## Off Case

### 1

#### Interpretation: Economic engagement requires the promotion of trade

Celik, 11 **–** master’s student at Uppsala University (Department of Peace and Conflict Research) (Arda, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies>)

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement policies differ from other tools in Economic Diplomacy. They target to deepen the economic relations to create economic intersection, interconnectness, and mutual dependence and finally seeks economic interdependence. This interdependence serves the sender state to change the political behaviour of target state. However they cannot be counted as carrots or inducement tools, they focus on long term strategic goals and they are not restricted with short term policy changes.(Kahler&Kastner,2006) They can be unconditional and focus on creating greater economic benefits for both parties. Economic engagement targets to seek deeper economic linkages via promoting institutionalized mutual trade thus mentioned interdependence creates two major concepts. Firstly it builds strong trade partnership to avoid possible militarized and non militarized conflicts. Secondly it gives a leeway to perceive the international political atmosphere from the same and harmonized perspective. Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows, “It is a policy of deliberate expanding economic ties with and adversary in order to change the behaviour of target state and improve bilateral relations”.(p523-abstact).It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term economic gains and more importantly; political gains. The main idea behind the engagement motivation is stated by Rosecrance (1977) in a way that “the direct and positive linkage of interests of states where a change in the position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.”

#### Violation: The plan is a non-trade promoting form of engagement that results in trade and an economic outcome. This only indirectly engages the country.

#### Voters-

#### Fairness: trade promotion is key to fair debates and neg strategy- affs that aren’t in the context of trade are unfair

#### Education: our interp is best for education- ensures debates that are about economic engagement. Our interpretation is grounded in lit.

#### Effects: even if they win the effect of the plan is increased trade that’s bad- it unlimits the resolution, undercuts neg ground, and makes topicality and solvency unnecessary

### 2

#### The United States federal government separates the environment from nature by separating it from other “spheres”. This allows the worst forms of manipulation to occur.

Luke 95 ‘On Environmentality: Geo-Power and Eco-Knowledge in the Discourses of Contemporary Environmentalism’ Cultural Critique, No. 31, The Politics of Systems and Environments, Part II p.57-81 (Autumn,1995), Phttp://www.jstor.org/stable/1354445 Accessed: 13/07/2012 12:05 BSH

The separation of organisms from their environments is the primary epistemological divide cutting through reality in the rhetorics of ecology. This discursive turn goes back to Haeckel's initial 1866 identification of ecology as the science that investigates all of the relations of an organism to its organic and inorganic environments. Nonetheless, there are differences among ecologists over what these "environments" might be. Because the expanse of the organic and inorganic environment is so broad, it often is defined in terms delimiting what it is by looking at what it is not. In other words, it is the organism, or biotic community, or local ecosystem that ecologists place at the center of their systems of study, while the environment is reduced to everything outside of the subject of analysis. With these maneuvers, environments are often transformed rhetorically into silences, backgrounds, or settings. In this manner, they also are studied and understood not directly as such, but more indirectly in terms of the objective relations and effects they register upon the subjects of study they surround. Even so, this inversion of one thing, like an organism or society, into everything, or the environment, might disclose the nature of the environment only in relation to this one thing. After all, environmental analysis must reduce "everything" to measures of "anything" available for measurement (like temperature levels, gas concentrations, molecular dispersions, resource variations, or growth rates) to track variations in "something" (like an organism's, a biome's, or a river's responses to these factors). But is it "the environment" that is being understood here, or is its identity being evaded in reducing it to a subset of practicable measurements? Does this vision of "environment" really capture the actual quality or true quantity of all human beings' interrelations with all of the terrains, waters, climates, soils, architectures, technologies, societies, economies, cultures, or states surrounding them? In its most expansive applications, then, the environment becomes a strong but sloppy force: it is anything out there, everything around us, something affecting us, nothing within us, but also a thing upon which we act. Despite its formal definitions, however, the environment is not, in fact, everything. Many environmental discourses look instead at particular sites or at peculiar forces. The discursive variations and conceptual confrontations of the "environment" really begin to explode when different voices accentuate this or that set of things in forming their environmental analysis. On the one side, they may privilege forces in the ecosphere, or, on the other side, they might stress concerns from the technosphere. But in either case, each rhetoric which operates as an agency protecting "the environment" struggles to site "the environmental" as a somewhere affected by or coming from everything. Perhaps the early origins of "the environment" as a conceptits historical emergence and original applications-might prove more helpful. In its original sense, which is borrowed by English from Old French, an environment is an action resulting from, or the state of being produced by a verb: "to environ." And environing as a verb is, in fact, a type of strategic action. To environ is to encircle, encompass, envelop, or enclose. It is the physical activity of surrounding, circumscribing, or ringing around something. Its uses even suggest stationing guards around, thronging with hostile intent, or standing watch over some person or place. To environ a site or a subject is to beset, beleaguer, or besiege that place or person. An environment, as either the means of such activity or the product of these actions, now might be read in a more suggestive manner. It is the encirclement, circumscription, or beleaguerment of places and persons in a strategic disciplinary policing of space. An environmental act, in turn, is already a disciplining move, aimed at constructing some expanse of space-a locale, a biome, a planet as biospherical space, or, on the other hand, some city, any region, the global economy in technospherical territory-in a discursive envelope. Within these enclosures, environmental expertise can arm environmentalists who stand watch over these surroundings, guarding the rings that include or exclude forces, agents, and ideas. If one thinks about it, this original use of "the environment" is an accurate account of what is, in fact, happening in many environmental practices today. Environmentalized places become sites of supervision, where environmentalists see from above and from without through the enveloping designs of administratively delimited systems. Encircled by enclosures of alarm, environments can be disassembled, recombined, and subjected to the disciplinary designs of expert management. Enveloped in these interpretive frames, environments can be redirected to fulfill the ends of other economic scripts, managerial directives, and administrative writs. Environing, then, engenders "environmentality," which embeds instrumental rationalities in the policing of ecological spaces.

#### The environment always exceeds human meddling—more intervention only worsens the cycle of crisis, guaranteeing ecological extinction- this turns the case.

Luke, 2001 (Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2001 Education, Environment and Sustainability: what are the issues, where to intervene, what must be done? TIMOTHY W. LUKE Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA, also he blew up the death star)

Commoner also presents these two worlds as being `at war’ . As humans in the technosphere disrupt the ecosphere, the ecosphere responds with equally or more disruptive secondary effects in the technosphere. In some sense, the environment is `nature’ for Commoner, but it is also `society’ , or, perhaps more accurately, a new composite of `nature-as-transformed-by-society’ . Commoner stresses this interpretation in The Closing Circle when he claims `the environment is, so to speak, the house created on the earth by living things, for living things’ (Commoner, 1971, p. 32). This representation of the environment as life’ s house, however, does little more than reduce it to a biophysical housing of all living thingsÐ or, again, the setting that surrounds organisms.Pesticides often are used to typify how environmental destruction happens in this conceptual register. A chemical agent is applied by humans in the technosphere on something in the biosphere, like weeds or animal pests. While this application was intended to eradicate only those plants or animals that destroyed crops, carried disease and infested dwellings, its impact was much broader. Soon pesticides jumped the dualist chasm and spread through everything in the ecosphereÐ both human technosphere and non-human biosphereÐ returning from `out there’ in natural environments back into plant, animal and human bodies situated `in here’ , affecting those arti® cial environments with unintended, unanticipated and unwanted negative effects. This recognition begins with Carson (1962). Many environmental educators accept this ontological momentum in ordinary Education 195 language use and allow the reductionist and dualist vision of the environment to in® ltrate their visions of human concern for the Earth’ s ecologies. Up to a point, this view works, but the limited advantage it provides culminate in resource, risk and recreationist managerialism. When the world is divisible into environment and society, nature and community, ecology and economics, environmental education’ s charge is to enlighten everyone about how to mitigate the damage caused by the latter on the former. Hence, various environmental protection agencies, built `in here’ by society to safeguard what is `out there’ in nature, can mobilise agents and activities to reduce resource use, mitigate risks, and contain recreational degradation in the environment. These approaches `work’ , but their workability is short-term and limited. They overlook how resources are misused, risks are avoidable and recreations are mutable.

