## 1nc

### 1nc – politics

**GOP will give into *political pressure* but it’ll be a fight**

**Sargent 10-30**-13 GREG SARGENT . Washington Post “Immigration reform is definitely undead” [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/10/30/immigration-reform-is-definitely-undead/] **[MG]**

We now have three House Republicans who have signed on to the House Dem comprehensive immigration reform bill, putting immigration reform officially back in the “undead” category. GOP Rep. David **Valada**o of California is officially on board with the bipartisan proposal, according to a statement from the Congressman sent my way: “I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground on the issue of immigration reform. Recently, I have focused my efforts on joining with likeminded Republicans in organizing and demonstrating to Republican Leadership broad support within the Party to address immigration reform in the House by the end of the year. “By supporting H.R. 15 I am strengthening my message: Addressing immigration reform in the House cannot wait. I am serious about making real progress and will remain committed to doing whatever it takes to repair our broken immigration system.” Valadao’s move is not wholly unexpected, given that he inhabits a moderate district with a lot of Latinos. But his insistence that addressing immigration reform “cannot wait” is helpful. It seems like an implicit message to the GOP leadership: We must act this year, and on this bill, if necessary. This comes after GOP Reps. leana Ros-Lehtinen and Jeff Denham did the same. Denham has said he expects “more” Republicans to ultimately sign on, and has also said that the House GOP leadership told him there will be a vote on something immigration-related by the end of the year. It’s unclear whether there will actually be a House vote on anything involving immigration before the year runs out, and it seems very unlikely that there will be a vote on the House Dem measure, which is essentially the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, without the Corker-Hoeven border security amendment that House Dems dislike, and instead with another border security amendment House Dems like swapped in. However, the movement among Republicans towards the Dem bill — even if it is only a trickle for now — is interesting, as a reminder that immigration reform can happen if House GOP leaders actually want it to. To be sure, immigration reform faces a huge obstacle: The stark underlying structural realities of the House Republican caucus. Far too few Republican members have large enough Latino populations to impact the outcome in 2014. With primaries coming, there just may be no incentive for Republicans to act until after the 2014 elections. But there are other factors to consider. In some key respects, immigration reform poses its own unique set of political challenges and conditions — **it is not quite as polarizing an issue** as, say, Obamacare or even the question of whether to agree to new revenues as part of a budget deal. Major GOP aligned constituencies — the **U.S. Chamber of Commerce**, **evangelicals,** **high tech and agricultural interests** in the districts of House Republicans – want immigration reform. What’s more, there is a built-in incentive for Republicans to put this issue behind them, given the slow forward march of demographic realities. Also, as longtime immigration operative Simon Rosenberg explains, Congressional Republicans have a long history of working on this issue. And some polls show that even sizable chunks of Republican voters want comprehensive reform, particularly if it is packaged with border security (Republican pollster Whit Ayres’ research, in particular, has shown that even GOP primary voters want action when informed that the other option is the status quo or “de facto amnesty,” as some pro-reform Republicans put it. Indeed, if there is anything that can make something happen, it’s the possibility that inaction is far more difficult politically for Republicans than many of them (and many commentators) claim. The immigration problem — “de facto amnesty” is not going away. If more Republicans like these three urge action inside the GOP caucus, it’s not impossible that House GOP leaders will allow votes on border security, the Kids Act, or potentially the legalization proposal that Republicans are said to be working on. That could possibly get us to conference. Yes, **immigration reform remains decidedly undead.**

**Conservatives hate science, plan guarantees a backlash.**

**Shepperd, staff reporter in Mother Jones, 3/29/12** (Kate, Mother Jones, “It's Not Your Imagination: Republicans Really Don't Like Science” <http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2012/03/its-not-your-imagination-republicans-really-dont-science> Date accessed: 7/13/13)KG

The premise of the 2005 book The Republican War on Science (by Mother Jones contributor Chris Mooney) was that conservatives in the US hate science. They don't like evolution, they don't like global warming—none of that stuff. Now a sociologist set out to figure out if that thesis really is true, and concluded that the right in the US is indeed growing increasingly distrustful of science. The reason for this, according to Mooney and others, is that the "political neutrality of science began to unravel in the 1970s with the emergence of the new right"—a growing body of conservatives who were distrustful of science and the intellectual establishment, who were often religious and concerned about defending "traditional values" in the face of a modernizing world, and who favored limited government. This has prompted backlash against subjects for which there is broad scientific consensus, like global warming and evolution—backlash that has been apparent in survey data over the past three decades.

**PC Is Key to Getting the *Essential Parts* of the Bill Through**

Anderson **Robichaud October 25**, 2013. n behalf of Robichaud, Anderson & Alcantara P.A. posted in US Immigration Law on “Beyond The Poisoned Well” http://www.robichaudlaw.com/blog/2013/10/beyond-the-poisoned-well-immigration-reform-tactics-changing.shtml

President Obama has not given up on enacting **c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform. ¶ To be sure, there is concern in Washington, DC and around the country that the partisan wrangling over the partial federal government shutdown "poisoned the well" of good will that may be needed to get the president and both chambers of Congress to agree on a specific proposal.¶ That is one reason why it may be necessary to break up the proposal passed by the Senate earlier this year into several different smaller bills. The smaller bills could tackle specific issues such as work visas or family immigration.¶ This week, there were indications that President Obama may be coming around to that point of view.¶ After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, the hope was that the U.S. House of Representatives would take up that bill. But the House did not do so. And now, after the passage of several months and the reality-check of the shutdown, the president appears to be shifting his tactics.¶ President Obama said this week that he is open to proposals from Republicans about possibly dividing up an immigration overhaul into several separate parts.¶ In political terms, it may be more practical to pass one or more of those parts than to keep holding out for a comprehensive reform that addresses all of the issues, all at once.¶ Of course, **in either form** -- either comprehensive or broken into separate parts -- **it will take considerable political capita**l and probably some (often elusive) compromise to actually pass immigration reform. But President **Obama is clearly** still **committed to making such reform one of the top priorities** of his second term.

**Immigration reform expands skilled labor—spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.**

**LA Times** 11/9/**12** [Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html>]

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

**US-Indian relations avert South Asian nuclear war.**

**Schaffer 2** [Spring 2002, Teresita—Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, Lexis]

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

### 1nc – t – environment

#### Interpretation – Environment treaties are NOT economic engagement

**Rose 8** (Andrew K, professor @ Haas School of Business Administration @ University of California, Berkeley, Mark M. Spiegel, researcher @ Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, “Non-Economic Engagement and International Exchange: The Case of Environmental Treaties,” NBER Working Paper No. 13988, May 2008, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13988>)

We examine the role of non-economic partnerships in promoting international economic exchange. Since far-sighted countries are more willing to join costly international partnerships such as environmental treaties, environmental engagement tends to encourage international lending. Countries with such **non-economic** partnerships also find it easier to engage in economic exchanges since they face the possibility that debt default might also spill over to hinder their non-economic relationships. We present a theoretical model of these ideas, and then verify their empirical importance using a bilateral cross-section of data on international cross-holdings of assets and environmental treaties. Our results support the notion that international environmental cooperation facilitates economic exchange.

### 1nc – shunning

**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**.

### 1nc – t – single area

#### Interpretation – engagement requires multiple-issue areas – affs that do 1 small part of the embargo aren’t topical

**Resnick 01** — Evan Resnick, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, holds an M.Phil. in Political Science and an M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University, 2001 (“Defining engagement,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Volume 54, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ABI/INFORM Complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT In order to establish **a more effective framework** for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the **comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts** with that state **across multiple issue-areas** (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include: DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS \* Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations \* Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes \* Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa MILITARY CONTACTS \* Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa \* Arms transfers \* Military aid and cooperation \* Military exchange and training programs \* Confidence and security-building measures \* Intelligence sharing ECONOMIC CONTACTS \* Trade agreements and promotion \* Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants CULTURAL CONTACTS \* Cultural treaties \* Inauguration of travel and tourism links \* Sport, artistic and academic exchanges Engagement is **an iterated process** in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.26 For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.27 Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state. This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.28 Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement. This reformulated conceptualization **avoids the pitfalls** of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as **a set of means rather than ends**, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in **multiple issue-areas**, allows for the existence of **multiple objectives** in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of **multiple types of positive sanctions**.

### 1nc – neolib

**The affirmative is confined to the dominant discourse of transnational capital. The affirmative buys into a system which produces unethical policy based on the short term logic of growth. This causes economic crisis and environmental destruction**

**Makwana 06** (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization¶ The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.¶ The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.¶ There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.¶ The neoliberal experiment has **failed to combat extreme** **poverty**, has **exacerbated global inequality**, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.¶ Introduction ¶ After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.¶ Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.¶ The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.¶ There is a **consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes** in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.¶ There is a **huge discrepancy** between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)¶ Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).¶ The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.¶ The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.¶ According to Maria Páez Victor:¶ “Since 1846 the United States has carried out **no fewer than 50 military invasions** and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of **perceived threats to its economic control** and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”¶ As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.¶ So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.¶ However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.¶ The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.¶ Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, **the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast**. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.¶ Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.¶ Economic Growth¶ Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.¶ Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.¶ Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.¶ The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.¶ Free Trade¶ Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.¶ With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.¶ The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, increased inequality and caused environmental destruction.¶ In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.¶ The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.¶ These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly biased in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.¶ Liberalization¶ The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.¶ According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.¶ Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely destroys local industries. It creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and economic crisis in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.¶ A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.¶

**Lifting the embargo would compromise cuba’s sustainable agriculture and impose neoliberal policies, food insecurity, exploitation, and inequality.**

**Gonzalez 04** (Carmen G. Gonzalez, Professor of International Law at Seattle University. . January 2004. "Trade Liberalization, Food Security, and the Environment: The Neoliberal Threat to Sustainable Rural Development". Selected Works. works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=carmen\_gonzalez)

¶ In sum, the neoliberal reforms of the last two decades exacerbated ¶ hunger and environmental degradation in the developing world by ¶ reinforcing pre-existing inequities in agricultural trade and production that ¶ have their genesis in colonialism. Specifically, the neoliberal policy ¶ prescription of the World Bank, the IMF, and the WTO reinforced ¶ debilitating specialization in agro-export production, **accelerated the adoption** ¶ **of ecologically harmful monocultures, and increased rural poverty and** ¶ **inequality.** ¶Structural adjustment exacerbated hunger in the developing world by ¶ obligating developing countries to open their markets to foreign competition ¶ without requiring corresponding reforms in the industrialized world. As ¶ developing countries lowered import barriers and slashed subsidies, ¶ developing country farmers were exposed to economically devastating ¶ competition from highly subsidized U.S. and EU agribusiness. Structural ¶ adjustment’s emphasis on cash crop production (to generate the revenue with ¶ which to service the foreign debt) aggravated rural inequality by favoring ¶ affluent farmers (who could afford the necessary inputs) at the expense of ¶ smallholders (who lacked the resources to shift to export production). ¶ Furthermore, the cash crop specialization promoted by structural adjustment ¶ glutted world markets and depressed commodity prices, thereby impairing ¶ the ability of developing countries to generate the steady and reliable ¶ revenue streams needed to finance food imports, service the foreign debt, and ¶ undertake economic diversification. Finally, structural adjustment intensified ¶ chemical-intensive monocultural farming techniques that **eroded biodiversity**, ¶ contaminated water supplies, depleted aquifers, accelerated deforestation, ¶ and degraded marginal lands.¶ Structural adjustment, in conjunction with the WTO Agreement on ¶ Agriculture, institutionalized a double standard that afflicts the agricultural ¶ sector to this day: protectionism in wealthy countries and liberalized trade in ¶ poor countries. This double standard aggravates food security at the ¶ household level by allowing cheap, subsidized food imports from the United ¶ States and the EU to undermine the livelihoods of millions of poor farmers in ¶ the developing world. This double standard also **intensifies food insecurity** at ¶ the national level in two distinct but complementary ways. First, the ¶ agricultural subsidies maintained by the industrialized world create ¶ disincentives to domestic food production in developing countries. Second, the ¶ trade-distorting subsidies and protectionist import barriers depress the ¶ export revenues necessary to finance food imports. Food security is ¶ compromised at the national level as developing countries produce less food ¶ and have less income with which to purchase food. The WTO SPS Agreement ¶ and the WTO TRIPS Agreement threaten to exacerbate the plight of small ¶ farmers and to reinforce chemical-intensive, monocultural production ¶ techniques by making farmers increasingly dependent on agricultural inputs ¶ (including patented seeds marketed with specific pesticides and herbicides) ¶ produced by transnational corporations based in the industrialized world. ¶ In short, the neoliberal economic model **institutionalized the tendency of ¶ colonialism**, the post-war agrochemical production boom, and the Green ¶ Revolution to favor large-scale, chemical-intensive agricultural production at ¶ the expense of the poor and of the natural world.288 The devastation wrought ¶ by this development model provides the necessary context for appreciating ¶ the historic significance of Cuba’s unique experiment in ecologically ¶ sustainable agriculture.¶ ¶ ¶ IV. CUBA: AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL? ¶ In an earlier article, I examined the evolution of Cuban agriculture from ¶ the colonial period to the present through the framework of food security and ¶ ecological sustainability.289 I argued that Cuba, prior to the collapse of the ¶ socialist trading bloc, was food insecure and ecologically compromised as a ¶ consequence of the export-oriented capital-intensive agricultural production ¶ model adopted by the Cuban government during the first three decades of the ¶ socialist revolution.290 Like the neoliberal economic model discussed in Part ¶ III.B above, Cuba’s post-revolutionary agricultural production strategy ¶ reinforced patterns of economic specialization imposed during the colonial ¶ period that created dependence on one agricultural commodity (sugar) to ¶ generate the foreign exchange necessary to purchase manufactured goods ¶ and imported food.291 This strategy rendered Cuba acutely vulnerable to ¶ fluctuations in world market prices for agricultural commodities and to ¶ political and economic pressure from its primary trading partner.292 When ¶ the collapse of the socialist trading bloc in 1990 coincided with low world ¶ market prices for sugar, the Cuban economy plunged into a state of crisis ¶ known as the Special Period in Peacetime.293 In response to the crisis, the ¶ Cuban government implemented an unprecedented series of reforms that ¶ decentralized and diversified agricultural production, emphasized production ¶ for the domestic market, and promoted organic and semi-organic ¶ techniques.294 These reforms enhanced food security and ecological ¶ sustainability by diversifying Cuba’s productive base and by utilizing natural ¶ pest, nutrient, and soil management technologies in lieu of non-renewable, ¶ environmentally damaging inputs.295¶ Once the U.S. economic embargo is lifted, Cuba will face extraordinary ¶ pressure from international trade and financial institutions to adopt ¶ neoliberal policies that may jeopardize Cuba’s agricultural transformation. ¶ Cuba is, therefore, a superb vehicle for exploring the constraints imposed by ¶ global trade and financial institutions on the development strategies of small, ¶ trade-dependent developing countries. This section outlines the origins of ¶ industrial agriculture in Cuba, discusses the transformation of Cuban ¶ agriculture in the aftermath of the demise of the socialist trading bloc, and ¶ examines the ways in which neoliberal economic policies may undermine ¶ Cuba’s post-1990 reforms.

