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## DA

#### Grid expansion now – the plan speeds up renewable development – collapses reliability

Garrison 10 – Environment and Climate Change Consultant for the United States Agency for International Development (John L, “Clean Energy & Climate Change Opportunities Assessment for USAID/Mexico,” USAID, 4/30/10, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\_docs/PNADS950.pdf)//SJF

b. Barriers to a Cross‐Border California‐Baja California Renewable Energy Market

A key issue for renewable energy power development is access to electricity grid infrastructure. A specific priority under the U.S.‐Mexico Bilateral Agreement is to promote the development of a regional renewable energy market between California and Baja California and to help facilitate the construction of new power lines in a sustainable manner.

In response to the adoption of California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS),the California Electricity Commission launched the California Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI) in the summer of 2007 to identify competitive renewable energy zones(CREZ) and possible transmission corridors and siting options to serve those zones. A year later, in May of 2008,the Western Governors’ Association and U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) launched the Western Renewable Energy Zones (WREZ)initiative, which includesrepresentativesfrom11 states, two Canadian provinces and areas in northern Mexico, to develop a framework for consensus among states and provinces within the Western Interconnection on how to best develop cost‐effective and environmentally sensitive renewable energy zones and transmission plans.41 Under Phase 2 of its renewable energy resource assessment, RETI completed a conceptual plan for expanding the California’s transmission grid to access the CREZ with the lowest costs and impacts needed to reach 33% electric power from renewables. Using National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) data, the RETI assessment identified approximately 9,000 MW of wind potential in La Rumorosa resource area of which 2,400 MW was deemed to be highly competitive developable wind potential.42 The USAID CP/RE program also conducted a study on the export potential for wind energy to California and Texas.43

Existing cross‐border transmission is limited with only 800 MW of transmission capacity through two 230‐kV lines. At present, Sempra is seeking a permit from DOE to build a cross‐border transmission line to carry electricity from its wind turbines at La Rumorosa to the Southwest Powerlink in Imperial County, California with a potential for 1,250 MW. The California Independent System Operator(CAISO) has reportedly submitted interconnection applications for both La Rumorosa and Santa Catarina. Nevertheless, four additional transmission lines will be needed if Baja California’s wind potential is to be fully met.

For future cross border renewable energy trade to grow, however, a number of barriers must be overcome. For one, power exported from Mexico and sold to California under its RPS must show that it meets California’s environmental quality standards and that it protects the environment to the same extent as if it were located in California.44 The RPS environmental requirements are not clear and need to be better defined. Also of concern is the potential impact that intermittent wind energy might have on CFE’s and Imperial Irrigation District(IID) electrical grids even if not directly connected to them. Such impacts must be identified and addressed to CFE’s satisfaction prior to its concurrence of the CRE’s issuance of an energy export permit. The integration of 5,000 MW of wind from Baja California, for example, may require CFE’s 230‐kV East‐West corridor to be significantly reinforced raising the question, who will pay. CAISO is in contact with CFE and IID to study the impact that the region’s renewable energy cluster might have on their respective systems. Nevertheless, remediation of potential impacts will need to be addressed between the developer and CFE and/orIID.45

Another barrier to cross‐border renewable energy trade is the biennial re‐certification requirement. The designation of Baja California border area as an Energy Resource Area under the RETI process will also be important for future renewable energy development as will the expansion and strengthening of the transmission grid on the California side to reach highly populated areas. Given the current economic climate, the transmission expansion envisioned by RETI may not materialize.

#### Adding Mexico grid interconnections means increased renewable investment kills spare capacity – causes overstretch and blackouts – causes 1ac impacts

The Economist 11 (“Difference Engine: Disaster waiting to happen,” Babbage, 9/16/11, http://www.economist.com/blogs/babbage/2011/09/reliability-grid)//SJF

Yet, further down the coast, 6m citizens of southern California and south-west Arizona, along with their cousins across the Mexican border, were just recovering from a man-made disaster that had plunged their sweltering world into darkness—shutting down schools, hospitals, offices, factories, shops and restaurants, as lighting, air-conditioning and other essential equipment ceased to function. Beaches in San Diego had to be closed to the public because raw sewage had seeped into the sea. Passengers on trains stuck between stations and trapped in lifts had to be rescued by the police. Flights from San Diego International Airport were cancelled because security checkpoints were inoperable during the power outage and passenger processing could not be carried out. (Emergency runway lights meant that inbound flights could still land.) With traffic lights out of action and petrol stations unable to pump, motorists abandoned their vehicles and added to the gridlock that ruled the roads. By great good fortune, no-one died or was seriously injured. But normal life, for those so affected, ground to a miserable and unnerving halt. The difference between the two events could not have been more stark. One was all about preparedness and professionalism. The other was a forceful reminder of the chaos wrought by personal negligence and institutional neglect. “We don't need no lousy terrorists to cause mayhem,” San Diegans must have reflected afterwards. “We can manage just fine by ourselves.” The power outage that swept across a large swathe of the American south-west on September 8th was the region's worst cascading blackout in 15 years. It started at the North Gila substation near Yuma, Arizona, where a utility employee “was doing some work” on faulty equipment. Something happened (still under investigation) to cause the substation to shut down, disconnecting a 500kV transmission line connected to it and disrupting the electricity supply to Yuma's 90,000 residents. The immediate power shortage at Yuma caused the current—which normally flows along the grid's key Southwest Power Link from Arizona to California—suddenly to reverse its direction. The result was a violent fluctuation in line voltage that fed back through the grid to trip switches at substations throughout the San Diego area. Altogether, some 15 power stations in the region shut down automatically to protect themselves from voltage swings—the biggest being the 2,200MW San Onofre nuclear power plant up the coast near San Clemente. With the San Onofre plant disconnected and the umbilical cord from Arizona effectively severed, the delicately balanced grid serving San Diego and its adjacent counties quickly became unstable. Such problems would normally be resolved by ratcheting up the output of surrounding power stations. But with so little base-load capacity in the area, standby plants for meeting peak demand could not be spun up fast enough to stabilise the voltage. The overloaded grid promptly crashed, causing blackouts to spread across the region and into Mexico. The lights did not come back on until the following morning. The wind was blowing at only 8mph and the sky was partially overcast. So, California's lauded sources of renewable energy were of little help. If anything, they were part of the problem. Critics point out, with some justification, that California's energy strategy of focusing on conservation and expanding intermittent sources of renewable energy—while ignoring the urgent need for more base-load generating capacity close to big cities—was the primary cause of the grid failure. The wider issue is that the original voltage spike which triggered the monster outage should have been isolated at the Yuma substation in Arizona. The two official bodies responsible for overseeing the distribution and reliability of bulk power in the United States—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC)—have launched an inquiry to learn why that did not happen. Their report will no doubt apportion blame and recommend changes in maintenance procedures. But few expect it to address the underlying problem. Both FERC and NERC are only too aware of the structural reasons why the American grid has become so fragile. They are equally aware of how intractable to solution those reasons are. As elsewhere, the electrical-power industry in America has changed over recent decades from a collection of heavily regulated regional monopolies to a complex, competitive, national, free-market business. In the process, electricity has become a commodity, with futures and contracts traded by participants just like any other commodity business. Independent power providers and transmission companies construct their own facilities, often paid for with bonds backed by future revenue streams. Retailers sign up customers, buy the electricity from wholesalers around the country, and bill users for it. Managing supply and demand, once the prerogative of the utilities' planners, has become a process shaped largely by an energy company's appetite for risk. Meanwhile, independent system operators who schedule the dispatches of electricity have become, effectively, asset managers—using market-clearing prices to equilibrate between bids by suppliers and those from retailers. By and large, such changes have made energy markets more efficient. For consumers, the competition created by deregulation has kept a lid on electricity prices. But it has had downsides, too. One of the biggest is the way it has removed what little spare capacity the grid once had. In the power industry's new competitive environment, transmission companies operate their lines at near full capacity, leaving little room for those threatening fluctuations in voltage caused by accidental outages. Compounding matters further is the way long-distance transmission lines connecting utilities around the country are being used differently these days. Before deregulation, such links were employed largely for emergencies—for when, say, a utility found its voltage dipping precipitously and a brownout imminent. Today, long-haul power lines are frequently made to handle more power than they were designed to, as wholesalers sell their electricity over longer and longer distances. The juice that comes out of a plug in clean-energy California can easily have come from a dirty coal-fired plant in Wyoming or West Virginia. As a result, the grid now suffers far greater fluctuations in electricity flow than ever before. The continual cycling of power plants up and down to meet demand from elsewhere in the country causes generating and transmission parts to heat up and cool down repeatedly. No surprise that they then wear out faster. Meanwhile, the amount of money the American power industry spends on maintenance has declined steadily, by 1% a year since 1992. With the grid's most critical components—the transformers at substations—now typically 40 years old, there are serious consequences for the stability and reliability of the grid as a whole. Another downside of deregulation has been the decline in investment. As the independent power providers, the electricity retailers and the utilities have no responsibility for the grid's main links, they have little incentive to maintain them properly. And as long as it is possible to purchase electricity elsewhere, there is little further incentive—as in the case of San Diego—to add more capacity locally. More and more blackouts sweeping the country are therefore inevitable. Will the so-called “smart grid” improve matters? It could do the opposite. All the smart grid does is add a communications layer to the local electricity-distribution network—so consumers can see at a glance how much electricity they are using at any time of the day, and how much it is costing them. Alerts sent by the utility at peak periods will allow customers to cut back their consumption and save money—or have it cut back for them to reap extra rewards. The real aim, of course, is to save the utility from having to invest in additional capacity. What is rarely mentioned in all the proselytising about the smart grid is that it adds a vast layer of hackable points to the network—some 440m by 2015, according to Lockheed Martin's Energy and Cyber Services. Every smart meter in the home will be a hackable device. The same goes for all the routers at substations. As the saying goes, if you can communicate with it, you can hack it. Today, you can cut off the power to someone's home by shinning up the nearest electricity pole and throwing a switch at the top. Once smart meters become widespread, you will be able to do that remotely, from the far side of the world. But evil-doers from afar might not stop at that. Instead of switching off the power, they could run the voltage up and down to wreck sensitive electronic equipment, such as computers and television sets. And they could do that not just on single homes, but on whole communities and even to routers in substations—in an attempt to take transformers offline, if not actually fry them. As we saw last week, the failure of just one substation in Yuma was enough to bring a whole chunk of the American south-west to its knees. Unless the grid is made more robust and secure, the threat to the country—from terrorist or technician—can only become more severe.