#### Vote negative to unravel the 1ac.

#### Interrogating the way contemporary environmental policy is bound within market relations best enables more sustainable ethics

Luke, 2001 (Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2001 Education, Environment and Sustainability: what are the issues, where to intervene, what must be done? TIMOTHY W. LUKE Department of Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA, USA, also he blew up the death star)

To create a truly more sustainable society, environmental education must unravel the complicated cycles of production and consumption, which are interwoven through most technological and economic practices in contemporary transnational commerce and this unravelling must show how these cycles are verging upon almost complete chaos. Highly planned programmes for economic growth are creating many unintended and unplanned outcomes of environmental destruction, boosting society’ s already high ecological risks to even higher levels. Most steps taken to mitigate these risks will not be executed with much certainty of successfully gaining their intended ends. Doing anything could make everything worse, doing nothing might make something better. At this juncture, environmental education must redefine some shared values for an ecological society. Unfortunately, most academic disciplines, from ecology to economics, are shackled by a set of disciplinary practices that constrain the imagination to ® t the approved scope and correct method of normal disciplinary inquiry. When Eugene Odum, for example, asserts that ecology is a `major interdisciplinary science that links together the biological, physical, and social sciences’ (Odum, 1975), very few biological, physical, or social scientists accept this broad interdisciplinary charge. Any ecology worth of its name would concede immediately that the economy and society are the Earth’ s main environments. This reality is acknowledged by Moscovici in his re¯ ections about the question of nature in the contemporary world system. That is, science and technology have reconstituted humanity as a new material force, working on planetary basis. `In 200 T. W. Luke short’ , he asserts, `the state of nature is not now just an economy of things; it has become at the same time the work of human beings. The fact is that we are dealing with a new nature’ (Moscovici, 1990). This fact and how the work of human beings continuously remediates this new nature are what environmental education must address to attain sustainability. Without sinking into a green foundationalist stance, environmental education must weave an analysis of power, politics and the state into an ecology’ s sense of sustainability, survival and the environment. This kind of interdisciplinary effort could develop a deeply contextual understanding of nature and society as holistic cluster of interdependent relations. This view should integrate a clear sense of how ecological constraints must reshape social/political/economic/cultural practices to move past the technological and environmental failings of the present global economy. In turn, this critical account of humanity’ s ecological failings, once it came common in environmental education classes, should open broader dialogues about how individuals, as both citizens and consumers, can intervene as defenders of their local habitats in many corners of today’ s global economy

### 3

#### Text: The United State federal government should substantially increase market-fixed production cost incentives for electricity from Small Modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors. The United States federal government should engage the United Mexican States to encourage Small Modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor construction and grid integration. The United States Federal Government should not increase renewable energy integration with the United Mexican States.

#### This causes a thorium renaissance

Rosner and Goldberg ‘11 (Robert (William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics) and Stephen (Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory) , *Energy Policy Institute at Chicago*, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.”, Technical Paper, Revision 1, November 2011)

Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets.43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following: 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 authorized a production tax credit of $18/MWh (1.8¢/kWh) for up to 6,000 MW of new nuclear power plant capacity. To qualify, a project must commence operations by 2021. Treasury Department guidelines further required that a qualifying project initiate construction, defined as the pouring of safety- related concrete, by 2014. Currently, two GW-scale projects totaling 4,600 MW are in early construction; consequently, as much as 1,400 MW in credits is available for other nuclear projects, including SMRs. The budgetary cost of providing the production cost incentive depends on the learning rate and the market price of electricity generated from the SMR project. Higher learning rates and higher market prices would decrease the magnitude of the incentive; lower rates and lower market prices would increase the need for production incentives. Using two scenarios (with market prices based on the cost of natural gas combined-cycle generation) yields the following range of estimates of the size of production incentives required for the FOAK plants described earlier. For a 10% learning rate, 􏰂 Based on a market price of $60/MWh44 (6¢/kWh), the LEAD plant and the subsequent eight FOAK plants would need, on average, a production credit of $13.60/MWh (1.4¢/kWh), 24% less than the $18 credit currently available to renewable and GW-scale nuclear technologies. (The actual credit would be on a sliding scale, with the credit for the LEAD plant at approximately $31/MWh, or 3.1¢/kWh, declining to a credit of about $6/MWh, or 0.6¢/kWh, by the time of deployment of FOAK-8). The total cost of the credit would be about $600 million per year (once all plants were built and operating). If the market price were about $70/MWh (7¢/kWh), the LEAD and only four subsequent FOAK plants would require a production incentive. In this case, the average incentive would be $8.40/MWh (0.8¢/kWh), with a total cost of about $200 million per year. Higher learning rates would drive down the size of the production incentive. For example, at a 12% learning rate, 􏰂 At a market price of $60/MWh (6¢/kWh), the LEAD and the subsequent five FOAK plants would require a production incentive, with an average incentive level of about $15/MWh (1.5¢/kWh). Total annual cost (after all plants are in full operation) would be about $450 million per year. 􏰂 At a market price of $70/MWh (7¢/kWh), the LEAD and three FOAK plants would require a production incentive averaging $9.00/MWh (0.9¢/kWh, half of the current statutory incentive), with a total annual cost of about $170 million per year. The range of costs for the production incentive illustrates the sensitivity of the incentive level to the learning rate and the market price of electricity. Thus, efforts to achieve higher learning rates, including fully optimized engineering designs for the SMRs and the manufacturing plant, as well as specially targeted market introduction opportunities that enable SMRs to sell electricity for higher priced and higher value applications, can have a critical impact on the requirements for production incentives. The potential size of the incentive should be subject to further analysis as higher quality cost estimates become available.

