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Infrastructure investment is building or maintaining physical assets.

Chan et al, 2009

Chan, C., Forwood, D., Roper, H., and Sayers, C. March 2009, “Public Infrastructure Financing — An International Perspective,” Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper (The Productivity Commission is the Australian Government’s independent research and advisory body on a range of economic, social and environmental issues affecting the welfare of Australians. Its role, expressed most simply, is to help governments make better policies, in the long term interest of the Australian community.), http://www.pc.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0008/86930/public-infrastructure-financing.pdf, p. 10

Investment can be regarded as an act of forgoing current consumption by allocating economic resources such as labour and capital to create increased capacities for future production and income. In the case of infrastructure, investment typically involves building new or maintaining existing long-lived physical assets.1 / ----START FOOTNOTE---- / 1 Maintenance is considered as investment because it entails certain costs and in return gives rise to a stream of future benefits. Further, the determinant of maintenance are the same as those for new investments, namely cost of funds and rate of asset utilisation (Bitros 1976). / ----END FOOTNOTE----/ Infrastructure investment mostly requires significant outlays during the asset-building phase of a project. On the other hand, the revenue flow to be generated from an infrastructure project, or its funding (in the case with social infrastructure) is spread over the economic life of the asset. This can lead to a divergence between the supply of and demand for project funds over time — even for projects that have the potential for full cost recovery. / Financing and refinancing — that is, raising and allocating cash flows to meet resource costs — play a crucial role in overcoming inter-temporal funding constraints. This enables productive infrastructure investment to be realised sooner than otherwise possible (or which might not otherwise have occurred).

VIOLATION – the plan does not build physical assets, it only raises money for that purpose which is distinctly not investment.

Chan et al, 2009

Chan, C., Forwood, D., Roper, H., and Sayers, C. March 2009, “Public Infrastructure Financing — An International Perspective,” Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper (The Productivity Commission is the Australian Government’s independent research and advisory body on a range of economic, social and environmental issues affecting the welfare of Australians. Its role, expressed most simply, is to help governments make better policies, in the long term interest of the Australian community.), http://www.pc.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0008/86930/public-infrastructure-financing.pdf, p. 3

This study is not directly concerned with investment. There are inherent differences between the economic functions of ‘investment funding’ and ‘financing’. Investment is about whether to allocate economic resources, whereas financing is about raising and allocating ‘monies’ or ‘finances’ — which are not economic resources, just claims on them as inputs. This distinction has significant implications for policy issues relevant to the efficient provision of public infrastructure (Brennan 1996). An efficiently financed project in no way guarantees that the project itself satisfies the criteria of allocative efficiency.

VOTE NEG – ONE – EDUCATION – First-order question is should we build not how should we finance.

Timothy J. Brennan, Professor, Public Policy and Economics, University of Maryland Baltimore County, 1996, “BALANCING PRESENT COSTS AND FUTURE BENEFITS,” FINANCING TOMORROW'S INFRASTRUCTURE: CHALLENGES AND ISSUES, NATIONAL ACADEMY PRESS: WASHINGTON, D.C., p. 13

SHOULD WE BUILD AND FOR WHOM? / Whether these financing effects are major first-order effects or minor second-order effects is something about which economists argue a great deal. The answer is likely to vary from context to context. The reason I offer this short review on the basic economics of deficit spending is to indicate why I believe financial issues are second order. Ultimately, we should be talking more about whether or not an investment should be made and not so much about how it should be financed—recognizing, of course, that it should be financed as efficiently as possible. / This brings us to the generational issue. The decision to make a public investment in infrastructure is a decision to direct resources away from current consumption and private investments to benefit people in the future. The first-order question is whether or not to build. Do we construct new highways? Do we expand the water system? Do we invest hundreds of billions of dollars in a fiber-optic broadband telecommunications network? These concerns are similar to concerns that arise when considering investing in ecological conservation and environmental protection.

Deciding whether to build is the essential public policy issue of the topic.

George Bugliarello, President Emeritus of the Polytechnic Institute of NYU, 1996, “OVERVIEW,” FINANCING TOMORROW’S INFRASTRUCTURE: CHALLENGES AND ISSUES, NATIONAL ACADEMY PRESS: WASHINGTON, D.C., p. 1

Dr. Brennan discussed the key public policy issue in infrastructure investment, i.e., deciding to commit resources to a particular project or program rather than how to finance it. Dr. Brennan emphasized that resource flows are more important than money flows. On that basis, the present preoccupation with budget deficits (which relate to money flows) as a justification for reducing infrastructure investment (resource flows) may be misplaced. He presented a tutorial on the potential consequences of these decisions indicating that how infrastructure is financed, although not the most essential issue, may indeed matter a great deal.

TWO – FAIRNESS – a broad reading of investment lets aff focus debate on the best ways to raise money for transportation infrastructure instead of actually increasing transportation infrastructure which means limitless reforms with no consistent neg ground since we cannot argue that what they build is bad – that slants every debate in aff’s favor by overstretching neg research.

THREE – DETERRENCE – rejecting untopical plans forces aff rethinking leading to more educational and fair debates for all competitors which outweighs the exclusion of a few reasonable plans.

FOUR – JURISDICTION – plan-focus debate works only if judges require that plans are within the resolution before approval making T a gateway issue.

# Cap

Aff’s capitalist

**Sheppard, ‘90**

E Sheppard, "Transportation in a capitalist space-economy: transportation demand, circulation time, and transportation innovations," 1990, <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a221007>/

Transportation, as the service of moving commodities between places, plays a unique role in a fully competitive capitalist space-economy. The commodity of transportation is consumed as a part of virtually every economic transaction, linking the production and consumption of a commodity; demand for transportation is derived from spatial configurations rather than being fixed by socially necessary techniques and real wages; and the circulation time taken in transportation is a deduction from capitalists' profits. The impact of circulation time on profits may be calculated precisely. The derived nature of the demand for transportation adds a level of uncertainty to the impact of cost-reducing technical change on profit rates. Given this, cost-reducing and time-reducing technical change in the transportation commodity is one of the few ways of ensur[es]ing an increased rate of profit for capitalis[m]ts, ceteris paribus. The public nature of transportation improvements and the high investments in fixed capital that are required help to explain the central role of the state in capitalism in the improvement of transportation and thus in underwriting capital accumulation.

Extinction

Ljubodrag Simonovic, Ph.D., Philosophy; M.A., Law; published author of seven books, 2007, A New World is Possible, “Basis of contemporary critical theory of capitalism.”

The final stage of a mortal combat between mankind and capitalism is in progress. A specificity of capitalism is that, in contrast to "classical" barbarism (which is of destructive, murderous and plundering nature), it annihilates life by creating a "new world" – a "technical civilization" and an adequate, dehumanized and denaturalized man. Capitalism has eradicated man from his (natural) environment and has cut off the roots through which he had drawn life-creating force. Cities are "gardens" of capitalism where degenerated creatures "grow". Dog excrement, gasoline and sewerage stench, glaring advertisements and police car rotating lights that howl through the night - this is the environment of the "free world" man. By destroying the natural environment capitalism creates increasingly extreme climatic conditions in which man is struggling harder and harder to survive – and creates artificial living conditions accessible solely to the richest layer of population, which cause definitive degeneration of man as a natural being. "Humanization of life" is being limited to creation of micro-climatic conditions, of special capitalistic incubators - completely commercialized artificial living conditions to which degenerated people are appropriate. The most dramatic truth is: capitalism can survive the death of man as a human and biological being. For capitalism a "traditional man" is merely a temporary means of its own reproduction. "Consumer-man" represents a transitional phase in the capitalism-caused process of mutation of man towards the "highest" form of capitalistic man: a robot-man. "Terminators" and other robotized freaks which are products of the Hollywood entertainment industry which creates a "vision of the future" degenerated in a capitalist manner, incarnate creative powers, alienated from man, which become vehicles for destruction of man and life. A new "super race" of robotized humanoids is being created, which should clash with "traditional mankind", meaning with people capable of loving, thinking, daydreaming, fighting for freedom and survival - and impose their rule over the Earth. Instead of the new world, the "new man" is being created – who has been reduced to a level of humanity which cannot jeopardize the ruling order. Science and technique have become the basic lever of capital for the destruction of the world and the creation of "technical civilization". It is not only about destruction achieved by the use of technical means. It is about technicization of social institutions, of interpersonal relations, of the human body. Increasing transformation of nature into a surrogate of "nature", increasing dehumanization of the society and increasing denaturalization of man are direct consequences of capital's effort, within an increasingly merciless global economic war, to achieve complete commercialization of both natural and the social environment. The optimism of the Enlightenment could hardly be unreservedly supported nowadays, the notion of Marx that man imposes on himself only such tasks as he can solve, particularly the optimism based on the myth of the "omnipotence" of science and technique. The race for profits has already caused irreparable and still unpredictable damage to both man and his environment. By the creation of "consumer society", which means through the transition of capitalism into a phase of pure destruction, such a qualitative rise in destruction of nature and mankind has been performed that life on the planet is literally facing a "countdown". Instead of the "withering away" (Engels) of institutions of the capitalist society, the withering away of life is taking place. / The thesis of conservative bourgeois theoreticians, according to which the history of mankind ends with capitalism, becomes more and more convincing. Unless it is prevented, capitalism will, already by the beginning of the third millennium, finish off what remains of the world. Scientists are a human form in which capitalism instrumentalizes natural forces in order to control men and nature. They have been reduced to specialty-idiots who, in a "technical world", where everything operates by "pressing a button" and where "everything is under control", see an ideal world that should be longed for, and in a machine-man the "culmination of progress". Scientists, for whom "obtaining expertise" is paid for with their humanity, perceive people as enemies and machines as "friends". The same way profit and not man is essential to capitalists, "progress" and not man is essential to scientists - progress being another name for profit, and "profit" being another name for destruction. "The technical intelligentsia" are mutilated people not able to express their humanity. Fear of people transforms into hatred of people. They consciously deprive themselves of all those features that make them men, and they escape into a technical world where they can "experiment" with machines, people, the living world.… The power of science and technique becomes the power of manipulation and dest

