## 1AC

### Contention One is Warming

#### The best science proves it’s anthropogenic

Muller, 2012 [Richard, professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and a former MacArthur Foundation fellow, “The Conversion of a Climate-Change Skeptic”, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/30/opinion/the-conversion-of-a-climate-change-skeptic.html?pagewanted=all]

CALL me a converted skeptic. Three years ago I identified problems in previous climate studies that, in my mind, threw doubt on the very existence of global warming. Last year, following an intensive research effort involving a dozen scientists, I concluded that global warming was real and that the prior estimates of the rate of warming were correct. I’m now going a step further: Humans are almost entirely the cause. My total turnaround, in such a short time, is the result of careful and objective analysis by the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature project, which I founded with my daughter Elizabeth. Our results show that the average temperature of the earth’s land has risen by two and a half degrees Fahrenheit over the past 250 years, including an increase of one and a half degrees over the most recent 50 years. Moreover, it appears likely that essentially all of this increase results from the human emission of greenhouse gases. These findings are stronger than those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], the United Nations group that defines the scientific and diplomatic consensus on global warming. In its 2007 report, the I.P.C.C. concluded only that most of the warming of the prior 50 years could be attributed to humans. It was possible, according to the I.P.C.C. consensus statement, that the warming before 1956 could be because of changes in solar activity, and that even a substantial part of the more recent warming could be natural. Our Berkeley Earth approach used sophisticated statistical methods developed largely by our lead scientist, Robert Rohde, which allowed us to determine earth land temperature much further back in time. We carefully studied issues raised by skeptics: biases from urban heating (we duplicated our results using rural data alone), from data selection (prior groups selected fewer than 20 percent of the available temperature stations; we used virtually 100 percent), from poor station quality (we separately analyzed good stations and poor ones) and from human intervention and data adjustment (our work is completely automated and hands-off). In our papers we demonstrate that none of these potentially troublesome effects unduly biased our conclusions. The historic temperature pattern we observed has abrupt dips that match the emissions of known explosive volcanic eruptions; the particulates from such events reflect sunlight, make for beautiful sunsets and cool the earth’s surface for a few years. There are small, rapid variations attributable to El Niño and other ocean currents such as the Gulf Stream; because of such oscillations, the “flattening” of the recent temperature rise that some people claim is not, in our view, statistically significant. What has caused the gradual but systematic rise of two and a half degrees? We tried fitting the shape to simple math functions (exponentials, polynomials), to solar activity and even to rising functions like world population. By far the best match was to the record of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2), measured from atmospheric samples and air trapped in polar ice.

#### Fossil fuels are key

Vertessy and Clark3-13**-**2012[Rob, Acting Director of Australian Bureau of Meteorology, and Megan, Chief Executive Officer at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, “State of the Climate 2012”, <http://theconversation.edu.au/state-of-the-climate-2012-5831>]

Carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions account for about 60% of the effect from anthropogenic greenhouse gases on the earth’s energy balance over the past 250 years. These global CO2 emissions are mostly from fossil fuels (more than 85%), land use change, mainly associated with tropical deforestation (less than 10%), and cement production and other industrial processes (about 4%). Australia contributes about 1.3% of the global CO2 emissions. Energy generation continues to climb and is dominated by fossil fuels – suggesting emissions will grow for some time yet. CO2 levels are rising in the atmosphere and ocean. About 50% of the amount of CO2 emitted from fossil fuels, industry, and changes in land-use, stays in the atmosphere. The remainder is taken up by the ocean and land vegetation, in roughly equal parts. The extra carbon dioxide absorbed by the oceans is estimated to have caused about a 30% increase in the level of ocean acidity since pre-industrial times. The sources of the CO2 increase in the atmosphere can be identified from studies of the isotopic composition of atmospheric CO2 and from oxygen (O2) concentration trends in the atmosphere. The observed trends in the isotopic (13C, 14C) composition of CO2 in the atmosphere and the decrease in the concentration of atmospheric O2 confirm that the dominant cause of the observed CO2 increase is the combustion of fossil fuels.

#### 4 degree warming is inevitable with current carbon usage trends – emissions must be reduced

Potsdam Institute, 2012 (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics, “Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided”, A report for the World Bank, November, http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn\_Down\_the\_heat\_Why\_a\_4\_degree\_centrigrade\_warmer\_world\_must\_be\_avoided.pdf)

The emission pledges made at the climate conventions in Copenhagen and Cancun, if fully met, place the world on a trajectory for a global mean warming of well over 3°C. Even if these pledges are fully implemented there is still about a 20 percent chance of exceeding 4°C in 2100.10 If these pledges are not met then there is a much higher likelihood—more than 40 percent—of warming exceeding 4°C by 2100, and a 10 percent possibility of this occurring already by the 2070s, assuming emissions follow the medium business-as-usual reference pathway. On a higher fossil fuel intensive business-as-usual pathway, such as the IPCC SRESA1FI, warming exceeds 4°C earlier in the 21st century. It is important to note, however, that such a level of warming can still be avoided. There are technically and economically feasible emission pathways that could still limit warming to 2°C or below in the 21st century. To illustrate a possible pathway to warming of 4°C or more, Figure 22 uses the highest SRES scenario, SRESA1FI, and compares it to other, lower scenarios. SRESA1FI is a fossil-fuel intensive, high economic growth scenario that would very likely cause mean the global temperature to exceed a 4°C increase above preindustrial temperatures. Most striking in Figure 22 is the large gap between the projections by 2100 of current emissions reduction pledges and the (lower) emissions scenarios needed to limit warming to 1.5–2°C above pre-industrial levels. This large range in the climate change implications of the emission scenarios by 2100 is important in its own right, but it also sets the stage for an even wider divergence in the changes that would follow over the subsequent centuries, given the long response times of the climate system, including the carbon cycle and climate system components that contribute to sea-level rise. The scenarios presented in Figure 22 indicate the likely onset time for warming of 4°C or more. It can be seen that most of the scenarios remain fairly close together for the next few decades of the 21st century. By the 2050s, however, there are substantial differences among the changes in temperature projected for the different scenarios. In the highest scenario shown here (SRES A1FI), the median estimate (50 percent chance) of warming reaches 4°C by the 2080s, with a smaller probability of 10 percent of exceeding this level by the 2060s. Others have reached similar conclusions (Betts et al. 2011). Thus, even if the policy pledges from climate convention in Copenhagen and Cancun are fully implemented, there is still a chance of exceeding 4°C in 2100. If the pledges are not met and present carbon intensity trends continue, then the higher emissions scenarios shown in Figure 22 become more likely, raising the probability of reaching 4°C global mean warming by the last quarter of this century. Figure 23 shows a probabilistic picture of the regional patterns of change in temperature and precipitation for the lowest and highest RCP scenarios for the AR4 generation of AOGCMS. Patterns are broadly consistent between high and low scenarios. The high latitudes tend to warm substantially more than the global mean. RCP8.5, the highest of the new IPCC AR5 RCP scenarios, can be used to explore the regional implications of a 4°C or warmer world. For this report, results for RCP8.5 (Moss et al. 2010) from the new IPCC AR5 CMIP5 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project; Taylor, Stouffer, & Meehl 2012) climate projections have been analyzed. Figure 24 shows the full range of increase of global mean temperature over the 21st century, relative to the 1980–2000 period from 24 models driven by the RCP8.5 scenario, with those eight models highlighted that produce a mean warming of 4–5°C above preindustrial temperatures averaged over the period 2080–2100. In terms of regional changes, the models agree that the most pronounced warming (between 4°C and 10°C) is likely to occur over land. During the boreal winter, a strong “arctic amplification” effect is projected, resulting in temperature anomalies of over 10°C in the Arctic region. The subtropical region consisting of the Mediterranean, northern Africa and the Middle East and the contiguous United States is likely to see a monthly summer temperature rise of more than 6°C.