#### Solves warming

Shellenberger et al ‘12 (Michael, founder of the Breakthrough Institute and MA in anthropology from UC Santa Cruz, Ted Nordhaus, Chairman of the Breakthrough Institute, and Jessica Lovering, Policy analyst in the Energy and Climate Program at the Breakthrough Institute with MA’s in Astrophysics and Environmental Studies from CU-Boulder. “New Nukes: Why We Need Radical Innovation to Make New Nuclear Energy Cheap” The Breakthrough Institute, <http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/programs/energy-and-climate/new-nukes/>)

Arguably, the biggest impact of Fukushima on the nuclear debate, ironically, has been to force a growing number of pro-nuclear environmentalists out of the closet, including us. The reaction to the accident by anti-nuclear campaigners and many Western publics put a fine point on the gross misperception of risk that informs so much anti-nuclear fear. Nuclear remains the only proven technology capable of reliably generating zero-carbon energy at a scale that can have any impact on global warming. Climate change -- and, for that matter, the enormous present-day health risks associated with burning coal, oil, and gas -- simply dwarf any legitimate risk associated with the operation of nuclear power plants. About 100,000 people die every year due to exposure to air pollutants from the burning of coal. By contrast, about 4,000 people have died from nuclear energy -- ever -- almost entirely due to Chernobyl. But rather than simply lecturing our fellow environmentalists about their misplaced priorities, and how profoundly inadequate present-day renewables are as substitutes for fossil energy, we would do better to take seriously the real obstacles standing in the way of a serious nuclear renaissance. Many of these obstacles have nothing to do with the fear-mongering of the anti-nuclear movement or, for that matter, the regulatory hurdles imposed by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and similar agencies around the world. As long as nuclear technology is characterized by enormous upfront capital costs, it is likely to remain just a hedge against overdependence on lower-cost coal and gas, not the wholesale replacement it needs to be to make a serious dent in climate change. Developing countries need large plants capable of bringing large amounts of new power to their fast-growing economies. But they also need power to be cheap. So long as coal remains the cheapest source of electricity in the developing world, it is likely to remain king. The most worrying threat to the future of nuclear isn't the political fallout from Fukushima -- it's economic reality. Even as new nuclear plants are built in the developing world, old plants are being retired in the developed world. For example, Germany's plan to phase-out nuclear simply relies on allowing existing plants to be shut down when they reach the ends of their lifetime. Given the size and cost of new conventional plants today, those plants are unlikely to be replaced with new ones. As such, the combined political and economic constraints associated with current nuclear energy technologies mean that nuclear energy's share of global energy generation is unlikely to grow in the coming decades, as global energy demand is likely to increase faster than new plants can be deployed. To move the needle on nuclear energy to the point that it might actually be capable of displacing fossil fuels, we'll need new nuclear technologies that are cheaper and smaller. Today, there are a range of nascent, smaller nuclear power plant designs, some of them modifications of the current light-water reactor technologies used on submarines, and others, like thorium fuel and fast breeder reactors, which are based on entirely different nuclear fission technologies. Smaller, modular reactors can be built much faster and cheaper than traditional large-scale nuclear power plants. Next-generation nuclear reactors are designed to be incapable of melting down, produce drastically less radioactive waste, make it very difficult or impossible to produce weapons grade material, useless water, and require less maintenance. Most of these designs still face substantial technical hurdles before they will be ready for commercial demonstration. That means a great deal of research and innovation will be necessary to make these next generation plants viable and capable of displacing coal and gas. The United States could be a leader on developing these technologies, but unfortunately U.S. nuclear policy remains mostly stuck in the past. Rather than creating new solutions, efforts to restart the U.S. nuclear industry have mostly focused on encouraging utilities to build the next generation of large, light-water reactors with loan guarantees and various other subsidies and regulatory fixes. With a few exceptions, this is largely true elsewhere around the world as well. Nuclear has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress for more than 60 years, but the enthusiasm is running out. The Obama administration deserves credit for authorizing funding for two small modular reactors, which will be built at the Savannah River site in South Carolina. But a much more sweeping reform of U.S. nuclear energy policy is required. At present, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has little institutional knowledge of anything other than light-water reactors and virtually no capability to review or regulate alternative designs. This affects nuclear innovation in other countries as well, since the NRC remains, despite its many critics, the global gold standard for thorough regulation of nuclear energy. Most other countries follow the NRC's lead when it comes to establishing new technical and operational standards for the design, construction, and operation of nuclear plants. What's needed now is a new national commitment to the development, testing, demonstration, and early stage commercialization of a broad range of new nuclear technologies -- from much smaller light-water reactors to next generation ones -- in search of a few designs that can be mass produced and deployed at a significantly lower cost than current designs. This will require both greater public support for nuclear innovation and an entirely different regulatory framework to review and approve new commercial designs. In the meantime, developing countries will continue to build traditional, large nuclear power plants. But time is of the essence. With the lion's share of future carbon emissions coming from those emerging economic powerhouses, the need to develop smaller and cheaper designs that can scale faster is all the more important. A true nuclear renaissance can't happen overnight. And it won't happen so long as large and expensive light-water reactors remain our only option. But in the end, there is no credible path to mitigating climate change without a massive global expansion of nuclear energy. If you care about climate change, nothing is more important than developing the nuclear technologies we will need to get that job done.

### 4

#### Congressional maneuvering can force a vote, even if that fails it strongly pressures GOP action on reform

UPI 2-14 (Obama predicts immigration reform no later than 2017, <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2014/02/14/Obama-predicts-immigration-reform-no-later-than-2017/UPI-83101392360045/#ixzz2tNcqgRmN>)

Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., said Thursday a procedural maneuver to circumvent the House Republican majority could revive stalled efforts on immigration.¶ He told the New York Times he was considering a legislative tactic known as a discharge petition to bring sweeping immigration legislation out of committee to the floor for consideration. The tactic, which has succeeded only twice since 1985, is done by bringing the measure directly to the House floor, bypassing the regular committee process, and usually without the cooperation of House leadership.¶ A successful petition "discharges" the committee from further consideration of a bill and brings it directly to the floor.¶ The petition would require the support of an absolute majority of House members, meaning if all Democrats supported the measure, it would still need more than a dozen Republican signatures, the Times said.¶ Schumer, one of the architects of a comprehensive immigration reform measure that passed the Senate in June, told the newspaper GOP House members were trying to "sweep this issue under the rug."¶ "In the next few months you're going to see increased pressure, and the discharge petition is one such way," he said.¶ Some Democratic lawmakers said the scheme would, at best, simply keep alive an election-year issue GOP lawmakers aligned with the Tea Party movement strongly oppose.¶ Michael Steel, a spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, told the Times Schumer's "scheme has zero chance of success."¶ "A clear majority in the House understands that the massive Senate-passed bill is deeply flawed," Steel said. "That's why we will continue to work on step-by-step, common-sense reform."¶ The Senate bill included a path to citizenship for the 11 million immigrants living in the country without legal permission.¶ House Republicans largely reject the measure as "amnesty." They have called for a piecemeal approach, with smaller bills.¶ Boehner, who tried to advance immigration reform at a recent GOP retreat, told reporters Feb. 6 the idea was all but dead this year.¶ His comments came two days after Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., who faces a primary challenge, predicted the immigration push would stall, saying the dissimilar approaches between the House and Senate presented "sort of an irresolvable conflict."¶ Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., said Feb. 2 comprehensive immigration reform was "clearly in doubt" this year.¶ Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, told Roll Call Feb. 4 Boehner should lose his speakership if he pursues the bill, which could be seen as giving Obama a legislative victory in a midterm election year.¶ "Discharge petitions are difficult, but when they work, it's because there's a clear majority of the body that supports a specific proposal, and in this case, that is true," Schumer told the Times. "But I have no illusions that this will be easy in any way."¶ Some Democratic lawmakers told the newspaper even if the maneuver fails, it would pressure Boehner and other Republicans to act on some form of immigration overhaul this year -- and could help Democrats looking toward the 2016 presidential elections.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to pushing CIR and getting Republicans on board