ruction. For them the "technical world" becomes the "natural" world and the highest esthetic challenge, like Eiffel's tower, this capitalistic Tyrannosaurus, which symbolizes domination of "technical civilization" over man. It becomes more and more obvious that capitalism creates an increasingly deep social and ecological crisis that it cannot control. The transition of capitalism is going on, from the stage of "controlled" into a stage of uncontrolled chaos which is the ultimate "answer" of the ruling order to its own incapacity to manage the increasingly dramatic existential crisis – out of which either the tearing down of capitalism and the creating of the new world, or the destruction of mankind and life on Earth, can be generated. The consequences of capitalism cannot be controlled by means of social institutions, for those have also become tools of capitalist corporations and are being used to achieve their interests. Men are deprived of basic human rights: the right to live, to labor, to a healthy environment, family, happiness, a future... A process of depersonalization by the capitalist governance shows no responsibility for its own actions. Invisible and impossible to seize, the spirit of capitalism, which becomes the fatal force of destiny, rules the world. Multinational corporations destroy the international legal system, democratic institutions, the "social state"... The political arena becomes a political circus, politicians become capital's court jesters. Public disputes on essential social issues are being replaced with fabricated affairs. "Rule of law" becomes an ideological mask of capitalist tyranny. Eventually, the political sphere becomes a vehicle of the ruling class used for depoliticization of citizens and extermination of trust in democratic institutions and hope for the possibility of creating a rational social order that would be an incarnation of the guiding principles of the French Revolution - upon which modern humanism is based. It turned out that (Western) democracy is a political form of the rule of capital over man. Multinational corporations destroy the emancipating legacy of civil society, and the institutions that should offer a possibility for expressi5on of the citizens' political will become the means for achieving their interests instead. The possibilities for the political articulation of increasing citizens' discontent through institutions are diminishing. A declining number of issues determining the destiny of men are being raised in "representative bodies". A declining number of people take an active part in the elections. Instead of being a political subject, the citizen becomes a consumer of political programs. Everything occurs in accordance with the principles of market economics, within which good advertising is of utmost importance for the sale of products. "Money does not stink!" becomes the basic political principle. Politics becomes an industry for production of "democratic" falsehoods and illusions. The more the crisis of capitalism develops, accompanied by the increasing discontent of people – which unavoidably generates the need for creation of the new world, for this is an existential imperative – the more aggressive are the efforts of the ruling class to prevent its disintegration. The most important task of the governing politics is to make it impossible that the objective possibilities for the change of the existing world become real potential for changes, through the change-oriented practice of the oppressed. Therefore, destruction of (critical) mind and "pacification" of the oppressed through idiotization become the most important task of the governing propaganda machinery. Degenerated capitalist rulers of the world develop increasingly horrible mechanisms for physical and mental destruction of people. Governing politics is limited to technique for the manipulation of the oppressed by which the emancipating legacy of civil society is being annihilated while an increasingly aggressive relationship between races, nations, religions, genders is being developed... Artificially provoked and controlled conflicts between people are being imposed, in which trust in man and change-oriented energy should burn out. "General suspects" are being labeled so as to be accountable for the causes of discontent and at which anger of citizens deprived of their rights should be vented. In this manner a critical and change-oriented relation towards the world and any class awareness are being annihilated, while contemporary fascism is being created. Production of fear, used to prepare the public for the use of the means of mass destruction (including atomic and neutron bombs) by the "bad guys" around the globe, becomes the most important task of the ruling propaganda machinery. The capitalist perpetuum mobile is in action: capitalism generates increasing discontent which is transformed, by means of politics limited to the technique of redirection of people's discontent toward the accomplishment of anti-human political and economic goals, into a driving power for repression and destruction. The governing regime tries to accomplish total criminalizing of the society, which means that chaos is created – controlled by that very way of life based on the totalizing principle of "Big fish devours small fish!"- within which all efforts to create a human world are being degenerated. Criminalizing of the society becomes the most important form of integration of the oppressed into a spiritual and existential orbit of capitalism and a way of dealing with the libertarian (class) struggle. The specifics of the capitalist criminalizing of the society go toward the expectation that it should eliminate a population "surplus", in other words, the "non usable labor force". Biological destruction of the oppressed becomes the most efficient way of controlling them. This method was "successfully" used by the American administration with Indians in "reservations" all over the USA: methanol and blankets infected with smallpox once played the role now assigned to AIDS, cigarettes, drugs, poisoned food...The faster the operating of capital, the less space remains for humanity. Capitalism destroys the family and all other forms of social life and produces the lonely man, for whom it becomes increasingly difficult to accept responsibility and to oppose the capitalist craze. This is a psychological moment of extraordinary importance for the ruling order. The growing misfortune becomes a generator of the growing evil into which the average citizen (petit bourgeois) masochistically blends so as to avoid responsibility for the annihilation of the world - in which process he, actively or passively, participates. No one raises the issue in public any more of man's responsibility for the established global "development" – for this responsibility implies the right to freedom and life. Therefore, the concept of "future happiness" was replaced by the fear for life as the main behavioral motivation factor. Capitalistically degenerated man has lost faith that he can do anything in the social area, so he tries to barricade himself within his own atomized hopelessness and to create his own micro-world. "Freedom" of the slaves of capitalism is limited to the possibility of purchasing an increasing variety of ever more destructive ways to "escape" from everyday life offered by the entertainment industry. Capitalism generates the pathological man that accepts destruction as way of life - the petit bourgeois is a man degenerated in a capitalist way. He has become a victim of capitalist nothingness to such an extent that he finds relief from the everyday agony he experiences in a vision of an ultimate and spectacular annihilation of mankind: instinct for life transforms into instinct for destruction. Capitalism as a totalitarian order crushes the emancipating legacy of civil society which opens a possibility for creation of the new world - and it produces forms of political struggle that have a destructive nature. Terrorism is a capitalistically degenerated form of the fight against capitalism – destructive violence that uses capitalist means and methods - and only contributes to the intensification of the process of destruction. It does not long for creation of the new world, but for annihilation of the existing world. This is the essential difference between revolutionary struggle and terrorist actions. Fanaticism, and not a visionary conscious based on reason and freedom, dominates terrorist violence. Fanaticism is a consequence of an increasingly merciless destruction of the world and people performed by capitalist monopolies. A typical example is so-called "Muslim extremism": it is an unavoidable consequence of the more and more obvious Western effort to crush the Muslims and take full control over oil deposits. At the same time, the "fight against terrorism" is a new ideological mask of American imperialism which is analogous to the "fight against Judaic bolshevism", a mask of the Nazi Drang nach Osten, annihilation of Jews and Slavs and conquering of Lebensraum for German capital. "Fight against terrorism" becomes a pretext for introduction of global terror by the most powerful capitalist corporations. Those who terrorize the world in the form of the "fight against terrorism" try to crush all those who threaten their efforts to transform the entire world into their own concentration camp. The offered "protection" from terrorism is of a mafia nature: those who do not accept the iron embrace of the "global policeman" will be exposed to the worst American terror. "Global terrorism" becomes the "main danger that threatens mankind" - this is being constantly repeated by servants of the American politics around the globe. From its position toward terrorism one can view the real outreach and the real objectives of the American politics: terrorism is neither ideological nor alignment-related, but of a global and anti-existential nature. Ruling oligarchies of the most developed capitalist countries are "solving" the increasingly deep existential crisis within their respective societies by shifting it onto the shoulders of the poor of the world. The survival of capitalism is directly conditioned by the robbing and destruction of the entire world. Contemporary imperialism (which has been named "globalism" by Coca Cola intellectuals), unlike its earlier historical forms that were exploitative (Rob!) and genocidal (Kill!) in nature, is of an ecocidal nature (Annihilate!). NATO, IMF and other "international organizations" are only a vehicle the West uses for carrying out its ecocide terrorism and the genocide politics based on it. A new fascism is being established, based on total global capitalist terror: each part of the planet, and each segment of life become means for capitalist reproduction - which means that life itself becomes terror over man and the destruction of humanity. The always more intensive destruction of life leads toward a radicalization of the genocide politics: destruction of an increasingly large number of people becomes a precondition for the survival of an ever-smaller number of people. Within that context a theory of the "golden billion" has been established which represents a strategic landmark for the political practice of the most developed capitalist countries. This ecocide capitalist craze generates a growing fear for survival and consequently, based on this fear, establishes conditions for radicalization of political decisions and political action. The use of atomic and neutron bombs, artificial viruses (such as HIV) and other lethal means becomes a legitimate "defense" tool. In almost all reports produced by the Western "experts", "overpopulation" of the planet is "the greatest danger for survival of mankind". Fear for survival is being redirected toward nations of the world that "excessively procreate" thus jeopardizing the survival of all. The solution is being imposed by itself: destruction of the billions of "superfluous" is essential for the survival of mankind. Those who unsparingly destroy nature and exterminate peoples become "saviors of mankind". The West has ample experience with destruction of nations: extermination of the North American Indians by American capitalism, and the Chinese and the Australian Aborigines by British imperialism - show the Western "traditions" of elimination of the "surplus" of humanity. At the same time, based on the American "new world order", "globalism" provides conditions for establishing new "national" genocide plutocracies that have the task of destroying the "excessive population" in their respective territory, by applying of economic and other measures. Further development of capitalism will be paid for by billions of innocent people, by a growing number of wildlife species that are facing extinction, by the entire living world... Eventually, it all serves to enable several million of the mentally degenerated "rich" to continue "enjoying" the material wealth created for them from the ashes and blood, tolerance for which is being provided by the use of police, mafia and military tyranny, and the illusions created by the entertainment industry. Fanatics of capitalism are the worst sort of terrorists: they are destroying life on Earth. The economic logic of monopolist capitalism, which is based upon the notion of "Big fish devours small fish!", has become the ruling political rationale that determines relations between states. What the Nazis did not achieve with weapons and concentration camps, the Western capitalist corporations accomplished with money and economic extortion: the transformation of former "Eastern block" countries into their own "living space", while transforming their citizens into contemporary (Coca Cola) slaves. The ruling European political circles identify Europe with the "European Union" in the same way as the Nazi ideologists declared Europe "the new European order". It is exactly those who advocate Europe as a community of equal nations and who insist on its emancipating heritage - who are the most bitter enemies of the "European Union" as a vehicle for the largest European corporations toward their destruction of the emancipating heritage of European nations. The so called "European Union" is being built upon an illusion that joining the "Union" guarantees all European nations "prosperity and a better life". It should be remembered here that the main goal proclaimed by the Nazi "new European order" was to make "all European nations happy"! The "European Union" is an anti-human and destructive order based upon the ruling principles of monopolist capitalism, "Big fish devours small fish!" and "Money does not stink!"; its ruling political sphere does not provide opportunity for expression of the citizens' political will but represents a political form of the rule of capital over people; the entire institutional, normative and propaganda area of that order is directed toward destruction of the cultural and libertarian self-conscious of people and toward their integration into a spiritual orbit of capitalism at the level of the idiotized labor-consumer "mass". The "European Union" is not a "democratic community of nations", but a form of integration of the European multinational corporations in their fight against the American corporations - which use the American state as a vehicle for the achievement of their interest at the global level. The "European Union" is not based upon the emancipating traditions of European nations, but upon the imperialist traditions of European capitalism. It is not a humanistic goal but a vehicle of the most powerful capitalist corporations for the achievement, by economic and political "measures", of the very same goals that Hitler was expected to achieve for German capital - by military means. It is a transitional phase in "European development" that leads toward the creation of a new (ecocide) fascist order. Appropriately, this violent, capitalistically established "integration of European nations" cause nationalism and racism to thrive in response to people's deprivation of basic human and civil rights - which is an introduction to new increasingly dramatic clashes that will develop based on the prevalent logic impose by monopolist capitalism, and also based on the increasingly contaminated natural environment and on the biological deterioration of European nations. The ecocide capitalist terrorism unavoidably generates nationalism which is no longer based on the struggle to obtain and preserve a job or a living standard, but on the struggle for survival. It becomes more and more obvious that "the uniting of Europe", instead of developing optimism and an atmosphere of tolerance, which would correspond to the "humanist ideals" referred to by politicians, the citizens' fear of the future and intolerance are growing. "Humanist speeches" cannot conceal the growing crime, unemployment, falling apart of the "welfare state" and, along with it, of social protection, devastation of environment, drug abuse, violence, suicides, fanaticism, extremism, the flourishing of Satanist sects and of fascism, the breaking up of the family, the growing number of parentless children, human-trafficking and child-trafficking aimed at sexual abuse or the taking of their lives to "obtain" organs (in England alone more than 40,000 underage children "disappear" annually), the spreading of AIDS and other diseases that would decimate the poor, loneliness that has achieved epidemic dimensions... The "United Europe" generates racism, similar to that developed in the USA. East European and Balkan peoples are getting the status of "people with no culture", which means "lesser creatures". The languages spoken by the Gastarbeiter population are not being perceived as part of the European cultural heritage, but become a motive for discrimination. As a mass phenomenon, migrant labourers keep their children from learning their own mother tongue in order to mask their origin and avoid humiliation. Bearing in mind that an insignificant number of children of migrant labor achieve college and university educations, it becomes clear that depriving them of their mother tongue represents obliteration of their cultural being, through which act they are predestined to be the "dirty labour force" predestined to perform the hardest and the most dangerous jobs. Within the "European Union" one can clearly discern the racist pyramid of power based upon economic, political and military supremacy: Germany, France and England are on the top, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium... are bellow them, the Balkan peoples are located at the bottom the pyramid. In the "United Europe", the place reserved for them is the one Afro-Americans occupy in the United States of America. On the "road toward Europe" the Balkan nations will lose their own historical (cultural) self-conscious and libertarian dignity in order to become a garbage collector labour force, while the Balkans become the septic tank of Europe. The Balkan peoples are commanded to renounce the libertarian myths that are the basis of their historical and libertarian self-conscious, while at the same time, they are expected to cling to the myth of "Europe" as a "community of free nations": libertarian myths are being replaced by colonial ones. The "uniting of Europe" in accordance with the American model, which means to be based upon the interests of multinational corporations and their struggle for supremacy, leads towards annihilation of "nationalism" which translates into annihilation of the cultural heritage of European nations and their right to make sovereign political decisions.

Vote neg as an abandonment of belief in capitalism

Adrian Johnston, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico, 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, Volume 9 // Issue 3

Perhaps the absence of a detailed practical roadmap in Žižek’s political writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby truly to open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance 127 (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle 128). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining just an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the earlier analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing 93 more than a kind of “magic,” that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The “external” obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, “internally” believe in it—capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socioperformative force emanating from this same material.

# LOST

Battle over LOST coming – first priority for Congress post-election – Obama will push

Dan **Joling**, August 17th, 2012, **8/17** (writer, Juneau Empire, “Murkowski hopeful on passing the Law of the Sea treaty,” <http://juneauempire.com/dan-joling/2012-08-17/murkowski-hopeful-passing-law-sea-treaty#.UEGIEdYia3F> >:)

ANCHORAGE — Melting summer sea ice is opening up the Arctic Ocean to commercial opportunities but the United States could miss them if it doesn’t sign the Law of the Sea treaty, according to U.S. Sen. Lisa Murkowski. The Alaska Republican hopes the Senate will vote to sign the treaty during the lame duck session following the November election. The treaty sets up a system for resolving disputes in international waters. It has been around since the Reagan administration, and 162 countries have signed on. “This is a treaty that I believe very strongly will contribute not only to our national security, but will allow us a level of certainly in accessing our resources in the north,” Murkowski said Wednesday. The Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senate — 67 votes — to ratify a treaty. The treaty recognizes sovereign rights over a country’s “exclusive economic zone” — the area covering its continental shelf out to 200 nautical miles. It recognizes rights beyond that zone if the country can provide evidence to substantiate its claims. That’s exactly what could happen off Alaska’s northern shore, Murkowski said. Outer continental shelf mapping indicates the United States could claim an area the size of California, she said. “I don’t want us, as an Arctic nation, to abandon those opportunities, and we would be doing that if we fail to ratify the Law of the Sea treaty,” Murkowski said. The treaty has support from the president, most Senate Democrats, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the military. “Anybody with a star on their shoulder has sat before the Foreign Relations Committee and testified about why it’s so important, so critical, to this nation,” she said. She has worked with Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., to educate fellow senators on the pact’s importance. Proponents faced a setback in June, she said, when Sens. Rob Portman, R-Ohio, and Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H., said they had concerns about the breadth and ambiguity of the treaty and that it was not in the national interest at that time. Their decision meant opponents had [have] enough votes to block ratification unless some senators change their minds. In the upcoming months, Murkowski said, representatives from shipping, telecommunications, petroleum and even tourism interests will make the case for the treaty. She said opponents are not worried U.S. interests could be exposed to international litigation. Instead, she said, they see a loss of U.S sovereignty if the United Nations is involved. “There are some colleagues — if the United Nations is in the title of any treaty, it’s an automatic no,” Murkowski said. “But the reality is the treaty has been amended or adapted from the time President Reagan was in office, and had concerns about it, to address some of the issues that have been raised.” The chance of treaty approval in November or December, she said, will depend on whether special interests such as the U.S. Chamber will push the measure as a priority over other legislation such as automatic deficit reduction or tax cut extension. “The concern is, we have these advocates, but they’re going have to prioritize what they’re going to be pushing for hardest,” Murkowski said.