## T

**Economic engagement is a long-term strategy that promotes structural linkage between two economies – plan doesn’t do either**

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” <http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf>

The basic causal logic of economic engagement, and the emphasis on domestic politics, can be traced to Hirschman. He viewed economic engagement as a **long-term, transformative strategy**. As one state gradually expands economic interaction with its target, the resulting (asymmetrical) interdependence creates vested interests within the target society and government. The beneficiaries of interdependence become addicted to it, and they protect their interests by pressuring the government to accommodate the source of interdependence. **Economic engagement is a form of structural linkage**; it is a means to get other states to *want* what you want, rather than to *do* what you want. The causal chain runs from economic interdependence through domestic political change to foreign policy accommodation.

**That’s a voter for limits – broad interpretations of engagement include anything that effects the economy, which means everything**

**Good is not good enough – precise definition outweighs**

**Resnick 01** – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a **precondition for effective policymaking**. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an **erratic, ad hoc fashion** risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error **undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research**. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they **undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy**.

## CP

The United States federal government should allow the economy to collapse.

The US economy is key to the global economy – that is a factual claim.

**Best scientific models show economic decline is key to solving anthropogenic run-away warming that will cause total extinction**

**Li 10** – (Dr. Ming Li, Assistant Professor Department of Economics, University of Utah. 2010. “The 21st Century Crisis: Climate Catastrophe or Socialism”, Paper prepared for the David Gordon Memorial Lecture at URPE Summer Conference)//SDL

The global average surface temperature is now about 0.8C (0.8 degree Celsius) higher than the pre-industrial time. Under the current trend, the world is on track towards a long-term warming between 4C and 8C. At this level of global warming, the world would be in an extreme greenhouse state not seen for almost 100 million years, devastating human civilization and destroying nearly all forms of life on the present earth (Conner and McCarthy 2009).¶ The scientific community has reached the consensus that the current global warming results from the excessive accumulation in the atmosphere of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gases (such as methane and nitrous oxide) emitted by human economic activities.[[1]](#footnote-1) The capitalist historical epoch has been characterized by the explosive growth of material production and consumption. The massive expansion of the world economy has been powered by fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas). Since 1820, the world economy has expanded by about seventy times and the world emissions of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels burning have increased by about sixty times (see Figure 1).¶ At the United Nations conference on climate change concluded at Copenhagen in December 2009, the world’s governments officially committed to the objective of limiting global warming to no more than 2C. However, according to the “Climate Action Tracker”, despite the official statement, the national governments’ current pledges regarding emission reduction in fact imply a warming of at least 3C by the end of the 21st century with more warming to come in the following centuries (Climate Action Tracker 2010).¶ In reality, all the major national governments are committed to infinite economic growth and none of them is willing to consider any emission reduction policy that could undermine economic growth. This is not simply because of intellectual ignorance or lack of political will. The pursuit of endless accumulation of capital (and infinite economic growth) is derived from the basic laws of motion of the capitalist economic system. Without fundamental social transformation, human civilization is now on the path to self-destruction. The next section (Section 2) reviews the basic scientific facts concerning the climate change crisis. Without an end of economic growth, it is virtually impossible for meaningful climate stabilization to be achieved (Section 3). However, both capitalist enterprises and states are constantly driven to expand production and consumption. The system of nation states effectively rules out a meaningful global political solution to the climate change crisis (Section 4). The climate change crisis is but one of several long-term historical trends that are now leading to the structural crisis of capitalism (Section 5). The resolution of the crisis and the survival of the humanity require the building of a fundamentally different social system that is based on social ownership of the means of production and society-wide planning (Section 6).

## K

**They utilize depictions of nanotechnology as a means to further their plan – this creates the world as standing reserve and legitimizes endless genocide – the only way to escape this cycle is to vote negative to affirm the infinite value of all forms of Being**

**Introna 9 –** Professor of Organization, Technology and Ethics at Lancaster University

(Lucas, “Ethics and the Speaking of Things,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 2009 vol 26 no 4, 25-46, dml)

In the ethics of hybrids our ethical relationship with things is determined beforehand by us, it is anthropocentric. In this encounter with things we have already chosen, or presumed, the framework of values that will count in determining moral signiﬁcance. In this ethics, things are always and already ‘things-for-us’ – objects for our use, in our terms, for our purposes. They are always inscribed with our intentionality – they carry it in their ﬂesh, as it were. The deﬁning measure of the ethics of hybrids is the human being – the meaning of the Latin root of ‘man’ is measure. Indeed our concern for things is what they might do to us humans, as was suggested above. Our concern is not our instrumental use of them, the violence of our inscriptions in/on them, but that such scripts may ultimately harm us. As things-for-us, or ‘objects’ as we will refer to them, they have no moral signiﬁcance as such. In the value hierarchy of the modern ethical mind they are very far down the value line. What could be less morally signiﬁcant than an inanimate object? Their moral signiﬁcance is only a derivative of the way they may circulate the network as inscriptions for utility or enrolment. For example, they may become valuable if they can be sold in a market where they are valued, as is the case with works of art. The magnitude and diversity of our projects are mirrored in the magnitude and diversity of the objects that surround us. As things-for-us they are at our disposal – if they fail to be useful, or when our projects drift or shift, we ‘dump’ them. Images of endless ‘scrap’ heaps at the edges of our cities abound. Objects are made/inscribed, used and ﬁnally dumped. We can dispose of them because we author-ized them in the ﬁrst place. Increasingly we design them in such a way that we can dispose of them as effortlessly as possible. Ideally, their demise must be as invisible as possible. Their entire moral claim on our conscience is naught, it seems. One can legitimately ask why should we concern ourselves with things in a world where the ethical landscape is already overcrowded with grave and pressing matters such as untold human suffering, disappearing bio-diversity and ozone layers – to name but a few. It is our argument that our moral indifference to so many supposedly signiﬁcant beings (humans, animals, nature, etc.) starts with the idea that there are some beings that are less signiﬁcant or not signiﬁcant at all. More originally it starts with a metaphysics that has as its centre – the ultimate measure – us human beings – a metaphysics which has been at the heart of Western philosophy ever since Plato (Heidegger, 1977a). Thus, when we start our moral ordering we tend to value more highly things like us (sentient, organic/natural, alive, etc.) and less highly, or not at all, things most alien to us (non-sentient, synthetic/artiﬁcial, inanimate, etc.). It is our argument that one of the reasons why this anthropocentric ethics of things fails is because it assumes that we can, both in principle and in practice, draw a deﬁnitive boundary between the objects (them) and us. Social studies of science and technology have thrown severe doubt on such a possibility. If it is increasingly difﬁcult to draw the boundary between our objects and us, and if in this entangled network of humans and non-humans objects lack moral signiﬁcance from the start, then it is rather a small step to take for an ethics to emerge in which all things – human and non-human alike – circulate as object**s**: ‘things-for-the-purposes-of’ the network. In ordering society as assemblages of humans and objects we ultimately also become ordered as a ‘for-the-purposes-of’. Thus, the irony of an anthropocentric ethics of things is that ultimately we also become ‘objects’ in programmes and scripts, at the disposal of a higher logic (capital, state, community, environment, etc.). In the network, others and our objects ‘objectify’ us. For example, I cannot get my money out from the bank machine because I forgot my PIN number. Until I identify myself in its terms (as a ﬁve digit number) I am of no signiﬁcance to it. Equally, if I cannot prove my identity by presenting inscribed objects (passport, drivers licence) I cannot get a new PIN number. In Heidegger’s (1977b) words we have all become ‘standing reserve’, on ‘stand by’ for the purposes of the network – enframed (Gestell) by the calculative logic of our way of being. Enframed in a global network that has as its logic to control, manipulate and dominate: ‘Enframing is the gathering together which belongs to that setting-upon which challenges man and puts him in position to reveal the actual, in the mode of ordering, as standing-reserve’ (Heidegger, 1977a: 305). The value hierarchy presumed in an anthropocentric ethics is in fact a dynamic network of values and interests – there never was a hierarchy. The fate of our objects becomes our fate. In the ethics of hybrids we are also already objects – indeed everything is already object. Instead of a hierarchy of values we ﬁnd a complete nihilism in which everything is leveled out, everything is potentially equally valuable/valueless; a nihilistic network in which ‘the highest values devaluate themselves’ (Nietzsche, 1967: 9). If this is so, then we would argue that we should not ‘extend’ our moral consideration to other things, such as inanimate objects – in a similar manner that we have done for animals and other living things, in environmental ethics for example. In other words we should not simply extend the reach of what is considered morally signiﬁcant to include more things. Rather, we should abandon all systems of moral valuing and admit, with Heidegger, that in ‘the characterisation of something as “a value” what is so valued is robbed of its worth’ and admit that ‘what a thing is in its Being is not exhausted by its being an object, particularly when objectivity takes the form of value’, furthermore, that ‘every valuing, even where it values positively, is a subjectivising’ (Heidegger, 1977a: 228). We must abandon ethics for a clearing beyond ethics – to let beings be in their own terms. We must admit that any attempt at humanistic moral ordering – be it egocentric, anthropocentric, biocentric (Goodpaster, 1978; Singer, 1975) or even ecocentric (Leopold, 1966; Naess, 1995) – will fail. Any ethics based on us will eventually turn everything into our image, pure will to power (Heidegger, 1977a, 1977b). As Lingis (1994: 9) suggests: ‘The man-made species we are, which produces its own nature in an environment it produces, ﬁnds nothing within itself that is alien to itself, opaque and impervious to its own understanding’ (emphasis added). Instead of creating value systems in our own image, the absolute otherness of every other should be the only moral imperative. We need an ethics of things that is beyond the self-identical-ness of human beings. Such an ethics beyond metaphysics needs as its ‘ground’ not a system for comparison, but rather a recognition of the impossibility of any comparison – every comparison is already violent in its attempt to render equal what could never be equal (Levinas, 1991 [1974]). How might we encounter the other in its otherness? Levinas (1991 [1974], 1996, 1999) has argued for the radical singularity of our fellow human beings. But what about all other others? In the next section we will argue that Heidegger, especially as presented in the work of Harman (2002, 2005), might provide us with some hints towards the overcoming of ethics, towards an ethos of letting-be of all beings.