#### Not too late – every reduction key

Nuccitelli 12

[Dana, is an environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm in the Sacramento, California area. He has a Bachelor's Degree in astrophysics from the University of California at Berkeley, and a Master's Degree in physics from the University of California at Davis. He has been researching climate science, economics, and solutions as a hobby since 2006, and has contributed to Skeptical Science since September, 2010, <http://www.skepticalscience.com/realistically-what-might-future-climate-look-like.html>, HM]

We're not yet committed to surpassing 2°C global warming, but as Watson noted, we are quickly running out of time to realistically give ourselves a chance to stay below that 'danger limit'. However, 2°C is not a do-or-die threshold. Every bit of CO2 emissions we can reduce means that much avoided future warming, which means that much avoided climate change impacts. As Lonnie Thompson noted, the more global warming we manage to mitigate, the less adaption and suffering we will be forced to cope with in the future. Realistically, based on the current political climate (which we will explore in another post next week), limiting global warming to 2°C is probably the best we can do. However, there is a big difference between 2°C and 3°C, between 3°C and 4°C, and anything greater than 4°C can probably accurately be described as catastrophic, since various tipping points are expected to be triggered at this level. Right now, we are on track for the catastrophic consequences (widespread coral mortality, mass extinctions, hundreds of millions of people adversely impacted by droughts, floods, heat waves, etc.). But we're not stuck on that track just yet, and we need to move ourselves as far off of it as possible by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions as soon and as much as possible. There are of course many people who believe that the planet will not warm as much, or that the impacts of the associated climate change will be as bad as the body of scientific evidence suggests. That is certainly a possiblity, and we very much hope that their optimistic view is correct. However, what we have presented here is the best summary of scientific evidence available, and it paints a very bleak picture if we fail to rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. If we continue forward on our current path, catastrophe is not just a possible outcome, it is the most probable outcome. And an intelligent risk management approach would involve taking steps to prevent a catastrophic scenario if it were a mere possibility, let alone the most probable outcome. This is especially true since the most important component of the solution - carbon pricing - can be implemented at a relatively low cost, and a far lower cost than trying to adapt to the climate change consequences we have discussed here (Figure 4).

#### Global warming collapses biodiversity and destroys ecosystem resiliency – makes extinction inevitable

Potsdam Institute, 2012 (Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics, “Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided”, A report for the World Bank, November, http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn\_Down\_the\_heat\_Why\_a\_4\_degree\_centrigrade\_warmer\_world\_must\_be\_avoided.pdf)