Transportation investment drains pol cap – Ideology, election year, Congressional Gridlock

**Freemark ‘12**

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress This Year Look Glum” – January 25th, 2012 – <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>)

President Obama barely mentions the need for improvements in the nation’s capital stock in his State of the Union. The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition. Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside. Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012. The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms.

Obama push key

**Bloomberg**, 20**12** (some… company, I guess, “Watch These Global Hotspots for 2012: View,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-02/after-tumult-of-2011-here-are-some-global-hotspots-to-watch-in-2012-view.html> >:)

The Arctic: This is not so much a hotspot as a cold spot, but it’s getting warmer. And as the planet’s northern icecap melts, it is becoming a cockpit of international competition. Tussles over newly accessible oil, other resources and suddenly navigable waterways may bring out the testiness even in such perennially agreeable countries as Denmark and Canada. Arctic states other than the U.S. are preparing their claims as signatories to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which determines who has the right to benefit from the riches of any ocean. Die-hard conservatives in Congress have blocked U.S. approval of the law, falsely claiming that it would constrain the military -- arguments that the military, among others, rejects. A push by President Barack Obama, could probably win approval for the law in the Senate, thereby helping to safeguard the U.S. stake in the Arctic race and its role in keeping the peace there.

LOST ratification’s key to resolve island disputes in Asia – those destabilize the continent

Michael T. **Klare**, September 4th, 2012, **9/4** (Foreign Affairs, “Island Grabbing in Asia,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138093/michael-t-klare/island-grabbing-in-asia> >:)

Recently, a group of 34 legislators promised to vote against the UN Convention on the Law of The Seas, ensuring that the bill will not be ratified. Their move will make it harder for the United States to continue to build up a rules-based order in the South China Sea. It could also spell the end of treaties as a tool of U.S. national security policy. Last month, Japanese activists planted their country's flag on one of the Senkaku Islands (which the Chinese call the Diaoyu Islands), a chain claimed by China, Japan, and Taiwan. The move sparked protests in China and inspired headlines in the West, but the provocation was hardly surprising. The three bodies of water in East Asia -- the Sea of Japan (bounded by Japan, North Korea, South Korea, and Russia), the East China Sea (bordered by China and Japan's Ryukyu Islands), and the South China Sea (surrounded by Borneo, China, the Philippines, and Vietnam) -- are home to hundreds of disputed islands, atolls, and shoals. And in the last few years, the diplomatic and militaristic struggles to assert authority have become increasingly brazen. On one level, patriotism is making things worse. Japan's tussle with China over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, for example, is a touchstone for those in Japan who fear China's growing political and economic might. Likewise, South Korea's assertion of control over the Dokdo Islands (known as the Takeshima Islands in Japan) is viewed at home as a patriotic riposte to Japan's 40-year occupation of the peninsula. Beyond symbolism, however, these three bodies of water flow over East Asia's Outer Continental Shelf and the submerged deltas of many major river systems -- geological features that suggest the presence of vast deposits of oil and natural gas. Yet, although the resources have been there for millennia, it is only in the last decade that the energy sector has even started to develop extractive technologies that will eventually make these reserves accessible. Nobody wants to lose out, especially because East Asia is energy hungry. The region is home to only three percent of the world's proven oil reserves and eight percent of its natural gas reserves. China, for example, already imports 58 percent of the oil and 22 percent of the gas it uses each year. Japan is far more dependent, importing nearly all of its oil and gas. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, in the next 25 years, Asia's energy consumption is expected to grow faster than anywhere else in the world. Eager for energy security, these countries have long sought to exploit their offshore oil and gas reserves. Until recently, however, given the difficulty of operating in the blue-water seas, that was all but impossible. But eager to take advantage of oil and gas reservoirs in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Africa, Western energy firms have developed drilling rigs capable of operating in a mile of water or more. Now that the necessary technology is within reach, powers in Asia are determined to assert what they argue are their rightful claims to vast amounts of energy. Just who owns the potential riches, however, is a matter of some contention. Under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), coastal states are allowed to claim a 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone extending from their land borders. All of the countries in the region have done so. But China has also laid claim to virtually all of the South China Sea on the basis that it has periodically occupied the Spratly and Paracel islands, small clusters of atolls and shoals that take up the northern and southernmost reaches of the sea. China has further cited provisions of UNCLOS that allow it to develop exclusively its Outer Continental Shelf (even if the shelf extends beyond 200 miles) and stake out a large stretch of the East China Sea. Of course, many other countries have claims in those seas, too. Chinese behavior is a good example of the trend. Beijing's claims on the South China Sea (and the islands within it) are long-standing, as are its intentions to exploit the undersea hydrocarbon reserves there. In the past few years, however, it has stepped up its use of force. In June 2011, it harassed survey ships working for PetroVietnam in Vietnamese-claimed waters. Then, in April 2012, Chinese ships blocked efforts by the Philippine Navy to combat illegal fishing by Chinese ships in Philippine-claimed waters. Such belligerence is in line with hard-line elements of the Chinese military that have recently assumed a more assertive role in foreign affairs. But the aggression also coincides with the China National Offshore Oil Corporation's acquisition of its first deepwater drilling rig and announcement of plans to operate in the South China Sea. The Chinese drilling rig, the CNOOC 981, was first deployed in May and sited some 200 miles southeast of Hong Kong, in an area also claimed by Taiwan and Vietnam. As the energy company's chairman, Wang Yilin, put it, "Large deepwater drilling rigs are our mobile national territory and strategic weapon for promoting the development of the country's offshore oil industry." The firm also chose the occasion to auction off to foreign and domestic corporations a number of exploration blocks in areas of the South China Sea situated close to Vietnam. Needless to say, the move infuriated Hanoi. The Vietnamese, too, want to drill in deeper waters, but their national oil company, PetroVietnam, lacks the technological capacity to do so on its own. In recent years, it has been teaming up with foreign firms -- including Chevron and ExxonMobil -- to explore farther offshore. Last October, ExxonMobil reported finding a large natural gas field off the coast of central Vietnam. The Vietnamese say the field lies within their 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone. The Chinese have countered by asserting that the land falls within their territory and warning non-Chinese companies to desist from operating there. To hammer home the message, Chinese ships have, on several occasions, sliced PetroVietnam cables to underwater sensors. The dispute between South Korea and Japan over the Dokdo/ Takeshima Islands is a variation on the same theme. So far, the two sides have fought mainly over fishing rights in the area. But the waters are also thought to harbor vast quantities of methane hydrates -- frozen bubbles of natural gas trapped in ice crystals on the ocean floor. If harvested safely (methane is a highly potent greenhouse gas, so any uncontrolled release would accelerate global warming), the hydrates would be a huge cache of energy. South Korea and Japan have raced to develop the technology to mine the undersea gold and hope to begin commercial extraction by the end of this decade. Once that starts, the seabed around the Dokdo/Takeshima Islands would become extremely valuable, rendering the fight over them far more economically critical. The Obama administration has been caught off guard by the intensity of these disputes, which are threatening progress on a wide range of other issues. The disagreement between Japan and South Korea over the Dokdo (Takeshima) Islands, for example, has sabotaged plans for improved defense ties between the two countries and hurt U.S. efforts to isolate North Korea. Increased Chinese-Japanese tensions over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands are damaging efforts to boost trade in the region, another U.S. objective. In the South China Sea, the Obama administration has sought to bolster its ties with Vietnam, the Philippines, and other local powers by supporting their drive to negotiate en masse with China over the contested islands. Although welcomed in Hanoi and Manila, the strategy has angered Beijing and put a damper on Sino-American relations.

Asian instability causes war – escalates nuclear

Landay, 2k

(Jonathon S, national security and intelligence correspondent, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, Knight Ridder)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster."

# Warming

Ice age coming now – causes extinction

Aym, ’10

[Terrence, 12/22/10, Helium, “German scientist predicts new Ice age now approaching” <http://www.helium.com/items/2045473-scientist-predicts-new-ice-age-now-approaching>]

Panicking people fleeing **dying cities**…***Pandemics and epidemics*** breaking out…**Europe facing** regional **famines**…Countries going to **war**…***Millions dying***… The plot for a new Hollywood disaster movie? No. **Scenes from the *near future***. For those that live in the upper half of the northern hemisphere no theater tickets are needed. Everyone will have front row seats. ***The ice is coming***  A growing number of **scientists have checked** their **data, the solar cycles, the climate cycles and the Arctic ice core samples.** What they see is ***approaching disaster:* a new Ice Age that could *displace whole nations*, destroy the word's fragile economy *and bring freezing death to*** as much as one-fifth of ***the world's population***. According to some, a new mini-Ice Age could occur **in** as little as **five to ten years.** And those are the optimists. The pessimists believe the **Earth is spinning towards a full-fledged Ice Age**—the kind **that lasts thousands of years**. The kind that changed the shape of continents and carved out gigantic fresh water lakes like the Great Lakes in the northern Midwest of the United States. The kind of planetary climate disaster that almost wiped out the entire human race some 12,000 years ago. Cycles Everything in the universe is cyclical. Climate is no exception. **Ice Ages have come and gone in cycles.** Two primary cycles exist: the cycle of the mini-Ice Ages and the major Ice Ages. **Both types of cooling are destructive**. Some **regions become** virtually **uninhabitable** with terribly shortened growing seasons, while **southern areas can suffer devastating droughts**. If the planet's truly on the cusp of a major Ice Age, some experts predict that the Antarctic ice sheet will calve at the edges and thicken towards the middle. That's exactly what's been happening during the last decade or so. According to the evidence gleaned from core ice samples**, the Ice Age cycles are normally preceded by a brief warm-up** in the atmosphere followed by years of greater precipitation and centuries or millennia of cooling. Despite the short-sightedness of the man-made global warming crowd—who were over-reacting to the brief warm-up before the massive global cooling kicked in—some of the clearer thinking climatologists have been tracking the trends towards a new Ice Age since the 1970s. Unfortunately, their voices of concern were shouted down by media and political hysteria over the trumped up warming. Now, **humans may be about to face something far, far worse. “It is quite possible that *we are at the beginning of a Little Ice Age,”*** ~ Thomas Globig, meteorological scientist As the frenzy over man-made global warming dies the slow death of a thousand cuts, desperate scientists are attempting to interpret what has happened to the sun, what will happen to the Earth as the solar system swings into alignment with the galactic core possibly exposing everything to titanic energies the planet is normally shielded from, and why **the Earth may slip into a full-fledged Ice Age in *less than ten years***. The clock is running out. Then add to their discoveries raw data that suggests the Earth's molten core may have shifted and the readings pouring in that the magnetic field protecting the planet from Unimaginable deadly solar radiation is weakening. Passing the zenith of a nearly two centuries of robust warming, the sun's next phase will see a decline. Climatologists and heliologists agree that within 30 years the sun will go quiet resulting in a dramatic drop of solar heating. The early stages of this activity are already being felt. All of these factors—in one way or another—have or will have a significant impact on the future climate. The impact is not a favorable one. And again, each of these events is cyclical. Arctic ice could spread farther to the south “I think it is even conceivable that the **Arctic ice spreads significantly in the years to come**,” Globig told reporters for the German weather site weter.t-online. de. "The impact of solar activity on climate has been criminally underestimated for a long time." During the last few weeks of November and the first several weeks of December 2010, ***amazing climate anomalies* have been occurring**: Cuba's temperature plunged towards the freezing mark, historic mega-storms battered the West Coast; across Europe's temperatures plummeted as far south as the Mediterranean; Sweden braced for the coldest weather in 1,000 years and Australia had a record snowfall with one week before the beginning of summer. England is fighting against the coldest weather seen in many hundreds of years. “***What actually will happen depends on the next five to ten year***s,” believes Globig. Harder, longer winters and shorter, colder summers Globig sees two main causes for the significant cooling: First, the cyclical changes in the big air currents over the Atlantic, and second, the variations in solar activity. Unfortunately, the high-tech Western world might not fare too well as the Ice Age advances. As Globig points out, people across northern Europe have been barely coping with just a little more snow and cold. “***Our modern, high-tech world was completely overwhelmed with the winter situation***." As the climate shifts towards an Ice Age footing, the world's weather patterns will reverse dramatically. Again, that is exactly what Globig sees happening. “The weather over the Atlantic is upside down,” explained Globig. "Now cold air from the polar region has lots of space to flow to Europe—and that's what's happening." The odds seem to favor an approaching Ice Age and Globig tends to agree. “We will have to abandon some climate forecasts.“ Perhaps weather prediction will actually become much easier. **Day after day the forecast will be: "Colder, with the likelihood of more snow."**

b.) High CO2 solves – this evidence answers any link turns

Lacis, et. al., ‘10

[Andrew, 10/15/10, Science Magazine, “Atmospheric CO2: Principal Control Knob Governing Earth’s Temperature,” http://www.sciencemag.org/content/330/6002/356.full]