**The alternative is a process of critique that challenges the ideology of capital by prioritizing human development over production**

**Lebowitz 07** (Michael A. Lebowitz is author of Beyond Capital: Marx’s Political Economy of the Working Class (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), Build It Now: Socialism for the Twenty-First Century (Monthly Review Press, 2006), and The Socialist Alternative: Real Human Development (Monthly Review Press, forthcoming in 2008). Portions of this essay were presented as “Going Beyond Survival: Making the Social Economy a Real Alternative” at the Fourth International Meeting of the Solidarity Economy, July 21–23, 2006, at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, “Venezuela: A Good Example of the Bad Left of Latin America”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/07/01/venezuela-a-good-example-of-the-bad-left-of-latin-america>,)

What constitutes a real alternative to capitalism? I suggest that it is a society in which the explicit goal is not the growth of capital or of the material means of production but, rather, human development itself—the growth of human capacities. We can see this perspective embodied in the Bolivarian Constitution of Venezuela—in Article 299’s emphasis upon “ensuring overall human development,” in the declaration of Article 20 that “everyone has the right to the free development of his or her own personality,” and in the focus of Article 102 upon “developing the creative potential of every human being and the full exercise of his or her personality in a democratic society.”¶ In these passages (which are by no means the whole of that constitution), **there is the conception of a real alternative—an economy whose logic is not the logic of capital.** “The social economy,” President Hugo Chávez said in September 2003, “bases its logic on the human being, on work, that is to say, on the worker and the worker’s family, that is to say, in the human being.” That social economy, he continued, does not focus on economic gain, on exchange values; rather, “the social economy generates mainly use-value.” Its purpose is “the construction of the new man, of the new woman, of the new society.”¶ These are beautiful ideas and beautiful words, but they are, of course, only ideas and words. The first set comes from a constitution and the second comes from the regular national educational seminar known as Aló Presidente. How can such ideas and words be made real? Let me suggest four preconditions for the realization of this alternative to capitalism.¶ (1) Any discussion of structural change must begin from an understanding of the existing structure—in short, from an understanding of capitalism. We need to grasp that the logic of capital, the logic in which profit rather than satisfaction of the needs of human beings is the goal, dominates both where it fosters **the comparative advantage of repression** and also where it accepts an increase in slave rations. (2) **It is essential to attack the logic of capital ideologically**. In the absence of the development of a mass understanding of the nature of capital—that capital is the result of the social labor of the collective worker—the need to survive the ravages of neoliberal and repressive policies produces **only the desire** for a fairer society, the search for a better share for the exploited and excluded: **in short, barbarism with a human face.**¶ (3) A critical aspect in the battle to go beyond capitalism is the recognition that human capacity develops only through human activity, only through what Marx understood as “revolutionary practice,” the simultaneous changing of circumstances and self-change. Real human development does not drop from the sky in the form of money to support survival or the expenditures of popular governments upon education and health. In contrast to populism, which produces people who look to the state for all answers and to leaders who promise everything, the conception which **truly challenges the logic of capital** in the battle of ideas is one which **explicitly recognizes the centrality of self-management in the workplace and self-government in the community as the means of unleashing human potential—i.e., the idea of socialism for the twenty-first century**.¶ (4) But, the idea of this socialism cannot displace real capitalism. Nor can dwarfish islands of cooperation change the world by competing successfully against capitalist corporations. You need the power to foster the new productive relations while truncating the reproduction of capitalist productive relations. You need to take the power of the state away from capital, and you need to use that power when capital responds to encroachments—when capital goes on strike, you must be prepared to move in rather than give in. Winning the “battle of democracy” and using “political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie” remains as critical now as when Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. Consider these preconditions. Are they being met by the new Latin American governments on the left? On the contrary, for the most part, we can see the familiar characteristics of social democracy—which does not understand the nature of capital, does not attack the logic of capital ideologically, does not believe that there is a real alternative to capitalism, and, not surprisingly, gives in when capital threatens to go on strike.¶ “We can’t kill the goose that lays the golden eggs,” announced the social democratic premier of British Columbia in Canada (in the 1970s when I was party policy chairman). Here, crystallized, is the ultimate wisdom of social democracy—the manner in which social democracy enforces the logic of capital and ideologically disarms and demobilizes people.¶ Venezuela, however, is going in a different direction at this point. While the Bolivarian Revolution did not start out to build a socialist alternative (and its continuation along this path is contested every step of the way), **it is both actively rejecting the logic of capital and also ideologically arming and mobilizing people to build that alternative**.

### 1nc – cp

**The United States federal government should offer to sign a science and technology agreement with Cuba excluding scientists to travel.**

**Cuban health care industry high – lifting the embargo on medical workers collapses it**

**Garrett ’10 –Senior Director of Foreign Policy** Laurie, “Castrocare in Crisis: Will Lifting the Embargo on Cuba Make Things Worse?” (August 1010)thecubaneconomy.com/wp-content/uploads/.../Castrocare-in-Crisis.docx‎)

Cuba's economic situation has been dire since 1989, when the country lost its Soviet benefactors and its economy experienced a 35 percent contraction. Today, Cuba's major industries -- tourism, nickel mining, tobacco and rum production, and health care -- are fragile. Cubans blame the long-standing U.S. trade embargo for some of these strains and are wildly optimistic about the transformations that will come once the embargo is lifted. Overlooked in these dreamy discussions of lifestyle improvements, however, is that Cuba's health-care industry will likely be radically affected by any serious easing in trade and travel restrictions between the United States and Cuba. If policymakers on both sides of the Florida Straits do not take great care, the tiny Caribbean nation could swiftly be robbed of its greatest triumph. First, its public health network could be devastated by an exodus of thousands of well-trained Cuban physicians and nurses. Second, for-profit U.S. companies could transform the remaining health-care system into a prime destination for medical tourism from abroad. The very strategies that the Cuban government has employed to develop its system into a major success story have rendered it ripe for the plucking by the U.S. medical industry and by foreigners eager for affordable, elective surgeries in a sunny climate. In short, although the U.S. embargo strains Cuba's health-care system and its overall economy, it may be the better of two bad options. MEDICAL HELP WANTED After half a century of socialist rule, there remain clearly distinct social classes in Cuba. The most obvious difference is between those households that regularly receive money from relatives in the United States and those that have no outside source of hard currency. A mere $20 a month from a cousin in Miami can lift a family out of poverty and provide it with a tolerable lifestyle. Elegant living is found in Havana's Miramar area, where architectural masterpieces of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have been restored and painted in pastels and are inhabited by diplomats or Cubans of mysteriously ample means. When they take ill (or need liposuction), the more privileged residents of Miramar go to Havana's Clínica Central Cira García, a well-appointed clinic that is run by the government-owned tourism conglomerate the Cubanacán Group and that primarily serves foreigners. (The doctors, technicians, and nurses who staff the Cubanacán Group's health facilities all work for the Cuban Ministry of Public Health. Cubanacán's medical operations include a retinal surgery center, a dermatology clinic that specializes in skin treatments with human placental preparations, and abortion services.) Aside from the posters of Che Guevara and Fidel Castro, Cira García feels like a top European or North American clinic, as the thousands of patients who arrive every year from more than 70 nations could attest. Private suites and a variety of elective procedures are provided at modest prices. Sixty full-time physicians, 40 specialist adjuncts from neighboring public health hospitals, and many nurses work at Cira García. All of the clinic's equipment appears to work, the pharmaceutical supplies are plentiful, the daily patient loads are small, and the doctors feel as though they have the tools and the time to do what they have long trained to do. On average, the physicians at Cira García have 20 years of experience, including at least two years in another developing country. The clinic's Canadian clients favor family package deals that allow children to play on local beaches while their parents get a new knee ($6,850) or a titanium implant to correct a herniated vertebral disk ($4,863). Spaniards and Italians tend to visit Cira García for thigh liposuctions ($1,090) and face lifts ($2,540). Some Latin Americans from countries with strict antiabortion laws travel to Cira García for the procedure ($600). The clinic is so popular that its administrators are assessing how to find space in the crowded neighborhood to build a new wing with 50 more beds. But a lot may change if the United States alters its policies toward Cuba. In 2009, a group of 30 physicians from Florida toured Cira García and concluded that once the U.S. embargo is lifted, the facility will be overwhelmed by its foreign patients. It takes little imagination to envision chains of private clinics, located near five-star hotels and beach resorts, catering to the elective needs of North Americans and Europeans. Such a trend might bode well for Canadians seeking to avoid queues in Ottawa for hip replacements or for U.S. health insurance companies looking to cut costs on cataract surgery and pacemakers. But providing health care to wealthy foreigners would drain physicians, technicians, and nurses from Cuba's public system. And any such brain drain within Cuba might be dwarfed by a brain drain out into the rest of the world, as Cuban doctors and nurses leave the country to seek incomes that cannot be matched at home. Countries facing gross deficits in skilled medical talent are already scrambling to lure doctors, nurses, lab technicians, dentists, pharmacists, and health administrators from other nations. In 2006, the WHO estimated that the global deficit of medical professionals was roughly 4.3 million, and the figure can only have grown since then. As the world's population ages and average life expectancies rise from the United States to China, millions more patients will need complex, labor-intensive medical attention. And in countries with falling life expectancies and high rates of HIV/AIDS, donor resources aimed at combating the disease often have the unintended consequence of further straining meager supplies of human medical resources by drawing talent away from less well-funded areas of medicine, such as basic children's health care.

**Current Cuban health care effective model for elimination of disease**

Cooper et al, 6 - Department of Preventive Medicine and Epidemiology, Loyola University Stritch School of Medicine (Richard S., Joan F Kennelly, and Pedro Orduñez-Garcia, “Health in Cuba,” International Journal of Epidemiology, http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/4/817.full)//SY

Two aspects of the Cuban experience serve as reasonable demonstrations of the value of that strategic approach. In the area of infectious disease, for example, the operative principles are particularly straightforward: once a safe and effective vaccine becomes available the entire at-risk population is immunized; if a vaccine is not available, the susceptible population is screened and treated; where an arthropod vector can be identified, the transmission pathway is disrupted by mobilizing the local community which in turn requires effective neighbourhood organization and universal primary health care. The joint effect of these strategic activities will result in the **elimination or control of virtually all serious epidemic infectious conditions**. In terms of child survival, a ‘continuum of care’ that provides for the pre-conceptional health of women, prenatal care, skilled birth attendants, and a comprehensive well-baby programme can quickly reduce infant mortality to levels approaching the biological minimum. Many observers will regard these propositions as reasonable, yet hopelessly too ambitious for the poorer nations of the world. It must be recognized, however, that these principles have been successfully implemented in Cuba at a cost well within the reach of most middle-income countries.

**Causes extinction**

**Quammen 12** David, award-winning science writer, long-time columnist for Outside magazine for fifteen years, with work in National Geographic, Harper's, Rolling Stone, the New York Times Book Review and other periodicals, 9/29, “Could the next big animal-to-human disease wipe us out?,” The Guardian, pg. 29, Lexis