Pace and Espo 2-1 (Julie Pace, David Espo, Associated Press writers, Ahead of elections, GOP wary of immigration issue, <http://bostonherald.com/news_opinion/us_politics/2014/02/ahead_of_elections_gop_wary_of_immigration_issue>, 2-1-14) aln

President Barack Obama's new declaration that he's open to legal status for many immigrants short of citizenship sounds a lot like House Speaker John Boehner and other GOP leaders, an election-year compromise that numerous Republicans as well as Democrats crave. But the drive for the first overhaul in three decades still faces major resistance from many Republicans who are wary that the divisive issue could derail what they see as a smooth glide path to winning November's congressional elections. And they deeply distrust the Democratic president to enforce the law. Just hours after Boehner pitched immigration to the GOP at a Maryland retreat, Obama suddenly indicated he would be open to legal status for many of the 11 million living here illegally, dropping his once-ironclad insistence on a special path to citizenship. Democrats, including Obama, and other immigration proponents have warned repeatedly about the creation of a two-tier class system. "If the speaker proposes something that says right away, folks aren't being deported, families aren't being separated, we're able to attract top young students to provide the skills or start businesses here, and then there's a regular process of citizenship, I'm not sure how wide the divide ends up being," Obama said in a CNN interview that was recorded Thursday and aired Friday. Obama's flexibility is a clear indication of the president's desire to secure an elusive legislative achievement before voters decide whether to hand him even more opposition in Congress. Republicans are expected to maintain their grip on the House and have a legitimate shot at grabbing the majority in the Senate. "I'm going to do everything I can in the coming months to see if we can get this over the finish line," Obama said Friday of an immigration overhaul in a Google Plus Hangout talk.

#### Renewable energy investment causes backlash

Leone 12 (Steve, Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World, "Part 2: Political Reality and the Way Forward for Renewable Energy," 4/3/12, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/04/part-2-political-reality-and-the-way-forward-for-renewable-energy)

New Hampshire, U.S.A. -- Political heavyweights know this about their rough-and-tumble game – you project victory long before the results are in. And when you think you've won, you never give your opponent an opening. In Washington, it’s hard enough to craft legislation even in relatively amicable times. In the tense atmosphere on the Hill today, meaningful legislation takes a ringside seat, and the game becomes theater. That’s where we are now. In one corner is the House budget, essentially the Republican Party’s line in the sand that’s been drawn over the size of the federal government. A key component of this is the federal government’s more limited role in supporting a clean energy future. In the other corner is the White House and the Democrat-controlled Senate, which has vowed to stonewall any legislation that it says caters to the super-wealthy and the entrenched fossil fuels industry. Like two tired boxers in the ring, they’re content to leave it in the hands of the judges — in this case the voters, who will in many ways determine the force with which our federal government pursues a national policy built on clean energy. But the real prospects for any meaningful legislation is likely to come after the election, when the rhetoric cools and when political capital comes due. Until then, most industry observers don’t expect much chance of any real federal renewable energy legislation passing through a divided Congress. That means no Clean Energy Standard, no revival of the 1603 Treasury grant program, no extension of the Production Tax Credit until the end of the year at the earliest. There are just too few vehicles that can be used to pass any of the measures, and too little trust between key negotiators to find find common ground. One of the last best hopes — the transportation bill — included an amendment that addressed some of these concerns. Ultimately, the amendment went nowhere, and the renewable industry was left looking months down the road to when something could get resolved. The question now is will it be too late. For 1603 to be brought back to life, it would require a major shift in thinking, especially in the House. The PTC has a better shot, but international players in the wind industry are already indicating that they’ll get out of the market if the credit tied to energy produced expires. Will they wait around until the end of the year to see if it can be revived? It’s increasingly looking like the answer may be no.

#### CIR’s key to future economic competitiveness

Kramer ‘14 (Hilary Kramer, top investment manager, MBA, University of Pennsylvania, 2/11/2014, How Immigration Reform - Or Lack Thereof - Is Hurting Our Economic Competitiveness, http://www.forbes.com/sites/hilarykramer/2014/02/11/how-immigration-reform-or-lack-thereof-is-hurting-our-economic-competitiveness/

With Washington often appearing hopelessly gridlocked, there’s one issue critical to the nation’s economic health that both parties seem to agree on: the need to fix the nation’s broken immigration system. In particular, the US needs to take advantage of the global high-skilled labor supply to meet demand as our global competitors step up their game to attract the best and brightest talent.¶ There’s agreement among government officials and industry leaders that America should be the world’s number one destination for highly-skilled workers. The H-1B visa program was created to connect those individuals with U.S. employers who can’t find domestic workers with the right skill sets. Without the H-1B program, many companies would be unable to find workers with the science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills (STEM) they need to innovate and grow.¶ The federal government only makes 65,000 of these highly coveted visas available each year. Applications become available on April 1st, and like a hot concert ticket are gone within days. According to the US Citizenship and Immigration Services, they received 124,000 H-1B petitions during the last filing period, including those filed for a special advanced degree exemption. Clearly, demand for these workers is staggering and continues to grow every year. The U.S. Senate and House both rightly recognize that the current arbitrary visa cap must be raised.¶ But there are critical differences between the House and Senate when it comes to highly-skilled worker visas that are not well-known.¶ Last summer, the House Judiciary Committee passed the “Skills Visa Act,” which would increase the number of H-1B visas and make the visa selection process fairer. Most importantly, the bill drops the discriminatory “outplacement” language present in the Senate bill that would bar IT services firms from sending specialists to work on-site at client facilities if more than 15% of the IT firm’s U.S. workforce consists of visa workers.¶ This is an arbitrary, protectionist (most of the IT services firms meeting the criteria are based in India) labor-backed amendment that has nothing to do with safeguarding American jobs. The temporary visa allocations will simply shift to other, larger corporations that manage to skate under the 15% cap due to their legacy U.S. labor force. In fact, so-called “H-1B dependent” firms targeted by the Senate bill would be forced to pay higher wages to their existing visa workers than they would have to pay to U.S.-born workers. Do the unions truly believe that it makes sense for the government to require businesses to pay foreign workers more than Americans?¶ What’s more, these “H-1B dependent” companies would be hit with new restrictions on the number of visa workers and filing fees that are in some cases nearly quintuple what other companies would pay. If these onerous provisions were to become law, U.S. jobs would most likely be outsourced or eliminated all together. And this is to say nothing of the impact on U.S. businesses that have established long-standing relationships with their IT services providers, particularly in the financial sector, if they are forced to disrupt these relationships by government fiat.¶ In general, those who claim increasing the number of skilled foreign workers costs American jobs are simply wrong on the facts. Economist Giovanni Peri of the University of California, Davis wrote in a report published by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco: “Data show that, on net, immigrants expand the U.S. economy’s productive capacity, stimulate investment, and promote specialization that in the long run boosts productivity…there is no evidence that these effects take place at the expense of jobs for workers born in the United States.”¶ In a study published last year, Peri and his fellow researchers found that foreign scientists and engineers with H-1B visas contributed to 10%-20% of the annual productivity growth in the US from 1990 to 2010.This immigrant-driven growth boosted GDP per capita by 4%, and increased the size of the economy by $615 billion in 2010. Peri and his colleagues also reported that H-1B holders had no negative impact on U.S.- born workers with similar skills and actually increased the compensation and overall employment of American-born scientists and engineers. Clearly, allowing more talented and entrepreneurial individuals into the country will lead to more jobs for all Americans, greater productivity growth and increased economic benefits.¶ Sustaining a robust pipeline for highly-skilled workers and keeping America competitive are two sides of the same coin. Consider the alternative: if these highly trained engineers, scientists, mathematicians and programmers are not allowed to stay and work in the U.S., they’ll simply end up helping one of our global competitors grow their own economy.¶ Similarly, college graduates with STEM degrees that are not allowed to stay and work in the U.S. will leave.¶ This undermines U.S. competitiveness and the ability of businesses to hire the talented workers they need. As President Obama said last year, “There are brilliant students from all over the world sitting in classrooms at our top universities. We’re giving them all the skills they need to figure that out. But then we’re going to turn around and tell them to start that business and create those jobs in China or India or Mexico…That’s not how you grow new industries in America.”¶ Another way to look at foreign born entrepreneurs’ impact on economic growth is in startup formation. A study conducted by Duke professor Vivek Wadhwa, who was cited last year by Time Magazine as one of the Top 40 Most Influential Minds in Tech, showed that a quarter of technology-based companies started between 1995 and 2005 had a foreign-born CEO or chief technologist. These new companies posted revenue of $52 billion and employed a staggering 450,000 people.¶ Furthermore, a report by the Kauffman Foundation held that “…immigrants were more than twice as likely to start businesses each month than were the native-born in 2010.” According to the Brookings Institution, “…among people with advanced degrees, immigrants are three times more likely to file patents than US-born citizens. Such investments in new businesses and in research may provide spillover benefits to US-born workers by enhancing job creation and by increasing innovation among their US-born peers.”¶ Simply put, the current limits for highly-skilled individuals to work in this country put the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace. These limits must be lifted while maintaining a level playing field for all those who need to tap that global talent pool to succeed – and without discriminatory carve-outs for special interests that will simply drive jobs offshore.¶ Fixing our immigration system is crucial as our country faces increasingly competitive challenges in the years ahead. Washington needs to take “yes” as an answer for once and take action on an issue that members of both parties say is long past due.¶