Ecosystems and their species provide a range of important goods and services for human society. These include water, food, cultural and other values. In the AR4 an assessment of climate change effects on ecosystems and their services found the following: • If greenhouse gas emissions and other stresses continue at or above current rates, the resilience of many ecosystems is likely to be exceeded by an unprecedented combination of change in climate, associated disturbances (for example, flooding, drought, wildfire, insects, and ocean acidification) and other stressors (global change drivers) including land use change, pollution and over-exploitation of resources. • Approximately 20 to 30 percent of plant and animal species assessed so far are likely to be at increased risk of extinction, if increases in global average temperature exceed of 2–3° above preindustrial levels. • For increases in global average temperature exceeding 2 to 3° above preindustrial levels and in concomitant atmospheric CO2 concentrations, major changes are projected in ecosystem structure and function, species’ ecological interactions and shifts in species’ geographical ranges, with predominantly negative consequences for biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services, such as water and food supply. It is known that past large-scale losses of global ecosystems and species extinctions have been associated with rapid climate change combined with other ecological stressors. Loss and/or degradation of ecosystems, and rates of extinction because of human pressures over the last century or more, which have intensified in recent decades, have contributed to a very high rate of extinction by geological standards. It is well established that loss or degradation of ecosystem services occurs as a consequence of species extinctions, declining species abundance, or widespread shifts in species and biome distributions (Leadley et al. 2010). Climate change is projected to exacerbate the situation. This section outlines the likely consequences for some key ecosystems and for biodiversity. The literature tends to confirm the conclusions from the AR4 outlined above. Despite the existence of detailed and highly informative case studies, upon which this section will draw, it is also important to recall that there remain many uncertainties (Bellard, Bertelsmeier, Leadley, Thuiller, and Courchamp, 2012). However, threshold behavior is known to occur in biological systems (Barnosky et al. 2012) and most model projections agree on major adverse consequences for biodiversity in a 4°C world (Bellard et al., 2012). With high levels of warming, coalescing human induced stresses on ecosystems have the potential to trigger large-scale ecosystem collapse (Barnosky et al. 2012). Furthermore, while uncertainty remains in the projections, there is a risk not only of major loss of valuable ecosystem services, particularly to the poor and the most vulnerable who depend on them, but also of feedbacks being initiated that would result in ever higher CO2 emissions and thus rates of global warming. Significant effects of climate change are already expected for warming well below 4°C. In a scenario of 2.5°C warming, severe ecosystem change, based on absolute and relative changes in carbon and water fluxes and stores, cannot be ruled out on any continent (Heyder, Schaphoff, Gerten, & Lucht, 2011). If warming is limited to less than 2°C, with constant or slightly declining precipitation, small biome shifts are projected, and then only in temperate and tropical regions. Considerable change is projected for cold and tropical climates already at 3°C of warming. At greater than 4°C of warming, biomes in temperate zones will also be substantially affected. These changes would impact not only the human and animal communities that directly rely on the ecosystems, but would also exact a cost (economic and otherwise) on society as a whole, ranging from extensive loss of biodiversity and diminished land cover, through to loss of ecosystems services such as fisheries and forestry (de Groot et al., 2012; Farley et al., 2012). Ecosystems have been found to be particularly sensitive to geographical patterns of climate change (Gonzalez, Neilson, Lenihan, and Drapek, 2010). Moreover, ecosystems are affected not only by local changes in the mean temperature and precipitation, along with changes in the variability of these quantities and changes by the occurrence of extreme events. These climatic variables are thus decisive factors in determining plant structure and ecosystem composition (Reu et al., 2011). Increasing vulnerability to heat and drought stress will likely lead to increased mortality and species extinction. For example, temperature extremes have already been held responsible for mortality in Australian flying-fox species (Welbergen, Klose, Markus, and Eby 2008), and interactions between phenological changes driven by gradual climate changes and extreme events can lead to reduced fecundity (Campbell et al. 2009; Inouye, 2008). Climate change also has the potential to facilitate the spread and establishment of invasive species (pests and weeds) (Hellmann, Byers, Bierwagen, & Dukes, 2008; Rahel & Olden, 2008) with often detrimental implications for ecosystem services and biodiversity. Human land-use changes are expected to further exacerbate climate change driven ecosystem changes, particularly in the tropics, where rising temperatures and reduced precipitation are expected to have major impacts (Campbell et al., 2009; Lee & Jetz, 2008). Ecosystems will be affected by the increased occurrence of extremes such as forest loss resulting from droughts and wildfire exacerbated by land use and agricultural expansion (Fischlin et al., 2007). Climate change also has the potential to catalyze rapid shifts in ecosystems such as sudden forest loss or regional loss of agricultural productivity resulting from desertification (Barnosky et al., 2012). The predicted increase in extreme climate events would also drive dramatic ecosystem changes (Thibault and Brown 2008; Wernberg, Smale, and Thomsen 2012). One such extreme event that is expected to have immediate impacts on ecosystems is the increased rate of wildfire occurrence. Climate change induced shifts in the fire regime are therefore in turn powerful drivers of biome shifts, potentially resulting in considerable changes in carbon fluxes over large areas (Heyder et al., 2011; Lavorel et al., 2006) It is anticipated that global warming will lead to global biome shifts (Barnosky et al. 2012). Based on 20th century observations and 21st century projections, poleward latitudinal biome shifts of up to 400 km are possible in a 4° C world (Gonzalez et al., 2010). In the case of mountaintop ecosystems, for example, such a shift is not necessarily possible, putting them at particular risk of extinction (La Sorte and Jetz, 2010). Species that dwell at the upper edge of continents or on islands would face a similar impediment to adaptation, since migration into adjacent ecosystems is not possible (Campbell, et al. 2009; Hof, Levinsky, Araújo, and Rahbek 2011). The consequences of such geographical shifts, driven by climatic changes as well as rising CO2 concentrations, would be found in both reduced species richness and species turnover (for example, Phillips et al., 2008; White and Beissinger 2008). A study by (Midgley and Thuiller, 2011) found that, of 5,197 African plant species studied, 25–42 percent could lose all suitable range by 2085. It should be emphasized that competition for space with human agriculture over the coming century is likely to prevent vegetation expansion in most cases (Zelazowski et al., 2011) Species composition changes can lead to structural changes of the entire ecosystem, such as the increase in lianas in tropical and temperate forests (Phillips et al., 2008), and the encroachment of woody plants in temperate grasslands (Bloor et al., 2008, Ratajczak et al., 2012), putting grass-eating herbivores at risk of extinction because of a lack of food available—this is just one example of the sensitive intricacies of ecosystem responses to external perturbations. There is also an increased risk of extinction for herbivores in regions of drought-induced tree dieback, owing to their inability to digest the newly resident C4 grasses (Morgan et al., 2008). The following provides some examples of ecosystems that have been identified as particularly vulnerable to climate change. The discussion is restricted to ecosystems themselves, rather than the important and often extensive impacts on ecosystems services. Boreal-temperate ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change, although there are large differences in projections, depending on the future climate model and emission pathway studied. Nevertheless there is a clear risk of large-scale forest dieback in the boreal-temperate system because of heat and drought (Heyder et al., 2011). Heat and drought related die-back has already been observed in substantial areas of North American boreal forests (Allen et al., 2010), characteristic of vulnerability to heat and drought stress leading to increased mortality at the trailing edge of boreal forests. The vulnerability of transition zones between boreal and temperate forests, as well as between boreal forests and polar/tundra biomes, is corroborated by studies of changes in plant functional richness with climate change (Reu et al., 2011), as well as analyses using multiple dynamic global vegetation models (Gonzalez et al., 2010). Subtle changes within forest types also pose a great risk to biodiversity as different plant types gain dominance (Scholze et al., 2006). Humid tropical forests also show increasing risk of major climate induced losses. At 4°C warming above pre-industrial levels, the land extent of humid tropical forest, characterized by tree species diversity and biomass density, is expected to contract to approximately 25 percent of its original size [see Figure 3 in (Zelazowski et al., 2011)], while at 2°C warming, more than 75 percent of the original land can likely be preserved. For these ecosystems, water availability is the dominant determinant of climate suitability (Zelazowski et al., 2011). In general, Asia is substantially less at risk of forest loss than the tropical Americas. However, even at 2°C, the forest in the Indochina peninsula will be at risk of die-back. At 4°C, the area of concern grows to include central Sumatra, Sulawesi, India and the Philippines, where up to 30 percent of the total humid tropical forest niche could be threatened by forest retreat (Zelazowski et al., 2011). There has been substantial scientific debate over the risk of a rapid and abrupt change to a much drier savanna or grassland ecosystem under global warming. This risk has been identified as a possible planetary tipping point at around a warming of 3.5–4.5°C, which, if crossed, would result in a major loss of biodiversity, ecosystem services and the loss of a major terrestrial carbon sink, increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations (Lenton et al., 2008)(Cox, et al., 2004) (Kriegler, Hall, Held, Dawson, and Schellnhuber, 2009). Substantial uncertainty remains around the likelihood, timing and onset of such risk due to a range of factors including uncertainty in precipitation changes, effects of CO2 concentration increase on water use efficiency and the CO2 fertilization effect, land-use feedbacks and interactions with fire frequency and intensity, and effects of higher temperature on tropical tree species and on important ecosystem services such as pollinators. While climate model projections for the Amazon, and in particular precipitation, remain quite uncertain recent analyses using IPCC AR4 generation climate indicates a reduced risk of a major basin wide loss of precipitation compared to some earlier work. If drying occurs then the likelihood of an abrupt shift to a drier, less biodiverse ecosystem would increase. Current projections indicate that fire occurrence in the Amazon could double by 2050, based on the A2 SRES scenario that involves warming of approximately 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels (Silvestrini