Infectious disease is all around us. It's one of the basic processes that ecologists study, along with predation and competition. Predators are big beasts that eat their prey from outside. Pathogens (disease-causing agents, such as viruses) are small beasts that eat their prey from within. Although infectious disease can seem grisly and dreadful, under ordinary conditions, it's every bit as natural as what lions do to wildebeests and zebras. But conditions aren't always ordinary. Just as predators have their accustomed prey, so do pathogens. And just as a lion might occasionally depart from its normal behaviour - to kill a cow instead of a wildebeest, or a human instead of a zebra - so a pathogen can shift to a new target. Aberrations occur. When a pathogen leaps from an animal into a person, and succeeds in establishing itself as an infectious presence, sometimes causing illness or death, the result is a zoonosis. It's a mildly technical term, zoonosis, unfamiliar to most people, but it helps clarify the biological complexities behind the ominous headlines about swine flu, bird flu, Sars, emerging diseases in general, and the threat of a global pandemic. It's a word of the future, destined for heavy use in the 21st century. Ebola and Marburg are zoonoses. So is bubonic plague. So was the so-called Spanish influenza of 1918-1919, which had its source in a wild aquatic bird and emerged to kill as many as 50 million people. All of the human influenzas are zoonoses. As are monkeypox, bovine tuberculosis, Lyme disease, West Nile fever, rabies and a strange new affliction called Nipah encephalitis, which has killed pigs and pig farmers in Malaysia. Each of these zoonoses reflects the action of a pathogen that can "spillover", crossing into people from other animals. Aids is a disease of zoonotic origin caused by a virus that, having reached humans through a few accidental events in western and central Africa, now passes human-to-human. This form of interspecies leap is not rare; about 60% of all human infectious diseases currently known either cross routinely or have recently crossed between other animals and us. Some of those - notably rabies - are familiar, widespread and still horrendously lethal, killing humans by the thousands despite centuries of efforts at coping with their effects. Others are new and inexplicably sporadic, claiming a few victims or a few hundred, and then disappearing for years. Zoonotic pathogens can hide. The least conspicuous strategy is to lurk within what's called a reservoir host: a living organism that carries the pathogen while suffering little or no illness. When a disease seems to disappear between outbreaks, it's often still lingering nearby, within some reservoir host. A rodent? A bird? A butterfly? A bat? To reside undetected is probably easiest wherever biological diversity is high and the ecosystem is relatively undisturbed. The converse is also true: ecological disturbance causes diseases to emerge. Shake a tree and things fall out. Michelle Barnes is an energetic, late 40s-ish woman, an avid rock climber and cyclist. Her auburn hair, she told me cheerily, came from a bottle. It approximates the original colour, but the original is gone. In 2008, her hair started falling out; the rest went grey "pretty much overnight". This was among the lesser effects of a mystery illness that had nearly killed her during January that year, just after she'd returned from Uganda. Her story paralleled the one Jaap Taal had told me about Astrid, with several key differences - the main one being that Michelle Barnes was still alive. Michelle and her husband, Rick Taylor, had wanted to see mountain gorillas, too. Their guide had taken them through Maramagambo Forest and into Python Cave. They, too, had to clamber across those slippery boulders. As a rock climber, Barnes said, she tends to be very conscious of where she places her hands. No, she didn't touch any guano. No, she was not bumped by a bat. By late afternoon they were back, watching the sunset. It was Christmas evening 2007. They arrived home on New Year's Day. On 4 January, Barnes woke up feeling as if someone had driven a needle into her skull. She was achy all over, feverish. "And then, as the day went on, I started developing a rash across my stomach." The rash spread. "Over the next 48 hours, I just went down really fast." By the time Barnes turned up at a hospital in suburban Denver, she was dehydrated; her white blood count was imperceptible; her kidneys and liver had begun shutting down. An infectious disease specialist, Dr Norman K Fujita, arranged for her to be tested for a range of infections that might be contracted in Africa. All came back negative, including the test for Marburg. Gradually her body regained strength and her organs began to recover. After 12 days, she left hospital, still weak and anaemic, still undiagnosed. In March she saw Fujita on a follow-up visit and he had her serum tested again for Marburg. Again, negative. Three more months passed, and Barnes, now grey-haired, lacking her old energy, suffering abdominal pain, unable to focus, got an email from a journalist she and Taylor had met on the Uganda trip, who had just seen a news article. In the Netherlands, a woman had died of Marburg after a Ugandan holiday during which she had visited a cave full of bats. Barnes spent the next 24 hours Googling every article on the case she could find. Early the following Monday morning, she was back at Dr Fujita's door. He agreed to test her a third time for Marburg. This time a lab technician crosschecked the third sample, and then the first sample. The new results went to Fujita, who called Barnes: "You're now an honorary infectious disease doctor. You've self-diagnosed, and the Marburg test came back positive." The Marburg virus had reappeared in Uganda in 2007. It was a small outbreak, affecting four miners, one of whom died, working at a site called Kitaka Cave. But Joosten's death, and Barnes's diagnosis, implied a change in the potential scope of the situation. That local Ugandans were dying of Marburg was a severe concern - sufficient to bring a response team of scientists in haste. But if tourists, too, were involved, tripping in and out of some python-infested Marburg repository, unprotected, and then boarding their return flights to other continents, the place was not just a peril for Ugandan miners and their families. It was also an international threat. The first team of scientists had collected about 800 bats from Kitaka Cave for dissecting and sampling, and marked and released more than 1,000, using beaded collars coded with a number. That team, including scientist Brian Amman, had found live Marburg virus in five bats. Entering Python Cave after Joosten's death, another team of scientists, again including Amman, came across one of the beaded collars they had placed on captured bats three months earlier and 30 miles away. "It confirmed my suspicions that these bats are moving," Amman said - and moving not only through the forest but from one roosting site to another. Travel of individual bats between far-flung roosts implied circumstances whereby Marburg virus might ultimately be transmitted all across Africa, from one bat encampment to another. It voided the comforting assumption that this virus is strictly localised. And it highlighted the complementary question: why don't outbreaks of Marburg virus disease happen more often? Marburg is only one instance to which that question applies. Why not more Ebola? Why not more Sars? In the case of Sars, the scenario could have been very much worse. Apart from the 2003 outbreak and the aftershock cases in early 2004, it hasn't recurred. . . so far. Eight thousand cases are relatively few for such an explosive infection; 774 people died, not 7 million. Several factors contributed to limiting the scope and impact of the outbreak, of which humanity's good luck was only one. Another was the speed and excellence of the laboratory diagnostics - finding the virus and identifying it. Still another was the brisk efficiency with which cases were isolated, contacts were traced and quarantine measures were instituted, first in southern China, then in Hong Kong, Singapore, Hanoi and Toronto. If the virus had arrived in a different sort of big city - more loosely governed, full of poor people, lacking first-rate medical institutions - it might have burned through a much larger segment of humanity. One further factor, possibly the most crucial, was inherent in the way Sars affects the human body: symptoms tend to appear in a person before, rather than after, that person becomes highly infectious. That allowed many Sars cases to be recognised, hospitalised and placed in isolation before they hit their peak of infectivity. With influenza and many other diseases, the order is reversed. That probably helped account for the scale of worldwide misery and death during the 1918-1919 influenza. And that infamous global pandemic occurred in the era before globalisation. Everything nowadays moves around the planet faster, including viruses. When the Next Big One comes, it will likely conform to the same perverse pattern as the 1918 influenza: high infectivity preceding notable symptoms. That will help it move through cities and airports like an angel of death. The Next Big One is a subject that disease scientists around the world often address. The most recent big one is Aids, of which the eventual total bigness cannot even be predicted - about 30 million deaths, 34 million living people infected, and with no end in sight. Fortunately, not every virus goes airborne from one host to another. If HIV-1 could, you and I might already be dead. If the rabies virus could, it would be the most horrific pathogen on the planet. The influenzas are well adapted for airborne transmission, which is why a new strain can circle the world within days. The Sars virus travels this route, too, or anyway by the respiratory droplets of sneezes and coughs - hanging in the air of a hotel corridor, moving through the cabin of an aeroplane - and that capacity, combined with its case fatality rate of almost 10%, is what made it so scary in 2003 to the people who understood it best. Human-to-human transmission is the crux. That capacity is what separates a bizarre, awful, localised, intermittent and mysterious disease (such as Ebola) **from a global pandemic**. Have you noticed the persistent, low-level buzz about avian influenza, the strain known as H5N1, among disease experts over the past 15 years? That's because avian flu worries them deeply, though it hasn't caused many human fatalities. Swine flu comes and goes periodically in the human population (as it came and went during 2009), sometimes causing a bad pandemic and sometimes (as in 2009) not so bad as expected; but avian flu resides in a different category of menacing possibility. It worries the flu scientists because they know that H5N1 influenza is extremely virulent in people, with a high lethality. As yet, there have been a relatively low number of cases, and it is poorly transmissible, so far, from human to human. It'll kill you if you catch it, very likely, but you're unlikely to catch it except by butchering an infected chicken. But if H5N1 mutates or reassembles itself in just the right way, if it adapts for human-to-human transmission, it could become the biggest and fastest killer disease since 1918. It got to Egypt in 2006 and has been especially problematic for that country. As of August 2011, there were 151 confirmed cases, of which 52 were fatal. That represents more than a quarter of all the world's known human cases of bird flu since H5N1 emerged in 1997. But here's a critical fact: those unfortunate Egyptian patients all seem to have acquired the virus directly from birds. This indicates that the virus hasn't yet found an efficient way to pass from one person to another. Two aspects of the situation are dangerous, according to biologist Robert Webster. The first is that Egypt, given its recent political upheavals, may be unable to staunch an outbreak of transmissible avian flu, if one occurs. His second concern is shared by influenza researchers and public health officials around the globe: with all that mutating, with all that contact between people and their infected birds, the virus could hit upon a genetic configuration making it highly transmissible among people. "As long as H5N1 is out there in the world," Webster told me, "there is the possibility of disaster. . . There is the theoretical possibility that it can acquire the ability to transmit human-to-human." He paused. "And then God help us." We're unique in the history of mammals. No other primate has ever weighed upon the planet to anything like the degree we do. In ecological terms, we are almost paradoxical: large-bodied and long-lived but grotesquely abundant. We are an outbreak. And here's the thing about outbreaks: they **end**. In some cases they end after many years, in others they end rather soon. In some cases they end gradually, in others they end with a crash. In certain cases, they end and recur and end again. Populations of tent caterpillars, for example, seem to rise steeply and fall sharply on a cycle of anywhere from five to 11 years. The crash endings are dramatic, and for a long while they seemed mysterious. What could account for such sudden and recurrent collapses? One possible factor is infectious disease, and viruses in particular.

### 1nc – solvency

**1 Cuba will say no – they don’t trust we’ll follow through and the embrgo serves their interests**

**French 13**, Director of the New America Foundation U.S. – Cuba Policy Initiative, (Anya Landau, “Secretary Kerry: Will He or Won't He Take On Cuba” http://thehavananote.com/2013/02/secretary\_kerry\_will\_he\_or\_wont\_he\_take\_cuba)

And, then there’s the Cuban government. As much as many in the Cuban government (particularly the diplomatic corps) want to reduce tensions with the United States and finally make real progress on long-standing grievances held by both sides, **they aren’t desperate for the big thaw**. Many U.S. analysts, including in government, speculate that this is because Cuba’s leaders don’t really want to change the relationship, that **strife serves their needs better** than would the alternative. That could be so, but there’s also a hefty amount of skepticism and pride on the Cuban side, as well. After so many decades and layers of what Cuba calls the U.S. blockade, Cubans are unwilling to have the terms of any ‘surrender’ dictated to them. In fact, they are bound and determined that there will be no surrender. They would argue, what is there to surrender but their government’s very existence, something the leadership obviously isn’t going to put on the table.¶ Many in the Cuban government question whether the U.S. would offer anything that truly matters to Cuba, or **honor any commitments made**. Arguably, the last deal the U.S. made good on was struck during the Missile Crisis of October 1963, and Cuba wasn’t even at the table for that. It’s a lesser known fact that the United States never fully implemented the 1994/1995 migration accords, which committed both nations to work to prevent migration by irregular means. The U.S. did stop accepting illegal migrants from Cuba found at sea, but it still accepts them when they reach our shores – thus dubbed our ‘wet foot, dry foot’ policy. And with our generous adjustment policy offering a green card after one year, the incentive to make the illegal trip remains largely in place.

**1nc – science**

**No impact to the ozone**

**Singer, 95** (S. Fred, Ph.D., president science and environment policy project, November 1, Washington Times, http://209.85.141.104/search?q=cache:YItL5uwXgYQJ:www.sepp.org/key%2520issues/ozone/oznobel.html+Time+and+again,+journalists+have+run+with+a+story+that+amounts+to+little+more+than+%22science+by+press+release.%22&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us)

Time and again, journalists have run with a story that amounts to little more than "science by press release." They have succumbed to tales of blind sheep and rabbits, plankton death, and the disappearance of frogs--all blamed on ozone depletion. Yet a little common sense could help to stem the tide of scare stories, punitive regulations, and politically motivated Nobel prizes. From the very outset it has been clear that the feared global ozone depletion would lead to a trivial increase of ultraviolet radiation at the Earth's surface, equivalent to moving just 60 miles closer to the equator, the distance from Washington to Richmond. This equivalence has been openly acknowledged by **ozone scientists** in press conferences and Congressional hearings. It puts the lie to fears of cataract epidemics, immune system failures, and various ecological disasters. The problem now is that the action of the Swedish Academy is being viewed as a scientific endorsement, not only of ozone depletion but of all of the horror stories put out by activist groups. Awarding the Nobel prize with the science still unsettled only says that facts are irrelevant, that data don't matter. What does seem to matter, at least to the Academy, is "salvation."

**Natural variability makes the impact inevitable and means that oceans will adapt—their studies don’t assume this**

Hofmann 11, Professor of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology – University of California Santa Barbara et al.,

(Gretchen E., “High-Frequency Dynamics of Ocean pH: A Multi-Ecosystem Comparison,” *PLoS ONE* Vol. 6, No. 12)