A direct consequence of this combination of feedback by the condensable and forcing by the noncondensable constituents of the atmospheric greenhouse is that **the** terrestrial **greenhouse effect would *collapse were it not for*** the presence of these ***noncondensing GHGs*.** If the global atmospheric temperatures were to fall to as low as TS = TE, the Clausius-Clapeyron relation would imply that the sustainable amount of atmospheric water vapor would become less than 10% of the current atmospheric value. This would **result in (radiative) forcing** reduced by ~30 W/m2, ***causing*** much of **the remaining water vapor to *precipitate***, thus **enhancing the snow/ice albedo to** further **diminish the absorbed solar radiation. Such** a condition **would inevitably lead to runaway glaciation, producing an ice ball Earth**. Claims that removing all CO2 from the atmosphere “would lead to a 1°C decrease in global warming” (7), or “by 3.53°C when 40% cloud cover is assumed” (8) are still being heard. A clear demonstration is needed to show that water vapor and clouds do indeed behave as fast feedback processes and that their atmospheric distributions are regulated by the sustained radiative forcing due to the noncondensing GHGs. To this end, we performed a simple climate experiment with the GISS 2° × 2.5° AR5 version of ModelE, using the Q-flux ocean with a mixed-layer depth of 250 m, zeroing out all the noncondensing GHGs and aerosols. The results, summarized in Fig. 2, show unequivocally that **the radiative forcing by noncondensing GHGs *is essential to sustain the atmospheric temperatures that are needed for significant levels of water vapor and cloud feedback.* Without this** noncondensable GHG forcing, **the physics of this model send** the climate of **Earth** plunging rapidly and ***irrevocably to an icebound state***, though perhaps not to total ocean freezeover. **The scope** of the climate impact **becomes apparent** in ***just 10 years*.** During the first year alone, global mean surface temperature falls by 4.6°C. After 50 years, the global temperature stands at –21°C, a decrease of 34.8°C. Atmospheric water vapor is at ~10% of the control climate value (22.6 to 2.2 mm). Global cloud cover increases from its 58% control value to more than 75%, and the global sea ice fraction goes from 4.6% to 46.7%, causing the planetary albedo of Earth to also increase from ~29% to 41.8%. This has the effect of reducing the absorbed solar energy to further exacerbate the global cooling. After 50 years, a third of the ocean surface still remains ice-free, even though the global surface temperature is colder than –21°C. At tropical latitudes, incident solar radiation is sufficient to keep the ocean from freezing. Although this thermal oasis within an otherwise icebound Earth appears to be stable, further calculations with an interactive ocean would be needed to verify the potential for long-term stability. The surface temperatures in Fig. 3 are only marginally warmer than 1°C within the remaining low-latitude heat island. From the foregoing, it is clear that *CO2 is the key atmospheric gas* ***that exerts principal control over the strength of the terrestrial greenhouse effect*.** Water vapor and clouds are fast-acting feedback effects, and as such are controlled by the radiative forcings supplied by the noncondensing GHGs. There is telling evidence that **atmospheric CO2 also governs the temperature of Earth on geological time scales,** suggesting the related question of what the geological processes that control atmospheric CO2 are. The geological evidence of glaciation at tropical latitudes from 650 to 750 million years ago supports the snowball Earth hypothesis (9), and by inference, that escape from the snowball Earth **condition** is **also** achievable.

#.) Warming is inevitable –

a.) China overwhelms – US can’t get them on board

Abigail **Haddad,**, 6-30-20**’08**, research assistant at the American Enterprise Institute, “The Answer to Climate Change?” The American, p http://www.american.com/archive/2008/june-06-08/the-answer-to-climate-change

If mitigating climate change through reductions in GHG emissions were cheap, or if the benefits of doing so were large, Scott Barrett of John Hopkins University said, it would already have been done. In fact, while current technology allows us to make small emissions cuts relatively cheaply, significant reductions would be extremely expensive and require major economic sacrifices. In addition, global **climate change** may be, as Barrett declared, “**the world’s** greatest ***collective*** action ***problem***,” since **no country** acting ***alone*** can reduce greenhouse gases **enough** to slow it. Lane agreed, saying that no mitigation-based solution is possible ***without China’s*** participation—and there is little the United States can do to force China to curb its emissions.

b.) Solar Irradiance – this also means they can’t access their internal link – CO2 has nothing to do with warming

Solomon, ‘07

(Lawrence Solomon, Staff Writer, National Post, “Look to Mars for Truth on Global Warming,” http://www.nationalpost.com/story.html?id=edae9952-3c3e-47ba-913f-7359a5c7f723&k=0)

Climate change is a much, much bigger issue than the public, politicians, and even the most alarmed environmentalists realize. Global ***warming extends to Mars***, where the polar ice cap is shrinking, where deep gullies in the landscape are now laid bare, and where the climate is the warmest it has been in decades or centuries. / "One explanation could be that Mars is just coming out of an ice age," NASA scientist William Feldman speculated after the agency's Mars Odyssey completed its first Martian year of data collection. "In some low-latitude areas, the ice has already dissipated." With each passing year more and more evidence arises of the dramatic changes occurring on the only planet on the solar system, apart from Earth, to give up its climate secrets. / NASA's findings in space come as no surprise to Dr. Habibullo Abdussamatov at Saint Petersburg's Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory. Pulkovo -- at the pinnacle of Russia's space-oriented scientific establishment -- is one of the world's best equipped observatories and has been since its founding in 1839. Heading Pulkovo's space research laboratory is Dr. Abdussamatov, one of the world's chief critics of the theory that man-made carbon dioxide emissions create a greenhouse effect, leading to global warming. / "Mars has global ***warming***, but **without** a greenhouse and without the participation of ***Martians***," he told me. "These **parallel** global **warmings** -- observed simultaneously on Mars and on Earth -- can only be a straightline **consequence of** the effect of the one same factor: a long-time change in ***solar irradiance***." / **The sun's increased irradiance** over the last century, not C02 emissions, is responsible for the global warming we're seeing, says the celebrated scientist, and this solar irradiance also explains the great volume of C02 emissions. / "It is no secret that increased solar **irradiance warms** Earth's ***oceans,*** which then ***triggers*** the emission of large amounts of carbon **dioxide** into the atmosphere. So the common view that man's industrial activity is a deciding factor in global warming has emerged from a misinterpretation of cause and effect relations."

c.) Warming is cyclical – happens every 1.5 thousand years

**Singer,** distinguished research professor at George Mason and Avery, director of the Center for Global Food Issues at the Hudson Institute, 20**’07** (S. Fred, Dennis T, “Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years” Pages 1-5)

The Earth is warmingbut physical **evidence** from around the worldtells us that **human-emitted CO2** (carbon dioxide) has played ***only a minor role* in it**. Instead, **the** mild **warming** seems to be part of a **natural *1,500-year climate cycle*** (plus or minus 500 years) that goes back at least one million years. The cycle has been too long and too moderate for primitive peoples lacking thermometers to recount in their oral histories. But written evidence of climatic change does exist. The Romans had recorded a warming from about 200 B.C. to AD. 600, registered mainly in the northward advance of grape growing in both Italy and Britain. **Histories** from both Europe and Asia **tell us there was a *Medieval Warming*** that lasted from about 900 to 1300; this period was also known as the Medieval Climate Optimum because of its mild winters, stable seasons, and lack of severe storms. Human histories also record the ***Little Ice Age***, which lasted from about 1300 to 1850.But people thought **each of these climatic shifts *was*** a distinct event and ***not part of a continuing pattern*.** This began to change in 1984 when Willi Dansgaard of Denmark and Hans Oeschger of Switzerland published their analysis of the oxygen isotopes in the first ice cores extracted from Greenland.**'** These cores provided 250,000 years of the Earth's climate history in one set of "documents." The scientists compared the ratio of "heavy" oxygen-18 isotopes to the "lighter" oxygen-16 isotopes, which indicated the temperature at the time the snow had fallen. They expected to find evidence of the known 90,000-year ice ages and the mild interglacial periods recorded in the ice, and they did. However, they did not expect to find anything in between. To their surprise, they found a clear cycle—moderate, albeit abrupt—occurring about every 2,550 years running persistently through both. (This period would soon he reassessed at 1,500 years, plus or minus 500 years). ***By the mid-1980s***, however, the First World had already ***convinced itself of the*** Greenhouse Theory and **believed that puny *human industries* had grown powerful enough to change the planet's climate**. There was little media interest in the frozen findings of obscure, parka-clad Ph.D.s in far-off Greenland. A ***wealth of other evidence*** has emerged since 1984, however, **corroborating** Dansgaard and Oeschger's **natural I ,500-year climate cycle: An ice core from the Antarctic's** Vostok **Glacier-at the other end of the world** from Iceland-was brought up in 1987 and showed the same 1,500year climate cycle throughout its 400,000-year length. • The ice-core findings correlate with **known advances and retreats in the glaciers of the Arctic, Europe, Asia, North America, Latin America, New Zealand, and the Antarctic.** • The I ,500-year cycle has been revealed in **seabed sediment cores** brought up from the floors of such far-flung waters as the North Atlantic Ocean and the Sargasso Sea, the South Atlantic Ocean and the Arabian Sea. • **Cave stalagmites from Ireland and Germany in the Northern Hemisphere to South Africa and New Zealand in the Southern Hemisphere** show evidence of the Modern Warming, the Little Ice Age, the Medieval Warming, the Dark Ages, the Roman Warming, and the unnamed cold period before the Roman Warming. **• Fossilized pollen from across North America** shows nine complete reorganizations of our trees and plants in the last 14,000 years, or one every 1,650 years. • In both Europe and South America, archaeologists have evidence that prehistoric humans moved their homes and farms up mountainsides during the warming centuries and retreated back down during the cold ones. The Earth continually warms and cools. The cycle is undeniable, ancient, often abrupt, and global. It is also unstoppable. Isotopes in the ice and sediment cores, ancient tree rings, and stalagmites tell us it is linked to small changes in the irradiance of the sun.The temperature change is moderate. Temperatures at the latitude of New York and Paris moved about 2 degrees Celsius above the long-term mean during warmings, with increases of 3 degrees or more in the polar latitudes. During the cold phases of the cycle, temperatures dropped by similar amounts below the mean. Temperatures change little in lands al the equator. but rainfall often does. **The cycle shifts have occurred** roughly on schedule ***whether CO2 levels were high or low****.* Based on this 1,500 year-cycle, **the Earth is about *150 years into a moderate Modern Warmin*g that will last for centuries longer**. It will essentially restore the fine climate of the Medieval Climate Optimum. The climate has been most stable during the warming phases, The "little ice ages" have been beset by more floods, droughts, famines, and storminess. Yet, despite all of this evidence, millions of well-educated people, many scientists, many respected organizations-even the national governments of major First World nations-are telling us that the Earth's current warming phase is caused by human-emitted CO2 and deadly dangerous, They ask society to renounce most of its use of fossil fuel-generated energy and accept radical reductions in food production, health technologies, and standards of living to "save the planet." We have missed the predictive power of the 1,500-year climate cycle. Will the fear of dangerous global warming lead society to accept draconian restrictions on the use of fertilizers, cars, and air conditioners?

d.) Irreversibility – tipping point’s inevitable – cutting emissions can’t solve

**NPR, ‘09**

[National Public Radio, 1/26/2009, “Global Warming Is Irreversible, Study Says,” <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99888903>//]

**Climate change is** essentially ***irreversible****,* according to a sobering new scientific study. **As carbon dioxide emissions *continue to rise*, the world will experience more and more *long-term environmental disruption*.** The **damage will persist *even when***, and if, ***emissions are brought under control***, says study author Susan Solomon, who is among the world's top climate scientists. "We're used to thinking about pollution problems as things that we can fix," Solomon says. "Smog, we just cut back and everything will be better later. Or haze, you know, it'll go away pretty quickly." That's the case for some of the gases that contribute to climate change, such as methane and nitrous oxide. But as Solomon and colleagues suggest in a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **it is not true for the most abundant greenhouse gas:** *carbon dioxide*. Turning off the carbon dioxide emissions won't stop global warming. "**People have imagined** that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide that **the climate would go back to normal in 100 years or 200 years.** What we're showing here is that's not right. **It's essentially an *irreversible change that will last for more than a thousand years***," Solomon says. This is because **the oceans are currently soaking up a lot of the planet's excess heat *— and a lot of the carbon dioxide put into the air*.** The carbon dioxide and heat will eventually start coming out of the ocean. And that will take place for many hundreds of years. Solomon is a scientist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Her new study looked at the consequences of this long-term effect in terms of sea level rise and drought.

e.) Too late – past emissions will overwhelm the plan – and, feedbacks prevent solvency

Adve, ‘08

[Nagraj, 4/23/2008, One World South Asia, “Can we avoid ‘dangerous’ global warming?” <http://southasia.oneworld.net/Article/can-we-avoid-2018dangerous2019-global-warming/>]

As a consequence**, the Earth’s average temperature has risen about *0.8 degrees C*** since the Industrial Revolution, reaching 14.5 degrees C in 2005. This **seemingly mild rise** has already caused lands to be ***nibbled by rising sea levels*** in the Sunderbans and the Gujarat coast, the 2005 floods in Bombay which killed a thousand people, Himalayan glaciers to recede, and rainfall patterns to change. According to the UN, 66 million people were affected by floods this year in South Asia alone. What used to seem ‘natural’ phenomena are not natural any more, as Bill McKibben lamented in *The End of Nature* nearly 20 years ago. The problem, as Paul Brown explains in Global Warming: The Last Chance for Change, is that ***there’s more warming in the pipeline***. ***There’s a lag of about 25-30 years between greenhouse gases being emitted and the full effects of their warming.*** So the **recent climate chaos is** actually the ***consequence of emissions in the*** late 19*70s.* The full ***effects of more recent emissions, including from China’s coal-based power stations*** that some are suddenly and rightly concerned about, *will be felt in the years to come*. We are committed, Brown writes, to a further 0.7 degrees C. That would add up to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial levels. At 1.5 degrees, 18% of the world’s species will die, and 400 million more people worldwide will be exposed to water stress. It gets worse. As the Earth gets warmer, it will trigger off certain ‘feedbacks’, which could be understood as the Earth’s systems themselves contributing to warming: as Arctic ice melts, there will be less of it to reflect heat, warming further, melting more, and so on.