et al., 2011), and can therefore be expected to be even higher in a 4°C world. Interactions of climate change, land use and agricultural expansion increase the incidence of fire (Aragão et al., 2008), which plays a major role in the (re)structuring of vegetation (Gonzalez et al., 2010; Scholze et al., 2006). A decrease in precipitation over the Amazon forests may therefore result in forest retreat or transition into a low biomass forest (Malhi et al., 2009). Moderating this risk is a possible increase in ecosystem water use efficiency with increasing CO2 concentrations is accounted for, more than 90 percent of the original humid tropical forest niche in Amazonia is likely to be preserved in the 2°C case, compared to just under half in the 4°C warming case (see Figure 5 in Zelazowski et al., 2011) (Cook, Zeng, and Yoon, 2012; Salazar & Nobre, 2010). Recent work has analyzed a number of these factors and their uncertainties and finds that the risk of major loss of forest due to climate is more likely to be regional than Amazon basin-wide, with the eastern and southeastern Amazon being most at risk (Zelazowski et al., 2011). Salazar and Nobre (2010) estimates a transition from tropical forests to seasonal forest or savanna in the eastern Amazon could occur at warming at warming of 2.5–3.5°C when CO2 fertilization is not considered and 4.5–5.5°C when it is considered. It is important to note, as Salazar and Nobre (2010) point out, that the effects of deforestation and increased fire risk interact with the climate change and are likely to accelerate a transition from tropical forests to drier ecosystems. Increased CO2 concentration may also lead to increased plant water efficiency (Ainsworth and Long, 2005), lowering the risk of plant die-back, and resulting in vegetation expansion in many regions, such as the Congo basin, West Africa and Madagascar (Zelazowski et al., 2011), in addition to some dry-land ecosystems (Heyder et al., 2011). The impact of CO2 induced ‘greening’ would, however, negatively affect biodiversity in many ecosystems. In particular encroachment of woody plants into grasslands and savannahs in North American grassland and savanna communities could lead to a decline of up to 45 percent in species richness ((Ratajczak and Nippert, 2012) and loss of specialist savanna plant species in southern Africa (Parr, Gray, and Bond, 2012). Mangroves are an important ecosystem and are particularly vulnerable to the multiple impacts of climate change, such as: rise in sea levels, increases in atmospheric CO2 concentration, air and water temperature, and changes in precipitation patterns. Sea-level rise can cause a loss of mangroves by cutting off the flow of fresh water and nutrients and drowning the roots (Dasgupta, Laplante et al. 2010). By the end of the 21st century, global mangrove cover is projected to experience a significant decline because of heat stress and sea-level rise (Alongi, 2008; Beaumont et al., 2011). In fact, it has been estimated that under the A1B emissions scenario (3.5°C relative to pre-industrial levels) mangroves would need to geographically move on average about 1 km/year to remain in suitable climate zones (Loarie et al., 2009). The most vulnerable mangrove forests are those occupying low-relief islands such as small islands in the Pacific where sea-level rise is a dominant factor. Where rivers are lacking and/ or land is subsiding, vulnerability is also high. With mangrove losses resulting from deforestation presently at 1 to 2 percent per annum (Beaumont et al., 2011), climate change may not be the biggest immediate threat to the future of mangroves. However if conservation efforts are successful in the longer term climate change may become a determining issue (Beaumont et al., 2011). Coral reefs are acutely sensitive to changes in water temperatures, ocean pH and intensity and frequency of tropical cyclones. Mass coral bleaching is caused by ocean warming and ocean acidification, which results from absorption of CO2 (for example, Frieler et al., 2012a). Increased sea-surface temperatures and a reduction of available carbonates are also understood to be driving causes of decreased rates of calcification, a critical reef-building process (De’ath, Lough, and Fabricius, 2009). The effects of climate change on coral reefs are already apparent. The Great Barrier Reef, for example, has been estimated to have lost 50 percent of live coral cover since 1985, which is attributed in part to coral bleaching because of increasing water temperatures (De’ath et al., 2012). Under atmospheric CO2 concentrations that correspond to a warming of 4°C by 2100, reef erosion will likely exceed rates of calcification, leaving coral reefs as “crumbling frameworks with few calcareous corals” (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2007). In fact, frequency of bleaching events under global warming in even a 2°C world has been projected to exceed the ability of coral reefs to recover. The extinction of coral reefs would be catastrophic for entire coral reef ecosystems and the people who depend on them for food, income and shoreline. Reefs provide coastal protection against coastal floods and rising sea levels, nursery grounds and habitat for a variety of currently fished species, as well as an invaluable tourism asset. These valuable services to often subsistence-dependent coastal and island societies will most likely be lost well before a 4°C world is reached. The preceding discussion reviewed the implications of a 4°C world for just a few examples of important ecosystems. The section below examines the effects of climate on biological diversity Ecosystems are composed ultimately of the species and interactions between them and their physical environment. Biologically rich ecosystems are usually diverse and it is broadly agreed that there exists a strong link between this biological diversity and ecosystem productivity, stability and functioning (McGrady-Steed, Harris, and Morin, 1997; David Tilman, Wedin, and Knops, 1996)(Hector, 1999; D Tilman et al., 2001). Loss of species within ecosystems will hence have profound negative effects on the functioning and stability of ecosystems and on the ability of ecosystems to provide goods and services to human societies. It is the overall diversity of species that ultimately characterizes the biodiversity and evolutionary legacy of life on Earth. As was noted at the outset of this discussion, species extinction rates are now at very high levels compared to the geological record. Loss of those species presently classified as ‘critically endangered’ would lead to mass extinction on a scale that has happened only five times before in the last 540 million years. The loss of those species classified as ‘endangered’ and ‘vulnerable’ would confirm this loss as the sixth mass extinction episode (Barnosky 2011). Loss of biodiversity will challenge those reliant on ecosystems services. Fisheries (Dale, Tharp, Lannom, and Hodges, 2010), and agronomy (Howden et al., 2007) and forestry industries (Stram & Evans, 2009), among others, will need to match species choices to the changing climate conditions, while devising new strategies to tackle invasive pests (Bellard, Bertelsmeier, Leadley, Thuiller, and Courchamp, 2012). These challenges would have to be met in the face of increasing competition between natural and agricultural ecosystems over water resources. Over the 21st-century climate change is likely to result in some bio-climates disappearing, notably in the mountainous tropics and in the poleward regions of continents, with new, or novel, climates developing in the tropics and subtropics (Williams, Jackson, and Kutzbach, 2007). In this study novel climates are those where 21st century projected climates do not overlap with their 20th century analogues, and disappearing climates are those 20th century climates that do not overlap with 21st century projected climates. The projections of Williams et al (2007) indicate that in a 4°C world (SRES A2), 12–39 percent of the Earth’s land surface may experience a novel climate compared to 20th century analogues. Predictions of species response to novel climates are difficult because researchers have no current analogue to rely upon. However, at least such climates would give rise to disruptions, with many current species associations being broken up or disappearing entirely. Under the same scenario an estimated 10–48 percent of the Earth’s surface including highly biodiverse regions such as the Himalayas, Mesoamerica, eastern and southern Africa, the Philippines and the region around Indonesia known as Wallacaea would lose their climate space. With limitations on how fast species can disperse, or move, this indicates that many species may find themselves without a suitable climate space and thus face a high risk of extinction. Globally, as in other studies, there is a strong association apparent in these projections between regions where the climate disappears and biodiversity hotspots. Limiting warming to lower levels in this study showed substantially reduced effects, with the magnitude of novel and disappearing climates scaling linearly with global mean warming. More recent work by Beaumont and colleagues using a different approach confirms the scale of this risk (Beaumont et al., 2011, Figure 36). Analysis of the exposure of 185 eco-regions of exceptional biodiversity (a subset of the so-called Global 200) to extreme monthly temperature and precipitation conditions in the 21st century compared to 1961–1990 conditions shows that within 60 years almost all of the regions that are already exposed to substantial environmental and social pressure, will experience extreme temperature conditions based on the A2 emission scenario (4.1°C global mean temperature rise by 2100) (Beaumont et al., 2011). Tropical and sub-tropical eco-regions in Africa and South America are particularly vulnerable. Vulnerability to such extremes is particularly acute for high latitude and small island biota, which are very limited in their ability to respond to range shifts, and to those biota, such as flooded grassland, mangroves and desert biomes, that would require large geographical displacements to find comparable climates in a warmer world. The overall sense of recent literature confirms the findings of the AR4 summarized at the beginning of the section, with a number of risks such as those to coral reefs occurring at significantly lower temperatures than estimated in that report. Although non-climate related human pressures are likely to remain a major and defining driver of loss of ecosystems and biodiversity in the coming decades, it is also clear that as warming rises so will the predominance of climate change as a determinant of ecosystem and biodiversity survival. While the factors of human stresses on ecosystems are manifold, in a 4°C world, climate change is likely to become a determining driver of ecosystem shifts and large-scale biodiversity loss (Bellard et al., 2012; New et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that large-scale loss of biodiversity is likely to occur in a 4°C world, with climate change and high CO2 concentration driving a transition of the Earth´s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience. Such damages to ecosystems would be expected to dramatically reduce the provision of ecosystem services on which society depends (e.g., hydrology—quantity flow rates, quality; fisheries (corals), protection of coastline (loss of mangroves). Barnosky has described the present situation facing the biodiversity of the planet as “the perfect storm” with multiple high intensity ecological stresses because of habitat modification and degradation, pollution and other factors, unusually rapid climate change and unusually high and elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations. In the past, as noted above, this combination of circumstances has led to major, mass extinctions with planetary consequences. Thus, there is a growing risk that climate change, combined with other human activities, will cause the irreversible transition of the Earth´s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience (Barnosky et al., 2012).