Since the publication of two reports in 2005–2006 [1], [2], the drive to forecast the effects of anthropogenic ocean acidification (OA) on marine ecosystems and their resident calcifying marine organisms has resulted in a growing body of research. Numerous laboratory studies testing the effects of altered seawater chemistry (low pH, altered pCO2, and undersaturation states - Ω - for calcium carbonate polymorphs) on biogenic calcification, growth, metabolism, and development have demonstrated a range of responses in marine organisms (for reviews see [3]–[8]). However, the emerging picture of biological consequences of OA – from data gathered largely from laboratory experiments – is not currently matched by equally available environmental data that describe present-day pH exposures or the natural variation in the carbonate system experienced by most marine organisms. Although researchers have documented variability in seawater carbonate chemistry on several occasions in different marine ecosystems (e.g., [9]–[15]), this **variation has been under-appreciated in** these early stages of **OA research.** Recently, a deeper consideration of ecosystem-specific variation in seawater chemistry has emerged (e.g., [16]–[18]), one that is pertinent to the study of biological consequences of OA. Specifically, assessments of environmental heterogeneity present a nuanced complement to current laboratory experiments. The dynamics of specific natural carbonate chemistry on local scales provide critical context because outcomes of experiments on single species are used in meta-analyses to project the overall biological consequences of OA [7], [19], to forecast ecosystem-level outcomes [20], and ultimately to contribute to policy decisions [21] and the management of fisheries [22], [23]. As noted earlier [24], **natural variability in pH is seldom considered** when effects of ocean acidification are considered. **Natural variability may occur at rates much higher than the rate at which carbon dioxide is decreasing ocean pH**, about −0.0017 pH/year [25], [26]. This ambient fluctuation in pH may have a large impact on the development of resilience in marine populations, or it may combine with the steady effects of acidification to produce extreme events with large impacts [24]. In either case, understanding the environmental variability in ocean pH is **essential.** Although data on the natural variation in the seawater CO2 system are emerging, nearly all high-resolution (e.g. hourly) time series are based on pCO2 sensors, with comparatively few pH time series found in the literature. From a research perspective, the absence of information regarding natural pH dynamics is a **critical data gap** for the biological and ecological arm of the multidisciplinary investigation of OA. Our ability to understand processes ranging from physiological tolerances to local adaptation is compromised. Specifically, laboratory experiments to test tolerances are often not designed to encompass the actual habitat exposure of the organisms under study, a critical design criterion in organismal physiology that also applies to global change biology [27]–[29]. It is noted that neither pH nor pCO2 alone provide the information sufficient to fully constrain the CO2 system, and while it is preferred to measure both, the preference for measuring one over the other is evaluated on a case-by-case basis and is often dictated by the equipment available. In this light, data that reveal present-day pH dynamics in marine environments and therefore ground pH levels in CO2 perturbation experiments in an environmental context are valuable to the OA research community in two major ways. First, estimates of organismal resilience are greatly facilitated. Empiricists can contextualize lab experiments with actual environmental data, thereby improving them. Notably, the majority of manipulative laboratory experiments in OA research (including our own) have been parameterized using pCO2 levels as per the IPCC emission scenario predictions [30]. One consequence of this practice is that organisms are potentially tested outside of the current exposure across their biogeographic range, and tolerances are not bracketed appropriately. This situation may not be a lethal issue (i.e. negating all past observations in experiments where environmental context was not known); however, the lack of information about the ‘pH seascape’ may be translated through these organismal experiments in a manner that clouds the perspective of vulnerability of marine ecosystems. For example, recent data on the heterogeneity of pH in coastal waters of the Northeastern Pacific [31], [32] that are characterized by episodic upwelling has caused biologists to re-examine the physiological tolerances of organisms that live there. Specifically, resident calcifying marine invertebrates and algae are acclimatized to existing spatial and temporal heterogeneity [17], [18], and further, populations are likely adapted to local to regional differences in upwelling patterns [33]. Secondly, in addition to improving laboratory experiments, data regarding the nature of the pH seascape also facilitate hypothesis-generating science. Specifically, heterogeneity in the environment with regard to pH and pCO2 exposure may result in populations that are acclimatized to variable pH or extremes in pH. Although this process has been highlighted in thermal biology of marine invertebrates [34], such insight is not available with regard to gradients of seawater chemistry that occur on biogeographic scales. With that said, recent field studies have demonstrated that natural variation in seawater chemistry does influence organismal abundance and distribution [16], [35], [36]. With our newfound access to pH time series data, we can begin to explore the biophysical link between environmental seawater chemistry and resilience to baseline shifts in pH regimes, to identify at-risk populations as well as tolerant ones. Additionally, the use of sensors in the field can identify hidden patterns in the CO2 system, revealing areas that are refugia to acidification or carbonate undersaturation; such knowledge could enable protection, management, and remediation of critical marine habitats and populations in the future. The recent development of sensors for in situ measurements of seawater pH [37], [38] has resulted in the ability to record pH more readily in the field in a manner that can support biological and ecological research. Since 2009, the Martz lab (SIO) has constructed 52 “SeaFET” pH sensors for 13 different collaborators (see http://martzlab.ucsd.edu) working in a broad range of settings. Using subsamples of data from many of these sensors, here we examine signatures of pH heterogeneity, presenting time series snapshots of sea-surface pH (upper 10 m) at 15 locations, spanning various overlapping habitat classifications including polar, temperate, tropical, open ocean, coastal, upwelling, estuarine, kelp forest, coral reef, pelagic, benthic, and extreme. Naturally, at many sites, multiple habitat classifications will apply. Characteristic patterns observed in the 30-day snapshots provide biome-specific pH signatures. This comparative dataset highlights the heterogeneity of present-day pH among marine ecosystems and underscores that contemporary marine organisms are currently exposed to different pH regimes in seawater that are not predicted until 2100. Results Overall, the patterns of pH recorded at each of the 15 deployment sites (shown in Figure 1, Table 1) were strikingly different. Figure 2 presents the temporal pattern of pH variation at each of these sites, and, for the sake of comparison, these are presented as 30-day time series “snapshots.” Note that all deployments generated >30 days of data except for sensors 3, 4, and 13, where the sensors were deliberately removed due to time constraints at the study sites. Though the patterns observed among the various marine ecosystems are driven by a variety of oceanographic forcing such as temperature, mixing, and biological activity, we do not provide a separate analysis of controlling factors on pH at each location. Each time series was accompanied by a different set of ancillary data, some rich with several co-located sensors, others devoid of co-located sensors. Given these differences in data collection across sites, here we focus on the comparative pH sensor data as a means to highlight observed pH variability and ecosystem-level differences between sites. For purposes of comparison, the metrics of variability presented here are pH minima, maxima, range, standard deviation, and rate of change (see Table 2). The rate presented in Table 2 and Figure 3 represents a mean instantaneous rate of change in pH hr−1, where a rate was calculated for each discrete time step as the absolute value of pH difference divided by the length of time between two adjacent data points. In terms of general patterns amongst the comparative datasets, the open ocean sites (CCE1 and Kingman Reef) and the Antarctic sites (Cape Evans and Cindercones) displayed the least variation in pH over the 30-day deployment period. For example, pH range fluctuated between 0.024 to 0.096 at CCE1, Kingman Reef, Cape Evans, and Cindercones (Figure 2A, B and Table 2). In distinct contrast to the stability of the open ocean and Antarctic sites, sensors at the other five site classifications (upwelling, estuarine/near-shore, coral reef, kelp forest, and extreme) captured much greater variability (pH fluctuations ranging between 0.121 to 1.430) and may provide insight towards ecosystem-specific patterns. The sites in upwelling regions (Pt. Conception and Pt. Ano Nuevo, Figure 2C), the two locations in Monterey Bay, CA (Figure 2D), and the kelp forest sites (La Jolla and Santa Barbara Mohawk Reef, Figure 2F) all exhibited large fluctuations in pH conditions (pH changes>0.25). Additionally, at these 6 sites, pH oscillated in semi-diurnal patterns, the most apparent at the estuarine sites. The pH recorded in coral reef ecosystems exhibited a distinct diel pattern characterized by relatively consistent, moderate fluctuations (0.1<pH change<0.25; Figure 2E). At the Palmyra fore reef site, pH maxima occurred in the early evening (~5:00 pm), and pH minima were recorded immediately pre-dawn (~6:30 am). On a fringing reef site in Moorea, French Polynesia, a similar diel pattern was observed, with pH maxima occurring shortly after sunset (~7:30 pm) and pH minima several hours after dawn (~10:00 am). Finally, the greatest transitions in pH over time were observed at locations termed our “Extreme” sites - a CO2 venting site in Italy (site S2 in ref. [36]) and a submarine spring site in Mexico. For these sites, the patterns were extremely variable and lacked a detectable periodicity (Figure 2G). The sites examined in this study do not comprehensively represent pH variability in coastal ecosystems, partly because we focused on surface epipelagic and shallow benthic pH variability. Many organisms that may be impacted by pH variability and ocean acidification reside at intermediate (>10 m) to abyssal depths. Notable regimes missing from Figure 2 include seasonally stratified open ocean locations that exhibit intense spring blooms; the equatorial upwelling zone; other temperate (and highly productive) Eastern Continental Boundary upwelling areas; subsurface oxygen minimum zones and seasonal dead zones; and a wide variety of unique estuarine, salt marsh, and tide pool environments. Spring bloom locations exhibit a marked increase in diel pCO2 variability during the peak bloom with a coincident drawdown similar in magnitude but opposite in sign to the upwelling signals shown in Figure 2 [39]. Equatorial upwelling locations undergo significant stochastic variability, as observed by pCO2 sensors in the TAO array (data viewable at http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/). Intertidal vegetated and tide pool habitats may exhibit major pH fluctuations due to macrophyte or animal respiratory cycles [15], while CO2 production in oxygen minimum zones can reduce pH to a limit of about 7.4 [40]. Due to local temperature differences, variable total alkalinity, and seasonal differences between deployment dates at each site, a comparison of average pH across the datasets would be somewhat misleading. However, some information can be gleaned from an examination of the averages: the overall binned average of all 15 mean values in Table 1 is 8.02±0.1. This pH value is generally in agreement with the global open ocean mean for 2010 of 8.07, a value generated by combining climatology data for temperature, salinity, phosphate, silicate [41]–[43], total alkalinity [44], and pCO2 [45] for the year 2000, corrected to 2010 using the average global rise of 1.5 µatm pCO2 yr−1. Rather than make a point-by-point comparison of the mean pH of each dataset, we focus instead on the differences in observed variability amongst the sites. For this analysis, summary statistics of the comparative datasets were ranked in order to examine the range of variability across all 15 sites (Fig. 3). Discussion Collected by 15 individual SeaFET sensors in seven types of marine habitats, data presented here highlight natural variability in seawater pH. Based on Figure 3, it is evident that regions of the ocean exhibit a continuum of pH variability. At sites in the open ocean (CCE-1), Antarctica, and Kingman reef (a coastal region in the permanently stratified open Pacific Ocean with very low residence times, and thus representative of the surrounding open ocean water), pH was very stable (SD<0.01 pH over 30 days). Elsewhere, **pH was highly variable across a range of ecosystems where sensors were deployed.** The salient conclusions from this comparative dataset are two-fold: (1) most non-open ocean sites are indeed characterized by natural variation in seawater chemistry that can now be revealed through continuous monitoring by autonomous instrumentation, and (2) in some cases, seawater in these sites reaches extremes in pH, sometimes daily, that are often considered to only occur in open ocean systems well into the future [46]. Admittedly, pH is only part of the story with regard to the biological impacts of OA on marine organisms. However, continuous long-term observations provided by sensors such as the SeaFET are a great first step in elucidating the biophysical link between natural variation and physiological capacity in resident marine organisms. In the end, knowledge of spatial and temporal variation in seawater chemistry is a critical resource for biological research, for aquaculture, and for management efforts. From a biological perspective, the evolutionary history of the resident organisms will greatly influence the adaptation potential of organisms in marine populations. Thus, present-day natural variation will likely shape capacity for adaptation of resident organisms, influencing the resilience of critical marine ecosystems to future anthropogenic acidification. Below we discuss the comparative SeaFET-collected data and, where applicable, the biological consequences of the temporal heterogeneity that we found in each of the marine ecosystems where sensors were deployed. As the most stable area, the open ocean behaves in a predictable way and generally adheres to global models attempting to predict future CO2 conditions based on equilibration of the surface ocean with a given atmospheric pCO2 (e.g. [47]). This can be shown with longer-term pH records obtained with SeaFET sensors, which are available at the CCE-1 mooring (Fig. 4). The ambient pH values for this open ocean location can be predicted to better than ±0.02 from the CO2-corrected climatology mentioned above; pH has dropped by about 0.015 units since 2000. At CCE-1, the annual carbonate cycle followed the sea surface temperature cycle, and pH was driven mostly by changes in the temperature dependence of CO2 system thermodynamics (Figure 4). SeaFET observations at CCE-1 agree with the climatology to +0.017±0.014 pH units, with episodic excursions from the climatology but a general return to the climatological mean. Although the annual cycle in the open ocean is somewhat predictable, it is notable that even at these seemingly stable locations, climatology-based forecasts consistently underestimate natural variability. Our observations confirm an annual mean variability in pH at CCE-1 of nearly 0.1, suggest an inter-annual variability of ~0.02 pH, and capture episodic changes that deviate from the climatology (Figure 4). Similar underestimates of CO2 variability were observed at nine other open ocean locations, where the Takahashi pCO2 climatology overlaps PMEL moorings with pCO2 sensors (not shown). Thus, on both a monthly (Fig. 2) and annual scale (Fig. 4), **even the most stable** open ocean **sites see pH changes many times larger than** the **annual rate of acidification.** This natural variability has prompted the suggestion that “an appropriate null hypothesis may be, until evidence is obtained to the contrary, that major biogeochemical processes in the oceans other than calcification will not be fundamentally different under future higher CO2/lower pH conditions” [24]. Similarly, the sensors deployed on the benthos in the Antarctic (Cindercones and Cape Evans, Figure 2B) recorded relatively stable pH conditions when compared to other sites in the study. Very few data exist for the Southern Ocean; however, open-water areas in this region experience a strong seasonal shift in seawater pH (~0.3–0.5 units) between austral summer and winter [48], [49] due to a decline in photosynthesis during winter and a disequilibrium of air-sea CO2 exchange due to annual surface sea ice and deep water entrainment [50]. Given the timing of deployment of our sensor in McMurdo Sound (austral spring: October–November), the sensor did not capture the change in seawater chemistry that might have occurred in the austral winter [49]. In general, due to sea ice conditions, observations from the Southern Ocean are limited, with water chemistry data falling into two categories: (1) discrete sampling events during oceanographic cruises (e.g. US Joint Global Ocean Flux Study, http://www1.whoi.edu/) and (2) single-point measurements from locations under sea ice [49], [51], [52]. Biologically speaking, the Southern Ocean is a region expected to experience acidification and undersaturated conditions earlier in time than other parts of the ocean [47], and calcifying Antarctic organisms are thought to be quite vulnerable to anthropogenic OA given the already challenging saturation states that are characteristic of cold polar waters [53]–[56]. Short-term CO2 perturbation experiments have shown that Antarctic calcifying marine invertebrates are sensitive to decreased saturation states [51], [57], although the number of species-level studies and community-level studies are very limited. The Western Antarctic Peninsula and the sub-Antarctic islands will experience pronounced increases in temperature [54] and could consequently undergo more variation and/or undersaturation given the increased potential for biological activity. Importantly, depending on the patterns of seasonally-dependent saturation state that will be revealed with improved observations [58], Antarctic organisms may experience more variation than might be expected, a situation that will influence their resilience to future acidification. Three other types of study sites – the coastal upwelling, kelp forest and estuarine/near-shore sites – all exhibited variability due to a combination of mixing, tidal excursions, biological activity, and variable residence time (Fig. 2). Although these sites are all united by fairly obvious heterogeneity in pH, organisms living in these areas encounter unique complexities in seawater chemistry that will influence their physiological response, resilience, and potential for adaptation. Typically, estuarine environments have riverine input that naturally creates very low saturation states [59]–[61]. Seawater chemistry conditions in these areas often shift dramatically, challenging biogenic calcification by resident organisms. Additionally, these species must also tolerate abiotic factors that interact with pH, such as temperature [62]. Two sensors in the Monterey Bay region, L1 (at the mouth of Elkhorn Slough) and L20 (~2 km seaward and north of L1), recorded rapid changes in pH. However, as opposed to riverine input, the low pH fluctuations observed here are likely due to isopycnal shoaling or low CO2 water that is pulsing up to the near shore on internal tides. These locations may also experience high river run-off in the rainy season, but such conditions were not reflected in the time series shown in Fig. 2. Organisms living in upwelling regions may be acclimatized and adapted to extremes in seawater chemistry; here, deep CO2-enriched waters reach the surface and may shoal onto the benthos on the continental shelf [31], [32]. Data collected from our upwelling sites support the patterns found by cruise-based investigations; pH fluctuations were often sharp, and large transitions of up to ~0.35 pH units occurred over the course of days (Fig. 2). Laboratory studies on calcifying marine invertebrates living in upwelling regions suggest that these organisms maintain function under such stochastic conditions. However, overall performance may be reduced, suggesting that these species are indeed threatened by future acidification [17], [18], [63]. For kelp forests, although there is less influence from riverine inputs, pH variation is quite dynamic at these sites in the coastal California region (Fig 2; [18]). Patterns here are likely driven by fluctuations in coastal upwelling, biological activity, currents, internal tides, seasonally shoaling isopleths, as well as the size of the kelp forest, which may influence residence times via reduced flow. Kelps may respond positively to increased availability of CO2 and HCO3−, which may allow for reduced metabolic costs and increased productivity [64]. Increased kelp production may elevate pH within the forest during periods of photosynthesis, causing wider daily fluctuations in pH, though this is speculative at this time. As a result, kelp forests, particularly those of surface canopy forming species such as Macrocystis pyrifera, may contain a greater level of spatial heterogeneity in terms of the pH environment; vertical gradients in pH may form due to enhanced levels of photosynthesis at shallower depths. Such gradients may increase the risk of low pH exposure for benthic species while buffering those found within the surface canopy. Kelp forests provide habitat to a rich diversity of organisms from a wide range of calcifying and non-calcifying taxa [65]. As with organisms from the other coastal locations (estuarine and upwelling), the biota living within kelp forest environments are most likely acclimatized to this degree of natural variation. However, continued declines in oxygenation and shoaling of hypoxic boundaries observed in recent decades in the southern California bight [66], [67] are likely accompanied by a reduction in pH and saturation state. Thus, pH exposure regimes for the coastal California region's kelp forest biota may be changing over relatively short time scales. Over longer temporal scales as pH and carbonate saturation levels decrease, the relative abundances of these species may change, with community shifts favoring non-calcified species, as exemplified by long-term studies in intertidal communities by Wootton et al. [15]. For all the marine habitats described above, one very important consideration is that the extreme range of environmental variability does not necessarily translate to extreme resistance to future OA. Instead, such a range of variation may mean that the organisms resident in tidal, estuarine, and upwelling regions are already operating at the limits of their physiological tolerances (a la the classic tolerance windows of Fox – see [68]). Thus, future acidification, whether it be atmospheric or from other sources, may drive the physiology of these organisms closer to the edges of their tolerance windows. When environmental change is layered upon their present-day range of environmental exposures, they may thereby be pushed to the “guardrails” of their tolerance [20], [68]. In contrast to more stochastic changes in pH that were observed in some sites, our coral reef locations displayed a strikingly consistent pattern of diel fluctuations over the 30-day recording period. Similar short-term pH time series with lower daily resolution [69], [70] have reported regular diel pH fluctuation correlated to changes in total alkalinity and oxygen levels. These environmental patterns of pH suggest that reef organisms may be acclimatized to consistent but moderate changes in the carbonate system. Coral reefs have been at the center of research regarding the effects of OA on marine ecosystems [71]–[73]. Along with the calcification biology of the dominant scleractinian corals and coralline algae, the biodiversity on coral reefs includes many other calcifying species that will likely be affected [74]–[77]. Across the existing datasets in tropical reef ecosystems, the biological response of calcifying species to variation in seawater chemistry is complex (see [78]) –all corals or calcifying algal species will not respond similarly, in part because these calcifying reef-builders are photo-autotrophs (or mixotrophs), with algal symbionts that complicate the physiological response of the animal to changes in seawater chemistry. Finally, the “Extreme” sites in our comparative dataset are of interest in that the low pH levels observed here represent a natural analogue to OA conditions in the future, demonstrating how the abundance and distribution of calcifying benthic organisms, as well as multi-species assemblages, can vary as a function of seawater chemistry [16], [35], [36], [79]. The variability in seawater pH was higher at both the groundwater springs off the coast of Mexico and the natural CO2 vents off the coast of Italy than at any of the other sensor locations. Offshore of Puerto Morelos, Mexico (and at other sites along the Mesoamerican Reef), natural low-saturation (Ω~0.5, pH 6.70–7.30, due to non-ventilated, high CO2, high alkalinity groundwater) submarine springs have been discharging for millennia. Here, variability in pH is due to long-term respiration driving a low ratio of alkalinity to dissolved inorganic carbon in effluent ground water. These sites provide insight into potential long-term responses of coral backreef ecosystems to low saturation conditions [79]. Unlike Puerto Morelos, the variability of pH at volcanic CO2 vents at Ischia, Italy is almost purely abiotically derived, due entirely to CO2 venting and subsequent mixing. This site in the Mediterranean Sea hosts a benthic assemblage that reflects the impacts of OA on rocky reef communities [16], [36]. Overall, the ‘extreme’ systems provide an opportunity to examine how variability in pH and extreme events (sensu [80]) affects ecological processes. Knowledge of this biophysical link is essential for forecasting ecological responses to acidification in ecosystems with sharp fluctuations in pH, such as upwelling or estuarine environments. **Despite reductions in species richness, several calcifying organisms are found in low pH conditions** close to the vents [16] and the springs [79]. The persistence of calcifying organisms at these extreme sites, where mean pH values are comparable to those that have reduced organism performance in laboratory experiments (i.e., pHT 7.8; reviewed in [16]), suggest that long exposures to such variability in pH, versus a consistently low-pH environment, could play an important role in regulating organism performance. Variability in pH could potentially promote acclimatization or adaptation to acidification through repeated exposure to low pH conditions [24]; alternatively, transient exposures to high pH conditions could buffer the effects of acidification by relieving physiological stress. Thus, the ecological patterns coupled with the high fluctuations in pH at the extreme sites highlight the need to consider carbonate chemistry variability in experiments and models aimed at understanding the impacts of acidification.