## DA

Iran deal will succeed---but Obama needs capital to stop a second round of sanctions

Parsi 11/20 (Trita Parsi is founder and president of the National Iranian American Council and an expert on US-Iranian relations, Iranian foreign politics, and the geopolitics of the Middle East, “Negotiations with Iran show promise, but true test comes later,” http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2013/11/iran-us-negotiationsgenevanuclearprogram.html)

After objections by France caused a momentary disruption, the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany (P5+1) are once again united and meeting in Geneva this week with Iranian representatives to strike a deal on Iran's nuclear program. The prospects for success appear favorable. However, it is also clear that the real hurdles to an enduring deal will not be encountered now, but after the first agreement has been concluded. This is partly because Washington's ability to give concessions has not been truly tested yet. The misinformation spread by Israeli cabinet ministers and opponents of President Barack Obama in the U.S. Congress notwithstanding, most of concessions in the first phase of the deal currently being negotiated in Geneva will be provided by Tehran. In return, the United States and European Union are offering very little. The sanctions relief is minimal and carefully avoids congressional approval. Obama has spent a lot of political capital in the past two weeks simply to convince Congress not to adopt new sanctions. If a deal is reached this week in Geneva, Obama will be faced with the much taller order of getting Congress to actually roll back existing sanctions. Unfortunately, negotiations on Iran’s nuclear program have in the past passed the first hurdle, only to fall apart during the second step, when a final deal must be concluded. Eagerness and pressure to reach a first deal, combined with lack of common clarity on what exactly had been agreed upon, contributed to this.

#### Capital is key---its on the brink and failure risks middle east war

Merry 11/19 (Robert W. Merry is political editor of The National Interest and the author of books on American history and foreign policy, “Obama and Netanyahu Go to War,” http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/obama-netanyahu-go-war-9420?page=1)

President Obama finds himself in a weakened state. His health care law is sapping his political strength and generating intense anxiety among his Democratic troops in Congress. His performance rating is at an all-time low. His trust with the American people is deteriorating badly, as reflected in a recent Quinnipiac University poll. His political capital is ebbing. And into this dire political situation comes a new challenge that will test the president’s resolve and mettle in a big way. If he wants to save his high-stakes effort to foster a negotiated agreement with Iran over its nuclear program, he must take on, directly, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the Israel lobby in the United States. If he doesn’t, Congress will kill his effort; the opportunity to find a peaceful solution will be lost; and chances for war with Iran will rise ominously. Indeed, administration officials have warned that the current congressional push for new sanctions on Iran, in the midst of his delicate efforts, would constitute "a march to war."

#### Negotiations failure triggers military strikes and regional proliferation-causes escalatory wars and collapses the economy.

**Cordesman, CSIS, 2013**

(Anthony, “Negotiating with Iran: The Strategic Case for Pragmatism and Real Progress”, 9-23, <http://csis.org/publication/negotiating-iran-strategic-case-pragmatism-and-real-progress>, ldg)

Nevertheless, it makes no sense at all to reject Hassan Rouhani’s opening or condemn the Obama Administration’s response. Iran’s nuclear programs have moved to the point where it is extremely doubtful that there will be another chance to begin what may be a long and difficult process for all nations involved, and an attempt at resolution is far better than any of the real world alternatives. As long as any negotiations that follow are realistic in terms of their content, and do not endorse indefinite delay in a U.S. response while Iran’s nuclear programs move forward, they offer what will be the last real hope of avoiding preventive strikes or a process of containment that would lock the region into an Iranian-Israeli nuclear arms race, a probable Saudi effort to acquire its own nuclear weapons, and a U.S. commitment to extended deterrence. The Uncertain Outcome of Preventive Strikes The United States, Iran, and all the other nations involved need to be far more pragmatic about what will happen if time does run out and Iran does go nuclear. Iran may well face a series of preventive strikes – triggered by Israel or planned by the United States – that will destroy far more than its nuclear facilities. This may or may not actually halt the Iranian nuclear effort. A limited set of Israeli preventive strikes could either force the United States to follow up, or create a situation in which Iran rejects all arms control and UN inspection and carries out a massive new disperse nuclear program or a crash basis. It could also drive Iran to lash out into a new wave of confrontation with the United States and Iran’s neighbors. A U.S.-led set of preventive strikes would be more successful, but the United States could only be sure of suppressing a meaningful Iran nuclear effort if it quickly re-strikes any known target it fails to destroy the first time, carries out constant surveillance of Iran, and repeatedly and thoroughly strikes at the targets created by any new Iranian initiatives. The United States would need regional support to do this and probably prolonged regional agreement to U.S. basing. At a minimum, the result would be years more of a regional arms race, military tension, and Iranian efforts to find ways to attack or pressure the Arab states, Israel, and United States. As the current conflict in Syria makes all too clear, no one can predict how much support the United States will really get from any of its allies, its own U.S. Congress, and no one can predict the limits to Iran’s reactions, ability to use third parties, and willingness to confront the United States and the region with new nuclear, missile, and asymmetric threats. The United States would face an almost certain challenge in the UN from Russia and China, and there is no way any U.S. action against Iran could be separated from Iran’s efforts in Iraq, Syria, or Lebanon; Afghanistan, or any other issue where Iran could try to find some form of revenge. This is not an argument for not acting. The risk of a fully nuclear Iran is simply too great. It is a very strong argument for finding a good alternative if one can be negotiated on realistic terms. The Uncertain Outcome of Iran Nuclear Weapons and Containment: The Most Likely Outcome is a No Win Escalation Ladder Contest If there are no preventive strikes – or preventive strikes fail to halt Iran – what is now a largely quiet one-sided nuclear arms race would become far more threatening. At one level, this arms race would become one between Iran and any allies it could find and the United States and its Arab allies in or near the Gulf. A nuclear Iran could change the balance in terms of the credibility of U.S. and Arab willingness to engage against Iranian threats, intimidation, and use of its asymmetric forces. It would inevitably make Gulf petroleum exports the scene of an ongoing arms race and constant tension, and risk a clash that might escalate in untended ways. What is less apparent – and needs far more realistic attention in Iran and outside assessments of the Iranian nuclear threat – is the impact of Iran actually going nuclear. One or several crude nuclear devices do not create a nuclear force. Iran cannot produce enough capable nuclear forces for at least the next decade to pose more of an existential threat to Israel than Israel can pose to Iran. Israel would scarcely be passive, however, and Israel already has far more capable missiles than Iran. Israel also has thermonuclear weapons, rather than the early fission devices Iran will probably be limited to for at least the next half-decade. As a result Israel will pose more of an existentialist threat to an Iran as dependent on the survival of Tehran than Iran can pose to an Israel dependent on the survival of Tel Aviv. As the United States and former Soviet Union both learned during the Cold War, even Iranian parity or superiority would be meaningless. The problem with mutually assured destruction is that no state can ever win an existential strike contest. As for the rest of the Middle East, if Iran shows it is going nuclear to enhance its power and dominate the Gulf region – as may be Iran’s real motive – the resulting threat to world oil exports and the world economy is not likely to intimidate to any degree that will benefit Iran. It will push both the United States and Arab states into responding. The fact Iran succeeded in acquiring nuclear weapons might increase the level of deterrence of a direct invasion, but would not lead the United States, or surrounding Arab states to passively accept the result. The United States already is transferring more than ten times the value of Iran’s total arms imports to its Gulf allies. Its ties to Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Oman already give the United States and its Gulf allies the ability to devastatingly defeat Iran in any direct military confrontation. Iran can only vastly increase the scale of the resulting destruction that the United States and its allies inflict if Iran ever actually escalates to the use of nuclear weapons. But the United States, the Arab allies, Israel, and other regional states will suffer as well – along with the global economy – if the end result is a major interruption in the flow of Gulf petroleum exports.