#### Competitiveness key to primacy and averting great power war

Baru ‘9 Sanjaya Baru, professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School in Singapore, “Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis,” Strategic Analysis 33:2, March 2009, pp. 163-168

Hence, **economic policies and performance do** have strategic consequences.2 In the modern era, the idea that **strong economic** performance is the foundation of power was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. **'Victory** (in war)', Kennedy claimed, **'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base**'.3 **Drawing attention to the interrelationships between** economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence, Kennedy argued that **nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others**. 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, **'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances**; and further, that the **rising and falling** of the various empires and states in the international system **has been confirmed by the outcomes of the** major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 In Kennedy's view, **the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and** military power. The classic 'guns versus butter' dilemma. Apart from such fiscal disempowerment of the State, **economic under-performance would also reduce a nation's attraction as a market, as a source of capital and technology, and as a 'knowledge power'**. As power shifted from Europe to America, so did the knowledge base of the global economy. **As China's power rises, so does its profile as a 'knowledge economy'**. Impressed by such arguments, the **China** Academy of Social Sciences **developed the concept of** Comprehensive National Power (**CNP) to get China's political and military leadership to focus more clearly on economic and technological performance** than on military power alone **in its quest for Great Power status**.5 **While China's impressive economic performance, and the consequent rise in China's global profile, has forced strategic analysts to acknowledge this link**, the recovery of the US economy in the 1990s had reduced the appeal of the Kennedy thesis in Washington, DC. We must expect a revival of interest in Kennedy's arguments in the current context. A historian of power who took Kennedy seriously, Niall Ferguson, has helped keep the focus on the geopolitical implications of economic performance. In his masterly survey of the role of finance in the projection of state power, Ferguson defines the 'square of power' as the tax bureaucracy, the parliament, the national debt, and the central bank. These four institutions of 'fiscal empowerment' of the state enable nations to project power by mobilizing and deploying financial resources to that end.6 **Ferguson shows how vital sound** economic management is to strategic policy and national power. More recently, Ferguson has been drawing a parallel between the role of debt and financial crises in the decline of the Ottoman and Soviet Empires and that of the United States. In an early comment on the present financial crisis, Ferguson wrote: We are indeed living through a global shift in the balance of power very similar to that which occurred in the 1870s. This is the story of how an over-extended empire sought to cope with an external debt crisis by selling off revenue streams to foreign investors. **The empire that suffered these setbacks in the 1870s was the Ottoman empire. Today it is the US. … It remains to** be seen how quickly today's financial shift will be followed by a comparable geopolitical shift in favour of the new export and energy empires of the east. Suffice to say that the historical analogy does not bode well for America's quasi-imperial network of bases and allies across the Middle East and Asia. Debtor empires sooner or later have to do more than just sell shares to satisfy their creditors. … as in the 1870s the balance of financial power is shifting. Then, the move was from the ancient oriental empires (not only the Ottoman but also the Persian and Chinese) to western Europe. Today the shift is from the US - and other western financial centres - to the autocracies of the Middle East and East Asia. …7 An economic or financial crisis may not trigger the decline of an empire. It can certainly speed up a process already underway. In the case of the Soviet Union, the financial crunch caused by the Afghan War came on top of years of economic under-performance and the loss of political legitimacy of the Soviet State. In a democratic society like the United States, the political legitimacy of the state is constantly renewed through periodic elections. Thus, the election of Barack Obama may serve to renew the legitimacy of the state and by doing so enable the state to undertake measures that restore health to the economy. This the Soviet State was unable to do under Gorbachev even though he repudiated the Brezhnev legacy and distanced himself from it. Hence, **one must not become an economic determinist, and historic parallels need not always be relevant.** Politics can intervene and offer solutions**. Political economy and politics, in the form of Keynesian economics and the 'New Deal' did intervene to influence the geopolitical implications of the Great Depression. Whether they will do so once again in today's America remains to be seen**.

## Case

### Warming

#### No anthropogenic consensus

Walter ‘7 Christopher Walter, former policy advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, "Consensus? What Consensus?" Science and Public Policy Institute, July 2007, accessed 1/8/10 http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/consensus.pdf