**Warming won’t cause extinction**

**Barrett 07**, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University

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

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

**CO2 isn’t key**

**Watts 12,** 25-year climate reporter, works with weather technology, weather stations, and weather data processing systems in the private sector, 7/25/**’12**

(Anthony, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/25/lindzen-at-sandia-national-labs-climate-models-are-flawed/>)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Richard Lindzen, a global warming skeptic, told about 70 Sandia researchers in June that too much is being made of climate change by researchers seeking government funding. He said their data and their methods did not support their claims. “Despite concerns over the last decades with the greenhouse process, **they oversimplify the effect**,” he said. “Simply cranking up CO2 [carbon dioxide] (as the culprit) is not the answer” to what causes climate change. Lindzen, the ninth speaker in Sandia’s Climate Change and National Security Speaker Series, is Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology in MIT’s department of earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences. He has published more than 200 scientific papers and is the lead author of Chapter 7 (“Physical Climate Processes and Feedbacks”) of the International Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Third Assessment Report. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a fellow of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society. For 30 years, **climate scientists have been “locked into a simple-minded identification of climate with greenhouse-gas level**. … That climate should be the function of a single parameter (like CO2) has always seemed implausible. Yet an **obsessive focus on such an obvious oversimplification** has likely set back progress by decades,” Lindzen said. **For major climates of the past, other factors were more important than carbon dioxide.** Orbital variations have been shown to quantitatively account for the cycles of glaciations of the past 700,000 years, he said, and the elimination of the arctic inversion, when the polar caps were ice-free, “is likely to have been **more important than CO2** for the warm episode during the Eocene 50 million years ago.” There is little evidence that changes in climate are producing extreme weather events, he said. “Even the IPCC says there is little if any evidence of this. In fact, there are important physical reasons for doubting such anticipations.” Lindzen’s views run counter to those of almost all major professional societies. For example, the American Physical Society statement of Nov. 18, 2007, read, “The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring.” But he doesn’t feel they are necessarily right. “Why did the American Physical Society take a position?” he asked his audience. “Why did they find it compelling? They never answered.” Speaking methodically with flashes of humor — “I always feel that when the conversation turns to weather, people are bored.” — he said a basic problem with current computer climate models that show disastrous increases in temperature is that relatively small increases in atmospheric gases lead to large changes in temperatures in the models. But, he said, “predictions based on high (climate) sensitivity ran well ahead of observations.” Real-world observations do not support IPCC models, he said: “**We’ve already seen** almost the equivalent of **a doubling of CO2** (**in radiative forcing**) **and that has produced very little warming.”** He disparaged proving the worth of models by applying their criteria to the prediction of past climatic events, saying, “The models are no more valuable than answering a test when you have the questions in advance.” Modelers, he said, merely have used aerosols as a kind of fudge factor to make their models come out right. (Aerosols are tiny particles that reflect sunlight. They are put in the air by industrial or volcanic processes and are considered a possible cause of temperature change at Earth’s surface.) Then there is the practical question of what can be done about temperature increases even if they are occurring, he said. “China, India, Korea are not going to go along with IPCC recommendations, so … the only countries punished will be those who go along with the recommendations.” He discounted mainstream opinion that climate change could hurt national security, saying that “historically there is little evidence of natural disasters leading to war, but economic conditions have proven much more serious. Almost all proposed mitigation policies lead to reduced energy availability and higher energy costs. All studies of human benefit and national security perspectives show that increased energy is important.” He showed a graph that demonstrated that more energy consumption leads to higher literacy rate, lower infant mortality and a lower number of children per woman. Given that proposed policies are unlikely to significantly influence climate and that lower energy availability could be considered a significant threat to national security, to continue with a mitigation policy that reduces available energy “would, at the least, appear to be irresponsible,” he argued. Responding to audience questions about rising temperatures, he said **a 0.8 of a degree C change in temperature in 150 years is a small change.** Questioned about five-, seven-, and 17-year averages that seem to show that Earth’s surface temperature is rising, he said temperatures are always fluctuating by tenths of a degree.

**Recent temperatures show no increase in warming**

**Happer 12** (William is a professor of physics at Princeton. “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again”, Wall Street Journal, 3/27/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979

**United States not key to solve warming and inevitable**

**Grose ‘13** (Thomas K., National Geographic News Writer, “As U.S. Cleans Its Energy Mix, It Ships Coal Problems Abroad”, March 15, 2013)

Ready for some good news about the environment? **Emissions** of carbon dioxide in the United States **are declining. But** don't celebrate just yet. A major side effect of that cleaner air in the U.S. has been the further darkening of skies over Europe and Asia. The United States essentially is **exporting** a share of its greenhouse gas **emissions** in the form of coal, data show. If the trend continues, the dramatic changes in energy use in the United States—in particular, the switch from coal to newly abundant natural gas for generating electricity—will have only a modest impact on global warming, observers warn. The Earth's atmosphere will continue to absorb heat-trapping CO2, with a similar contribution from U.S. coal. It will simply be burned overseas instead of at home. "Switching from coal to gas only saves carbon if the coal stays in the ground," said John Broderick, lead author of a study on the issue by the Tyndall Center for Climate Change Research at England's Manchester University. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) released data this week showing that United States coal **exports hit a record** 126 million short tons in 2012, a 17 percent increase over the previous year. Overseas shipments surpassed the previous high mark set in 1981 by 12 percent. The United States clearly is using less coal: Domestic consumption fell by about 114 million tons, or 11 percent, largely due to a decline in the use of coal for electricity. But U.S. coal production fell just 7 percent. The United States, with the world's largest coal reserves, continued to churn out the most carbon-intensive fuel, producing 1 billion tons of coal from its mines in 2012. Emissions Sink The EIA estimates that due largely to the drop in coal-fired electricity, U.S. carbon emissions from burning fossil fuel declined 3.4 percent in 2012. If the numbers hold up, it will extend the downward trend that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) outlined last month in its annual greenhouse gas inventory, which found greenhouse gas emissions in 2011 had fallen 8 percent from their 2007 peak to 6,703 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent (a number that includes sources other than energy, like methane emissions from agriculture). In fact, if you don't count the recession year of 2009, U.S. emissions in 2011 dropped to their lowest level since 1995. President Barack Obama counted the trend among his environmental accomplishments in his State of the Union address last month: "Over the last four years, our emissions of the dangerous carbon pollution that threatens our planet have actually fallen." The reason is clear: Coal, which in 2005 generated 50 percent of U.S. electricity, saw its share erode to 37.4 percent in 2012, according to EIA's new short-term energy outlook. An increase in U.S. renewable energy certainly played a role; renewables climbed in those seven years from 8.7 percent to 13 percent of the energy mix, about half of it hydropower. But the big gain came from natural gas, which climbed from 19 percent to 30.4 percent of U.S. electricity during that time frame, primarily because of abundant supply and low prices made possible by hydraulic fracturing, or fracking. The trend appears on track to continue, with U.S. coal-fired plants being retired at a record pace. But U.S. coal producers haven't been standing still as their domestic market has evaporated. They've been shipping their fuel to energy-hungry markets overseas, from the ports of Norfolk, Baltimore, and New Orleans. Although **demand is growing rapidly in Asia**—U.S. coal exports to China were on track to **double** last year—Europe was the biggest customer, importing more U.S. coal last year than all other countries combined. The Netherlands, with Europe's largest port, Rotterdam, accepted the most shipments, on pace for a 24 jump in U.S. coal imports in 2012. The United Kingdom, the second largest customer, saw its U.S. coal imports jump more than **70 percent**. The hike in European coal consumption would appear to run counter to big government initiatives across the Continent to cut CO2 emissions. But in the European Union, where fracking has made only its initial forays and natural gas is still expensive, **American coal is**, well, **dirt cheap**. European utilities are now finding that generating power from coal is a profitable gambit. In the power industry, the profit margin for generating electricity from coal is called the "clean dark spread"; at the end of December in Great Britain, it was going for about $39 per megawatt-hour, according to Argus. By contrast, the profit margin for gas-fired plants—the "clean spark spread"—was about $3. Tomas Wyns, director of the Center for Clean Air Policy-Europe, a nonprofit organization in Brussels, Belgium, said those kinds of spreads are typical across Europe right now. **The EU** has a cap-and-trade carbon market, the $148 billion, eight-year-old Emissions Trading System (ETS). But it's in the doldrums because of a huge **oversupply of permits**. That's caused the price of carbon to fall to about 4 euros ($5.23). A plan called "backloading" that would temporarily extract allowances from the market to shore up the price has faltered so far in the European Parliament. "A better carbon price could make a difference" and even out the coal and gas spreads, Wyns said. He estimates a price of between 20 and 40 euros would do the trick. "But a structural change to the Emissions Trading System is not something that will happen very quickly. A solution is years off." The Tyndall Center study estimates that the burning of **all that** exported **coal could erase** fully half the **gains the U**nited **S**tates has made in reducing carbon emissions. For huge reserves of shale gas to help cut CO2 emissions, "displaced fuels must be reduced globally and remain suppressed indefinitely," the report said. Future Emissions It is not clear that the surge in U.S. coal exports will continue. One reason for the uptick in coal-fired generation in Europe has been the looming deadline for the EU's Large Combustion Plant Directive, which will require older coal plants to meet lower emission levels by the end of 2015 or be mothballed. Before that phaseout begins, Wyns says, "**there is a** bit of a **binge** going on." Also, economic factors are at work. Tyndall's Broderick said American coal companies have been essentially selling surplus fuel overseas at low profit margins, so there is a likelihood that U.S. coal production will decrease further. The U.S. government forecasters at EIA expect that U.S. coal exports will fall back to about 110 million tons per year over the next two years, due to economic weakness in Europe, falling international prices, and competition from other coal-exporting countries. The Paris-based International Energy Agency (IEA) calls Europe's "coal renaissance" a temporary phenomenon; it forecasts an increasing use of renewables, shuttering of coal plants, and a better balance between gas and coal prices in the coming years. But IEA does not expect that the global appetite for coal will slacken appreciably. The agency projects that, by 2017, coal will rival oil as the world's primary energy source, mainly because of skyrocketing demand in Asia. U.S. coal producers have made clear that they aim to tap into that growing market.

## 2nc

### 2nc – neolib

#### Structural violence outweighs – their threat discourse masks it

Jackson 12—Director of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, the University of Otago. Former. Professor of International Politics at Aberystwyth University (8/5/12, Richard, The Great Con of National Security, http://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-great-con-of-national-security/)

It may have once been the case that being attacked by another country was a major threat to the lives of ordinary people. It may also be true that there are still some pretty serious dangers out there associated with the spread of nuclear weapons. For the most part, however, most of what you’ve been told about national security and all the big threats which can supposedly kill you is one big con designed to distract you from the things that can really hurt you, such as the poverty, inequality and structural violence of capitalism, global warming, and the manufacture and proliferation of weapons – among others.¶ The facts are simple and irrefutable: you’re far more likely to die from lack of health care provision than you are from terrorism; from stress and overwork than Iranian or North Korean nuclear missiles; from lack of road safety than from illegal immigrants; from mental illness and suicide than from computer hackers; from domestic violence than from asylum seekers; from the misuse of legal medicines and alcohol abuse than from international drug lords. And yet, politicians and the servile media spend most of their time talking about the threats posed by terrorism, immigration, asylum seekers, the international drug trade, the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea, computer hackers, animal rights activism, the threat of China, and a host of other issues which are all about as equally unlikely to affect the health and well-being of you and your family. Along with this obsessive and perennial discussion of so-called ‘national security issues’, the state spends truly vast sums on security measures which have virtually no impact on the actual risk of dying from these threats, and then engages in massive displays of ‘security theatre’ designed to show just how seriously the state takes these threats – such as the x-ray machines and security measures in every public building, surveillance cameras everywhere, missile launchers in urban areas, drones in Afghanistan, armed police in airports, and a thousand other things. This display is meant to convince you that these threats are really, really serious.¶ And while all this is going on, the rulers of society are hoping that you won’t notice that increasing social and economic inequality in society leads to increased ill health for a growing underclass; that suicide and crime always rise when unemployment rises; that workplaces remain highly dangerous and kill and maim hundreds of people per year; that there are preventable diseases which plague the poorer sections of society; that domestic violence kills and injures thousands of women and children annually; and that globally, poverty and preventable disease kills tens of millions of people needlessly every year. In other words, they are hoping that you won’t notice how much structural violence there is in the world.¶ More than this, they are hoping that you won’t notice that while literally trillions of dollars are spent on military weapons, foreign wars and security theatre (which also arguably do nothing to make any us any safer, and may even make us marginally less safe), that domestic violence programmes struggle to provide even minimal support for women and children at risk of serious harm from their partners; that underfunded mental health programmes mean long waiting lists to receive basic care for at-risk individuals; that drug and alcohol rehabilitation programmes lack the funding to match the demand for help; that welfare measures aimed at reducing inequality have been inadequate for decades; that health and safety measures at many workplaces remain insufficiently resourced; and that measures to tackle global warming and developing alternative energy remain hopelessly inadequate.¶ Of course, none of this is surprising. Politicians are a part of the system; they don’t want to change it. For them, all the insecurity, death and ill-health caused by capitalist inequality are a price worth paying to keep the basic social structures as they are. A more egalitarian society based on equality, solidarity, and other non-materialist values would not suit their interests, or the special interests of the lobby groups they are indebted to. It is also true that dealing with economic and social inequality, improving public health, changing international structures of inequality, restructuring the military-industrial complex, and making the necessary economic and political changes to deal with global warming will be extremely difficult and will require long-term commitment and determination. For politicians looking towards the next election, it is clearly much easier to paint immigrants as a threat to social order or pontificate about the ongoing danger of terrorists. It is also more exciting for the media than stories about how poor people and people of colour are discriminated against and suffer worse health as a consequence.¶ Viewed from this vantage point, national security is one massive confidence trick – misdirection on an epic scale. Its primary function is to distract you from the structures and inequalities in society which are the real threat to the health and wellbeing of you and your family, and to convince you to be permanently afraid so that you will acquiesce to all the security measures which keep you under state control and keep the military-industrial complex ticking along.¶ Keep this in mind next time you hear a politician talking about the threat of uncontrolled immigration, the risk posed by asylum seekers or the threat of Iran, or the need to expand counter-terrorism powers. The question is: when politicians are talking about national security, what is that they don’t want you to think and talk about? What exactly is the misdirection they are engaged in? The truth is, if you think that terrorists or immigrants or asylum seekers or Iran are a greater threat to your safety than the capitalist system, you have been well and truly conned, my friend. Don’t believe the hype: you’re much more likely to die from any one of several forms of structural violence in society than you are from immigrants or terrorism. Somehow, we need to challenge the politicians on this fact.

