emissions and energy use, and committed themselves to pursuing renewable energy. Even China has made reducing emissions a goal, a fact it refuses to let the United States ignore. But none of those nations currently has the ability to lead a global initiative. President Obama committed the United States to energy and carbon reform at the Copenhagen Summit in 2009, but the increasingly polarized domestic political environment and the truculent American economic recovery are unlikely to inspire progress on costly energy issues. China is also critically important to any discussion of the management of climate change as it produces 21% of the world's total carbon emissions, a percentage that will only increase as China develops the western regions of its territory and as its citizens experience a growth in their standard of living. China, however, has refused to take on a leadership role in climate change, as it has also done in the maritime, : space, and cyberspace domains. China uses its designation as a developing country to shield itself from the demands of global stewardship. China's tough stance at the 2009 Copenhagen Summit underscores the potential dangers of an American decline: no other country has the capacity and the desire to accept global stewardship over the environmental commons. V Only a vigorous Unites States could lead on climate change, given Russia's dependence on carbon-based energies for economic growth, India's relatively low emissions rate, and China's current reluctance to assume global responsibility. The protection and good faith management of the global commons—sea, space, cyberspace, nuclear proliferation, water security, the Arctic, and the environment itself—are imperative to the long-term growth of the global economy and the continuation of basic geopolitical stability. But in almost every case, the potential absence of constructive and influential US leadership would fatally .undermine the essential communality of the global commons.

### 1NC: Global Goods-Disease

#### Alternative centers of power can’t provide global goods, key to check terrorism, poverty, disease and the environment.

Gelb 9

[Leslie H., President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs, “Necessity, Choice and Common Sense”, June 2009, p. asp ]

The real danger in this universe of primitivism and plenty is not new wars or explosions among major states, or a world war, or even a nuclear war. It is the specter of nations drowning in a flood of terrorism, tribal and religious hatred, lawlessness, poverty, disease, environmental calamities, and governmental incompetence. Many nations are going under because they are simply unable to cope, and they will drag others down with them. Managing these problems lies beyond the power of the weak and poor states themselves. And these states do not receive much succor from their neighbors or regional organizations. Major powers such as China, India, and Russia are not ready to lend others a hand, both because they are still evolving themselves and because they lack the tradition of helping those less fortunate. Europe and Japan do help in various ways, consistent with their goal of sustaining their own high standards of living. The United Nations helps with refugees, health care, and the like, but its members do not seem eager to take on additional responsibilities. Nongovernmental organizations heroically make life more bearable for ordinary people in unbearable situations with irredeemable governments.

#### Unchecked disease causes human extinction

**South China Morning Post,** 1-4-19**96** (Dr. Ben Abraham= “called "one of the 100 greatest minds in history" by super-IQ society Mensa” and owner of “Toronto-based biotechnology company, Structured Biologicals Inc” according to same article)

Despite the importance of the discovery of the "facilitating" cell, it is not what Dr Ben-Abraham wants to talk about. There is a much more pressing medical crisis at hand - one he believes the world must be alerted to: the possibility of a virus deadlier than HIV. If this makes Dr Ben-Abraham sound like a prophet of doom, then he makes no apology for it. AIDS, the Ebola outbreak which killed more than 100 people in Africa last year, the flu epidemic that has now affected 200,000 in the former Soviet Union - they are all, according to Dr Ben-Abraham, the "tip of the iceberg". Two decades of intensive study and research in the field of virology have convinced him of one thing: in place of natural and man-made disasters or nuclear warfare, humanity could face extinction because of a single virus, deadlier than HIV. "An airborne virus is a lively, complex and dangerous organism," he said. "It can come from a rare animal or from anywhere and can mutate constantly. If there is no cure, it affects one person and then there is a chain reaction and it is unstoppable. It is a tragedy waiting to happen." That may sound like a far-fetched plot for a Hollywood film, but Dr Ben -Abraham said history has already proven his theory. Fifteen years ago, few could have predicted the impact of AIDS on the world. MARKEDEbola has had sporadic outbreaks over the past 20 years and the only way the deadly virus - which turns internal organs into liquid - could be contained was because it was killed before it had a chance to spread. Imagine, he says, if it was closer to home: an outbreak of that scale in London, New York or Hong Kong. It could happen anytime in the next 20 years - theoretically, it could happen tomorrow. The shock of the AIDS epidemic has prompted virus experts to admit "that something new is indeed happening and that the threat of a deadly viral outbreak is imminent", said Joshua Lederberg of the Rockefeller University in New York, at a recent conference. He added that the problem was "very serious and is getting worse". Dr Ben-Abraham said: "Nature isn't benign. The survival of the human species is not a preordained evolutionary programme. Abundant sources of genetic variation exist for viruses to learn how to mutate and evade the immune system." He cites the 1968 Hong Kong flu outbreak as an example of how viruses have outsmarted human intelligence. And as new "mega-cities" are being developed in the Third World and rainforests are destroyed, disease-carrying animals and insects are forced into areas of human habitation. "This raises the very real possibility that lethal, mysterious viruses would, for the first time, infect humanity at a large scale and imperil the survival of the human race," he said.