There is indeed a consensus that humankind is putting large quantities of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere; that some warming has resulted; and that some further warming can be expected. However, there is less of a consensus about whether most of the past half-century’s warming is anthropogenic, which is why, rightly, Oreskes is cautious enough to circumscribe her definition of the “consensus” about the anthropogenic contribution to warming over the past half-century with the qualifying adjective “likely”. There is no scientific consensus on how much the world has warmed or will warm; how much of the warming is natural; how much impact greenhouse gases have had or will have on temperature; how sea level, storms, droughts, floods, flora, and fauna will respond to warmer temperature; what mitigative steps – if any – we should take; whether (if at all) such steps would have sufficient (or any) climatic effect; or even whether we should take any steps at all. Campaigners for climate alarm state or imply that there is a scientific consensus on all of these things, when in fact there is none. They imply that Oreskes’ essay proves the consensus on all of these things. Al Gore, for instance, devoted a long segment of his film *An Inconvenient Truth* to predicting the imminent meltdown of the Greenland and West Antarctic ice-sheets, with a consequent global increase of 20 feet (6 m) in sea level that would flood Manhattan, Shanghai, Bangladesh, and other coastal settlements. He quoted Oreskes’ essay as proving that all credible climate scientists were agreed on the supposed threat from climate change. He did not point out, however, that Oreskes’ definition of the “consensus” on climate change did not encompass, still less justify, his alarmist notions. Let us take just one example. The UN’s latest report on climate change, which is claimed as representing and summarizing the state of the scientific “consensus” insofar as there is one, says that the total contribution of ice-melt from Greenland and Antarctica to the rise in sea level over the whole of the coming century will not be the 20 feet luridly illustrated by Al Gore in his movie, but just 2 inches. Gore’s film does not represent the “consensus” at all. Indeed, he exaggerates the supposed effects of ice-melt by some 12,000 per cent. The UN, on the other hand, estimates the probability that humankind has had any influence on sea level at little better than 50:50. The BBC, of course, has not headlined, or even reported, the UN’s “counterconsensual” findings. Every time the BBC mentions “climate change”, it shows the same tired footage of a glacier calving into the sea – which is what glaciers do every summer.

#### No warming impact—lack of evidence, no harm in CO2, their authors are biased

Allegre et al. ’12 Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming,” Wall Street Journal, 1/27/2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html#articleTabs%3Darticle

Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO2 can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2. The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted—or worse. They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the journal Climate Research, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job. This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death. Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money." Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them.

#### Warming impacts overstated—new data

Taylor ’11 James Taylor, senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, 7/27/2011, http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and our elected officials would be wise to take notice. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

#### Can’t solve warming—emission patterns are locked in

Dye 12 Lee Dye, “It May Be Too Late to Stop Global Warming,” ABC News, 10/26/2012, http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/late-stop-global-warming/story?id=17557814&singlePage=true#.UI58icXR5DA

Here's a dark secret about the earth's changing climate that many scientists believe, but few seem eager to discuss: It's too late to stop global warming. Greenhouse gasses pumped into the planet's atmosphere will continue to grow even if the industrialized nations cut their emissions down to the bone. Furthermore, the severe measures that would have to be taken to make those reductions stand about the same chance as that proverbial snowball in hell. Two scientists who believe we are on the wrong track argue in the current issue of the journal Nature Climate Change that global warming is inevitable and it's time to switch our focus from trying to stop it to figuring out how we are going to deal with its consequences. "At present, governments' attempts to limit greenhouse-gas emissions through carbon cap-and-trade schemes and to promote renewable and sustainable energy sources are probably too late to arrest the inevitable trend of global warming," Jasper Knight of Wits University in Johannesburg, South Africa, and Stephan Harrison of the University of Exeter in England argue in their study. Those efforts, they continue, "have little relationship to the real world." What is clear, they contend, is a profound lack of understanding about how we are going to deal with the loss of huge land areas, including some entire island nations, and massive migrations as humans flee areas no longer suitable for sustaining life, the inundation of coastal properties around the world, and so on ... and on ... and on. That doesn't mean nations should stop trying to reduce their carbon emissions, because any reduction could lessen the consequences. But the cold fact is no matter what Europe and the United States and other "developed" nations do, it's not going to curb global climate change, according to one scientist who was once highly skeptical of the entire issue of global warming. "Call me a converted skeptic," physicist Richard A. Muller says in an op-ed piece published in the New York Times last July. Muller's latest book, "Energy for Future Presidents," attempts to poke holes in nearly everything we've been told about energy and climate change, except the fact that "humans are almost entirely the cause" of global warming. Those of us who live in the "developed" world initiated it. Those who live in the "developing" world will sustain it as they strive for a standard of living equal to ours. "As far as global warming is concerned, the developed world is becoming irrelevant," Muller insists in his book. We could set an example by curbing our emissions, and thus claim in the future that "it wasn't our fault," but about the only thing that could stop it would be a complete economic collapse in China and the rest of the world's developing countries. As they race forward, their industrial growth -- and their greenhouse gas emissions -- will outpace any efforts by the West to reduce their carbon footprints, Muller contends. "China has been installing a new gigawatt of coal power each week," he says in his Times piece, and each plant pumps an additional ton of gases into the atmosphere "every second." "By the time you read this, China's yearly greenhouse gas emissions will be double those of the United States, perhaps higher," he contends. And that's not likely to change. "China is fighting poverty, malnutrition, hunger, poor health, inadequate education and limited opportunity. If you were the president of China, would you endanger progress to avoid a few degrees of temperature change?" he asks.

#### Even mutated pathogens don't spread widely or cause extinction

Arthur ‘3 Charles Arthur, "Future Tense: Is Mankind Doomed?" The Independent, 25 July 2003, accessed 11/24/09 http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0725-04.htm

Maybe - though plenty of experienced graduate students could already have a stab. But nature knows that infectious diseases are very hard to get right. Only HIV/Aids has 100 per cent mortality, and takes a long time to achieve it. By definition, lethal diseases kill their host. If they kill too quickly, they aren't passed on; if too slowly, we can detect them and isolate the infected. Any mutant smallpox or other handmade germ would certainly be too deadly or too mild. And even Sars killed fewer people worldwide than die on Britain's roads in a week. As scares go, this one is ideal - overblown and unrealistic.

#### No risk of acidification—prefer newest studies

Ridley ’12 Matt Ridley, “Taking Fears of Acid Oceans With a Grain of Salt,” Wall Street Journal, 1/7/2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203550304577138561444464028.html

Coral reefs around the world are suffering badly from overfishing and various forms of pollution. Yet many experts argue that the greatest threat to them is the acidification of the oceans from the dissolving of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. The effect of acidification, according to J.E.N. Veron, an Australian coral scientist, will be "nothing less than catastrophic.... What were once thriving coral gardens that supported the greatest biodiversity of the marine realm will become red-black bacterial slime, and they will stay that way." This is a common view. The Natural Resources Defense Council has called ocean acidification "the scariest environmental problem you've never heard of." Sigourney Weaver, who narrated a film about the issue, said that "the scientists are freaked out." The head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration calls it global warming's "equally evil twin." But do the scientific data support such alarm? Last month scientists at San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography and other authors published a study showing how much the pH level (measuring alkalinity versus acidity) varies naturally between parts of the ocean and at different times of the day, month and year. "On both a monthly and annual scale, even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification," say the authors of the study, adding that because good instruments to measure ocean pH have only recently been deployed, "this variation has been under-appreciated." Over coral reefs, the pH decline between dusk and dawn is almost half as much as the decrease in average pH expected over the next 100 years. The noise is greater than the signal. Another recent study, by scientists from the U.K., Hawaii and Massachusetts, concluded that "marine and freshwater assemblages have always experienced variable pH conditions," and that "in many freshwater lakes, pH changes that are orders of magnitude greater than those projected for the 22nd-century oceans can occur over periods of hours." This adds to other hints that the ocean-acidification problem may have been exaggerated. For a start, the ocean is alkaline and in no danger of becoming acid (despite headlines like that from Reuters in 2009: "Climate Change Turning Seas Acid"). If the average pH of the ocean drops to 7.8 from 8.1 by 2100 as predicted, it will still be well above seven, the neutral point where alkalinity becomes acidity. The central concern is that lower pH will make it harder for corals, clams and other "calcifier" creatures to make calcium carbonate skeletons and shells. Yet this concern also may be overstated. Off Papua New Guinea and the Italian island of Ischia, where natural carbon-dioxide bubbles from volcanic vents make the sea less alkaline, and off the Yucatan, where underwater springs make seawater actually acidic, studies have shown that at least some kinds of calcifiers still thrive—at least as far down as pH 7.8. In a recent experiment in the Mediterranean, reported in Nature Climate Change, corals and mollusks were transplanted to lower pH sites, where they proved "able to calcify and grow at even faster than normal rates when exposed to the high [carbon-dioxide] levels projected for the next 300 years." In any case, freshwater mussels thrive in Scottish rivers, where the pH is as low as five. Laboratory experiments find that more marine creatures thrive than suffer when carbon dioxide lowers the pH level to 7.8. This is because the carbon dioxide dissolves mainly as bicarbonate, which many calcifiers use as raw material for carbonate. Human beings have indeed placed marine ecosystems under terrible pressure, but the chief culprits are overfishing and pollution. By comparison, a very slow reduction in the alkalinity of the oceans, well within the range of natural variation, is a modest threat, and it certainly does not merit apocalyptic headlines.