Middle east war goes global and nuclear

Primakov 9 - Doctor of Economics, Professor, executive member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Head of the Center for Situational Analysis at the Russian Academy of Sciences

Yevgeny Primakov is President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation; Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs. The Fundamental Conflict: The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations. Russia in Global Affairs Vol 7 No 3. 2009. http://kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/105702/ichaptersection\_singledocument/71a40dca-23cb-411d-9c5d-a7ce495e2522/en/12.pdf

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS Liberty was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict. The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

## DA

#### The affirmative engages with known human rights abusers-— *moral duty* to shun

Beversluis 89 — Eric H. Beversluis, Professor of Philosophy and Economics at Aquinas College, holds an A.B. in Philosophy and German from Calvin College, an M.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University, an M.A. in Economics from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. in the Philosophy of Education from Northwestern University, 1989 (“On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 2, April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 17-19)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger I want to smash your [end page 17] face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict. But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions? We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing … morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a **duty** (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but **also to support that moral order**. Consider that the moral order itself **contributes significantly** to people's rights being respected. It does so by **encouraging and reinforcing** moral behavior and by **discouraging and sanctioning** immoral behavior. In this moral community people **mutually reinforce** each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be **much more violation of people's rights**. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in. Certain types of behavior constitute **a direct attack on the moral order**. When the violation of human rights is **flagrant**, **willful**, and **persistent**, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually **undermine altogether** the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order. An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the [end page 18] weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentant sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone **flagrantly**, **willfully**, and **repeatedly** violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, **must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order**. How does shunning do this? First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces **support for the moral order** and **backs up the announcement with action**. This action **reinforces the commitment to the moral order** both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his call for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.) Further, shunning may have **a moral effect** on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by **moral suasion** what cannot be achieved by "force." Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of **moral sanction**, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of **maintaining the moral order**, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it. Yet not every immoral action requires that we shun. As noted above, we live in a fallen world. None of us is perfect. If the argument implied that we may have nothing to do with anyone who is immoral, it would consist of a reductio of the very notion of shunning. To isolate a person, to shun him, to give him the "silent treatment," is a serious thing. Nothing strikes at a person's wellbeing as person more directly than such ostracism. Furthermore, not every immoral act is an attack on the moral order. Actions which are repented and actions which are done out of weakness of will clearly violate but do not attack the moral order. Thus because of the serious nature of shunning, it is defined as a response not just to any violation of the moral order, but to attacks on the moral order itself through flagrant, willful, and persistent wrongdoing. We can also now see why failure to shun can under certain circumstances suggest complicity. But it is not that we have a duty to shun because failure to do so suggests complicity. Rather, because we have **an obligation to shun** in certain circumstances, when we fail to do so others may interpret our failure as **tacit complicity** in the **willful**, **persistent**, and **flagrant immorality**.

## DA

#### Economy is growing – reforms – oil income key to sustainability

Olga Kuvshinova 9/27 – Writer for Russia Beyond the Headlines,(“Investment in infrastructure to fuel economic growth”, <http://rbth.ru/business/2013/09/27/investment_in_infrastructure_to_fuel_economic_growth_30229.html>, AW)

The government has also completed a number of construction megaprojects, and government investment has decreased by 20 percent in real terms. Over the next year, there will be no such decline, and the "base effect" that had a negative impact on economic growth this year will, on the contrary, enhance growth. This effect in the second half of 2013 is predicted to improve growth in GDP to 2.2 percent, compared to 1.4 percent in the first half. Meanwhile, growth in private investment (excluding state-owned companies) is projected to slow down from 11 percent this year to 5 percent in 2014. Therefore, the Ministry expects a rather large contribution from quasi-budget projects — construction of roads using money from the National Welfare Fund (NWF). Related: Russian Railways invests $18.7 billion in Far East Russia dreams of creating an alternative to Suez High-speed trains to help address transport problems Infrastructure is an opportunity to increase potential growth, and the government should therefore actively participate in this," says Oleg Zasov, director of a department in the Ministry. However, budget rules impose restrictions, and, therefore, oil and gas income is the only source of funding available. An easing of the Central Bank's monetary policy is expected to maintain the high rates of growth in consumer lending — at least 20 percent per year, offsetting the slowdown of the growth in real incomes. As recently as a month ago, it was assumed that the latter, in 2014–2016, would be higher or at the level of 2013. This growth will be slowed down not so much because of the decision to index tariffs for the population in 2014 (their addition to the inflation rate will only be about 0.2 percentage points), but because of the pension reform that starts in 2015.

#### Link – Renewables – DUH

#### Oil prices key to Russia’s economy – over half of government revenue

**Schuman, 12 –** (Michael Schuman, Associated Press Staff Writer for Times. July 5, 2012. “Why Vladimir Putin Needs Higher Oil Prices,” http://business.time.com/2012/07/05/why-vladimir-putin-needs-higher-oil-prices/)//SDL

But Vladimir Putin is not one of them. The economy that the Russian President has built not only runs on oil, but runs on oil priced extremely high. Falling oil prices means rising problems for Russia – both for the strength of its economic performance, and possibly, the strength of Putin himself.¶ Despite the fact that Russia has been labeled one of the world’s most promising emerging markets, often mentioned in the same breath as China and India, the Russian economy is actually quite different from the others. While India gains growth benefits from an expanding population, Russia, like much of Europe, is aging; while economists fret over China’s excessive dependence on investment, Russia badly needs more of it. Most of all, Russia is little more than an oil state in disguise. The country is the largest producer of oil in the world (yes, bigger even than Saudi Arabia), and Russia’s dependence on crude has been increasing. About a decade ago, oil and gas accounted for less than half of Russia’s exports; in recent years, that share has risen to two-thirds. Most of all, oil provides more than half of the federal government’s revenues.¶ What’s more, the economic model Putin has designed in Russia relies heavily not just on oil, but high oil prices. Oil lubricates the Russian economy by making possible the increases in government largesse that have fueled Russian consumption. Budget spending reached 23.6% of GDP in the first quarter of 2012, up from 15.2% four years earlier. What that means is Putin requires a higher oil price to meet his spending requirements today than he did just a few years ago.¶ Research firm Capital Economics figures that the government budget balanced at an oil price of $55 a barrel in 2008, but that now it balances at close to $120. Oil prices today have fallen far below that, with Brent near $100 and U.S. crude less than $90. The farther oil prices fall, the more pressure is placed on Putin’s budget, and the harder it is for him to keep spreading oil wealth to the greater population through the government. With a large swath of the populace angered by his re-election to the nation’s presidency in March, and protests erupting on the streets of Moscow, Putin can ill-afford a significant blow to the economy, or his ability to use government resources to firm up his popularity.

**Russian economic decline causes nuclear war**

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Author – Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>)

**In Russia**, historically, **economic** health **and** political **stability are intertwined** to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that **desperate personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations**. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## Case

## Solvency

#### War is likely

Miller, assistant professor of international security studies – National Defense University, 12/16/’11

(Paul, <http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/16/how_dangerous_is_the_world_part_ii>)

Some scholars are unimpressed with the supposed threats from Russia and China. The end of the Cold War led to a plethora of theories that conventional war was dead, great power conflict was over, competition would take place through trade instead of war, the "end of history" had come, the face of war would be "new" war or a "war amongst the people," while the state was dead and non-state actors would define world politics. These fads have led most commentators to vastly under-appreciate the persistence of the old fashioned, conventional, state-centric threat that has defined world politics for centuries: great power rivalry. Even if the world is changing in the ways the new-fangled theories claim (and I think those changes are overstated), it is changing much more slowly than critics appreciate. Russia and China remain massive, powerful, and hostile to U.S. interests-like they were during the Cold War. The "Cold War," after all, was just a name given to typical great power relations in an atypically bipolar environment. What was unique was not the global-chessboard contest, the mutual suspicion and hostility, and the division of the world into spheres of influence. Those features tend to characterize great power relations in any era of history. What made the Cold War distinct was the presence of only two major powers and the ideological dimension to the contest. In the post-Cold War world, the sharp ideological divide has been dampened, but suspicion and competition among big states remains a permanent and dangerous feature of world politics.

#### Can’t predict blanket peace

Donald **Kagan 99**, Professor of Classics and History at Yale, “Is Major War Obsolete? An Exchange”, Survival, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer 1999, pp. 139-152

But I would go further and would want to say even that very important concession is not sufficient, because the one great truth of history is that there is always one other possibility besides all the ones that you imagine, no matter how clever you are. What usually happens in history is in the category called ‘none of the above’. If one examines the predictions made in the area of international relations over the centuries, most of the time, most of the people get it wrong – even the most learned, experienced and intelligent people. Without going into a long dissertation on chaos theory, it suffices that it has generally happened that wars break out in places where they were never imagined and often for reasons that were not to be anticipated. The same unpredictability applies to other associated historical trends: democracy, for example. When it was invented in Greece around 500BC, democracy really looked like the future. Athenian power became great and Athens became an attractive model. And a number of Greek states – certainly not the majority, but a great many – became democracies. If one lived, say, in 450 or even in 440BC, one might very well have made what would have been an intelligent prediction: that democracy was the road of the future. Then the Athenians lost the Peloponnesian War, and democracy stopped. That was the end of democracy until the American Revolution. It is worthwhile remembering, therefore, that great historical reversals can happen. I don’t argue that a comparable reversal will happen, and it would be a tragedy if it did, but we have to be alert to the possibility. Right now democratic systems have a great deal of appeal, partly on their own merits, but partly because they seem to be winning. And winning systems look great. But if you consider Europe in 1940, and ask yourself what people thought the future was in those days, the answer probably would not have been democracy. Then the Germans lost the war, and the future looked different. There is yet another more critical factor that cannot be taken for granted: the continuous prosperity that underlies the current situation. It is 70 years since the last world-wide depression began. Will this prosperous condition without such world-wide depressions last forever? What will happen if it does not? Europe and the world had troubles in the 1920s, but it took the Great Depression to blow away liberal regimes in Germany and Japan, and to unleash monstrous bellicose forces. Are we sure that would not happen again? Since we cannot be sure that it will not, we must face the real possibility that major war may yet again come into fashion, and that it will take considerable effort, especially by the US, to keep it at bay.