#### Cuban agriculture is key to solve the environment

Peters 10 (Kathryn A. Peters, J.D. from the University of Oregon . "Creating a Sustainable Urban Agriculture Revolution". University of Oregon Law School. law.uoregon.edu/org/jell/docs/251/peters.pdf)

While urban agriculture was a response to a dramatic crisis in ¶ Cuba’s history, through the development of a community-based ¶ system of cultivation on previously vacant lots employing organic ¶ farming techniques, Cuba has created a sustainable food production ¶ system.189 As of 2005, Havana was producing over ninety percent of ¶ the perishable produce consumed in its city as well as a significant ¶ portion of its milk and meat.190 With government support, the urban ¶ gardens have become a profitable economic enterprise for many ¶ Cubans.191 Local access to fresh foods has added diversity to the ¶ Cuban diet and reduced the carbon footprint associated with its food ¶ supply by reducing the transportation and chemical input required to ¶ grow and transport the food.192 The development of urban farming ¶ has also ensured food security for Cuba.193 The success of Cuba’s ¶ system has established the country as a model for the urban ¶ production of sustainable agriculture around the world.194¶ In transitioning to a sustainable urban agricultural system, Cuba ¶ has drastically reduced its harmful impacts on the environment. ¶ Cubans have been able to significantly reduce their carbon footprints ¶ as their food supply is no longer shipped across oceans and Cuban ¶ residents can walk to local markets for fresh produce rather than drive¶ to grocery stores.195 Reduced mechanization in food production ¶ further reduces carbon emissions. Increased urban vegetation also ¶ mitigates the impact of climate change because vegetation has a ¶ cooling effect when air temperatures are high.196 Because much of ¶ Cuba’s urban land is now vegetative, surface temperatures in Cuba ¶ may remain cooler due to the thermoregulation created by the ¶ vegetation cover.197¶ According to Dr. Nelso Camponioni Concepción, the Cuban ¶ government, through its urban agricultural program, aims “to gain the ¶ most food from every square meter of available space.”198 By ¶ utilizing available urban space for sustainable food production, Cuba ¶ is reducing its impact on the planet’s carrying capacity. The organic ¶ urban gardening techniques do not consume greenspace or harm the ¶ environment; therefore, measuring the true cost of externalities is not ¶ an issue. The growth of the urban gardens has created an increasing ¶ food supply and a new economy for many Cubans without negatively ¶ impacting the environment or society.

**Newest studies prove - no impact for 1.5 billion years**

Spotts, 13 – Spotts is a graduate of the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Fla and a writer for CSM since 1976(Pete, “When would global warming destroy life on Earth? Study hazards a guess.” http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/2013/0730/When-would-global-warming-destroy-life-on-Earth-Study-hazards-a-guess)

The most recent of the two studies, published Monday in the journal Nature Geoscience, found that the amount of energy needed to shift a planet's climate into thermal overdrive at Earth's distance from the sun was about 10 percent less than estimates many scientists have been using for more than two decades. The research suggests that from a standpoint of Earth's climate, it would likely take another 1.5 billion years, even accounting for the pace at which human activities are pumping greenhouse gases into the air, for a runaway greenhouse effect to take over, says Colin Goldblatt, an assistant professor at the University of Victoria in British Columbia who studies the evolution of Earth's climate. The results also imply that a star's habitable zone – where a planet could capture enough warmth from its sun to allow liquid water to remain stable on the surface – may be smaller than previously estimated. If the results hold up, this would reduce the number of extrasolar planets deemed potentially habitable. The study serves as a useful reminder that scientists can't determine habitability only from estimates of how much radiation reaches a planet, says Larry Esposito, a researcher who studies planetary atmospheres at the University of Colorado at Boulder. A planet's current climate and the history of that climate play key roles, too. The atmospheric model used in looking at the greenhouse effect on Earth represents "a first pass at doing the problem again," says Dr. Goldblatt. It doesn't account for clouds, which would be crucial to determining the mount of sunlight reaching Earth's surface. Instead, the model operates assuming clear skies. "You start off with simple models. You try to understand the answers. Then you go on to more complex models," he says.Over the past 25 years, researchers have developed more-detailed measurements of water vapor and how it interacts with the infrared radiation the Earth's surface sends skyward. These improvements prompted the team to try to take another crack at measuring the energy needed to trigger a runaway greenhouse effect. Water vapor and other greenhouse gases absorb most of that radiation and re-radiate it in all directions, including back toward Earth's surface. But radiation in a narrow band of wavelengths can escape, allowing some of that heat to head back toward space. As the atmosphere warms, more water evaporates, and the atmosphere's ability to hold moisture increases. Runaway heating can occur when warming temperatures push enough water vapor into the air to in effect slam the infrared window shut, Goldblatt explains. Nor is sunlight alone in determining the surface temperature. A study published earlier this year in the journal Astrobiology described how tidal heating – the friction created within a planet as it is tugged by a star's gravity – could produce enough heat at the planet's surface to push an otherwise stable climate into runaway greenhouse warming. Runaway heating from these tidal forces would be limited to planets orbiting dim, low-mass red-dwarf stars along highly elliptical paths. Those paths might take the planet into and out of the star's habitable zone. While the planet might eventually stabilize in a circular orbit within a habitable zone, it would be bone-dry. he team, led by Rory Barnes, a research scientist at the University of Washington in Seattle, dubbed these runaway-heating victims "tidal Venuses." [Editor's note: The original version of this story misspelled the name of Rory Barnes.] For the more familiar Venus, the modeling Goldblatt and colleagues undertook imply that the planet may never have had oceans to begin with – unless the levels of nitrogen in its atmosphere were comparable to the relatively high levels seen today, Dr. Espositio suggests. Nitrogen is effective at scattering visible light and so would tend to be a cooling agent if it was present in sufficient amounts. Though the study would seem to rule out any immanent runaway greenhouse effect on Earth, Goldblatt underscores the importance of reining in global warming. "There is this thing known as a runaway greenhouse effect. It is easier than we thought to cause it. But it's not something that's likely to happen in the context of anthropogenic global change," he says. "But the flip side of that is that we really do need to still worry about anthropogenic global change. It's still a really big deal."

#### Their evidence is overhyped and based on unverifiable feedbacks

Miyazaki 11, PhD mathematics – University of Texas

(K. “An Analytic Study of Climate Sensitivity,” UT Mathematical Physics database, <https://www.math.utexas.edu/mp_arc/c/11/11-16.pdf>)\

Based on the Stefan-Boltzmann law, the IPCC derives the climate sensitivity of¶ \_T = 1 \_C in the absence of feedbacks. Is this naive picture reasonable? In the present¶ work we examine the radiative forcing in a refined theoretical framework based on an¶ analytic model of radiative transfer. We have found that the naive picture of IPCC is¶ incorrect. The precise climate sensitivity is \_T = 1:4 \_C. The observed temperature¶ anomaly can be reproduced even in the absence of feedbacks. The result is quite sug-¶ gestive. Although the IPCC derives the overall climate sensitivity of \_T = 3 \_C, the¶ value might be too high as pointed out in Ref. [18]. So as to assess the overestimates¶ by IPCC, we examine the climate sensitivity using a pure analytic expression of water¶ vapor feedback, which is however expected to produce the results overestimated. The¶ obtained value \_T = 2:32 \_C is similar to the overall climate sensitivity predicted in Ref.¶ [32]. The water vapor feedback factor 1.65 is however lower than 2 predicted by IPCC.¶ It is therefore seen that the IPCC overestimates the water vapor feedback. In addition,¶ as an experiment, we continue the calculation using the water vapor feedback reduced¶ artiÖcially by half. The result can reproduce the observed temperature anomaly fairly¶ well. The resultant feedback factor 1.25 agrees with the cloud feedback factor in Ref. [33]¶ but is much weaker than the IPCC prediction. This indicates that our model effectively¶ includes the cloud feedback and that the IPCC also overestimates the positive feedbacks¶ other than water vapor. Moreover, the overestimates of positive feedbacks also indicate¶ that the IPCC overestimates the negative forcing by aerosols. Consequently, we can say¶ that the IPCC exaggerates the anthropogenic effects on climate.

### 2nc – science

#### IPCC reports use terrible methodology to spur action – overestimates impacts

Knappenberger, 13 – is the Assistant Director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute.(Paul C., 9-26, “UN’s New Climate Change Report an Embarrassment, Self-Serving and Beyond Misleading” http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/uns-new-climate-change-report-embarrassment-self-serving-beyond-misleading)djm

Friday, the world was treated to the latest, greatest report on global warming from the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in the form of its Fifth Assessment Report. It is an embarrassment of internal inconsistency, entirely self-serving, and is beyond misleading. That’s because the IPCC is more intent on maintaining the crumbling “consensus” on global warming than on following climate science to its logical conclusion; a conclusion that increasingly suggests that human greenhouse gas emissions are less important in driving climate change than commonly held. That’s right, the latest climate science (some 10 studies published in just the past 3 years) indicates that the earth’s climate sensitivity—that is, how much the global average surface temperature will rise as a result of greenhouse gases emitted from human activities—is some 33 percent less than scientists thought at the time of the last IPCC Assessment, published in 2007. “ The IPCC misleads policymakers around the world.” A little climate 101: climate sensitivity is one of the key parameters for understanding the future impacts from climate change. Virtually all elements of climate are related in some way to changes in the earth’s average temperature. The less the earth warms up, the fewer the resulting impacts, and the lower the urgency to try to do something to alleviate them. Meaning, initiatives like President Obama’s Climate Action Plan—the motivation for such things as the EPA’s just-announced effective moratorium on future coal-fired power plants—would be even more unnecessary and ineffective than they are already. The IPCC is not altogether blind to the new scientific findings indicating a lower climate sensitivity, but it barely pays them lip-service in its new report. It can’t. Why? The meat of the new IPCC report — and the part that politicians predominantly look to for new legislation — is its projections of future climate change. The problem is that the climate models the IPCC relies upon to produce these projections have a climate sensitivity that averages some 50 percent higher than what the latest science suggests. This means that the IPCC’s projections of future climate change and the resulting impacts are nearly twice as large as they likely should be. In other words, the models don’t work. The IPCC can’t very well admit to the fact that observations say one thing, but the climate models say another. If they did, they would have to throw out virtually the whole report. But just because the IPCC doesn’t admit to it, doesn’t mean that the rest of the world doesn’t know it to be true. It is increasingly obvious that the earth’s average temperature over the past several decades has refused to warm up at the rate foretold by these climate models. In fact, there has been no clear large-scale surface warming for more than 16 years now, and a new paper published earlier this month in the prestigious journal Nature Climate Change affirms the climate models inability to correctly simulate these observations. So we have a situation in which the latest science on two key issues: how much the earth will warm as a result of human greenhouse gas emissions, and how well climate models perform in projecting the warming, is largely not incorporated into the new IPCC report. In this manner, the IPCC misleads policymakers around the world. The IPCC’s exaggerated projections are the root of fears of coming climate disaster (sinking cities, storm-ravaged coastlines, widespread famine, etc.)—fears that result in calls to limit our use of fossil fuels used to produce the energy that supports human society and feeds innovation.

#### No ocean acidification impact – CO2 doesn’t hurt it

Craig Idso et al 12, founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, and Association of American Geographers; Sherwood Idso, research physicist with the USDA's Agricultural Research Service at the US Water Conservation Laboratory and adjunct professor at the ASU Office of Climatology; and Keith Idso, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, July 11, 2012, “The Potential for Adaptive Evolution to Enable the World's Most Important Calcifying Organism to Cope with Ocean Acidification,” CO2 Science, Vol. 15, No. 28

In an important paper published in the May 2012 issue of Nature Geoscience, Lohbeck et al. write that "our present understanding of the sensitivity of marine life to ocean acidification is based primarily on short-term experiments," which often depict negative effects. However, they go on to say that phytoplanktonic species with short generation times "may be able to respond to environmental alterations through adaptive evolution." And with this tantalizing possibility in mind, they studied, as they describe it, "the ability of the world's single most important calcifying organism, the coccolithophore Emiliania huxleyi, to evolve in response to ocean acidification in two 500-generation selection experiments." Working with freshly isolated genotypes from Bergen, Norway, the three German researchers grew them in batch cultures over some 500 asexual generations at three different atmospheric CO2 concentrations - ambient (400 ppm), medium (1100 ppm) and high (2200 ppm) - where the medium CO2 treatment was chosen to represent the atmospheric CO2 level projected for the beginning of the next century. This they did in a multi-clone experiment designed to provide existing genetic variation that they said "would be readily available to genotypic selection," as well as in a single-clone experiment that was initiated with one "haphazardly chosen genotype," where evolutionary adaptation would obviously require new mutations. So what did they learn? Compared with populations kept at ambient CO2 partial pressure, Lohbeck et al. found that those selected at increased CO2 levels "exhibited higher growth rates, in both the single- and multi-clone experiment, when tested under ocean acidification conditions." Calcification rates, on the other hand, were somewhat lower under CO2-enriched conditions in all cultures; but the research team reports that they were "up to 50% higher in adapted [medium and high CO2] compared with non-adapted cultures." And when all was said and done, they concluded that "contemporary evolution could help to maintain the functionality of microbial processes at the base of marine food webs in the face of global change [our italics]." In other ruminations on their findings, the marine biologists indicate that what they call the swift adaptation processes they observed may "have the potential to affect food-web dynamics and biogeochemical cycles on timescales of a few years, thus surpassing predicted rates of ongoing global change including ocean acidification." And they also note, in this regard, that "a recent study reports surprisingly high coccolith mass in an E. huxleyi population off Chile in high-CO2 waters (Beaufort et al., 2011)," which observation is said by them to be indicative of "across-population variation in calcification, in line with findings of rapid microevolution identified here."