#### Their Peters evidence on AG gives 5 alt causes that the aff can’t overcome- dependence on foreign oil and food imports, urban development trends, and increased demand due to population growth and the emerging biofuel industry2

### No War

#### Trade doesn’t solve conflict

Martin et al. ‘8 Philippe Martin, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Thierry Mayer, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, and Matthias Thoenig, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, Review of Economic Studies (2008) 75, pp. 865-900, http://econ.sciences-po.fr/sites/default/files/file/tmayer/MMT.pdf

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Great power war is still possible–competition, security concerns, nationalism, and mindsets of policymakers

Mearsheimer ’99 John Mearsheimer, R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of political science at the University of Chicago and co-director of the Program on International Security Policy, “Is Major War Obsolete?” Great Debate Series, 25 February 1999, CIAO

Now I think the central claim that’s on the table is wrong-headed, and let me tell you why. First of all, there are a number of good reasons why great powers in the system will think seriously about going to war in the future, and I’ll give you three of them and try and illustrate some cases. First, states oftentimes compete for economic resources. Is it hard to imagine a situation where a reconstituted Russia gets into a war with the United States and the Persian Gulf over Gulf oil? I don’t think that’s implausible. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war in the South China Sea over economic resources? I don’t find that hard to imagine. A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that. What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers. Second reason: There is no question that in the twentieth century, certainly with nuclear weapons but even before nuclear weapons, the costs of going to war are very high. But that doesn’t mean that war is ruled out. The presence of nuclear weapons alone does not make war obsolescent. I will remind you that from 1945 to 1990, we lived in a world where there were thousands of nuclear weapons on both sides, and there was nobody running around saying, “ War is obsolescent.” So you can’t make the argument that the mere presence of nuclear weapons creates peace. India and Pakistan are both going down the nuclear road. You don’t hear many people running around saying, “ That’s going to produce peace.” And, furthermore, if you believe nuclear weapons were a great cause of peace, you ought to be in favor of nuclear proliferation. What we need is everybody to have a nuclear weapon in their back pocket. You don’t hear many people saying that’s going to produce peace, do you? Conventional war? Michael’s right; conventional war was very deadly before nuclear weapons came along, but we still had wars. And the reason we did is because states come up with clever strategies. States are always looking for clever strategies to avoid fighting lengthy and bloody and costly wars of attrition. And they sometimes find them, and they sometimes go to war for those reasons. So there’s no question in my mind that the costs of war are very high, and deterrence is not that difficult to achieve in lots of great-power security situations. But on the other hand, to argue that war is obsolescent-I wouldn’t make that argument. My third and final point here is, the fact of the matter is, that there’s hardly anybody in the national security establishment-and I bet this is true of Michael-who believes that war is obsolescent. I’m going to tell you why I think this is the case. Consider the fact that the United States stations roughly 100,000 troops in Europe and 100,000 troops in Asia. We spend an enormous amount of money on defense. We’re spending almost as much money as we were spending during the Cold War on defense. We spend more money than the next six countries in the world spend on defense. The questions is, why are we spending all this money? Why are we stationing troops in Europe? Why are we stationing troops in Asia? Why are we concentrating on keeping NATO intact and spreading it eastward? I’ll tell you why, because we believe that if we don’t stay there and we pull out, trouble is going to break out, and not trouble between minor powers, but trouble between major powers. That’s why we’re there. We know very well that if we leave Europe, the Germans are going to seriously countenance, if not automatically go, and get nuclear weapons. Certainly the case with the Japanese. Do you think the Germans and the Japanese are going to stand for long not to have nuclear weapons? I don’t think that’s the case. Again, that security zone between the Germans and the Russians-there’ll be a real competition to fill that.

#### Prolif’s net destabilizing:

#### Stability/instability paradox

Kroenig ’12 Matthew Kroenig, Council on Foreign Relations Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow and Georgetown University assistant professor of government, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have A Future?” Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, 5/26/2012, http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1182&tid=30

The final gaping weakness in the proliferation optimist argument, however, is that it rests on a logical contradiction. This is particularly ironic, given that many optimists like to portray themselves as hard-headed thinkers, following their premises to their logical conclusions. But, the contradiction at the heart of the optimist argument is glaring and simple to understand: either the probability of nuclear war is zero, or it is nonzero, but it cannot be both. If the probability of nuclear war is zero, then nuclear weapons should have no deterrent effect. States will not be deterred by a nuclear war that could never occur and states should be willing to intentionally launch large-scale wars against nuclear-armed states. In this case, proliferation optimists cannot conclude that the spread of nuclear weapons is stabilizing. If, on the other hand, the probability of nuclear war is nonzero, then there is a real danger that the spread of nuclear weapons increases the probability of a catastrophic nuclear war. If this is true, then proliferation optimists cannot be certain that nuclear weapons will never be used. In sum, the spread of nuclear weapons can either raise the risk of nuclear war and in so doing, deter large-scale conventional conflict. Or there is no danger that nuclear weapons will be used and the spread of nuclear weapons does not increase international instability. But, despite the claims of the proliferation optimists, it is nonsensical to argue that nuclear weapons will never be used and to simultaneously claim that their spread contributes to international stability.