# Heg

Heg is unsustainable – emerging powers, wealth transfer, and nonstate actors

US National Intel Council Report, ‘08

(National Intelligence Council, U.S. National Intelligence Agency Mid-Term and Long-Term Thinking, Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, p.vi)

The international system—as constructed following the Second World War—will be almost unrecognizable by 2025 owing to the rise of emerging powers, a globalizing economy, an historic transfer of relative wealth and economic power from West to East, and the growing influence of nonstate actors. By 2025, the international system will be a global multipolar one with gaps in national power continuing to narrow between developed and developing countries. Concurrent with the shift in power among nation-states, the relative power of various nonstate actors—including businesses, tribes, religious organizations, and criminal networks—is increasing. The players are changing, but so too are the scope and breadth of transnational issues important for continued global prosperity. Aging populations in the developed world; growing energy, food, and water constraints; and worries about climate change will limit and diminish what will still be an historically unprecedented age of prosperity. Historically, emerging multipolar systems have been more unstable than bipolar or unipolar ones. Despite the recent financial volatility—which could end up accelerating many ongoing trends—we do not believe that we are headed toward a complete breakdown of the international system, as occurred in 1914-1918 when an earlier phase of globalization came to a halt. However, the next 20 years of transition to a new system are fraught with risks. Strategic rivalries are most likely to revolve around trade, investments, and technological innovation and acquisition, but we cannot rule out a 19th century-like scenario of arms races, territorial expansion, and military rivalries. This is a story with no clear outcome, as illustrated by a series of vignettes we use to map out divergent futures. Although the United States is likely to remain the single most powerful actor, the United States’ relative strength—even in the military realm—will decline and US leverage will become more constrained. At the same time, the extent to which other actors—both state and nonstate—will be willing or able to shoulder increased burdens is unclear. Policymakers and publics will have to cope with a growing demand for multilateral cooperation when the international system will be stressed by the incomplete transition from the old to a still-forming new order. Economic Growth Fueling Rise of Emerging Players In terms of size, speed, and directional flow, the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way—roughly from West to East—is without precedent in modern history. This shift derives from two sources. First, increases in oil and commodity prices have generated windfall profits for the Gulf states and Russia. Second, lower costs combined with government policies have shifted the locus of manufacturing and some service industries to Asia. Growth projections for Brazil, Russia, India, and China (the BRICs) indicate they will collectively match the original G-7’s share of global GDP by 2040-2050. China is poised to have more impact on the world over the next 20 years than any other country. If current trends persist, by 2025 China will have the world’s second largest economy and will be a leading military power. It also could be the largest importer of natural resources and the biggest polluter. India probably will continue to enjoy relatively rapid economic growth and will strive for a multipolar world in which New Delhi is one of the poles. China and India must decide the extent to which they are willing and capable of playing increasing global roles and how each will relate to the other. Russia has the potential to be richer, more powerful, and more self-assured in 2025 if it invests in human capital, expands and diversifies its economy, and integrates with global markets. On the other hand, Russia could experience a significant decline if it fails to take these steps and oil and gas prices remain in the $50-70 per barrel range. No other countries are projected to rise to the level of China, India, or Russia, and none is likely to match their individual global clout. We expect, however, to see the political and economic power of other countries—such as Indonesia, Iran, and Turkey—increase. For the most part, China, India, and Russia are not following the Western liberal model for selfdevelopment but instead are using a different model, “state capitalism.” State capitalism is a loose term used to describe a system of economic management that gives a prominent role to the state. Other rising powers—South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore—also used state capitalism to develop their economies. However, the impact of Russia, and particularly China, following this path is potentially much greater owing to their size and approach to “democratization.” We remain optimistic about the long-term prospects for greater democratization, even though advances are likely to be slow and globalization is subjecting many recently democratized countries to increasing social and economic pressures with the potential to undermine liberal institutions.

Unipolar system creates recalcitrant power backlash which leads to proliferation and war

Monteiro 12- Professor of Political Science at Yale, PhD in Political Science from UChicago

(Nuno, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is Not Peaceful,” MIT Press Journals, International Security Vol. 36, No. 3, Pages 9-40)

In an international system with more than one great power, recalcitrant mi-nor powers would, in principle, be able to balance externally by finding a great power sponsor.70 In unipolarity, however, no such sponsors exist.71 Only major powers are available, but because their survival is already guaranteed, they are likely to accommodate the unipole. And even if some do not, they are unlikely to meet a recalcitrant minor power’s security needs given that they possess only limited power-projection capabilities.72 As such, recalcitrant minor pow-ers must defend themselves, which puts them in a position of extreme self-help. There are four characteristics common to states in this position: (1) anarchy,(2) uncertainty about other states’ intentions, (3) insufficient capabilities to de-ter a great power, and (4) no potential great power sponsor with whom to forma balancing coalition. The first two characteristics are common to all states in all types of polarity. The third is part of the rough-and-tumble of minor power sin any system. The fourth, however, is unique to recalcitrant minor powers in unipolarity. This dire situation places recalcitrant minor powers at risk for as long as they lack the capability to defend themselves. They depend on the goodwill of the unipole and must worry that the unipole will shift to a strategy of offensive dominance or disengagement. Recalcitrant minor powers will therefore attempt to bolster their capabilities through internal balancing. To deter an eventual attack by the unipole and bolster their chances of sur-vival in the event deterrence fails, recalcitrant minor powers will attempt to re-inforce their conventional defenses, develop the most effective asymmetric strategies possible, and, most likely in the nuclear age, try to acquire the ulti-mate deterrent—survivable nuclear weapons.73 In so doing, they seek to become major powers.

Extinction

Asal and Beardsley 09 (Victor, Department of Political Science, State University of New York, Albany, and Kyle, Department of Political Science, Emory University, Winning with the Bomb, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/uploads/Beardsley-Asal_Winning_with_the_Bomb.pdf>)

Conclusion Why do states proliferate? Nuclear weapons and the programs necessary to create them are expensive. They are dangerous. Other countries may attack a state while it is trying to create a nuclear arsenal and there is always the risk of a catastrophic accident. They may help generate existential threats by encouraging first strike incentives amongst a state's opponents. This paper has explored the incentives that make nuclear weapons attractive to a wide range of states despite their costly and dangerous nature. We have found that nuclear weapons provide more than prestige, they provide leverage. They are useful in coercive diplomacy, and this must be central to any explanation of why states acquire them. Since 9 August 1945 no state has used a nuclear weapon against another state, but we find evidence that the possession of nuclear weapons helps states to succeed in their confrontations with other states even when they do not “use” them. Conflict with nuclear actors carries with it a potential danger that conflict with other states simply does not have. Even though the probability of full escalation is presumably low, the evidence confirms that the immense damage from the possibility of such escalation is enough to make an opponent eager to offer concessions. Asymmetric crises allow nuclear states to use their leverage to good effect. When crises involve a severe threat – and nuclear use is not completely ruled out – the advantage that nuclear actors have is substantial. Nuclear weapons help states win concessions quickly in 25 salient conflicts. Consistent with the other papers in this issue and the editors’ introduction (Gartzke and Kroenig this issue), we report that nuclear weapons confer tangible benefits to the possessors. These benefits imply that there should be a general level of demand for nuclear weapons, which means that explanations for why so few states have actually proliferated should focus more on the supply side, as applied by Matthew Kroenig (this issue) and Matthew Fuhrmann (this issue). The findings here importantly suggest an additional reason why “proliferation begets proliferation,” in the words of George Shultz (Shultz 1984, 18). If both parties to a crisis have nuclear weapons, the advantage is effectively cancelled out. When states develop nuclear weapons, doing so may encourage their rivals to also proliferate for fear of being exploited by the shifting bargaining positions. And once the rivals proliferate, the initial proliferator no longer has much bargaining advantage. On the one hand, this dynamic adds some restraint to initial proliferation within a rivalry relationship: states fear that their arsenal will encourage their rivals to pursue nuclear weapons, which will leave them no better off (Davis 1993; Cirincione 2007). On the other hand, once proliferation has occurred, all other states that are likely to experience coercive bargaining with the new nuclear state will also want nuclear weapons. The rate of proliferation has the potential to accelerate because the desire to posses the “equalizer” will increase as the number of nuclear powers slowly rises. Our theoretical framework and empirical findings are complementary to Gartzke and Jo (this issue), who posit and find that nuclear states enjoy greater influence in the international realm. An interesting dynamic emerges when comparing the results to Rauchhaus (this issue), who finds that nuclear weapons in asymmetric dyads tend to increase the propensity for escalation. We have argued that nuclear weapons improve the bargaining leverage of the 26 possessors and tested that proposition directly. It is important to note that the factors that shape conflict initiation and escalation are not necessarily the same factors that most shape the outcome of the conflict. Even so, one explanation for why a stronger bargaining position does not necessarily produce less escalation is that escalation is a function of decisions by both sides, and even though the opponent of a nuclear state is more willing to back down, the nuclear state should be more willing to raise its demands and push for a harder bargain in order to maximize the benefits from the nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons appear to need ever-greater shares of their bargains in order to be satisfied, which helps to explain both their proclivity to win and their proclivity toward aggressive coercive diplomacy. An important implication in light of these findings is thus that even though nuclear weapon states tend to fare better at the end of their crises, this does not necessarily mean that the weapons are a net benefit for peace and stability.

# Econ

*Downswings don’t cause war* – 93 empirical examples

Miller 2K

(Morris Miller, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would **not appear to be** any **merit in this** hypothesis. After studying *ninety-three episodes* of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of **economic crisis** - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore *no relationship* to the *collapse of regimes* ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an *outbreak of violence* ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

Competitiveness hurts growth and risks trade wars.

Paul Krugman, Professor of Economics at MIT, Mar/Apr 1994, “Competitiveness: A dangerous obsession,” Foreign Affairs 73.2, ebsco

Thinking and speaking in terms of competitiveness poses three real dangers. First, it could result in the wasteful spending of government money supposedly to enhance U.S. competitiveness. Second, it could lead to protectionism and trade wars. Finally, and most important, it could result in bad public policy on a spectrum of important issues. / During the 1950s, fear of the Soviet Union induced the U.S. government to spend money on useful things like highways and science education. It also, however, led to considerable spending on more doubtful items like bomb shelters. The most obvious if least worrisome danger of the growing obsession with competitiveness is that it might lead to a similar misallocation of resources. To take an example, recent guidelines for government research funding have stressed the importance of supporting research that can improve U.S. international competitiveness. This exerts at least some bias toward inventions that can help manufacturing firms, which generally compete on international markets, rather than service producers, which generally do not. Yet most of our employment and value-added is now in services, and lagging productivity in services rather than manufactures has been the single most important factor in the stagnation of U.S. living standards. / A much more serious risk is that the obsession with competitiveness will lead to trade conflict, perhaps even to a world trade war. Most of those who have preached the doctrine of competitiveness have not been old-fashioned protectionists. They want their countries to win the global trade game, not drop out. But what if, despite its best efforts, a country does not seem to be winning, or lacks confidence that it can? Then the competitive diagnosis inevitably suggests that to close the borders is better than to risk having foreigners take away high-wage jobs and high-value sectors. At the very least, the focus on the supposedly competitive nature of international economic relations greases the rails for those who want confrontational if not frankly protectionist policies. / We can already see this process at work, in both the United States and Europe. In the United States, it was remarkable how quickly the sophisticated interventionist arguments advanced by Laura Tyson in her published work gave way to the simple-minded claim by U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor that Japan's bilateral trade surplus was costing the United States millions of jobs. And the trade rhetoric of President Clinton, who stresses the supposed creation of high-wage jobs rather than the gains from specialization, left his administration in a weak position when it tried to argue with the claims of NAFTA foes that competition from cheap Mexican labor will destroy the U.S. manufacturing base. / Perhaps the most serious risk from the obsession with competitiveness, however, is its subtle indirect effect on the quality of economic discussion and policymaking. **If top government officials are strongly committed to a particular economic doctrine, their commitment inevitably sets the tone for policy-making on all issues,** even those which may seem to have nothing to do with that doctrine. And if an economic doctrine is flatly, completely and demonstrably wrong, the insistence that discussion adhere to that doctrine inevitably blurs the focus and diminishes the quality of policy discussion across a broad range of issues, including some that are very far from trade policy per se. / [he continues] / To make a harsh but not entirely unjustified analogy, a government wedded to the ideology of competitiveness is as unlikely to make good economic policy as a government committed to creationism is to make good science policy, even in areas that have no direct relationship to the theory of evolution.

# 2NC

# LOST

China war spills over to other countries and ensures nuclear extinction.

Straits Times, 2k

(6-25-2000, “No One Gains in War Over Taiwan,” p L/N, NJ)

Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said *[if] that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation*. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

Senate Democrats will force LOST as the first issue during the lame-duck sesh – but it still won’t pass minus Obama

Stewart M. **Patrick**, September 5th, 2012, **9/5** (“The South China Sea and the Law of the Sea,” <http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2012/09/05/the-south-china-sea-and-the-law-of-the-sea/> >:)

Of course, Secretary Clinton’s lectures about the Code of Conduct would be more credible if the United States were a party to UNCLOS. But Congressional Republicans continue to stall ratification of the treaty. Senate Democrats will likely bring UN[C]LOS to a vote after the November elections, during the lame-duck session of Congress, when some representatives might be less averse to casting a controversial vote. But even then, despite universal support for the convention from Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, and U.S. multinational corporations, republican Senators might still marshal a blocking coalition. And later in the future, the treaty’s prospects obviously hinge on the November elections. The 2012 republican platform expressly condemns the treaty—in a notable departure from the Republican administration of George W. Bush. While Mitt Romney has remained silent on the issue this year, he would be unlikely to support ratification. As I’ve written before, it is high time for the United States to ratify the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. With tensions rising in the South and East China Seas, the need is only growing.