#### No risk of catastrophic acidification

Christopher Monckton 10. Chief Policy Advisor—Science and Public Policy Institute, former Special Advisor to UK Prime Minister Thatcher. “ANSWERS TO A FISHERMAN’S TESTIMONY ABOUT OCEAN ACIDIFICATION”, 4-28, <http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/answers_to_fishermans_testimony.pdf>.

Ocean acidification is real. It has been documented by researchers all over the world and there is no doubt that the pH of the ocean is dropping, becoming more acidic. There is no evidence whatsoever that the oceans have become “more acidic”. The oceans are in fact pronouncedly alkaline, and will remain so however much CO2 we add to the atmosphere. The pH or acid-base index is neutral at a value of 7; acid below 7; alkaline (also known as “base”) above The oceans are currently at a pH of 7.9-8.No serious scientist suggests that the oceans will become acid: at worst, they will come a little closer to neutrality. To put this in context, ordinary rainwater is acid, with a pH of 5.There is not the slightest danger that the oceans will become acid at all, yet alone as acid as harmless rainwater. The reason is that the oceans run over rocks, which react chemically with seawater to keep it firmly alkaline. Nor is it at all clear that “the pH of the ocean is dropping”. At most, the pH may have fallen by 0.1 acid-base units over the past century, but we do not know for sure because no comprehensive, worldwide measurements have ever been taken by a single research project, and there were certainly far too few measurements a century ago to provide a reliable baseline from which any such conclusion can be drawn. What is certain is that even a shift of as little as 0.1 acid-base units cannot have been caused by the change in CO2 concentration, because in the past 250 years we have added only 0.19% to the partial pressure of CO2 already pre-existing in the oceans. This is too little to make any measurable difference to the acid-base balance of the oceans.

#### No biodiversity impact—species are resilient.

Oxford University 09—Can biodiversity persist in the face of climate change?, November, http://www.ox.ac.uk/media/news\_stories/2009/091106\_2.html

Predictions made over the last decade about the impacts of climate change on biodiversity may be exaggerated, according to a paper published in the journal Science. Oxford University researchers, Professor Kathy Willis and Dr Shonil Bhagwat, argue that predicting the fate of biodiversity in the face of climate change is ‘fraught with caveats and complexities’. They say that several larger-scale models are failing to take into account local, more detailed variations and that models often underestimate the full capacity of plants and animals to adapt to a changing climate. The researchers’ view is that these factors ‘seriously alter the model predictions’. They suggest that ‘we should expect to see species turnover, migrations, and novel communities, but not necessarily the levels of extinction previously predicted’. Their synthesis of research highlights the contradictions in previous studies about the likely survival rates of alpine plants in the Swiss Alps, European butterfly populations and the South American tropical rainforests. ‘These studies highlight the level of complexity that we are faced with in trying to model and predict the possible consequences of future climate change on biodiversity,’ the paper says. The researchers say the mixed picture that is emerging from previous studies also emphasises a high level of persistence in many communities.

#### Species loss has no impact and is slow.

Sagoff 97 – U Maryland School of Public Affairs Institute for Philosophy and Public policy Senior Research Scholar, Mark, “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, Lexis

Somewhat fewer than 1,000 domestic species are listed as endangered, and roughly one third that number or more are considered threatened or in jeopardy. n335 In biodiversity-rich California, the problem is particularly troubling. About one third of the species in jeopardy in the United States reside in California, and of these approximately 125 are listed as endangered. n336 Although these grim statistics should appall us for ethical reasons, we may wonder if the extinction of hundreds of species in California and thousands nationwide will cause any harm to human welfare. If any of these extinct species had a known economic use, for example, as crops, we would be able to judge the value of the species in terms of its market price. As a rule, creatures that have a direct economic use, such as crops, have habitats created for them (e.g., farms) rather than taken from them. The economic benefits, if any, that flow from endangered species are indirect and not likely to fetch a market price. To estimate the economic value of such an endangered species we must determine its worth "at the margin," in other words, in relation to the cost of obtaining the least expensive substitute species that performs the same function or service. Suppose, for example, that the American burying beetle, a marvelous but endangered creature, n337 functions in the ecosystem by decomposing the corpses of small animals. We would ask to what expense we must go to find a different kind of beetle or some other animal ready, willing, and able to do the same work of decomposing [\*904] small corpses. Nothing can be assessed economically except at the margin, that is, in relation to the price of substitutes. "Healthy ecosystems carry out a diverse array of processes that provide both goods and services to humanity," observed the Ecological Society of America in a recent report. n338 Ecosystem services, according to the report, include: "Maintaining hydrological cycles[;] [r]egulating climate; [c]leansing water and air; [m]aintaining the gaseous composition of the atmosphere; [p]ollinating crops and other important plants[;] [g]enerating and maintaining soils[;] [s]toring and cycling essential nutrients; [a]bsorbing and detoxifying pollutants[;] [and] [p]roviding beauty, inspiration, and research[.]" n339 For one reason or another, no extinction of any species in the United States seems thus far to have altered the capacity of the ecosystems to provide these services. The reason may be that for any species that is lost, tens, hundreds, or thousands of others are ready, willing, and able to perform the same functions and services valuable to human beings. Perhaps twenty species of birds have vanished in the United States since 1492; of those, fifteen have vanished in Hawaii. n340 What specific losses in ecosystem services, such as those listed above, have occurred as a result? Mammals that have become extinct include Goof's pocket gopher, Shaman's pocket gopher, and the Tacoma pocket gopher-all of which disappeared this century. "The loss of a species from a particular area may have little or no net effect on the ability of the ecosystem to perform its ecological processes if competitors take the species' place." n341 Has any ecosystem service diminished owing to the loss of these gophers? Or have other species, including many other kinds of gophers, simply taken their place? [\*905] To be sure, if extinctions continue at present rates indefinitely, at some point there may be too few viable species ready, willing, and able to substitute for those that have been lost. How much of a "buffer" exists? How many "extra" rivets are in the wings? Many ecologists follow Paul Ehrlich, Peter Raven, and others in declaring that with every extinction we run the risk of calamitous damage to the environment. n342 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 beings 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

#### We’ll be fine

Pearce 10 – Sr Environmental Correspondent for New Scientist, Fred, Earth's nine lives, New Scientist, 2/27, Vol. 205, Issue 2749

The world acted quickly to heal the hole. With most of the culprit chemicals now banned, the worst of the danger has passed. It is not over entirely, however. One concern is global warming. Trapping more heat close to the Earth's surface leaves the stratosphere colder. This means that the Arctic stratosphere could get cold enough in coming years for the remaining ozone-eating chemicals in the atmosphere to open up an ozone hole over the northern continents. Away from the poles we look safe, unless there is some unknown quirk of atmospheric chemistry waiting to trip us up. Rockström and Paul Crutzen of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany - who won his Nobel prize for ozone-layer chemistry - recommend preventing stratospheric ozone concentrations outside the polar regions from falling by more than 5 per cent, or below a global average of 276 Dobson units (a measurement of the density of stratospheric ozone). With the concentrations of ozone-eaters still falling, it seems likely that we will stay within this planetary boundary.

## 1nr

### 1nr – politics

#### Smooth immigration debate is key to preserve capital to push for warming

Koons 2-1 – Andy Koons, writer for the Daily Iowan, February 1st, 2013, "Koons: Immigration reform not done" www.dailyiowan.com/2013/02/01/Opinions/31576.html

And make no mistake: Obama will be given credit if immigration reform passes. A big win this early in his second term will strengthen the wind already at his back from his election. Obamacare passed after almost two years of work and sucked the president dry of electoral goodwill. If Republicans don’t use immigration to sap Obama’s political capital, Obama will have enough remaining momentum to take on climate change before the midterms.

#### That solves warming

**Stavins 07**(Robert N. Stavins is the Albert Pratt Professor of Business and Government at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, and Director of the Harvard Environmental Economics Program -- A U.S. Cap-and-Trade System to Address Global Climate Change -- DISCUSSION PAPER – Oct 13th --http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2007/10climate\_stavins/10\_climate\_stavins.pdf)

The need for a domestic U.S. policy that seriously addresses climate change is increasingly apparent. A cap-and-trade system **is the best approach** in the short to medium term. Besides providing certainty about emissions levels, cap-and-trade offers an easy means of compensating for the inevitably unequal burdens imposed by climate policy; it is straightforward to harmonize with other countries’ climate policies; it avoids the current political aversion in the United States to taxes; and it has a history of successful adoption in this country. The paper proposes a specific cap-and-trade system with several key features including: an upstream cap on CO2 emissions with gradual inclusion of other greenhouse gases; a gradual downward trajectory of emissions ceilings over time to minimize disruption and allow firms and households time to adapt; and mechanisms to reduce cost uncertainty. Initially, half of the program’s allowances would be allocated through auctioning and half through free distribution, primarily to those entities most burdened by the policy. This should help limit potential inequities while bolstering political support. The share distributed for free would phase out over twenty-five years. The auctioned allowances would generate revenue that could be used for a variety of worthwhile public purposes. The system would provide for linkage with international emissions reduction credit arrangements, harmonization over time with effective cap-and-trade systems in other countries, and appropriate linkage with other actions taken abroad that maintains a level playing field between imports and import-competing domestic products.

#### Comprehensive immigration reform is key to solve structural and violence against immigrant communities and turns all of their impacts

Banuelas 10 (Arturo, "The lies are killing us: The need for immigration reform," US Catholic, October,www.uscatholic.org/culture/social-justice/2010/10/lies-are-killing-us-need-immigration-reform)

Immigrants like Marisol show us that immigration reform is more than simply a matter of human rights for undocumented immigrants. It is a matter of survival for the poorest. No child of God should ever have to leave her family at 5 years of age to be able to eat and survive in our world. Like the majority of people who cross the border, these are not terrorists or drug smugglers but our brothers and sisters.¶ The growing anti-immigrant sentiment in our country since 9/11 did not happen because people suddenly wanted to become cruel and heartless. It began because people started believing a lie about who we Latinos are, both documented and undocumented.¶ This is why immigration is a defining issue that is about us—all of us Latinos—and about how we will shape the future of our church and our country. There is a saying in Spanish, "La mentira nos trae la muerte." Lies bring death.¶ The lie is that immigrants, and by association all of us Latinos, are disposable as human beings and not worthy of human dignity and respect. And this lie is killing us.¶ An immigrant recently told me, "I've been sacrificing myself for my family, but in this country I am worth nothing." Latinos and immigrants encounter racism, resentment, and extreme hostilities against them, and they masquerade as patriotism and now also as national security.¶ By now we are familiar with the countless problems immigrants endure as a result of this lie: an increase in border deaths to more than 400 a year; raids, arrests, and deportations separating families; a backlog in family reunification and visa requests; militarization of the border; sexual exploitation of women immigrants traveling north; abuses in detention centers.¶ Arizona has recently made national headlines for passing harsh anti-immigrant laws, but today more than 20 states have introduced even harsher laws than Arizona. The solutions these laws propose perpetuate lies, persecute innocent people, expose all of us Latinos to racial profiling, and cause death and suffering to the poor. Those who say that they are not against immigrants yet support such oppressive laws are practicing backdoor racism at its worst.¶ Sure, every nation has a right to protect its borders against impending threats, but immigrants working to feed their children are not a threat to anyone. Their presence is not a threat, it is a human right; and we support their right to a better life.¶ Many today scapegoat the poor for self-serving political gain, for economic greed, and security fears. Their lies blind people from seeing Christ in others and keep them from hearing the gospel call to hospitality of the stranger among us. These lies are being used to justify injustice and foster racism that causes pervasive exploitation of immigrants, who are demonized as illegal, as alien, as suspicious human beings.¶ Since the majority of the more than 90 nationalities that daily cross our borders are from the Americas, it is our Latinidad itself that is being attacked. We know that the root causes of immigration include extreme poverty, unemployment, political and military corruption, and government instability in the countries of origin. However, we Latinos and Latinas throughout the Americas also know that the United States shares in the responsibility for these conditions that drive immigrants north across our borders.¶ It is not a secret that once the estimated 12 to 20 million currently undocumented immigrants become citizens, our country will be different. This process has already begun, but wait until we get to vote, buy homes, graduate from universities, and become elected officials.¶ Es mentira, it is a lie that immigrants will not learn English. In our parish we have some 100 people learning English to become citizens, and similar programs exist all over.¶ Es mentira that all immigrants are here illegally. The truth is that the majority are here on some type of visa.¶ Es mentira that stronger enforcement along the U.S.-Mexico border will stop immigrants from crossing the border. It is jobs that bring immigrants to the United States.¶ Es mentira that immigrants are draining our health care and educational systems. The fact is that immigrants contribute about $90 billion in taxes, much more than the $5 billion they use in services.¶ Despite these lies I feel optimistic because this is our time, this is Latino time. We are coming of age, and we want to help fashion a new nation: one that is more just, equal, and free for all citizens, especially the poorest.¶ But we will need to do this the Latino way, grounded in a new vision we inherited from our indigenous ancestors, who said, "Tu eres mi otro yo," you are my other self. This is a profound spiritual vision of life, an economic program for justice, a cultural solution for peace, and an authentic reform for human dignity.¶ Tu eres mi otro yo is the Latino way. We are all linked as one. We stand together, or we fall together. We are each other, and we need to help each other. Our ancestors teach us: If I despise you, I despise myself. And if I promote the good in you, I promote the goodness in me and everyone else.¶ Our fathers, mothers, and abuelos have always taught what Christ teaches us: that we were made good and for good. When we see life from this decidedly Latino worldview, we discover that there are more good people in the world than bad, that the world is in truth moving toward this oneness. This is the Latino good news.¶ I believe that our greatest meaning in life comes from our solidarity with others, especially the struggling poorest among us. As long as they do not eat, have health care, get a good education, live in decent housing, get treated with respect and dignity, then we all remain incomplete in ourselves and as a nation.¶ In a time of such propaganda, lies, drastic poverty, violence, racism, and war, in this time when human life seems so dirt cheap, we must proclaim that each person matters, that they matter enormously to us because tu eres mi otro yo.¶ As a Latino from the border I have reason to feel optimistic about life and our future because in us we carry this deep Latino desire to live out our God-given oneness; at the end of all our human struggles, we will see that it is our oneness that will win over lies, divisions, hate, and racism. In the end the glory will go to those who know how to embrace tu eres mi otro yo. In the end victory comes in our togetherness.¶ I look at our Latino history in terms of the biblical story of the Exodus: Some have crossed the sea into the Promised Land of no more borders. Others are still in the water trying to make it to land. And some arrived late and are still wandering in the desert. Moses told them to be at the edge of the sea by 10 a.m., but, being Latino, they arrived at noon. They are still out there dreaming and wondering what it will be like when they get to the other side. Some of them are dying without water, acceptance, lack of health care, food, or shelter.¶ But today we say, "Come, venganse," we are with you because our ministries represent solidarity in the struggle for human rights for all people.¶ The divisive border wall exists also in our hearts. When the border fence went up, I was part of a march protesting it. I remember walking up to the ugly steel barrier. I put my fingers through the fence, and I felt deep anger. I wanted to tear it down with my bare hands.¶ I kept remembering the Raramuri children in our parish missions in Mexico's northern Sierra Tarahumara, who do not have enough to eat, whose fathers and brothers search for ways to feed their families. Holding the fence I remembered their empty stomachs. I could hear Ester ask her mother, "Are we going to eat today?"¶ Holding the fence in my hands, I said a prayer. I asked Jesus to forgive us. And I asked la Virgen de Guadalupe to protect her children. What the fence says is: "I don't want you to be my other self."¶ Those of us who live on the border question whether the racial make-up of our families has anything to do with the fact that Canada and the Atlantic and Pacific coasts do not have disgusting walls, yet their combined border miles far exceed our 2,000-mile-long southwest border.¶ This immoral wall along our border and in our nation's heart is causing moral damage to the nation's soul with long-term consequences far beyond the fears we have of terrorists. It says that we have stopped dreaming of the possibilities to help each other as human beings in the land of the free. It says that we have given in to smallness of our hearts because of the fear-filled lies that claim doom when we welcome the strangers in our midst.¶ This ugly $242 billion wall is a wake-up call that our national leadership has failed to help us and that it is time for us to offer a better vision for national problems. We need to stop the further construction of this wall, tear it down, and make good use of the materials. What we need instead is just, comprehensive immigration reform, which will help America become a decent nation.¶ This is an historic moment for us. We have never been this close to immigration reform, and we are not backing down because we are not afraid of those who oppose us. I have seen in the faces of Latinos all over the country that we are ready to show our resolve, our conviction, and our dedication to the immigrants and to reform. We want to do what it takes because we deeply believe that justice will triumph over hate, that love will conquer racism, and that common compassion will overcome the lies.