## Warming

### Warming is slow – and not real

Taylor ’11 (7/27- senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute (2011, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, http://blogs.forbes.com/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-revewed 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.

### No extinction – and adaption solves

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 [he] 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.

## Nanotech

#### No impact to biodiversity

Sagoff 97  Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on **the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human** being**s will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain **why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth**. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority **of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans** one iota."n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive just as well** if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**.

n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, **one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes**. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point**; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

#### Dominant species are more important to ecology than diversity

**Mokani et al, 08** (Karel, School of Botany and Zoology, Australia National University, \*AND Julian Ash, School of Botany and Zoology, Australia National University, \*AND Stephen Roxburgh, Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre, School of Biological, Earth, and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales and ENSIS, May 7, 2008, “Functional identity is more important than diversity in influencing ecosystem processes in a temperate native grassland,” Journal of Ecology Volume 96, Issue 5, Wiley, Hensel)

In conclusion, the results from our study suggest that the traits of the **dominant species are of primary importance** in determining the effect of the biota on ecosystem processes, supporting Grime’s (1998) **mass ratio hypothesis**. Functional diversity was also important in some instances, indicating that complementarity may influence ecosystem processes, but not always positively. In contrast, we found species richness to be relatively poor at explaining variation in ecosystem processes. The results we present suggest that changes in community dominance hierarchies deserve the greatest attention when managing communities for the maintenance of ecosystem processes.

# Block

### **2nc Grid DA**

#### Renewables get adopted before grids can undergo the improvements their ev references – increases volatility and risk of black-outs which thwarts long-term renewable development – Europe proves

Neslen 12 -- EurActiv, part of the Guardian Environment Network (Arthur, 2/10/12, "Grid blackout threat weighs on renewables take-up," http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/feb/10/grid-blackout-threat-renewables)

The policy chief of Europe's electricity industry association has told EurActiv that Europe will have to slow down its integration of renewable energies or risk power cuts and systems instability because of the slow pace of cross-border grid improvements. "Either you go very fast in the transition - which is impossible [because] smart grids are expensive and the storage is not there in the needed scope – or you diminish the speed for integrating renewables into the system," Susanne Nies of Eurelectric told EurActiv in a phone interview. Given a choice between meeting the EU's target of getting 20% of energy – and 35% of the EU's electricity mix – from renewables by 2020 or keeping the system stable, "I would rather say that system stability and avoiding blackouts is more important," she said. Nies cited a report claiming a rise of serious systems stability incidents last year from 300 to 1,000 across a swathe of northern Europe, and said that the Czech Republic came close to power black-outs in November and December 2010. "We want to meet the 2020 targets but we need to be very careful," she said, "because the worst case scenario is one in which we have a series of blackouts in Europe and there would be a loss of support first for the utilities but maybe also for the renewables. That would be a disaster." Her words reflect pessimism in the electricity transmission industry about the likelihood of balancing capacity for variable energy sources like wind and solar in time for 2020. Usually though, this is voiced off the record. Speaking to EurActiv last month, another industry insider said that renewables advocates "want to increase solar panels and we want to keep the lights on, but if the lights go out because PV [solar photovoltaic energy] has not maintained the power quality, it's not in either of our interests." "If we're connecting things that the system wasn't designed for," the source continued, "we're putting stresses on it. Some people think it is a bit conservative for network operators to say that, but maybe it's good to have a bit of conservatism when you're thinking about a constant electricity supply. There is a bit of a trade-off between security of supply and reliability" and renewables.

#### New renewable electricity collapses the grid – they assume subsequent grid developments that are too costly

Perlstein 12 -- Dr. Perlstein has over 25 years' experience consulting on energy- and financial risk- related strategy, management, policy, and valuation related issues; has taught at Columbia University's Graduate School of Public & International Affairs and Northeastern University, and lectured at M.I.T. and Brandeis University. He holds a Ph.D. in Economics and Politics from Brandeis University and an Sc.M. in Finance and Applied Economics from M.I.T.'s Sloan School of Management (Bruce, 8/9/12, "Can Demand Response Programs Help Meet the Renewable Energy Integration Challenge?" http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/09/can-demand-response-programs-help-meet-the-renewable-energy-inte/)

Achieving these goals will require a number of states to rely much more heavily on electricity generated by intermittent and solar resources. In California, wind and solar generation are expected to provide virtually all of the additional renewable energy needed to achieve the state's RPS target (see Figure 2). In order to maintain the stability of the electricity grid, supply and demand must be in balance at all times. Wind and solar generation, however, tend to be intermittent. As a result, heavier reliance on wind and solar generation will make it harder to maintain the stability of the grid from moment to moment. This will increase the need for the "ancillary" services (3) and load following services grid operators use to maintain the stability of the grid, and avoid the supply and demand imbalances that, in a worst-case scenario, could lead to load shedding, brownouts, and/or blackouts. The need for these services used to manage the effect of variable renewable generation on grid stability is the "renewables integration" challenge. Ancillary and load following services are typically provided by quick start fossil-fueled power plants. (4) However, California may not have enough of these resources to meet the additional need created by its increased reliance on wind and solar, due largely to a state environmental policy requiring the retrofitting or retirement of 17,000 MW of "once through cooling" fossil-fueled power plant capacity by 2017. The potential retirement of that much capacity is a serious issue because those units already account for more than 36 percent of the capacity available to meet forecasted peak demand during the summer of 2012. (5) And, adding new back-up generation capacity would be costly.

## Dedev CP

#### Now key – delay makes extinction inevitable

**Ledger 12** – (Florida news service citing Richard Heinberg, senior fellow at the Post-Carbon Institute. Yossim Hizzod, “Unsustainable Economy”, <http://www.theledger.com/article/20121127/EDIT02/121129434>)//SDL

With the Industrial Revolution came the idea of material progress possible for all mankind, with infinite economic growth. Alas, we live on a finite planet with finite resources.¶ A profoundly important 2012 book is "The End of Growth, Adapting to Our New Economic Reality," by Richard Heinberg. Mr. Heinberg says three big factors are converging, which will someday soon end most of all further economic growth in current modern industrial nations and also in nations which want to industrialize, e.g., China and India.¶ These three factors are:¶ The fast-approaching depletion of Earth's resources needed for industry to function.¶ The saturation point of the Earth to absorb toxic wastes and poisons from industrialization, e.g., global warming from carbon dioxide.¶ Modern societies now reaching the saturation point and the end of ability to use credit(national deficits) to stimulate more economic growth.¶ From Mr. Heinberg's book, it can be implied that if we first acknowledge this situation (maybe politically impossible) and then work to manage the coming economic decline, we can stop the regression at an 1880s economic level with trains and horses for transportation, thus maintain a national cohesion and national identity.¶ If leaders and voters ignore and deny the problem and do not try to manage the decline, we will get random chaos and a possible die-off of a large segment of the population from starvation, lack of medical care, etc. Survivors might return to a feudal type lifestyle where strongmen warlords rule isolated, disconnected regions. Or the worst-case scenario could be a return to a Stone-Age or Iron-Age system of tribes (gangs) fighting over the scarce resources.

**View this debate through a lens of warming – it makes econ collapse inevitable – they must first beat that to get any of their offense**

Thomas Homer-Dixon, 11 – (Thomas Homer-Dixon, the CIGI chair of global systems at the Balsillie School of International Affairs in Waterloo. January, 2011. “Economies can’t just keep on growing,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,1)//SDL

Humanity has made great strides over the past 2,000 years, and we often assume that our path, notwithstanding a few bumps along the way, goes ever upward. But we are wrong: Within this century, environmental and resource constraints will likely bring global economic growth to a halt. Limits on available resources already restrict economic activity in many sectors, though their impact usually goes unacknowledged. Take rare-earth elements -- minerals and oxides essential to the manufacture of many technologies. When China recently stopped exporting them, sudden shortages threatened to crimp a wide range of industries. Most commentators believed that the supply crunch would ease once new (or mothballed) rare-earth mines are opened. But such optimism overlooks a fundamental physical reality. As the best bodies of ore are exhausted, miners move on to less concentrated deposits in more difficult natural circumstances. These mines cause more pollution and require more energy. In other words, opening new rare-earth mines outside China will result in staggering environmental impact. Or consider petroleum, which provides about 40 percent of the world's commercial energy and more than 95 percent of its transportation energy. Oil companies generally have to work harder to get each new barrel of oil. The amount of energy they receive for each unit of energy they invest in drilling has dropped from 100 to 1 in Texas in the 1930s to about 15 to 1 in the continental United States today. The oil sands in Alberta, Canada, yield a return of only 4 to 1. Coal and natural gas still have high energy yields. So, as oil becomes harder to get in coming decades, these energy sources will become increasingly vital to the global economy. But they're fossil fuels, and burning them generates climate-changing carbon dioxide. If the World Bank's projected rates for global economic growth hold steady, global output will have risen almost tenfold by 2100, to more than $600 trillion in today's dollars. So even if countries make dramatic reductions in carbon emissions per dollar of GDP, global carbon dioxide emissions will triple from today's level to more than 90 billion metric tons a year. Scientists tell us that tripling carbon emissions would cause such extreme heat waves, droughts, and storms that farmers would likely find they couldn't produce the food needed for the world's projected population of 9 billion people. Indeed, the economic damage caused by such climate change would probably, by itself, halt growth.