# Warming

**We’ll magnify this argument – US space development tanks relations – no way China would get on board**

**Zhang, ‘11**

[Baohui, Spring 2011, “The Security Dilemma in the U.S.-China Military Space Relationship,” [http://dl2af5jf3e.search.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?&url\_ver=Z39.88-2004&url\_ctx\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:ctx&rft\_val\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.atitle=The%20Security%20Dilemma%20in%20the%20US-China%20Military%20Space%20Relationship%20The%20Prospects%20for%20Arms%20Control&rft.auinit=B&rft.aulast=Zhang&rft.date=2011&rft.epage=332&rfto t.genre=article&rft.issn=0004-4687&rft.issue=2&rft.spage=311&rft.stitle=ASIAN%20SURV&rft.title=ASIAN%20SURVEY&rft.volume=51&rfr\_id=info:sid/www.isinet.com:WoK:UA](http://dl2af5jf3e.search.serialssolutions.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/?&url_ver=Z39.88-2004&url_ctx_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:ctx&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.atitle=The%20Security%20Dilemma%20in%20the%20US-China%20Military%20Space%20Relationship%20The%20Prospects%20for%20Arms%20Control&rft.auinit=B&rft.aulast=Zhang&rft.date=2011&rft.epage=332&rfto%20t.genre=article&rft.issn=0004-4687&rft.issue=2&rft.spage=311&rft.stitle=ASIAN%20SURV&rft.title=ASIAN%20SURVEY&rft.volume=51&rfr_id=info:sid/www.isinet.com:WoK:UA).]

This strategy of space dominance, however, generates the classic security dilemma between the U.S. and other countries. Although the U.S. may be motivated by defensive purposes, such as shielding the American population from nuclear weapons and other threats, other countries have to assume the worst in an anarchic world. As observed by Joan Johnson-Freese, “I would argue that the rest of the world accepts U.S. space supremacy. What the Bush Administration claims is space dominance, and that’s what the rest of the world won’t accept.”17 ***Chinese*** strategists certainly ***perceive*** the ***U.S.*** quest for ***space dominance as damaging to*** China’s ***national security***; **whoever controls space will have** the **edge in winning** the ***next war***. Indeed, Chinese military and civilian strategists argue that the U.S. search for “absolute security” **jeopardizes other countries’** security. It is widely reported in Chinese military literature that the U.S. has already developed and is in fact implementing a master plan for military dominance in space. The challenge for China is to prevent the U.S. from jumping too far ahead. As observed by a major study organized by **the General Staff of the PLA**, “In recent decades the U.S. has been consistently pursuing **dominance in space *in order to become its overlord.”***

China and India’s emissions will increase

Robert **Bryce**, Aug 20**08**, managing editor of Energy Tribune magazine, “The Good News About Energy,” The American, p http://www.american.com/archive/2008/july-august-magazine-contents/the-good-news-about-energy

Of course, there are counter-indicators to the decarbonization trend. Both **China and India** **are *relying* *heavily on coal***. For instance, in 2006 alone, China expanded its electricity generation capacity by 102 gigawatts—that’s about the same capacity as all of France’s electric power plants combined. In other words, China’s electric grid added France. And of that 102 gigawatts of new power capacity, about 90 percent was coal-fired. And depending on whose numbers you believe, the Chinese continue **add**ing new **coal**-fired power **plants at** the rate of about ***one per week***. India, the second most populous country on the planet, is emulating China’s electrification plans. **By 2030,** **India plans to *more than triple its electricity generation*** capacity, going from about 130 gigawatts in 2007 to about 400 gigawatts. And like China, the vast majority of that new electricity will be generated by burning coal. By 2012, India plans to add more than 46 gigawatts of new coal-fired power plants. That 46 gigawatts is approximately equal to all of the electricity generation capacity of Mexico. By 2012, India’s coal consumption is expected to jump by more than 50 percent to some 730 million tons per year.

China’s rapid growth makes US measures meaningless – and also tanks the economy

Conn **Carroll,** 4-16-20**08**, researcher at the Heritage Foundation, “The Good and Bad in Bush’s Global Warming Speech,” The Foundry, p http://blog.heritage.org/2008/04/16/the-good-and-bad-in-bush%E2%80%99s-global-warming-speech/

In addition, rapid **growth from** nations like ***China*** means that **unilateral U.S. measures would be** virtually ***inconsequential.* They would** also put the U.S economy at **a global disadvantage** and lead to the outsourcing of manufacturing jobs. Again, the President made clear that all major emitting nations would have to commit to something.

AND – Cosmic rays

**Rao, ‘11**

[Udipi, 1/25/2011, “Contribution of changing galactic cosmic ray flux to global warming,” Current Science, http://www.ias.ac.in/currsci/25jan2011/223.pdf]

**The well established excellent correlation between *low-level clouds and primary cosmic ray intensity*,** which act as nuclei for cloud condensation, clearly **shows that a *decrease in primary cosmic ray intensity results in lesser low cloud cover*.** **Reduced albedo radiation reflected back into space, due to lesser low cloud cover, *results in an increase in the surface temperature on the earth***. Extrapolation of the intensity of galactic cosmic radiation using 10Be measurements in deep polar ice as the proxy, clearly shows that the primary cosmic ray intensity has decreased by 9% during the last 150 years, due to the continuing increase in solar activity. We present evidence to show that the radiative forcing component due to the decrease in primary cosmic ray intensity during the last 150 years is 1.1 Wm–2, which is about 60% of that due to CO2 increase. We conclude that the future prediction of global warming presented by IPCC4 requires a **relook to take into the effect due to *long-term changes in the galactic cosmic ray intensity***. Keywords: Cloud cover, climate change, cosmic rays, global warming. THE working group of the Fourth Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change1 (IPCC-4) has made a comprehensive assessment of the effect of anthropogenic greenhouse gases on global warming and its consequences under different scenarios for the increase in greenhouse gas emission. Since the average growth rate of CO2 (1.9 ppm/year) is by far the largest compared to other greenhouse gases and is also expected to increase due to the growing global demand for energy, a realistic assessment of the actual contribution of CO2 to global warming is essential to accurately predict the increase in temperature and its consequences on weather and climate. In addition to the uncertainties involved in predicting the growth rate of CO2, many scientists believe ***there are additional causes contributing to the global climate change***, which have not been fully taken into account in the report. New experimental evidence provides evidence to show **that the primary galactic cosmic ray changes, which generate cloud condensation nuclei, *can significantly affect global temperature*.** The role of primary galactic cosmic rays in generating low-level cloud condensation nuclei, which reflect solar energy back into space affecting the temperature on earth, was first reported by Svensmark and Christensen2. The effect of long-term changes in galactic cosmic ray intensity on low level cloud cover formation and its impact on global warming was however not clearly understood due to non-availability of reliable estimate of cosmic ray intensity changes over a long period. In this paper we present recent results on galactic cosmic intensity changes since 1800, obtained using accurate measurements of 10Be derived from deep ice core measurements3 as proxy, in order to estimate the realistic contribution of long-term cosmic ray intensity changes to climate warming. It is well known that 10Be nuclei in deep polar ice is a reliable proxy measure of the ~ 2 GeV/nucleon cosmic ray intensity impinging on the earth. By merging long time cosmogenic 10Be data derived from deep ice core measurements with actual cosmic ray observations during 1933–1965, McCracken et al.4 have reconstructed the long-term changes in cosmic ray intensity during 1428– 2005. Figure 1 shows the long-term changes in cosmic ray intensity as seen in neutron monitor counting rates and corresponding changes in helio-magnetic field (HMF) during 1800–2000, reproduced from McCracken’s papers5,6. From a critical analysis of the data, McCracken has shown that **the average cosmic ray intensity near the earth during 1954–1996 was lower by 16% compared to the average for the period 1428–1944. The primary cosmic ray intensity recorded during the space era 1960– 2005 is *the lowest in the last 150 years*.** Similar conclusion has been independently reached by Taricco et al.7 by analysing the 44Ti activity in meteorites. During the last 150 years when the carbon-dioxide intensity increased from around 280 ppm to 380 ppm, we find the corresponding decrease in cosmic ray intensity is about 9%, as seen from the data presented by McCracken and Beer3,4.

**Here is some more evidence for this distinction -**

**BELL 1-5-2011** (Larry, Prof at U of Houston, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/2011/01/03/climate-change-hoax-opinions-contributors-larry-bell.html)

Another lie claims that there is a consensus among climate scientists that a known man-made global warming crisis exists. Official statements to the contrary presented by more than 650 international climate-related experts who presented contrary official testimony recorded in a 2008 U.S. Senate minority report suggest otherwise. So do petitions signed by more than 30,000 scientists that have challenged IPCC's 1995 procedures and report representations. Those circumstances prompted Dr. Frederick Seitz, former president of the U.S. Academy of Sciences, the American Physical Society, and Rockefeller University to write in The Wall Street Journal: "I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer review process than events that led to this IPCC report."

Warming rate and impacts overstated – scientists mint money off of warming hype and media exaggeration.

**Kelly,** Real Clear Politics, 20**08**

[Jack Kelly, January 8 2008, Real Clear Politics, “Media Promotes Global Warming Alarmism”, <http://www.realclearpolitics .com/articles/2008/01/temperatures\_trending\_cooler.html>]

About this time last year, Dr. Phil Jones, head of the Climatic Research Unit of East Anglia University in Britain, predicted 2007 would be the warmest year on record.It didn't turn out that way. 2007 was only the 9th warmest year since global temperature readings were first made in 1861.2007 was also **the coldest year of this century**, noted Czech physicist Lubos Motl. Both global warming alarmists like Dr. Jones and skeptics like Dr. Motl forecast that this year will be slightly cooler than last year. If so, that means it will be a decade since the high water mark in global temperature was set in 1998. And the trend line is down. Average global temperature in 2007 was lower than for 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002 and 2001. November of last year was the coldest month since January of 2000, and December was colder still. "Global warming has stopped," said David Whitehouse, former science editor for the BBC. "It's not a viewpoint or a skeptic's inaccuracy. It's an observational fact." But observational fact matters little to global warming alarmists, particularly to those in the news media. "In 2008, your television will bring you image after image of natural havoc linked to global warming," said John Tierney, who writes a science column for the New York Times. "You will be told that such bizarre weather must be a sign of dangerous climate change -- and that these images are a mere preview of what's in store unless we act quickly to cool the planet.""Global warming can mean colder, it can mean drier, it can mean wetter," said Steven Guibeault of Greenpeace.There is no dispute among scientists that the planet warmed about 0.3 degrees Celsius between 1980 and 1998. What is in dispute is what caused the warming, and whether it will continue. The alarmists say the warming was caused chiefly by emissions of carbon dioxide from our automobiles and factories, and that, consequently, it will continue at an ever increasing rate unless we humans change our behavior. The skeptics say the warming trend was caused chiefly by natural cycles, and that it is at or near its end. "The earth is at the peak of one of its passing warm spells," said Dr. Oleg Sorokhtin of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences. It'll start getting cold by 2012, and really, really cold around 2041, he predicts. The news media **promote global warming alarmism through selective reporting**. Dr. Roger Pielke of the University of Colorado noted that a paper published in an obscure scientific journal that argued there was a link between hurricanes and global warming generated 79 news articles, while a paper that debunked the connection published in a far more prestigious journal generated only three. "When the Arctic sea ice last year hit the lowest level ever recorded by satellites, it was big news and heralded as a sign the planet was warming," Mr. Tierney wrote. "When the **Antarctic sea ice last year reached the highest level** ever recorded by satellites, it was pretty much ignored."Two studies published last year which indicated the melting of Arctic sea ice was due more to cyclical changes in ocean currents and winds than to planetary warming also attracted little attention, Mr. Tierney noted. And though the record melting of Arctic sea ice this summer was widely reported, the record growth of Arctic sea ice this fall (58,000 square miles of ice each day for 10 straight days) was not. More than 400 scientists -- many of them members of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change -- challenge the claims of the leading global warming alarmist, former Vice President and now Nobel laureate Al Gore, said a report issued by the Republicans on the U.S. Senate's Environment and Public Works committee last month. Kailee Kreider, a spokeswoman for Mr. Gore, said there criticisms should be discounted because 25 or 30 of the scientists may have received funding from the Exxon Mobil Corp. It's Mr. Gore who is the crook, says French physicist Claude Allegre in a new book. He's made millions in an eco-business based on phony science, Dr. Allegre charges.Mr. Gore isn't alone, says Weather Channel founder John Coleman: "Some dastardly scientists with environmental and political motives **manipulated long term scientific data to create an illusion** of rapid global warming," Mr. Coleman wrote. "Their friends in government **steered huge research grants their way** to keep the movement going...In time, in a decade or two, the outrageous scam will be obvious."