#### These are not normal debate impacts with loose internal chains and low probabilities. Global Warming has effects across countries, classes and populations. The effects of CO2 will be felt disproportionately by minority bodies.

Mandell 2008 [Bekah, A.B., Vassar College; J.D., Boston College Law School; Director of the Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity Fair Housing Project, “Racial Reification and Global Warming: A Truly Inconvenient Truth,” Boston College Third World Law Journal Volume 28 | Issue 2 Article 3, 4-1-2008, <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1046&context=twlj> ]

We are facing a global climate crisis. The release of the 2007 U.N. ¶ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report eliminates any ¶ legitimate doubt that human activities have caused carbon dioxide ¶ (CO2) to accumulate in the earth’s atmosphere, dangerously increasing ¶ the earth’s average temperature.1 Already, increasing atmospheric temperatures are having disastrous effects on the earth’s climate.2 Traditional ways of life for indigenous peoples of Alaska face extinction as polar ice caps and permafrost continue to melt, unfreezing seas and ¶ unleashing storm surges that engulf villages and endanger lives.3¶ The rapid changes in northern coastal regions foreshadow the ¶ danger more southern latitudes are just beginning to encounter.4 The ¶ climate crisis also promises to bring more severe weather events to ¶ more heavily populated regions of the world, causing famine and disease in warmer areas.5 The concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere ¶ derived from anthropogenic sources has already brought more severe ¶ weather to much of the earth’s most populated areas, illustrated most ¶ famously by the Hurricane Katrina disaster.6¶ However, despite decades of irrefutable evidence about the credibility of the global climate crisis and its anthropogenic causes, climate ¶ change is not a priority for most Americans7. The American public successfully has ignored the increasing ~~visibility~~ of the effects of climate ¶ change for years, developing an attitude of willful ignorance despite the ¶ immediacy of the problem.8 A Gallup poll conducted in 2004 found ¶ that the percentage of Americans who worried a “great deal” or a “fair ¶ amount” about the “greenhouse effect” or “global warming” had decreased from the previous year, with only fifty-one percent of respondents noting that they were concerned about the climate crisis.9 The ¶ other half of those surveyed reported that they worried “only a little” or ¶ “not at all” about global warming or the greenhouse effect.10 This public attitude towards global warming legitimates inaction from the gov- ernment and the private sector, as businesses and even national environmental non-profits have generally failed to make it an issue.11¶

### Plan – wake

#### The President should not have the authority to enter armed forces into hostilities to prevent proliferation.

### Contention Two: Solvency

#### Obama’s counter-prolif posture is based on the Bush Doctrine interp of war powers authority to preempt

Mathew Waxman, September 11, 2013. “The Most Puzzling Line of the President’s Speech,” http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/09/the-most-puzzling-line-of-the-presidents-speech/

My first question is to what he’s referring here, or to which part of the past decade. President Bush undoubtedly held very broad views of war powers, but the two major wars embarked up during his presidency, in Afghanistan and Iraq, were clearly congressionally authorized, and Congress has played a significant role in pushing their wind-down. The 2011 Libya intervention, by contrast, was not congressionally authorized, and the Obama administration adopted the view that the War Powers Resolution did not apply to the operations there (which, unlike the contemplated Syria operations, aimed to help bring down a regime). The Obama administration has also resisted the idea that Congress should re-examine the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which has been interpreted to apply in geographically broad ways that may or may not have been intended by Congress at the time it was adopted. My second question is why, if he believes it’s problematic that more and more war-making power has been put in the hands of the President to the exclusion of Congress, President Obama also adopts the position that he possesses unilateral constitutional authority to act in this case. We haven’t yet seen the underlying legal opinion and analysis, but Jack has pointed out here that in asserting the authority to act independently the Obama administration may be extending, not pulling back on, previous OLC reasoning about presidential power to use force. My third question is about effectiveness. I agree that as a general matter “America acts more effectively abroad when we stand together,” but which is better for the strategic goal Obama lays out here of deterring future chemical weapon use through limited strikes: a more congressionally constrained presidential power or a more flexible one? A President with broad unilateral authority, or a system of strong, formal constitutional checks? I’ve been thinking and writing recently about the relationship between constitutional allocation of war powers and strategies of deterrence or coercive diplomacy, and I believe that even without formally voting to authorize force or not, Congress plays an important role in politically constraining the President and in signaling abroad – to adversaries and allies alike – about our policy preferences and resolve. Part of what worries me about the President’s current approach is that even if the President can win a congressional vote to strike Syria in this instance, the debate so far has shown weak congressional commitment to a global chemical-weapons policing policy – which is what the President claims is important to U.S. security interests (“As the ban against these weapons erodes, other tyrants will have no reason to think twice about acquiring poison gas, and using them”).

#### Statutory restrictions control the perception of force posture – Congressional complicity with Bush doctrine authority implies “green-light” to preempt

Bacevich, 2007 (Andrew, professor of history and international relations at Boston University, “Rescinding the Bush Doctrine”, Boston News, March 1, http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles/2007/03/01/rescinding\_the\_bush\_doctrine/)

RATHER THAN vainly sniping at President Bush over his management of the Iraq war, the Democratic-controlled Congress ought to focus on averting any recurrence of this misadventure. Decrying the so-called "surge" or curbing the president's authority to conduct ongoing operations will contribute little to that end. Legislative action to foreswear preventive war might contribute quite a lot. Long viewed as immoral, illicit, and imprudent, preventive war -- attacking to keep an adversary from someday posing a danger -- became the centerpiece of US national security strategy in the aftermath of 9/11. President Bush unveiled this new strategy in a speech at West Point in June 2002. "If we wait for threats to fully materialize," he said, "we will have waited too long." The new imperative was to strike before threats could form. Bush declared it the policy of the United States to "impose preemptive, unilateral military force when and where it chooses." Although the Constitution endows the legislative branch with the sole authority to declare war, the president did not consult Congress before announcing his new policy. He promulgated the Bush Doctrine by fiat. Then he acted on it. In 2003, Saddam Hussein posed no immediate threat to the United States; arguing that he might one day do so, the administration depicted the invasion of Iraq as an act of anticipatory self-defense. To their everlasting shame, a majority of members in both the House and the Senate went along, passing a resolution that "authorized" the president to do what he was clearly intent on doing anyway. Implicitly, the Bush Doctrine received congressional endorsement. Events since have affirmed the wisdom of seeing preventive war as immoral, illicit, and imprudent. The Bush administration expected a quick, economical, and decisive victory in Iraq. Advertising the war as an effort to topple a brutal dictator and liberate an oppressed people, it no doubt counted on battlefield success to endow the enterprise with a certain ex post facto legitimacy. Elated Iraqis showering American soldiers with flowers and candies would silence critics who condemned the war as morally unjustified and patently illegal. None of these expectations has come to pass. In its trial run, the Bush Doctrine has been found wanting. Today, Iraq teeters on the brink of disintegration. The war's costs, already staggering, continue to mount. Violence triggered by the US invasion has killed thousands of Iraqi civilians. We cannot fully absolve ourselves of responsibility for those deaths. Our folly has alienated friends and emboldened enemies. Rather than nipping in the bud an ostensibly emerging threat, the Iraq war has diverted attention from existing dangers (such as Al Qaeda) while encouraging potential adversaries (like Iran) to see us as weak. The remedy to this catastrophic failure lies not in having another go -- a preventive attack against Iran, for example -- but in acknowledging that the Bush Doctrine is inherently pernicious. Our reckless flirtation with preventive war qualifies as not only wrong, but also stupid. Indeed, the Bush Doctrine poses a greater danger to the United States than do the perils it supposedly guards against. We urgently need to abrogate that doctrine in favor of principles that reflect our true interests and our professed moral values. Here lies an opportunity for Congress to make a difference. The fifth anniversary of President Bush's West Point speech approaches. Prior to that date, Democratic leaders should offer a binding resolution that makes the following three points: First, the United States categorically renounces preventive war. Second, the United States will henceforth consider armed force to be an instrument of last resort. Third, except in response to a direct attack on the United States, any future use of force will require prior Congressional authorization, as required by the Constitution. The legislation should state plainly our determination to defend ourselves and our allies. But it should indicate no less plainly that the United States no longer claims the prerogative of using "preemptive, unilateral military force when and where it chooses." Declaring the Bush Doctrine defunct will not solve the problems posed by Iraq, but it will reduce the likelihood that we will see more Iraqs in our future. By taking such action, Congress will restore its relevance, its badly tarnished honor, and its standing in the eyes of the American people.