#### Collapse inevitable – current rate can’t maintain gdp and is causing severe climate change – freeing ourselves from the myth of economic growth allows a mindset shift that creates value to life

**Gardner, 13 –** (Dave Gardner, director of the documentary, *Growthbusters: Hooked on Growth*, and founding contributor to [www.growthbiasbusted.org](http://www.growthbiasbusted.org). August 20, 2013. “Planetary Overload: Faked Out by the Holy Grail of Economic Growth,” http://nationbuilders.thenation.com/profiles/blogs/planetary-overload-faked-out-by-the-holy-grail-of-economic-growth)//SDL

Today (August 20) is Earth Overshoot Day, according to scientists at Global Footprint Network. That means in about eight months we've consumed the renewable resources the Earth takes a year to replenish. If we want to live sustainably and leave our children a world worth inheriting, we need to turn off the lights, stop eating, drinking, driving, flying, and shopping - and hold our breath for the rest of the year - to make up for our unsustainable rate of resource use.¶ WWF's Living Planet Report tells us we're using 50% more resources each year than the Earth can replenish. That's why we're seeing climate disruption, fisheries collapsing, aquifer and river levels dropping, fertile soil declining and deserts expanding. In the U.S. we're actually using resources at five times the sustainable rate. Overshoot Day for the U.S. was back in March!¶ How did we get here? Our use of resources is determined by the size of our economy and our population. Forty years ago, a group of MIT scientists ran computer models that revealed we should change course in order to live within our means on planet Earth. We ignored those models and allowed our global population and economy to cross into unsustainable territory. The primary reason: our quest for the Holy Grail of economic growth. We didn't just allow overshoot to happen; we have pursued it. ¶ This quest for perpetual economic growth has also been driving nations, regions and cities to pursue population growth (more workers and more consumers make for a bigger economy). Today we have over 7 billion people - either living materially affluent lifestyles or aspiring to do so. We have a $74 trillion global economy. Just maintaining current GDP requires extraction of raw materials from the planet at unsustainable rates. Constantly growing GDP accelerates the liquidation of natural resources.¶ So strong is our conviction that economic growth is a universal, unalloyed good, we've been happy to sacrifice the integrity of our life support systems to keep it up. If we were living on a spaceship, this would be comparable to dismantling and devouring the craft in order to feed our voracious appetite for more. Everlasting economic growth should come with a warning: Don't Try This at Home!¶ Our obsession with economic growth is based on the myth that it improves our lives. That myth was born when we confused cause with effect. During the 19th and 20th centuries we made great strides in reducing mortality and making life more convenient. Few would argue electricity, indoor plumbing, the internal combustion engine, flight, telecommunications and computers haven't worked wonders. Our mistake has been assuming the economic growth that occurred during this time period is responsible for these technological achievements.¶ Thomas Edison didn't say one day, "Ah, GDP growth is 3%; that gives me an idea for generating electricity!" Economic growth was a byproduct of widespread adoption of these achievements. It was accelerated by harnessing the power of fossil fuels and gaining access to previously untapped continents of resources. Over time, we conflated growth with progress. We believe we must have economic growth, and we've built a system that depends on it. If we don't spend enough at the mall, if we don't buy enough cars or build more and more houses, our economy collapses.¶ Equating progress with GDP growth, however, is like equating a rise in automobile exhaust with increasing mobility. Mobility is desirable, but if we gauge it by measuring exhaust, we are not likely to focus on healthy, sustainable ways to improve mobility. Good lives with needs met are good, but when we gauge them by measuring economic throughput, we get off track and focus on the wrong things. We should be finding ways to improve our lives that don't require us to dismantle our spaceship.¶ The good news is the very things that really count in life, that bring fulfillment, happiness and a sense of purpose, don't require the creation and consumption of more stuff. Abandoning our quest for the Holy Grail of economic growth will free us to step off the treadmill and spend our time doing what matters - what Mike Nickerson describes in Life, Money & Illusion as "the three L's:" loving, learning, and laughing. Here's the announcement from Global Footprint Network. Here's a brief video about overshoot from the Global Footprint Network.

This **crisis is different than all previous ones**

**Li 10** – PhD, Assistant Professor Department of Economics, University of Utah (Minqui, paper prepared for the David Gordon Memorial Lecture at URPE Summer Conference 2010, “The 21st Century Crisis: Climate Catastrophe or Socialism”)

**The** impending **climate catastrophe is but one of several aspects of the** structural **crisis of capitalism in the 21st century**. **We are** currently **in the beginning of** a **prolonged** period of **global instability and chaos**. Similar periods of systemic chaos had happened before (for example, during the first half of the 20th century). Capitalism had managed to survive earlier crises, through institutional adjustments without changing the system’s essential features (production for profit and endless accumulation of capital).¶ Because of this historical observation, some have developed the belief that capitalism is such a remarkably “flexible” and “creative” system that it can always reform itself, adapt to change, survive crises, and meet challenges. But this belief is short-sighted and fundamentally ahistorical.¶ Like every other social system, **for capitalism to exist** and function, **it requires certain** **necessary historical conditions**. Capitalism would remain viable (and therefore “reformable”) only to the extent the necessary historical conditions required for its normal operations are present. But the development of capitalism inevitably leads to fundamental changes in the underlying historical conditions. Sooner or later, a point will be reached where the necessary historical conditions are no longer present, and capitalism as a historical system will cease to exist.¶ **If one compares the current systemic crisis with earlier instances of systemic crisis, what are some of the major differences?**¶ **First, in previous periods of crisis, the world’s natural resources remained relatively abundant and the global environment remained largely intact. Today,** **the** global **ecological system is literally on the verge of complete collapse. The** impending **climate catastrophe is only one among many** aspects of global **environmental crisis**. Global capitalism has already exhausted the environmental space for further capital accumulation.¶ **Secondly**, the **successful operations** **of the capitalist** world **system require** it be regulated by **an effective hegemonic power** at the systemic level. **However**, **with the decline of** the US **hegemony, no other** big **power was in a position to replace the US** to become the new hegemonic power. **Without a**n effective **hegemonic power, the system would be unable to pursue its** own **long-term interest** and solve system-wide problems.¶ **Thirdly, in the past the** capitalist **system had managed to survive** crisis **through social reforms**. In essence, social reform is for the system to buy off certain opposition groups by making limited concessions. The concessions have to be limited so that they do not undermine the essential interest of the ruling class. **Today, the system has run out of its** historical **space** **for social compromise**.¶ In virtually all the advanced capitalist countries, now a restoration of favorable conditions for capitalist accumulation would require nothing short of large and sustained declines of working class living standards. Will the western working classes simply surrender and give up their entire historical gains since the 19th century? If not, Western Europe and North America will again become major battlegrounds of class struggle in the coming decades.¶ Fourthly, **the world has reached** the **advanced** stage of **proletarianization**. Marx famously predicted that the proletariat would become the grave diggers of capitalism. For the entire 19th and much of 20th century, the process of proletarianization was largely limited to the “West” (the advanced capitalist countries). In the neoliberal era, as capital is relocated from advanced capitalist countries to the rest of the world to exploit the reserve army of cheap labor force, **there have been large formations of industrial working classes** in the non-western world.¶ Over time, the non-western working classes will have developed the organizational capacity and demand a growing range of economic, social, and political rights. For the capitalist world system, if its economic and ecological resources are already so limited that it is no longer possible to accommodate the historical demands of the western working classes, what is the chance for the system to accommodate the demands of the much larger non-western working classes?¶ If the system can no longer survive by buying off its potential oppositions, can it simply survive by repression, and for how long?¶ How will the combination of these trends play out in the coming decades? **Will the current** structural **crisis turn out to be the terminal crisis of capitalism? One thing is clear. If capitalism does survive** the current crisis, **there is** probably **not much hope for** the **humanity to survive** the coming global climate catastrophe. For the humanity’s sake, end capitalism before we are ended by capitalism.

### A2 tech solves warming

**Tech doesn’t solve—prefer statistics**

**Speth, law prof, 8**—Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school. Former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University . Former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law. .Former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President. Co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council. Was law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black JD, Yale. (James Gustave, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, Gigapedia, 55-56,)

Another reason for concern about the growth coming our way is the absence of adequate natural self-correcting forces within the economy. One area of hope in this regard has been the natural evolution of technology. The economy of the future will not be identical to that of the past because technology is changing. It is creating opportunities to reduce materials consumed and wastes produced per unit of output; it is opening up new areas and new products that are lighter, smaller, more efficient. Clearly these things are happening. Resource productivity is increasing. There is a large literature on these trends. The principal fi nding is refl ected in the conclusion of a 2000 report of fi ve major European and U.S. research centers: “Industrial economies are becoming more efficient in their use of materials, but waste generation continues to increase. . . . Even as decoupling between economic growth and resource throughput occurred on a per capita and per unit GDP basis, overall resource use and waste flows into the environment continued to grow. We found no evidence of an absolute reduction in resource throughput. One half to three quarters of annual resource inputs to industrial economies are returned to the environment as wastes within a year.”19 Tellingly, one review of a large number of countries found that “with the exception of one specifi c case, no absolute decline of direct material input of industrial economics took place as those economies grew. . . . [T]he trend of material use in industrial countries is relatively steady.” It also found that, as economies grow, pressures on domestic resources are reduced by shifting the burden abroad to developing economies.20 More resource-intensive goods are imported. Another major review of studies of “dematerialization” found that “there is no compelling macroeconomic evidence that the U.S. economy is ‘decoupled’ from material inputs, and we know even less about the net environmental eff ects of many changes in materials use. We caution against gross generalizations about materials use, particularly the ‘gut’ feeling that technical change, substitution, and a shift to the information age inexorably lead to decreased materials intensity and reduced environmental impact.”21 Technology expert Arnulf Grubler has noted, “At best, dematerialization has led to a stabilization of absolute material use at high levels. . . . Improved materials and increased environmental productivity have substantially lessened the environmental impacts of output growth, even if, to date, output growth has generally outstripped improvements.”22

## Warming

## 2NC – No Warming

### AND - there is no better evidence

Wilson ’12 (GLOBAL WARMING: THE SATELLITES DON'T LIE March 3, 2012 7:48 AM | 7 Comments James A. Wilson

Over the summer Forbes Magazine published NASA satellite data indicating the alarmist predictions - even the UN computer models on which they were based - are dead wrong. The study, reported in the peer reviewed journal, Remote Sensing, correlates data from 2000 through 2011. It shows two phenomena surprising to the apostles of doom in the scientific and political community. There is much less heat being trapped in the atmosphere by greenhouse gases - or any other cause - than the models portend, and a lot more of it is being released naturally into space. This is especially true over the oceans. James M. Taylor, a senior fellow for environmental policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment and Climate News authored the Forbes article. Credentials don't get any more impeccable.