AND – Empirics first

Richard I. Hofferbert, Professor of Political Science @ SUNY Binghamton, 1990, The reach and grasp of policy analysis, p. 38-40

In the everyday world, how does process research begin? How are relationships between analysts and program personnel developed and/ or damaged? What purposes are served by quantitative research, statistics, and computerized analyses in more or less routine public program evaluation in tandem with implementation (Vollzugsforschung)! Two purposes stand out: / Testing Common sense: / Do programs out in the field really fit the purposes hoped for by their supporters and administrators? At what cost, directly and in side effects? / Pattern Recognitions: / How can we sort through the murky complexity of society and everyday human relations? How can we see the patterns that will help policy makers reduce their ignorance in trying to alleviate human problems through public programs? / Formal theory provides guidance and incentive for the scientist through a set of statements about relationships from which hypotheses can be derived for test in empirical circumstances. By implication. Chapter 2 suggests that much of applied policy analysis is not very theoretical, in the sense that it is derived not from scientifically stated postulates, aimed toward maximum generalizability, but rather is inspired by clients1 needs and local conditions. But I have also argued in favor of the scientific "respectability" of such "atheoretical" research. Clients' needs and local conditions provide the incentive and guidance for policy analysis. I question, however, whether the results derived from research so motivated are any less coherent or generalizable than those stimulated by scientifically loftier frameworks. I further suspect that much of the "theoretical" framing in the social sciences is retrofitted to research stimulated by considerations at least as mundane as clients' needs and local conditions. / Reports of social research usually become self-consciously theoretical at about the point at which the author runs out of data. And the result is more rhetoric than science. Why? I am not sure. But I suspect it is because of the partiality and artificiality of the way social scientists denote their domains (or "guilds"). To expect a "theory of public policy" is probably about as sensible as to expect a "theory of eating." The acts studied are not suitable to self-standing, coherent theory, in the proper philosophy of science sense. But the form and consequences of eating habits are interesting as they fit into the larger biological system. So are the patterns and consequences of public programs interesting as they fit into the larger social system. / What does empirical policy research do that is respectable if it does not deliberately or directly build "theory"? It tests common sense, and it aids pattern recognition. / The testing of common sense by empirical research occasionally shows that conventional wisdom is right. Sometimes it shows that common sense is simply wrong. More often, however, empirical research reveals a world that is much more complex than one is led by accepted explanations to believe. Likewise, once complexity is perceived, it is helpful to have a map, some means to recognize patterns, to help the wise policy maker approach goals more efficiently. / These are important but modest mandates for empirical policy research. But they are eminently more realistic and useful than pretending to "build theory" or to "explain" to the ill-informed how the world actually works, especially when the "ill-informed" are seasoned policy makers and program managers. Testing Common Sense / The "easy" sciences (e.g., physics and chemistry) are able to create, in the laboratory, circumstances that exclude impurities that would con-ruse observations. One or a few tests of expectations with purified chemicals or physical material are sufficient to deal with a hypothesis. Unfortunately, such purity of conditions is rare in the "hard" (i.e., difficult) sciences (e.g., political science, anthropology, economics, sociology). There, we often compensate for impurity by examining very large numbers of cases, which allows us to control for alternative causes or impurities. That accounts for the frequency with which policy evaluators use survey research or other information resources to produce large numbers of observations.

AND – A Little Ice Age will hit in 2014

Corsi, ’10

[Jerome, WND, “New Ice Age to Begin in 2014,” <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.printable&pageId=155225>]

CHICAGO – **A new** "Little **Ice Age**" **could begin in** just ***four years***, predicted Habibullo Abdussamatov, the head of space research at St. Petersburg's Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory in Russia. Abdussamatov was speaking yesterday at the Heartland Institute's Fourth International Conference on Climate Change in Chicago, which began Sunday and ends today. The Little **Ice Age**, which occurred after an era known in scientific circles as the Medieval Warm Period, **is** typically ***defined as a period of about 200 years***, beginning around 1650 and extending through 1850. In the first of a two-part video WND recorded at the conference, Abdussamatov explained that **average annual sun activity has experienced an *accelerated decrease* since the** 19**90s.** In 2005-2008, he said, **the earth reached the *maximum of the recent observed global-warming trend***. In Part 2 of the video, Abdussamatov further explained that **through 2014 the earth will go through a *series of unstable variations*** in which **global temperature will *oscillat***e around the maximum reached in the years 1998-2005.

3.) Magnitude – warming is natural and cyclical – the Ice Age would be FAR worse

**Wigmore, ‘07**

[Barry, 9/13. London Times “Global Warming? It’s Natural, say Experts,” <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDcQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dailymail.co.uk%2Fnews%2Farticle-481613%2FGlobal-warming-Its-natural-say-experts.html&ei=kh7_TtXUOOre0QHG9ZHoCQ&usg=AFQjCNHpilehFfz_S8qcLWDOHRz79i9Qxg&sig2=i6ERe8VDpplaTTJ7QkGiag>]

Global warming is a **natural event** and the effects are not all bad, two respected researchers claimed yesterday. Authors Dennis Avery and Fred Singer looked at the work of more than 500 scientists and argue that these experts are doubtful the phenomenon is caused by man-made greenhouse gases. Climate change is much more likely to be part of a cycle of warming and cooling that has happened regularly every 1,500 years for the last million years, they say. And the doom and gloom merchants, who point to the threat to the polar bear from the melting North Pole, are wrong, the authors say. Even if our climate is changing, it is not all bad, they suggest, because *past cold periods* ***have killed twice as many people* as warm periods**. Mr Avery said: "Not all of these researchers who doubt man-made climate change would describe themselves as global warming sceptics but the evidence in their studies is there for all to see. "Two thousand years of published human histories say that the **warm periods were good for people**. "It was the harsh, unstable Dark Ages and ***the Little Ice Age*** that brought bigger storms, untimely frost, ***widespread famine, plagues and disease***." Mr Singer said: "**We have a *greenhouse theory with*** *no evidence* ***to support it, except a moderate warming turned into a scare* by computer models whose** results have never been verified with real-world events**.** "The models only reflect the warming, not its cause." The most recent global warming was between 1850 and 1940, the authors say, and was therefore probably not caused by man-made greenhouse gases. Historical evidence of the natural cycle includes a record of floods on the Nile going back 5,000 years; Roman wine production in Britain in the first century AD; and thousands of museum paintings that portray sunnier skies during what is called the Medieval Warming, and more clouds during the Little Ice Age. The authors looked at a raft of studies which, they claim, undermine the "scare-mongering" by those blaming man for destroying the planet. In the current warming cycle, they say there is evidence that storms and droughts have been fewer and milder; corals, trees, birds, mammals and butterflies have adapted well; and sea levels are not rising significantly. Mr Avery is a fellow of the Hudson Institute, an independent U.S. thinktank that tends to side with big business. He was a senior agricultural analyst at the State Department when Ronald Reagan was president. Mr Singer is a climate physicist. The pair spent months analysing scientific reports for their book, Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years, to counter claims made by former U.S. Vice President Al Gore in his film An Inconvenient Truth. They argue that variations in the Sun's radiation have far more influence on our climate than humans. Mr Singer said: "This can all be explained by the Sun's activity." He added: "The number of the Sun's cosmic rays hitting the Earth affect the number of low, cooling clouds that reflect solar heat back into space, amplifying small variations in the intensity of the Sun."

Ice age causes extinction, this ev is comparative to warming

EU Referendum, ‘08 (4/24/08, “The scariest photo” http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2008/04/scariest-photo.htm)

It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850. Echoing precisely the point we made in our previous piece, Chapman says there is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now, he writes, and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. In fact, Chapman posits a remote but much more serious scenario of "severe glaciation" which can occur quickly – as fast as 20 years. "The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years," he reassures us. "On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027." By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Thus, he concludes, "All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead." Inevitably, Chapman warns, "It will be difficult for people to face the truth when their reputations, careers, government grants or hopes for social change depend on global warming, but the fate of civilisation may be at stake."

Warming doesn’t cause an Ice Age, only a lowered level of carbon dioxide does – this evidence will smoke them

**Weaver,** Ph.D in psychology, and Hillaire-Marcel, geo-scientist and Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, 20**04**

(Andrew and Claude. “Global warming and the next ice age.” *Science* magazine. April 16, online)

A popular *idea* in the media, exemplified by the soon-to-be-released movie The Day After Tomorrow, is that human-induced global warming will cause another ice age. But where did this idea come from? Several recent magazine articles (1-3) report that abrupt climate change was prevalent in the recent geological history of Earth and that there was some early, albeit controversial, evidence from the last interglacial--thought to be slightly warmer than preindustrial times (4)--that abrupt climate change was the norm (5). Consequently, the articles postulate a sequence of events that goes something like this: If global warming were to boost the hydrological cycle, enhanced freshwater discharge into the North Atlantic would shut down the AMO (Atlantic Meridional Overturning), the North Atlantic component of global ocean overturning circulation. This would result in downstream cooling over Europe, leading to the slow growth of *glaciers* and the onset of the *next ice age*. This view prevails in the popular press despite a relatively solid understanding of glacial inception and growth. What glacier formation and growth require is, of course, a change in s*easonal incoming solar radiation* (warmer winters and colder summers) associated with changes in Earth's axial tilt, its longitude of perihelion, and the precession of its elliptical orbit around the Sun. These small changes must then be amplified by *feedback from reflected light associated with enhanced snow/ice cover, vegetation associated with the expansion of tundra, and greenhouse gases associated with the uptake* (not release) *of carbon dioxide* and methane. Several modeling studies provide outputs to support this progression. These studies show that with elevated levels of carbon dioxide, such as those that exist today, no permanent snow can exist over land in August (as temperatures are too warm), a necessary *prerequisite for the growth of glaciers* in the Northern Hemisphere [e.g., (6)]. These same models show that if the AMO were to be artificially shut down, there would be regions of substantial cooling in and around the North Atlantic. Berger and Loutre (7) specifically noted that "most C[O.sub.2] scenarios led to an exceptionally long interglacial from 5000 years before the present to 50,000 years from now ... with the next glacial maximum in 100,000 years. *Only for CO2 concentrations less than 220 ppmv was an early entrance into glaciation simulated.*" They further argued that the next glaciation would be unlikely to occur for another 50,000 years. Although most paleoclimatologists would agree that the past is unlikely to provide true analogs of the future, past climate synopses are valuable for confronting the results of modeling experiments or for illustrating global warming. A reduction of the AMO due to a global warning--induced increase in freshwater supplies to the North Atlantic is often discussed in relation to a short event that occurred some 8200 years ago (8.2 ka). During this event, one of the largest glacial lakes of the Laurentide Ice Sheet, Lake Ojibway, drained into the North Atlantic through Hudson Strait, quickly releasing enormous quantities of fresh water (8). However, to our knowledge, unequivocal evidence that this event resulted in a substantial reduction of the AMO has not yet been obtained. Notably, the Western Boundary UnderCurrent (WBUC)--which carries North Atlantic Deep Water masses (originating from the Norwegian and Greenland seas) along the continental slopes of Greenland and eastern North America--apparently remained unchanged during this episode [for example, (9)]. Because we cannot possibly foresee increases in freshwater inputs to the North Atlantic that could approach the magnitude of the Lake Ojibway discharge peak (the present Arctic river cumulative discharge rate is about two orders of magnitude lower), and because the effect of this event on the AMO is still unclear, further reference to the 8.2-ka event with respect to a reduction of the AMO in the near future seems irrelevant (also see letter by Broecker, page 388 of this issue).Unquestionable evidence for a substantial reduction of AMO has been found *only for intervals such as the Last Glacial Maximum* (LGM) and some short, particularly cold, intervals of the last ice ages (such as those during Heinrich events) During these time periods, vast ice sheets occupied the Northern Hemisphere, providing a large freshwater source to the North Atlantic through either the dispersal of huge quantities of icebergs (Heinrich events) or the direct release of meltwater into the most critical sector associated with the AMO--the northeast Atlantic. On the other hand, the most critical site with respect to sensitivity to enhanced freshwater supplies from the Arctic has been, and would be, the Labrador Sea (10) Indeed, *convection could stop there in response to global warming*, as demonstrated by recent modeling experiments, apparently *without any major effect on the overall rate of AMO* (11). Worthy of mention is the fact that the strong east-west salinity gradient of the North Atlantic, with more saline waters eastward, seems a robust and permanent feature that was maintained even during the Last Glacial Maximum, when the rate of AMO was considerably reduced (12). A clear picture of the North Atlantic under high freshwater supply rates arises from its recent history. High freshwater supplies may indeed impede convection in the Labrador Sea because of their routing along western North Atlantic margins, but this would result in an increased eastward branch of AMO (see the figure). Further indication for such behavior is found in records of the Last Interglacial Interval. Relatively dilute surface water existed in the Labrador Sea, preventing intermediate water formation. However, a high-velocity WBUC existed throughout the whole period, indicating a high AMO along the "eastern route" (10). The observed rate of global sea level rise during the 20th century is estimated to be in the range 1.0 to 2.2 mm/year (3). If one makes the clearly incorrect assumption that the entire maximum rate of observed sea level rise is a consequence of fresh water being added to the North Atlantic between 50[degrees] and 70[degrees]N, then this equates to a rate of freshwater forcing of 0.022 Sv (22 x [10.sup.4] [m.sup.3] [s.sup.-1]). This rate in itself is *certainly too small to cause a major shutdown of the AMO*, although it may be large enough to cause cessation of convection in the Labrador Sea [for example, (6)]. It is certainly true that if the AMO were to become inactive, substantial short-term cooling would result in western Europe, especially during the winter However, it is important to emphasize that not a single coupled model assessed by the 2001 IPCC Working Group I on Climate Change Science (4) predicted a collapse in the AMO during the 21st century. Even in those models where the AMO was found to *weaken during the 21st century, there would still be warming over Europe due to the radiative forcing associated with increased levels of greenhouse gases*. Models that eventually lead to a collapse of the AMO under global warming conditions typically fall into two categories: (i) flux-adjusted coupled general circulation models, and (ii) intermediate-complexity models with zonally averaged ocean components. Both suites of models are known to be more sensitive to freshwater perturbations. In the first class of models, a small perturbation away from the present climate leads to large systematic errors in the salinity fields (as large flux adjustments are applied) that then build up to cause dramatic AMO transitions. In the second class of models, the convection and sinking of water masses are coupled (there is no horizontal structure). In contrast, newer non flux-adjusted models find a more stable AMO under future conditions of climate change (1l, 13, 14). Even the recent observations of freshening in the North Atlantic (15) (a reduction of salinity due to the addition of freshwater) appear to be consistent with the projections of perhaps the most sophisticated non--flux-adjusted model (11). Ironically, this model suggests that such freshening is associated with an increased AMO (16). This same model proposes that it is only Labrador Sea Water formation that is susceptible to collapse in response to global warming. In light of the paleoclimate record and our understanding of the contemporary climate system, *it is safe to say that global warming will not lead to the onset of a new ice age. These same records suggest that it is highly unlikely that global warming will lead to a widespread collapse of the AMO--*despite the appealing possibility raised in two recent studies (18, 19)--although it is possible that deep convection in the Labrador Sea will cease. Such an event would have much more minor consequences on the climate downstream over Europe.
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[\_] Here’s more for China.