**Dems and GOP moderates will arm twist a vote—**

**Bloomberg 10-28**-13 Editors “Immigration Reform Isn’t Dead Yet” [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-28/immigration-reform-isn-t-dead-yet.html] **[MG]**

House Democrats, meanwhile, have produced their own legislation, which essentially takes the Senate bill and replaces its bloated border security provisions with the House Homeland Security Committee legislation. This is a ploy to force Boehner’s hand. If Republican inertia continues, Republican moderates will be able to **issue a threat to Boehner**: Bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor or we’ll sign on to the Democrats’ bill. Indeed, last weekend, Republican Representative Jeff Denham of California did just that. House leaders have other options. They could bundle and pass legislation containing a handful of Republican provisions - - for example, to strengthen border control, to establish an E-Verify system for authenticating worker identities and to increase the number of visas for high-skilled workers. That could then go to conference with the Senate bill, and a **single package would emerge** for both chambers to vote on. This path might enrage immigration opponents in the Republican conference. But it may be the only way to get serious reform to the House floor for a vote.

**CIR will still pass despite fractured party**

By Warren Swil 10/30 2013 WED OCT 30, 2013 AT 07:05 AM PDT

DIVIDE & CONQUER: Immigration reform could further split GOP

THE PUSH BY President Obama for **c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform got a boost on Tuesday when a large group descended on the Capitol to lobby Republicans on the issue.¶ Viewed in tactical terms, **this could be seen as a stroke of genius by the president and his Democratic allies.**¶ The GOP is riven with internal divisions on immigration. It’s well documented by the Pew Research Center, and has been widely reported.¶ We analyzed it this morning in¶ Coalition of conservatives, liberals pushes for action¶ Just as it splintered over the government shutdown, the Republican Party could suffer another humiliating defeat as its warring factions splinter on immigration proposals under consideration.¶ On Tuesday a huge group descended on the Capitol to advance the president’s agenda.¶ We learn the details in The New York Times online story¶ G.O.P. Urged to Act on Immigration by Coalition of Its Allies¶ Ashley Parker reports:¶ “On Tuesday, the group of more than 600 leaders from roughly 40 states descended on the Capitol for meetings with nearly 150 Republican lawmakers.”¶ The issue was brought front and center by the president in remarks Oct. 24 in the East Room at The White House.¶ “This is not just an idea whose time has come; this is an idea whose time has been around for years now,” Obama said. “And this is the moment when we should be able to finally get the job done.”¶ But in the process of moving forward, there is likely to be serious strain within the GOP. It could quite easily be a re-run of the acrimonious internecine warfare that erupted in the aftermath of the government shutdown.

**Budget Victory Gives Obama PC**

By Steve **Holland and** Mark **Felsenthal 10/17** 2013 Crisis averted, Obama says Americans 'completely fed up' with Washington http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/17/us-usa-fiscal-obama-idUSBRE99G0R720131017

Hours after he signed into law a bill hastily cobbled together to end the crisis, Obama said events over the past two weeks had inflicted "completely unnecessary" damage on the U.S. economy.¶ An increase in borrowing costs caused by the near-debt default was harmful and consumers cut back on spending with hundreds of thousands of government workers suddenly idled, he said.¶ "There was no economic rationale for all of this," he said.¶ Though bruised by the battle, **Obama emerged as the clear winner**. He immediately sought to use the political capital gained to advance a domestic policy agenda centered around a fresh round of budget talks and an effort to win approval of two stalled items, immigration reform and a farm bill.¶ He did not mention an urgent challenge facing him now: Repairing the flaws in his signature healthcare law that have prevented many Americans from even signing up for it.¶ Obama issued an aggressive challenge to Congress, particularly the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, to stop focusing on who wins and loses political battles and get to work with him on issues critical to improving the economy.

**Obama Wont Use PC on Obamacare Hearings – GOP Attacks Lack Support so They Will Have to Bend to Public Pressure**

By CHARLES M. **BLOW 10/30** October 30, 2013 Grudge Spectacle New York Times

The Obamacare hearings before the House Energy and Commerce Committee are a grudge spectacle.¶ They aren’t about fixing problems but affixing blame. They want to make the problems with HealthCare.gov into a problem with “government health care.”¶ These hearings are a charade and a sham. They are devoid of equanimity and reek of vengeance. This is not the way to win an argument, only to elevate the screeching.¶ And Republicans did themselves no favors on Wednesday with their rough handling of Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. At one point during the hearing, Sebelius could be heard saying: “Don’t do this to me.”¶ Sebelius was proxy for the president and they unleashed on her all they had. The secretary’s taking responsibility for the website debacle, as she called it, could have added to public unease about the government’s ability to manage such an enormous undertaking. But the hearing quickly became a mockery of itself, with congressmen underlining the bully in bully pulpit. Committee Republicans lost a chance to rise above, and stooped to their lowest.¶ The White House and the Department of Health and Human Services are not without shame and blame here. The website rollout was a mess. And the president’s repeated promise that people could keep their insurance if they liked it has turned out not to be true for many people in the market for individual, not group, policies — about 5 percent of the population.¶ It is true that the administration has forced insurers to offer more robust plans and many of the plans being canceled don’t meet the threshold, but it would have been better to be upfront about that than to deal with the fallout from nondisclosure on the back end.¶ That said, even these two issues are not the whole of the health care law and don’t mean it is destined to fail. And, perhaps more important, they haven’t much affected Americans’ opinions of the law. Americans may not know all the details or keep track of all the machinations, but they know a piling on when they see it.¶ According to a Gallup poll released Wednesday, the share of people who say the law will have a negative impact on their family or the country **has remained virtually unchanged** since the website rollout. The only notable change between June and October was a decline in the percentage of people saying that the law would make things worse for their families — a drop to 34 percent from 42 percent.¶ Republicans, with their incessant attempts to destroy, defund or defang the law using a barrage of spurious, unsupported allegations, **have lost all credibility** to be critical of the actual issues with the law’s implementation.¶ **All their gripes are too easily dismissed as sour grapes**. You shut down the government to try to kill Obamacare, then open hearings to try to fix it? C’mon.

#### GOP has no confidence in science policy—plan will be opposed

Hoeffel 3/29/12-writer for The Los Angeles Times (John, “Conservatives' trust in science has declined sharply”, The Los Angeles Times 2012, <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/29/nation/la-na-conservatives-science-20120329>, MB)

¶ As the Republican presidential race has shown, the conservatives who dominate the primaries are deeply skeptical of science — making Newt Gingrich, for one, regret he ever settled onto a couch with Nancy Pelosi to chat about global warming.¶ ¶ A study released Thursday in the American Sociological Review concludes that trust in science among conservatives and frequent churchgoers has declined precipitously since 1974, when a national survey first asked people how much confidence they had in the scientific community. At that time, conservatives had the highest level of trust in scientists.¶ ¶ Confidence in scientists has declined the most among the most educated conservatives, the peer-reviewed research paper found, concluding: "These results are quite profound because they imply that conservative discontent with science was not attributable to the uneducated but to rising distrust among educated conservatives."¶ ¶ "That's a surprising finding," said the report's author, Gordon Gauchat, in an interview. He has a doctorate in sociology and is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.¶ ¶ To highlight the dramatic impact conservative views of science have had on public opinion, Gauchat pointed to results from Gallup, which found in 2012 that just 30% of conservatives believed the Earth was warming as a result of greenhouse gases versus 50% two years earlier. In contrast, the poll showed almost no change in the opinion of liberals, with 74% believing in global warming in 2010 versus 72% in 2008.¶ ¶ Gauchat suggested that the most educated conservatives are most acquainted with views that question the credibility of scientists and their conclusions. "I think those people are most fluent with the conservative ideology," he said. "They have stronger ideological dispositions than people who are less educated."¶ ¶ Chris Mooney, who wrote "The Republican War on Science," which Gauchat cites, agreed. "If you think of the reasons behind this as nature versus nurture, all this would be nurture, that it was the product of the conservative movement," he said. "I think being educated is a proxy for people paying attention to politics, and when they do, they tune in to Fox News and blogs."¶ ¶ Gauchat also noted the conservative movement had expanded substantially in power and influence, particularly during the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush, creating an extensive apparatus of think tanks and media outlets. "There's a whole enterprise," he said.¶ ¶ Science has also increasingly come under fire, Gauchat said, because its cultural authority and its impact on government have grown. For years, he said, the role science played was mostly behind the scenes, creating better military equipment and sending rockets into space.

#### Political capital is key

\*at: passage inev because of shutdown

\*at: amnesty bad

\*at: rubio

Orlando Sentinel, 11-1 – (“It'll take both parties to clear immigration logjam” EDITORIAL; FLORIDA; WHAT WE THINK; Pg. A18 lexis)djm

For those who thought the end of the government shutdown would provide a break from the partisan bickering in Washington, think again. The battle over comprehensive immigration reform could be every bit as contentious. Polls show the popular momentum is there for comprehensive reform, which would include a path to citizenship for many of the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants. But it'll take plenty of political capital from President Obama and leaders in both parties on Capitol Hill to make it happen. Immigration-reform activists, who have been pushing for reform for years, are understandably impatient. This week police arrested 15 who blocked traffic at a demonstration in Orlando. There are plenty of selling points for comprehensive immigration reform. An opportunity for millions of immigrants to get on the right side of the law. Stronger border security. The chance for law enforcement to focus limited resources on real threats to public safety, instead of nannies and fruit pickers. A more reliable work force to meet the needs of key industries. Reforms to let top talent from around the world stay here after studying in U.S. universities. The Senate passed its version of comprehensive immigration in June. It includes all of the benefits above. Its path to citizenship requires undocumented immigrants to pay fines, learn English, pass a criminal back-ground check and wait more than a decade. So far, House Republicans have balked, taking a piecemeal rather than comprehensive approach. Many members fear being challenged from the right for supporting "amnesty." Yet polls show the public supports comprehensive reform. In June, a Gallup poll found 87 percent of Ameri-cans -- including 86 percent of Republicans -- support a pathway to citizenship like the one outlined in the Senate bill. Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio took flak from tea-party supporters for spearheading the comprehensive bill. Now, apparently aiming to mend fences, he says immigration should be handled piecemeal. He's politically savvy enough to know that's a dead end. But comprehensive reform won't have a chance without President Obama making full use of his bully pulpit to promote it, emphasizing in particular all that undocumented immigrants would need to do to earn citizen-ship. House Democratic leaders will have to underscore the president's message.

**Demographics aren’t enough anymore—**

**Gomez 10-27**-13 Alan Gomez writer for USA Today “What are the chances for immigration reform in 2013?” [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/politics/july-dec13/gomez\_10-27.html] **[MG]**

But at the same time when you look at these House members, a lot of them -- just from 2010 to 2012 after redistricting -- House Republicans represent **6.6 million fewer minorities**. Now their districts are on average up to 75 percent white. So there are just dozens and dozens and dozens of House Republicans who have just a tiny, tiny fraction of minorities in their district. So for them this idea of the grander party trying to appeal to Hispanics is not as important for them. It doesn’t really resonate back in their home districts. So for them that’s not that important. So there’s a good chunk of that House that are resistant to anything that includes a pathway to citizenship -- as many of them refer to it as amnesty -- so **there is going to absolutely be that friction**. So House Speaker Boehner is back where he seems to be a lot these days – trying to corral those very different sides of his caucus.

#### Hirsh’s argument is just that you can’t MEASURE political capital – but he concedes it’s real

Michael Hirsh 2-7, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “**It’s an** unquantifiablebut **meaningful concept,”** says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, **it’s a concept that matters, if you have** popularity and some **momentum** on your side.”

#### Regardless of general capital, the plan pushes immigration off the agenda—Hirsch concedes this matters even if capital isn’t true

Michael Hirsh 2-7, National Journal, 2-7-13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

**Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course**, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But **the real problem was that the plan was** unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had **settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood**. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it **distracted the government’s attention** from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

#### Winners lose specifically for Obama’s second term

Walsh 12 Ken covers the White House and politics for U.S. News. “Setting Clear Priorities Will Be Key for Obama,” 12/20, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/12/20/setting-clear-priorities-will-be-key-for-obama

And there is an axiom in Washington: Congress, the bureaucracy, the media, and other power centers can do justice to only one or two issues at a time. Phil Schiliro, Obama's former liaison to Congress, said Obama has "always had a personal commitment" to gun control, for example.¶ But Schiliro told the New York Times, "Given the crisis he faced when he first took office, there's only so much capacity in the system to move his agenda." So Obama might be wise to limit his goals now and avoid overburdening the system, or he could face major setbacks that would limit his power and credibility for the remainder of his presidency.