### AND - Consensus of data

Wilson ’12 (GLOBAL WARMING: THE SATELLITES DON'T LIE March 3, 2012 7:48 AM | 7 Comments James A. Wilson

The latest satellite gathered information is consistent with NOAA and NASA data showing humidity and the formation of cirrus clouds has lagged far behind alarmist predictions as well. These findings, and those of NASA's ERBS satellite show similar patterns of heat exhange for the years 1985 to 1999. In other words, we are simply not going to hell in a climate change hand basket.

## 2NC – Warming Inevitable

Warming is irreversible

ANI 10, **[**3-20-2010, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html]

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

### All of their impacts are inevitable

Dean ‘9(Emissions Cut Won’t Bring Quick Relief, Scientists Say By CORNELIA DEAN Published: January 26, 2009

Many people who worry about global warming hope that once emissions of heat-trapping gases decline, the problems they cause will quickly begin to abate. Now researchers are saying that such hope is ill-founded, at least with regard to carbon dioxide. Because of the way carbon dioxide persists in the atmosphere and in the oceans, and the way the atmosphere and the oceans interact, patterns that are established at peak levels will produce problems like “inexorable sea level rise” and Dust-Bowl-like droughts for at least a thousand years, the researchers are reporting in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. “That peak would be the minimum you would be locking yourself into,” said Susan Solomon, a senior scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, who led the work. The researchers describe what will happen if the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide — the principal heat-trapping gas emission — reaches 450 to 600 parts per million, up from about 385 p.p.m. today. Most climate researchers consider 450 p.p.m. virtually inevitable and 600 p.p.m. difficult to avoid by midcentury if the use of fossil fuels continues at anything like its present rate. At 450 p.p.m., the researchers say, rising seas will threaten many coastal areas, and Southern Europe, North Africa, the Southwestern United States and Western Australia could expect 10 percent less rainfall. “Ten percent may not seem like a high number,” Dr. Solomon said Monday in a telephone news conference, “but it is the kind of number that has been seen in major droughts in the past, like the Dust Bowl.” At 600 p.p.m., there might be perhaps 15 percent less rain, she said. In 1850, atmospheric carbon dioxide was roughly 280 p.p.m., a level scientists say had not been exceeded in at least the previous 800,000 years. In their paper, Dr. Solomon and her colleagues say they confined their estimates to known data and effects. For example, they based their sea level estimates largely on the expansion of seawater as it warms, a relatively straightforward calculation, rather than including the contributions of glacial runoff or melting inland ice sheets — more difficult to predict but potentially far greater contributors to sea level rise. The new work dealt only with the effects of carbon dioxide, which is responsible for about half of greenhouse warming. Gases like chlorofluorocarbons and methane, along with soot and other pollutants, contribute to the rest. These substances are far less persistent in the atmosphere; if these emissions drop, their effects will decline relatively fast. Michael Oppenheimer, a geoscientist at Princeton, praised the report in an e-mail message as a “remarkably clear and direct” discussion of whether it would be possible to temporarily exceed a level like 450 p.p.m. and then reduce emissions in time to avoid catastrophic events like the collapse of a major inland ice sheet. Dr. Oppenheimer said the new analysis showed that “some dangerous consequences could be triggered and persist for a long, long time, even if emissions were cut radically.” “Policy makers need to understand,” he continued, “that in some ways once we are over the cliff, there’s nothing to stop the fall.”

## Shunning

#### “Solvency” isn’t necessary — voting neg bears witness and upholds the moral order.

Beversluis 89 — Eric H. Beversluis, Professor of Philosophy and Economics at Aquinas College, holds an A.B. in Philosophy and German from Calvin College, an M.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University, an M.A. in Economics from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. in the Philosophy of Education from Northwestern University, 1989 (“On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 2, April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 20-21)

But perhaps Thompson's pragmatic argument against interfering in the affairs of other states rules out national shunning:

Respect for domestic jurisdiction causes diplomatists to question a crusading approach to human rights. Routine interference in the essential conduct of the affairs of one government (that is, in its definition of its rights and duties) by another is a recipe for disaster in political relationships. Furthermore, history offers little support for the assumption that moral intervention can even make the situation worse. Given the realities of national sovereignty, methods such as quiet diplomacy, the private offering of incentives and rewards, and sustained individual contacts are more likely to yield results. Workability is a companion principle to respect for domestic jurisdiction. Together they provide the diplomatists' main guidelines for action in human rights as in other spheres of foreign policy. (Thompson, 1980, pp. 91-92)

As a general caution against our desire to "do something" when we do not like the policies of another country, Thompson's pragmatic approach is sound. But shunning represents a special situation in which, persuasion and direct pressure having been tried and having failed, the objective is not to change behavior but to witness against it. "Workability" has been tried and has [end page 20] failed; the flagrant, persistent, and willful violation of human rights continues and must be confronted publicly.

## Politics

#### Try or die neg---failing negotiations make nuclear war inevitable

IBT 11-15 (International Business Times,- quoting senior editor of Executive Intelligence Review, Jeff Steinberg http://au.ibtimes.com/articles/522412/20131115/iran-nuclear-programme-geneva-talks-p5-1.htm#.Uofz55Fqc6J)

If talks of Iran's, nuclear programme fail, fears are that it could lead to a global nuclear confrontation involving the U.S., Russia and China. With the plausible use of nuclear arsenals, it could lead to an imminent doomsday catastrophe. Iran's Press TV quoted analyst and senior editor of Executive Intelligence Review, Jeff Steinberg on Wednesday saying, that if the talks fail, international pressure will drive the U.S. to a conflict with Iran. Driving towards conflict "If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that's a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of," Mr Steinberg said. "The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar," Mr Steinberg, quoted by Press TV pointed out. "So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don't go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that's got to be avoided at all costs when you've got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with" their arsenals of "nuclear weapons," he warned. The warning from Mr Steinberg comes as the Obama administration made it clear to Congress that, imposing new sanctions on Iran could lead to the failure of talks.

#### New round of sanctions would threaten broad enforcement of extraterritorial sanctions

Kahl-Director, Middle East Security Program, Center for a New American Security-11/13/13

<http://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA00/20131113/101478/HHRG-113-FA00-Wstate-KahlC-20131113.pdf>

Second, and somewhat paradoxically, escalating sanctions at this moment could actually end up weakening international pressure on Iran. For better or worse, Rouhani has already succeeded in shifting international perceptions of Iran. If the United States, rather than Iran, comes across as the intransigent party, it will become much more difficult to maintain the international coalition currently isolating Tehran. In particular, if negotiations on a comprehensive framework collapse because of Washington’s unwillingness to make a deal on limited enrichment – a deal Russia and China and numerous other European and Asian nations support – it will likely become much harder to enforce sanctions. Some fence sitters in Europe and Asia will start to flirt with Iran again, leaving the United States in the untenable position of choosing between imposing extraterritorial sanctions on banks and companies in China, India, Japan, South Korea, Turkey and elsewhere, or acquiescing to the erosion of the comprehensive sanctions regime.

#### That undermines US trade leadership and Sino-US relations

Leverett-professor at Pennsylvania State University's School of International Affairs-2/25/13

Imposing secondary sanctions on non-US entities transacting with Iran could backfire on Washington if implemented.