#### Broad development of nuclear energy is slow now – preempting prolif cements the “nuclear suppliers cartel,” killing technology trade and civilian growth

Mueller, 2008 (John, Dept of Political Science at Ohio State University, “The Costs and Consequences of Efforts to Prevent Proliferation”, July 16, http://politicalscience.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller//apsa08.pdf)

The nonproliferation focus has also exacerbated the nuclear waste problem in the United States. In the late 1970s, the Carter administration banned the reprocessing of nuclear fuel, something that radically reduces the amount of nuclear waste, under the highly questionable assumption that this policy would reduce the danger of nuclear proliferation. Nonproliferation efforts worldwide also hamper worldwide economic development by increasing the effective costs of developing nuclear energy--sometimes even making them prohibitive for some countries. As countries grow, they require ever increasing amounts of power. Any measure that limits their ability to acquire this vital commodity--or increases its price--effectively slows economic growth and essentially kills people by reducing the gains in life expectancy commonly afforded by economic development. The Non-Proliferation Treaty specifically guarantees to signing nonnuclear countries "the fullest possible exchange of technology" for the development of peaceful nuclear power. However, as Richard Betts points out, this rationale has been undermined by the development of a "nuclear suppliers cartel" which has worked to "cut off trade in technology for reprocessing plutonium or enriching uranium," thereby reducing the NPT to "a simple demand to the nuclear weapons have-nots to remain so."49 More broadly the nonproliferation quest has from time to time boosted international oil prices to the detriment of almost all the countries in the world except for the potential proliferator. Because nuclear power does not emit greenhouse gases, it is an obvious potential candidate for helping with the problem of global warming, an issue many people hold to be of the highest concern for the future of the planet.

#### Aff signal encourages suppliers – dual-use tech raises security flags – US posture is the number one factor in willingness to assist developing nuclear powers

Kate Davidson, UNE Business School Faculty of the Professions, University of New England, 2012. “Contemporary Perspectives on Nuclear Proliferation,” http://www.une.edu.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0008/24110/econwp12-2.pdf