Ikenberry ‘8

(John, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20080101faessay87102/g-john-ikenberry/the-rise-of-china-and-the-future-of-the-west.html)

The United States' "unipolar moment" will inevitably end. If the defining struggle of the twenty-first century is between China and the United States, China will have the advantage. If the defining struggle is between China and a revived Western system, the West will triumph. TRANSITIONAL ANXIETIES / CHINA IS well on its way to becoming a formidable global power. The size of its economy has quadrupled since the launch of market reforms in the late 1970s and, by some estimates, will double again over the next decade. It has become one of the world's major manufacturing centers and consumes roughly a third of the global supply of iron, steel, and coal. It has accumulated massive foreign reserves, worth more than $1 trillion at the end of 2006. China’s military spending has increased at an inflation-adjusted rate of over 18 percent a year, and its diplomacy has extended its reach not just in Asia but also in Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. Indeed, whereas the Soviet Union rivaled the United States as a military competitor only, China is emerging as both a military and an economic rival—heralding a profound shift in the distribution of global power.

**Here’s new evidence on this question**

Niblett ’12 **–** Director of Chatham House

Robert, Director of Chatham House, Elcano Royal Institute, The Economic Crisis and the Emerging Powers: Towards a New International Order?, http://www.eurasiareview.com/21022012-economic-crisis-and-emerging-powers-towards-a-new-international-order-analysis/

The US does not face the same demographic challenges as its European partners, but it now appears to be facing its own structural economic challenges. For example, US unemployment has been stuck at roughly 9% over the past two years –nearly double its rate in the late 1990s and most of the 2000s, and only a little below the EU-27 rate, which climbed back up to 9.5% in the first half of 2011–. The current high rate of unemployment and slow rate of job creation in the US may not simply reflect the after-effects of credit de-leveraging. As Michael Spence has noted in the July/August 2011 edition of Foreign Affairs, many US multinational companies are now creating more jobs abroad than they are at home, focusing their job creation on the dynamic markets of East Asia with its well-educated and well-priced workforces. Today, the US, Japan and major European economies depend on exports to China and other emerging markets to drive their own marginal rates of growth. In 2010, President Obama made exports a central plan in his growth strategy for the US. Similarly, French, German and British political leaders are beating a path to Beijing and New Delhi to try to secure major new export orders. And the UK has announced a new ‘commercial diplomacy’ that places improved access for UK goods and services to emerging markets at the heart of the Foreign Office’s remit. This economic rebalancing is contributing to a weakening of the West’s strategic influence across the world, from the Middle East and Latin America to South-East Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. First of all, regional powers in each region (Turkey and Iran in the Middle East; Brazil in South America; China in South-East Asia; South Africa in Sub-Saharan Africa) now vie more effectively for influence relative to the US in capitals in these regions, partly because of their own growing economic magnetism and partly because they have taken advantage of the decline in the legitimacy and credibility of US global leadership during and following the George W Bush Administration. Secondly, regional organisations are also challenging US and western influence across the world, whether it is ASEAN, the East Asia Summit, UNASUL, the African Union or the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation. Third, the West’s influence is declining also in the world’s major international institutions, such as the UN, IMF and WTO, where the emerging powers now follow a far more independent line. The most obvious symptom of this shift in institutional power was the nomination of the G20 (at the London 2009 G20 summit) to be the world’s primary forum for international economic coordination, in place of the Western-led G7. Finally, perceptions are also important in the emergence of a new international order. When asked in a 1997 ABC/Washington Post poll which country would be the world’s leading nation in 20 years time, 56% of Americans said the US and only 9% said China. In a similar ABC/Washington Post poll conducted in 2011, only 35% said the US while 38% said China. The growing sense among US citizens of their relative declining power risks becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy, which will then weaken the US and the West’s voice on the international stage.

[\_] We’ll magnify it – asymmetry will cause serial policy failure and loss of faith in power

Newmann ‘8

(William, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University, Hegemonic Competition, Hegemonic Disruption and the Current War, p.. 2-4)

Al- Qaeda’s network and ideology is less likely to produce a national champion, such as communism had in the form of the USSR, than to instigate or take advantage of a series of flashpoints where its ideology squares off with local or regional opponents in insurgency or civil war. The conflicts in Iraq, Somalia, and Afghanistan could be seen as visions of the future for many states. Such disruption can be an initial indication of hegemonic decline, leading second-tier powers to sense vulnerability in the US, a vulnerability which may change their calculus of the costs and benefits of balancing against the US or posing a direct challenge. It could also lead the US into overextension, miscalculations in foreign policy priorities, and provocative policies which could alienate allies, threaten fence sitters, and play into the hands of critics or enemies of US hegemony, again changing the cost and benefit estimates for second-tier powers of balancing or challenging the US. A third possibility emerges if the American public loses its commitment to the duties of hegemony and begins to ask its leaders to minimize US involvement in troublesome regions. This too would lead to a reassessment of US hegemony by second-tier powers. The situation in Iraq today provides evidence for all three of these scenarios. In addition, the unique features of US unipolar dominance complicate the strategic calculus of US hegemony. Following the demise of the USSR, the US has taken upon itself, on an inconsistent basis, the task of reconstructing the world in its own image. Both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations have committed the US to a revisionist goal of spreading of liberal-democratic norms around the globe as a first order foreign policy priority.4 As a revisionist hegemon, US power and policy directly challenges non-liberal-democratic nations and ideological movements – an ideological contest that raises the stakes for the US. The survival of al-Qaeda and its revolutionary ideology undermines the foundation of US hegemonic policies as it seeks to spread democracy and free trade. The US cannot ignore al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda is not likely to ignore the US. In this sense, unless the US moves away from its revisionism, accepting a more status quo realist hegemony, its hegemonic future depends, in part, on how well it can compete with al-Qaeda’s revolutionary ideology in nations with substantial Muslim populations. The first section of this essay develops a model of hegemonic disruption in which the al-Qaeda led and inspired global insurgency presents an asymmetric challenge to US hegemony through its violent activities, organizational efforts, and ideological inspiration. A second section places the al-Qaeda network and its role as the vanguard of a revolutionary movement within the context of this model by defining it as a strategic sub-national actor; its firm ideological roots and its power projection capabilities justify its elevation to this status. Third, a discussion of al-Qeada’s “national security strategy” illustrates how its objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives make it a global insurgency acting against US hegemony. Based upon the model of hegemonic disruption and al-Qeada’s strategic relevance, a fourth section presents scenarios of how recent events and potential developments throughout Africa and Asia may impact US hegemony.

**Horizontal Escalation - Inter-state conflicts are inevitable, but nuclear prolif ensures every disagreement turns into a nuclear fireball, the amount of potential routes to extinction makes the turn numerically more probable than their advantages**

Trachtenberg ‘2 (Marc, Prof. Pol. Sci. – UCLA, The National Interest, “Waltzing to Armageddon?” Fall)

Waltz does not approach the problem this way. For him, wars are started by one side or another. There is an attacker and a defender; with nuclear weapons, the attacker is deterred and war is avoided. "Where nuclear weapons threaten to make the cost of wars immense", he asks, "who will dare to start them?" The Soviet Union would have been deterred by any state that might have been able to deliver one or two simple fission bombs on Moscow. Indeed, he argues, "with nuclear weapons, any state will be deterred by another state's second-strike forces." "A nation", he says, "will be deterred from attacking even if it believes there is only a possibility that its adversary will retaliate." There is no doubt in Waltz's mind about this; for him, the deterrent effect is absolute: no one will start a war, and wars-at least major wars, wars in which nuclear weapons will be used-will simply not happen. In the real world, however, wars are often not simply "started" by one side, and the distinction between defender and attacker can be very problematic. In 1914, for example, who "started" the First World War? Germany, by invading Belgium and attacking France? Or Russia, by ordering general mobilization a few days earlier, knowing full well that such action made war virtually inevitable? Who was the "defender"? Austria, supported by Germany, for trying to prevent Serbia from serving as a base for terrorist activities directed against the Habsburg Monarchy? Or Russia, supported by the Western powers, for trying to defend Serbian sovereignty and maintain its own political position in the Balkans? And if all the major powers had been armed with nuclear weapons at the time, is it clear who exactly would have been deterred? Or take the case of the coming of World War II in 1939. If both Britain and Germany had been nuclear powers at the time, again, is it clear who would have been deterred? Waltz thinks that Germany would have backed off: Hitler would not have "started" a war that would destroy the Third Reich. But Hitler did not intend to "start" a war with Britain at that point; his aim was to get Britain to back down in the confrontation over Poland. Nor did Britain intend to start a war with Germany. War broke out not because either side wanted war in late 1939, but rather because neither was willing to give way-and because each was hoping that the other would. Once we get away from the idea that wars are simply "started" by one side and that the "attacker" can be readily identified, the whole problem appears in an entirely different light. If war is seen as the outcome of a process in which two sides interact, it makes no sense to focus simply on the calculations of just one side. Instead, the calculations of both sides, and especially their calculations about each other, have to be taken into account. Each side may be trying to deter the other-to get its way without war if it can. Each side might be afraid of escalation, but those fears are balanced by the knowledge that one's adversary is also afraid, and his fears can be exploited. In the case of a conflict between two nuclear powers, if either side believed that Waltz's analysis was correct-if either side believed that its adversary would give way rather than run any risk of nuclear attack, as long as his vital interests were not threatened-there would be no reason for that country not to take advantage of that situation. That side could threaten its adversary with nuclear attack if its demands were not met in the firm belief that its opponent was bound to give way, and that it would therefore not be running any risk itself. That belief might turn out to be correct, but if it were not-if its rival was unwilling to allow it to score such an easy victory-there could be very serious trouble indeed. And if both sides were convinced by Waltz's arguments, and both adopted strong deterrent strategies, the situation would be particularly dangerous. Each side would dig in its heels, convinced that when confronted with the risk of nuclear war, the other side would ultimately back down. Such a situation could quickly get out of hand. As Dean Rusk pointed out in 1961, "one of the quickest ways to have a nuclear war is to have the two sides persuaded that neither will fight." This is an extreme case, but it illustrates the problem. In the real world, states will not be so sure that their opponent "will be deterred" by the prospect of nuclear war and that they can therefore go as far as they like in a political dispute-say, in the Cold War case, in a dispute over Cuba or Berlin. Nor will they themselves, in all probability, be absolutely deterred by the threat of nuclear war. They would be under a certain competitive pressure to play the same game as their rivals; their rivals could not be allowed to profit so easily from a simple threat-making strategy while themselves running no real risk at all. Each side would be afraid of escalation, but each side would in the final analysis also be willing to run a certain risk. Each side would know that its adversary was also worried about what would happen if things got out of hand, and that an unwillingness to run any risk at all would remove that element of restraint and give the adversary too free a hand. Each side would know that its adversary was probably also willing to run a certain risk for the same reason, which is why each side could not be sure that its opponent would be deterred in a confrontation. In such situations, it is impossible to say how all these calculations would sort themselves out. Deterrence cuts in more than one way, and it for this reason that in a nuclear world, no one can know how far things will go before a conflict is resolved, or whether it even can be resolved before nuclear weapons are actually used. Each side may calculate that if it is just a bit tougher, its opponent may back down. Having gone so far, wouldn't it make sense to go further still? And there is no natural end-point to that process. For Waltz, if deterrence fails, "a few judiciously delivered warheads are likely to produce sobriety in the leaders of all of the countries involved and thus bring rapid deescalation." But it is just as likely that if a few bombs are exploded, the country that had been targeted would choose to retaliate in kind. It might even choose to escalate the conflict. A political dispute can thus become a gigantic poker game, with each side raising the stakes in the hope that its opponent, frightened by the prospect of nuclear war, will fold before things go too far. Conflicts in such a world, as Thomas Schelling argued years ago, would become "contests in risk-taking." The side with the greater resolve, the side more willing to run the risk of nuclear war, has the upper hand and will prevail in a showdown. In the pre-nuclear world, more or less objective factors-above all, the balance of military power-played a key role in determining how political conflicts ran their course. The weak tended to give way to the strong; in an admittedly rough and imperfect way, the military balance gave some indication as to how a dispute would be worked out. But in a world of invulnerable nuclear forces, as Waltz points out, the military balance counts for little. Subjective factors, like will and resolve, would play the key role in determining how political conflicts are worked out. The result is that in such a world there would be a great premium on resolve, on risk-taking, and perhaps ultimately on recklessness. In international politics, as in other areas of life, what you reward is what you get. Resolve would tend to harden, and the parties involved would tend to dig in their heels. A reputation for toughness would be of fundamental importance, since one has to worry not just about the present but about the future, and this would provide further incentive to take a tough stand. And as each side hardens its position, its rival is also led by competitive pressure to do the same. Why would anyone think that a world of that sort, where political outcomes are up for grabs and victory goes to the side with the strongest nerves, would be particularly stable?
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Second, although a competitive component to U.S. relations with the other great powers in a multipolar world would be inescapable, multipolar politics have historically engendered periods of great-power cooperation. On the cooperative side, an offshore balancing strategy would be coupled with a policy of spheres of influence, which have always been an important item in the toolbox of great-power policymakers. By recognizing each other's paramount interests in certain regions, great powers can avoid the kinds of misunderstandings that could trigger conflict. Moreover, the mere act of signaling that one country understands another's larger security stake in a particular region, a stake that it will respect by noninterference, allows states to communicate a nonthreatening posture to one another. By recognizing the legitimacy of other interests, a great power also signals that it accepts them as equals. An offshore balancing strategy would immunize the United States against a post – war-on-terrorism backlash against U.S. hegemony in one other way. By accepting the emergence of new great powers and simultaneously pulling back from its primacy-driven military posture, the United States would reduce perception of a "U.S. threat," thereby lowering the chances that others will view it as an overpowerful hegemon. In this sense, offshore balancing is a strategy of restraint that would allow the United States to minimize the risks of open confrontation with the new great powers.