<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/02/201322584515426148.html>

Secondary sanctions Secondary sanctions are a legal and political house of cards. They almost certainly violate American commitments under the World Trade Organisation, which allows members to cut trade with states they deem national security threats but not to sanction other members over lawful business conducted in third countries. If challenged on the issue in the WTO's Dispute Resolution Mechanism, Washington would surely lose. India aims to cash in on Iran sanctions Consequently, US administrations have been reluctant to impose secondary sanctions on non-US entities transacting with Iran. In 1998, the Clinton administration waived sanctions against a consortium of European, Russian and Asian companies developing an Iranian gas field; over the next decade, Washington declined to make determinations whether other non-US companies' Iranian activities were sanctionable. The Obama administration now issues blanket waivers for countries continuing to buy Iranian oil, even when it is questionable they are really reducing their purchases. Still, legal and reputational risks posed by the threat of US secondary sanctions have reduced the willingness of companies and banks in many countries to transact with Iran, with negative consequences for its oil export volumes, the value of its currency and other dimensions of its economic life. Last year, the European Union - which for years had condemned America's prospective "extraterritorial" application of national trade law and warned it would go to the WTO's Dispute Resolution Mechanism if Washington ever sanctioned European firms over Iran-related business - finally subordinated its Iran policy to American preferences, banning Iranian oil and imposing close to a comprehensive economic embargo against the Islamic Republic. In recent weeks, however, Europe's General Court overturned European sanctions against two of Iran's biggest banks, ruling that the EU never substantiated its claims that the banks provided "financial services for entities procuring on behalf of Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programmes". The European Council has two months to respond - but removing sanctions against the banks would severely weaken Europe's sanctions regime. Other major players in Iran's economy, including the Central Bank of Iran and the National Iranian Oil Company, are now challenging their own sanctioned status. On the other side of the world, America is on a collision course with China over sanctions. In recent years, Beijing has tried to accommodate US concerns about Iran. It has not developed trade and investment positions there as rapidly as it might have, and has shifted some Iran-related transactional flows into renminbito to help the Obama administration avoid sanctioning Chinese banks (similarly, India now pays for some Iranian oil imports in rupees). Whether Beijing has really lowered its aggregate imports of Iranian oil is unclear - but it clearly reduces them when the administration is deciding about six-month sanctions waivers for countries buying Iranian crude. The administration is taking its own steps to forestall a Sino-American conflict over sanctions. Besides issuing waivers for oil imports, the one Chinese bank Washington has barred from the US financial system for Iran-related transactions is a subsidiary of a Chinese energy company - a subsidiary with no business in the US. However, as Congress enacts additional layers of secondary sanctions, President Obama's room to manoeuver is being progressively reduced. Therein lies the looming policy train wreck.

### UQ

#### Last night Obama reached a deal with Iran on nuclear weapons, but he needs capital to prevent congress from passing sanctions

Dennis, staff writer @ Roll Call, 11/23/13

(“Obama Faces Skeptical Congress as Iran Nuclear Deal Reached,”http://blogs.rollcall.com/wgdb/obama-announces-iran-nuclear-deal/ DA: 11/23/13, dsg)

President Barack Obama has a sales job to do with Congress after he announced an interim deal Saturday night that will halt Iran’s nuclear program — although not dismantle it — in return for a partial rollback of sanctions. Obama said in a statement from the White House that the agreement would “cut off Iran’s most likely paths to a bomb” and said Iran must work toward a comprehensive solution over the next six months or the full sanctions would resume. “The burden is on Iran that its nuclear program will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes,” Obama said. He urged Congress to hold back on plans for a new round of sanctions, which lawmakers in both chambers have been pushing and could receive a vote after Thanksgiving. “We will comtinue to work closely with Congress,” he said. “However, now is not the time to move forward on new sanctions, because doing so would derail this promising first step, alienate us from our allies and risk unraveling the coalition that enabled our sanctions to be enforced in the first place.” Instant reaction from Republicans was skeptical. “Unless the agreement requires dismantling of the Iranian centrifuges, we really haven’t gained anything,” Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., tweeted. “Amazing what WH will do to distract attention from O-care,” tweeted Sen. John Cornyn of Texas, the No. 2 Republican in the Senate.

### Link debate

\*Framing issue\*---Obama isn’t popular but congress is even more hated; if their evidence doesn’t say renewables issue makes congress stronger relative to Obama they can’t thump the DA

Brownstein, Editorial Director @ the national journal, 11/18

(“Poll: Obama Down but Congress Is Down Further,”http://www.nationaljournal.com/next-economy/poll-obama-down-but-congress-is-down-further-20131118, DA: 11/23/13, dsg)

The bottom has fallen out for everyone in the nation's political leadership.

That's the message from the latest Allstate/National Journal Heartland Monitor Poll, which shows that after a government shutdown, near-default on the federal debt, the calamitous debut of President Obama's health care plan, and continued sluggishness in the economy, Americans aren't feeling much holiday cheer about the country's direction or anyone setting it.

Just 38 percent of those polled said they approved of Obama's job performance, with 55 percent disapproving. That's the lowest approval, and highest disapproval, the Heartland Monitor poll has recorded for Obama in the 19 times it has measured his standing since April 2009. The latest numbers continue a slide for Obama that had taken his approval rating from 54 percent immediately after his reelection last November to 40 percent in September.

Americans are even more dubious about Congress. Just 9 percent of those polled (down from 21 percent last November) approved of its performance. Fully 84 percent disapproved. Almost nine-in-10 of those who disapproved of Obama's performance also gave Congress a thumbs-down; 56 percent of those who disapproved of Congress also flunked Obama.

#### Iran and foreign policy separated from domestic issues---their uniqueness arguments aren’t relevant but the plan is

**Hammond, Oxford Analytica geopolitical analyst, 11-14-13**

(Andrew, “Iranian diplomacy underscores Obama's search for legacy”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/11/13/opinion/iran-obama-legacy-hammond/>, ldg)

Despite the concerns of regional U.S. allies like Israel and Saudi Arabia, and also a significant number of legislators in the U.S. Congress, it is clear that the Obama administration is pushing strongly for deal as part of its wider Middle Eastern strategy. Indeed, Kerry has now spent more time negotiating with counterpart Iranian officials than any other U.S. high-level engagement for perhaps three decades. The seriousness of negotiations was emphasized by the fact that, as well as Kerry and his Iranian counterpart Mohammad Javad Zarif, foreign ministers from Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany and France, and the Chinese deputy foreign minister, came together. If agreement can be reached, an interim deal (potentially setting the ground for a later comprehensive agreement) would reportedly see Iran's nuclear capacity capped for six months and opened up to U.N. inspections. In exchange, Iran would be given limited, sequenced relief from sanctions. Remaining disagreements reportedly include the status of the Arak heavy-water reactor, and production of highly enriched uranium -- both processes, that can potentially be used to produce nuclear weapons. A second problem to resolve is how to handle the existing Iranian stockpile of uranium that Iran enriched to 20%. Progress in nuclear diplomacy with Iran, combined with continued uncertainty in Syria and Egypt, has refocused Washington's attention towards the Middle East in a manner unanticipated by Obama only a few months ago. In addition to Syria and Egypt, the administration has spent significant political capital resuming Israeli-Palestinian peace talks. The urgency of U.S. focus there reflects growing international conviction that, 20 years after the Oslo Process began, the "window of opportunity" for securing a two-state solution may be receding. Intensified U.S. focus on the Middle East has accentuated a shift, common to many recent re-elected presidents, of increased focus on foreign policy in second terms of office. In part, this reflects the fact that presidents often see foreign policy as key to the legacy they wish to build. For instance, after the 2001 terrorist attacks, George W. Bush sought to spread his freedom agenda across the Middle East. Bill Clinton also devoted significant time to trying to secure a comprehensive Israeli-Palestinian peace deal. As important as an Iran nuclear agreement might prove to be, the Middle East is one of only two regions in which Obama is looking for legacy. Since he was elected in 2008, Asia in general, and China in particular, has assumed greater importance in U.S. policy. To this end, Obama is seeking to continue the so-called pivot towards Asia-Pacific through landmark initiatives like the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Key threats, however, remain on the horizon to securing this re-orientation. These include a dramatic, sustained escalation of tension in the Middle East (perhaps in Syria or Egypt); and/or the remaining possibility of further terrorist attacks on the U.S. homeland. As well as legacy-building, the likelihood of Obama concentrating more on foreign policy also reflects domestic U.S. politics. Particularly the intense polarization and gridlock of Washington. Since re-election, Obama has achieved little domestic policy success. His gun control bill was defeated, immigration reform faces significant opposition in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, and the prospect of a long-term federal budgetary "grand bargain" with Congress looks unlikely. Moreover, implementation of his landmark healthcare initiative has been botched. Many re-elected presidents in the post-war era have, like Obama, found it difficult to acquire domestic policy momentum. In part, this is because the party of re-elected presidents, as with the Democrats now, often hold a weaker position in Congress. Thus Dwight Eisenhower in 1956, Richard Nixon in 1972, and Bill Clinton in 1996 were all re-elected alongside Congresses where both the House and Senate were controlled by their partisan opponents. Another factor encouraging foreign policy focus in second terms is the fact that re-elected presidents have often been impacted by domestic scandals in recent decades. Thus, Watergate ended the Nixon administration in 1974, Iran-Contra badly damaged the Reagan White House, and the Lewinsky scandal led to Clinton being impeached. Since Obama's re-election, a series of problems have hit the administration. These include revelations that the Internal Revenue Service targeted some conservative groups for special scrutiny; and the Department of Justice's secret subpoenaing of private phone records of several Associated Press reporters and editors in the wake of a terrorist plot leak. Even if Obama escapes further significant problems, he will not be able to avoid the "lame-duck" factor. That is, as a president cannot seek more than two terms, political focus will refocus elsewhere, particularly after the November 2014 congressional ballots when the 2016 presidential election campaign kicks into gear. Taken overall, Iranian diplomatic progress and wider recent events in the Middle East are therefore likely to accentuate the incentives for Obama to place increasing emphasis on foreign policy -- which Congress has less latitude over -- in his remaining period of office. And, this shift is only likely to be reinforced if, as anticipated, the U.S. economic recovery continues to build up steam in 2014.

1. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that the observed global warming since the mid-20th century was very likely to have been caused by rising anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations (IPCC 2007a). Despite the media hype of the so-called “climate gate” (caused by the leak of the emails stolen from the Climate Research Unit at the British University of East Anglia), none of the basic scientific facts concerning climate change was challenged. See the open letter by 255 leading scientists on the issue (Guardian 2010). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)