The role of the United States in matters of proliferation cannot be emphasised enough. In the Cold War period, the foreign policies of both the US and the Soviet Union were by and large premised upon nuclear matters and necessarily shaped the nuclear field we are faced with today. Post Cold War, US policy has dominated international interactions. The US does contribute enormously to the development of norms; however its own influence extends beyond and almost independently of these norms. In typical “do as I say, not as I do” style, the US exerts huge pressures on states to follow the path of non-proliferation despite their own attachment to nuclear weapons. Levite (2002/03, p76) acknowledges the “glaring omission” in the literature of a “systematic assessment of the vast array of non-proliferation instruments and assets employed by the United States across the cases of nuclear restraint and reversal”, mounting a convincing argument36 based on the claim that “an understanding with the United States is, in fact, a hallmark of many cases of nuclear slowdown or reversal” (p82). She contends that the US is least influential in effecting the nature of domestic regimes which shape nuclear ambitions, concluding that “success is within reach only to the extent that foreign influence and domestic conditions converge, and the foreign effort is closely tuned (in terms of both agenda and timing) to the domestic context” (p87). While the mechanisms by which the US asserts its influence are many and varied37, the hegemon’s role in non-proliferation is deemed to be fundamental.¶ Following on from this, since the US has been so willing to “purchase” non- proliferation through various means perhaps this leads states to making small developments towards the nuclear end which they can then “sell” in order to enhance their economic or diplomatic standing. Japan and North Korea have been implicated in such actions, and it is certainly a notion worth some consideration. It is also possible that Israel’s unwillingness to admit its own nuclear status is in part that doing so may compromise its foreign aid flows, particularly from the US.¶ The second and related issue of vital significance is the role of sanctions, both positive and negative, in non-proliferation measures. While such actions are inextricably linked with US policy and superpower, the theoretical grounding is markedly different. Quite fortunately for the purpose of this discussion, the very recent publishing of the book ‘Sanctions, Statecraft, and Nuclear Proliferation’ edited by Solingen (2012) addresses this very subject. While the authors focus largely on specific causal mechanisms, domestic distributional costs and benefits remain at the forefront and provide insight as to how sanctions and inducements, either targeted or comprehensive, can actually have unintended consequences, particularly given varying domestic political economy models and regime types.¶ As noted by Stein (2012, p30) although “sanctions are as old as antiquity”, they are more prevalent now than ever, but “ironically, sanctions can weaken a state absolutely¶ but also strengthen it relatively (to its society and domestic opposition)” (p55). That is, sanctions may actually support the regime which is driving a nuclear program and thereby strengthen its support – a counterproductive action by any standards. Similarly, Kreps and Pasha argue that military threats may make “good politics” domestically (p175), but empirically support the hypothesis that “military threats reinforce the coalitions that are hostile to international economic integration and cooperation with international regimes more generally” (p208) – the very regimes which Solingen argues are most likely to nuclearise.¶ Tying in with the initial point of discussion in this section, Nincic (2012) rethinks the US counter proliferation policy with regard to inducements, intuitively noting that “few measures could be fully effective when not initiated, or at least supported, by the world’s sole superpower” (p127). Observing the “abysmal failure and frequently counterproductive character of threats and punishment” (p153), Nincic pushes the role of positive engagement in non-proliferation measures. In a less US-centric rationale, Drezner (2012) claims “that more comprehensive economic sanctions – or more wide ranging inducements – will often be more likely to lead to the desired policy changes” than ‘smart sanctions’ which are specifically targeted to reduce externalities (p155).¶ The consistent failure of sanctions to procure desired outcomes is a theme throughout the various chapters. Solingen concludes by outlining three factors which burden the probability that sanctions would have the desired effects in the nuclear realm (2012, p347):¶ 1. Inward looking autocracies, being the most frequent targets of these sanctions, are also the least vulnerable to them.¶ 2. Selection bias results as “sanctions are expected to surface only when targets believe that concessions would risk regime survival more than defiance”. That is, targets receptive to inducements may pre-empt sanctions, leaving analysis of sanctions largely on inward-looking autocracies which “appear to be endogenous to why sanctions emerge as tools of statecraft to begin with”.¶ 3. Inward looking autocracies may price nuclear weapons markedly highly, justified as public goods, making them more resistant to comply with non-proliferation demands.¶ To illustrate the common use of these tools, Figure 6 shows the number of sanctions and inducements directed toward the four main targets of the period 1990 to 2009: North Korea, Libya, Iraq and Iran. From this the relative use of sanctions versus inducements for each target can be recognised, as can the dominance of the US in the utilisation of these tools. Other senders depicted in the legend of the Figure are non- US unilateral (Uni), United Nations (UN), and non-UN multilateral (Multi). It is also interesting to note that 78% of sanctions in the past three decades were imposed on non-democratic target states38, which gives rise to a possibility that perhaps discriminate treatment of non-democratic regimes by more powerful nations may provide incentive for nuclear weapon acquisition by the weaker state in a struggle for power. Or in other words, economic mistreatment gives rise to a perception of threatened security, which under the assumption of realism will provide motivation for nuclear weapon acquisition.¶ With Iran’s nuclear ambitions being so enthusiastically repressed at present, a few brief points are worth mentioning – the most obvious being that the huge numbers of sanctions have not worked. Stein notes the need to create an “international sanctioning cartel”39 can often “multilateralize an initial bilateral conflict” (p41). Unilateral sanctions are often ineffective or difficult to implement on their own and thus allies in sanctioning will often be sought. Drezner (2012, p167) points out that Iran “has been under some form of embargo for its entire existence, and the regime has grown comfortable with them”. Nader (2012) examines Iran in greater depth, finding it to be unclear whether sanctions have impacted Iran’s willingness to pursue its nuclear program but also suggesting the nation may actually thrive on a sense of political and economic isolation stemming from its ideology (p214). He concludes: “The regime’s survival is increasingly contingent on a favourable outcome regarding the nuclear program, whether it leads to a virtual or actual nuclear weapons capability. A sanctions regime contributing to Iran’s economic decline cannot alter this reality.” (p231)¶ A third point with regard to external incentives is, again, tied in tightly with the other two but worthy of mention: institutional organisations. A number of institutional non- proliferation measures have been already discussed: these include the IAEA, the UN, regional NWFZs and various other multilateral treaties. Through encouraging membership to these institutions and also utilising mechanisms under these structures, external pressure can be applied to nations in order to discourage them from developing nuclear weapons programs. The role of the US, and the use of sanctions and inducements by various nations, are both major features of any such institution, however, given the complex web of globalised trade and business patterns which have developed across the globe, the interactions of such institutions needs to be considered. ¶ While the subject of external incentives has focussed rather heavily on¶ discouraging proliferation, such circumstances may exist under which external pressures act in favour of nuclearisation. Aggressive marketing by nuclear technology companies may lead a nation down the path of nuclear energy, only to find its “Siamese twin” comes too**.** This now leads into the supply side explanation of ¶ proliferation. ¶ Access to nuclear technology: more able leads to more willing ¶ This theory of nuclear proliferation is a relatively new development in the literature40 ¶ and represents the supply side, positing that a state’s ability to build nuclear weapons ¶ will influence its probability of actually doing so. As nuclear technology has spread ¶ over the globe41¶ ¶ , the technical means of developing nuclear weapons has also spread ¶ through the dual purpose nature of the technology. The technical links between ¶ civilian nuclear facilities and military programs have previously been discussed, as has ¶ the notion of a virtual nuclear state, and it is important to remember that “whether or ¶ not a state wants a nuclear weapons is irrelevant if it is unable to acquire them” ¶ (Kroenig, 2009 p163). However, as many as fifty states could be considered to be ¶ nuclear weapons capable (Hymans, 2010 p13). The puzzle then is to explain the gap ¶ between the number of states which are technically capable of developing nuclear ¶ weapons and the number which actually choose to do so. Supply side theories seem to ¶ have relied heavily on empirical analysis, and as a result some of the quantitative ¶ proliferation literature will now be introduced to this discussion. ¶ Initially, there is a requirement that nuclear capability be defined. The possession of a ¶ nuclear reactor is obviously the first point required for a state to even be considered ¶ nuclear capable, however this is by no means sufficient. Contemporary literature has ¶ built on Meyer’s (1984) landmark book ‘The Dynamics of Nuclear Proliferation’ and ¶ Stoll’s (1996) revision of this data (cited in Sagan, 2011 p228). In defining nuclear ¶ latency, Meyer measured ten technical and economic indicators – previous national ¶ mining activity, indigenous uranium deposits, metallurgists, steel production, ¶ construction work force, chemical engineers, nitric acid production, electrical ¶ production capacity, nuclear engineers, physicists, chemists and explosives and ¶ electronics specialists42¶ ¶ . As neither the quantity or quality of a state’s nuclear ¶ engineers nor its explosives and electronics specialists could be accurately determined ¶ as being sufficient to develop a nuclear weapon, Meyer used two proxy indicators: ¶ whether the state had been operating a research reactor for three reactor years and ¶ whether the state manufactured automobiles, or assembled automobiles and ¶ manufactured radios and television sets. Based on these indicators, Meyer concluded ¶ that 34 states had the latent capability of building nuclear weapons in 1982 (cited in ¶ Sagan, 2011 p229). ¶ Stoll’s (1996) revision of the data set assumed that all states had access to nuclear ¶ materials since they were (purportedly) available on the open market, and thus ¶ “assumed away the crucial technical bottleneck of whether a state has access to ¶ uranium that, once enriched, could be used in a nuclear weapons program” (Sagan, ¶ 2011 p229). Stoll’s updated data set led to the conclusion that 48 states had latent ¶ weapons capability in 1992. ¶ ¶ Real world events brought supply side issues to the forefront of the proliferation ¶ debate and the 9/11 attack on the United States highlighted the potential role of non-¶ state actors in international conflict. Furthermore, the uncovering of the AQ Khan ¶ network of supplying nuclear equipment and knowledge, and the apparent ¶ nuclearisation of North Korea (more on these later) demonstrated that supply chains ¶ of nuclear material and technology were out of control, and the notion of second tier ¶ proliferation became a subject for debate. Braun and Chyba (2004) point to three ¶ challenges to the non-proliferation regime: ¶ ¶ i. Latent proliferation under the Non-proliferation Treaty ¶ ¶ ii. First tier nuclear proliferation, in which technology or material is ¶ stolen from private companies or state nuclear programs assists ¶ non-nuclear weapon states develop illegal programs ¶ ¶ iii. Second tier proliferation in which states in the developing world with ¶ varying technical capabilities trade amongst themselves to bolster ¶ one another’s nuclear and strategic weapons efforts ¶ ¶ They explore the proliferation “ring” formed by strategic alliances and trade occurring ¶ between and among a list of nations, most notably Pakistan, North Korea, Libya, Iran ¶ and Iraq. This inspired a greater focus on the supply of nuclear technology globally ¶ and more pertinently, the need to better understand the relationship between access ¶ to nuclear technology and materials, and weapons proliferation itself. ¶ ¶ Data coding applied to proliferation studies were further developed by Jo and Gartzke ¶ (2007), who considered the determinants of nuclear proliferation in terms of ¶ opportunity and willingness (p168). On the supply-side, they further organised ¶ opportunity into three categories (p169): the set of technologies related to the ¶ manufacture of nuclear weapons, nuclear fissile materials, and economic capacity. ¶ They then devised three variables upon which to base their analysis (Jo and Gartzke, ¶ 2007 p172-3). First, latent nuclear weapons production capability was constructed by ¶ summing resource and production capacities using seven components: uranium ¶ deposits, metallurgists, chemical engineers, and nuclear ¶ engineers/physicists/chemists, electronic/explosive specialists, nitric acid production ¶ capacity, and electricity production capacity. Second, economic capacity was ¶ constructed using data relating to states’ energy consumption and iron/steel ¶ production. Third, diffusion of knowledge of how to build nuclear weapons was ¶ assumed to occur, and quantified using a log transformation of years passed since ¶ 1938. The dependent variables were dichotomous and coded annually: NWEAPON ¶ identified whether states had a nuclear weapon in the given year, and NPROGRAM a ¶ nuclear weapons program. ¶ ¶ In relation to nuclear proliferation opportunity, they found that latent nuclear ¶ production capabilities increased the predicted probability of having a weapons ¶ program, but did not impact the conditional decision to produce weapons. ¶ Furthermore they concluded that barriers to proliferation ease with the diffusion of ¶ time. This data set was a significant step in the quantitative approach to proliferation ¶ studies and is very widely cited, thus warrants discussion here despite doing little to ¶ actually define nuclear latency. Their measure of nuclear latency was a simple scale ¶ from zero to seven reflecting the seven components of the index. Sagan (2011, p229) ¶ is quite critical of Jo and Gartzke’s coding, claiming the failure to treat possession of ¶ fissile materials as necessary for nuclear capability as inadequate. The shortcomings¶ of their coding rules are evidenced by the fact that North Korea and South Africa are ¶ both considered to not have full capability to develop weapons in 200143¶ ¶ (ibid). ¶ More recently, the supply side proliferation literature has explored the relationship between civilian nuclear assistance and nuclear proliferation. Matthew Fuhrmann has contributed enormously to the proliferation literature to this end44. He explored the determinants of dual-use trade (2008), defining dual-use commodities as having two ¶ applications: “they can be used in weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs but ¶ also have many legitimate civilian applications” (p634). With most governments placing restrictions on the export of such commodities he was able to analyse licensed dual-use exports from the US between 1991 and 2001 (post Cold War era). He concludes his research to be “preliminary support for the assertion that states channel dual-use trade towards destinations where security guarantees exist and away from targets where security threats are present to minimise its potentially negative security externalities” 45¶ ¶ (p648). Following from this, Fuhrmann (2009a) explores whether the diffusion of knowledge makes proliferation more likely and further examines the determinants of civilian nuclear cooperation (2009b). These works tie in with the ¶ research of Matthew Kroenig, another significant contributor on the topic of nuclear ¶ assistance.