#### Chain reactions of armament risk pre-emption

Kroenig ’12 Matthew Kroenig, Council on Foreign Relations Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow and Georgetown University assistant professor of government, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have A Future?” Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, 5/26/2012, http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1182&tid=30

Wohlstetter’s study undermined a key pillar of proliferation optimism. If nuclear forces were potentially vulnerable, encouraging an enemy nuclear attack, it was not a great leap to argue that the spread of nuclear weapons would not necessarily lead to peace. Just as a belief in minimum deterrence supports the idea of a nuclear peace, attention to nuclear vulnerability and counterforce nuclear war necessarily leads to proliferation pessimism. Indeed, it is difficult to find analysts who simultaneously believe that the details of nuclear posture matter and that the spread of nuclear weapons necessarily leads to peace. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that Albert Wohlstetter was a proliferation pessimist. In subsequent writing, Wohlstetter catalogued the potential downsides of nuclear proliferation for U.S. interests, even if nuclear weapons spread to friendly states, such as America’s NATO allies.[13] First, he identified nuclear war as a potential problem. A few nuclear weapons would not be enough for deterrence, but rather “The problem of deterring a major power requires a continuing effort because the requirements for deterrence will change with the counter-measures taken by the major power.”[14] But, if that investment was not made, deterrence could fail and nuclear war could result. Second, Wohlstetter worried that the spread of nuclear weapons within the NATO alliance would undermine alliance cohesion by making the allied states less interdependent. Third, Wohlstetter forecasted that the spread of nuclear weapons would lead to the further spread of nuclear weapons. He criticized U.S. decision makers for calculating the pros and cons of nuclear proliferation to an “Nth” state without also figuring in the potential negative consequences of what he called the “N+1 problem.”[15]

### Solvency

#### No modeling and signal is non-unique

Loris ‘13 Nicolas Loris, Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow at Heritage, master's degree in economics from George Mason University, “No 'Following the Leader' on Climate Change,” Heritage Foundation, 1/30/2013, http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2013/1/no-following-the-leader-on-climate-change

In his second inaugural address, President Obama pledged that the United States “will respond to the threat of climate change” and will take the lead for other countries to follow suit. This commitment is a willful rejection of reality. Congress has been unwilling to address climate change unilaterally through legislation. Multilateral attempts become more futile each year as major players, especially developing nations such as China and India, refuse to play ball. And why should they? Developing nations are not going to curb economic growth to solve a theoretical problem when their citizens face far more pressing environmental problems — especially when so many are trapped in grinding poverty and lack access to reliable electricity. This leaves the president with only one option for making good on his pledge: impose costly regulatory actions. This approach would be as pointless as unilateral legislative action. Why? Even accepting as fact the theory that Earth is warming and that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions are a warming agent does not make any of the following true: &bull; Man-made emissions are driving climate change and are a negative externality that needs to be internalized. Greenhouse gas emissions are a warming agent. But that fact doesn’t begin to settle the scientific debate about climate change and climate sensitivity — the amount of warming projected from increased greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, viewing man-made carbon dioxide as a strictly negative externality ignores a lot of peer-reviewed literature that identifies many positive effects (e.g., plant growth, human longevity, seed enrichment and less soil erosion as a result of more robust tree root growth) associated with higher levels of CO2 in the atmosphere. &bull; Earth is cooking at a catastrophic rate. The media breathlessly reported that a recent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s study found 2012 to be the warmest on record for the continental United States. What they largely failed to report was that, globally, 2012 was only the ninth-warmest in the past 34 years. In fact, average global temperatures have leveled off over the past decade and a half. &bull; Sea levels will rise dramatically, threatening America’s coastlines. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report, the bible of CO2-reduction proponents, projects sea levels rising 7 inches to 23 inches over the next century. That’s not as alarming as it sounds. Sea level has risen at the lower end of that projection over the past two centuries. &bull; There will be more extreme droughts, heat waves, hurricanes and other natural disasters. Natural disasters (they’re called “natural” for a reason, right?) will occur with or without increased man-made emissions. Having failed repeatedly to win legislation limiting greenhouse gas emissions, the Obama administration appears bent on taking the regulatory route. The Environmental Protection Agency is promulgating stringent emission standards for new power plants that would effectively prohibit construction of coal-fired generators and prematurely shut down existing plants. The EPA also has introduced costly new air-quality standards for hydraulically fractured wells and new fuel-efficiency standards that will make cars and light-duty trucks more expensive, smaller and less safe. Restricting greenhouse gas emissions, whether unilaterally or multilaterally, will impose huge costs on consumers and the U.S. economy as a whole. Congress should exercise its seldom-used muscles as regulatory watchdog to keep regulatory proposals that are not cost-effective from full implementation and reverse the administration’s course on regulating CO2. As for the president’s suggestion that unilateral action by the U.S. will somehow inspire other countries to emulate our example — the repeated failure of U.N. negotiations to produce multilateral climate action demonstrates a near universal disinclination to sacrifice economic growth on the altar of global warming.

#### Solar intermittencies can’t keep up with demand variations

Jadhav ’11 Nilesh Jadhav, “Solar Energy Intermittency: Grid operator’s nightmare?” Solar Novus Today, 5/18/2011, http://www.solarnovus.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=2824:solar-energy-intermittency-grid-operators-nightmare&catid=75:editors-blogs&Itemid=352

Grid operators are always busy forecasting and matching the supply from the generators to the demand from consumers. Over a day, the demand profile of a typical city grid goes from a low base load (mostly at night time) to a high peak demand (mostly during office hours). Supply is managed by “dispatching” generating assets i.e., making them run harder during peak load demand. When asked about solar energy integration into the grid, they shared that their number one concern about intermittent sources such as solar energy is that it’s not dependable during peak load conditions. The production of electricity from solar sources depends on the amount of light energy in a given location and point of time. Solar output varies throughout the day and through the seasons, affected by factors such as the cloud cover. When a small amount of solar generators are connected to the grid, the grid operator can manage the variations in one of the following traditional ways: Automatic generation control (AGC) or frequency regulation to respond to variation on the order of seconds to a few minutes; Activation of “spinning reserves” to respond to variation on the order of minutes to an hour; Activation of peak-power generation (usually referred to as reserve margin capacity) to respond to hourly variation. However, grid operators worry when solar energy forms a significant portion of the generation mix (say 10-30%). The concern is that such a scenario is unmanageable due to the fact that spinning reserves and peak power generation capacity may not be sufficiently available. The conclusion by some grid operators is that solar energy cannot really provide major share of electricity generation, which could be bad news for grid-connected solar. This leads to the question of whether there is an upper limit on grid-connected solar systems that is actually much smaller (e.g., <10%) than what many forecast today?

#### Dust and sandstorms multiply solar power costs and reduce effectiveness

Sharman et al. ’11 Hugh Sharman, Incoteco (Denmark) ApS, an energy consulting and brokering company, and cofounder of DimWatt.eu, a webbased campaign for energy security, Bryan Leyland, New Zealand-based Consulting Engineer specialising in hydropower, power systems and markets, and Martin Livermore, Director of the Scientific Alliance and science communications consultant and commentator, “Renewable energy: Vision or mirage?” Adam Smith Institute, 12/12/2011, <http://www.adamsmith.org/sites/default/files/research/files/ASI_renewables_report_colour_web.pdf>

Dust can be a major problem with solar power systems. A relatively small amount of dust can cause a large reduction in solar output. 57 Cleaning solar cells and solar reflectors can lead to considerable expenditure. According to one source, it costs about $15,000 to clean 1MW of solar panels 3 times per year. 58 If the solar cells are in a desert the problem can be much greater because, in many cases, dust storms happen more frequently and cause a dramatic loss of output. One factor that does not seem to have received much attention in the literature is that of “sandblasting” in the deserts of the Middle East (and presumably in others). A severe dust storm can sandblast car paintwork and damage windows and, presumably it will damage the surfaces of solar cells. It can also erode cable terminal boxes and other electrical equipment. Clearly, there is a risk of losing all the solar panels in an installation during one severe sandstorm. Cleaning panels usually also requires water, which is scarce and expensive in the desert. Such factors further reduce the attractiveness of the concept of supplying Europe from PV farms in North Africa.