#### It’s reverse-causal – supplier perception is key to nuclear expansion – secure financing trumps obstacles

Sharon Squassoni, director and se- nior fellow of the Proliferation Prevention Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Prior to joining CSIS, she was a senior asso- ciate in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 2010. “Mapping Nuclear Power’s Future Spread, ” NUCLEAR POWER’S GLOBAL EXPANSION: WEIGHING ITS COSTS AND RISKS Henry Sokolski Editor, online

The largest increases in nuclear capacity in the next 20-30 years undoubtedly will occur in Asia, specifically, China, Japan, South Korea, and India. These countries are building nuclear power plants now and anticipate continued high economic growth levels. Other countries could feel the pinch of the current financial crisis more acutely, dampening demand for electricity below anticipated levels. A major expansion of nuclear power across the board, however, is not a foregone conclusion.¶ In addition, the traditional challenges besetting nuclear energy—cost, safety, waste, and proliferation—will likely continue to limit widespread growth. Government policies supporting nuclear energy in the future—as has been the case in the past—would be necessary to make major expansion a reality.¶ For many states, cost is the first and most immediate obstacle to nuclear expansion. But in those states where there is heavy involvement by the government in electricity markets, supporting nuclear energy may be as simple as providing government funding or financing. Solutions to nuclear waste tend to be deferred into the future, but policies by major suppliers to take back spent fuel could provide some incentives for growth. In states seeking nuclear power for the first time, actions to develop what some have termed the “three Ss”—safeguards, safety, and security— could improve their attractiveness to nuclear vendors. In all countries, some limits on, or costs attached to, carbon dioxide emissions could help enhance the attractiveness of nuclear power, but these should also enhance the attractiveness of renewable sources of energy as well.

#### The prolif dilemma underlies all nuclear energy development – relaxing posture is key to safe distribution at a scale large enough to solve warming

Squassoni, 2009 (Sharon, Senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace focusing on nuclear nonproliferation and national security, “Nuclear Power: How Much More?” Nuclear Policy Education Center, March 25, http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=176&rid=2)

The amount of nuclear capacity required to make a signification contribution to global climate change mitigation is so large that it would inevitably be widely distributed across the globe. Such a distribution would have particular implications for nuclear proliferation. However, projected distributions of nuclear energy out to 2050 are extremely speculative. The industry itself does not engage in such projections, and countries that set nuclear energy production goals have a history of widely missing long-range targets, such as China and India. The discussion below considers a hypothetical distribution of nuclear energy for 2050, based on the 2003 MIT Study. [12] Scenario III, shown in Figure 7, uses the “High 2050” scenario in Appendix 2 (“Global Electricity Demand and the Nuclear Power Growth Scenario”) of the 2003 MIT study, The Future of Nuclear Power. Although this is not a distribution designed to achieve optimal CO2 reductions, it is expansion at a level significant enough (1500 GWe) to have an effect on CO2 emissions. This would mean a fourfold increase from current reactor capacity. The MIT study used an underlying assumption that the developed countries would continue with a modest annual increase in per capita electricity use and the developing countries would move to the 4000 kWh per person per year benchmark if at all feasible (the 4000 kWh benchmark being the dividing line between developed and advanced countries). Electricity demand was then pegged to estimated population growth. Finally, it was assumed that nuclear energy would retain or increase its current share of electricity generation. The least-off developing countries were assumed in the MIT study not to have the wherewithal for nuclear energy. It should be noted that MIT’s 2050 projection was “an attempt to understand what the distribution of nuclear power deployment would be if robust growth were realized, perhaps driven by a broad commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and a concurrent resolution of the various challenges confronting nuclear power’s acceptance in various countries.” A few countries that the MIT High 2050 case included but are not included here are countries that currently have laws restricting nuclear energy, such as Austria. Implications for Uranium Enrichment A fourfold expansion of nuclear energy would entail significant new production requirements for uranium enrichment as shown in Figure 8 and possibly, reprocessing. The MIT study anticipated that 54 states would have reactor capacities that could possibly justify indigenous uranium enrichment. If a capability of 10 GWe is considered the threshold at which indigenous enrichment becomes cost-effective, more than 15 additional states could find it advantageous to engage in uranium enrichment. Figure 9 depicts what the geographic distribution of enrichment capacity might look like, based on the development of 10 GWe or more of reactor capacity. Of course, some states – such as Australia or Kazakhstan – might opt to enrich uranium regardless of domestic nuclear energy capacity, choosing to add value to their own uranium exports. In addition, states may choose to take the path of the UAE, which has formally renounced domestic enrichment and reprocessing in its domestic law, despite aspiring to reach 10 GWe of capacity. Ultimately, these decisions lie very much in the political realm, and can be reversed. Implications for Proliferation Proliferation experts generally fall into two camps – those that do not consider power reactors a cause for proliferation concern but focus on the sensitive aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle and those that are concerned about the entire fuel cycle. Advocates of nuclear energy point out that most states that have developed nuclear weapons have used dedicated production or research reactors rather than power reactors to produce their fissile material [13]; others point to the potential for a state to use peaceful nuclear power to further a clandestine weapons program, either through technology transfer, hiding clandestine activities within a peaceful nuclear fuel cycle or diverting lightly irradiated fuel to be further enriched. Regardless of one’s views on the proliferation risks of power reactors, the recent surge of enthusiasm for nuclear energy poses several proliferation risks. First, recent enthusiasm is not limited just to power reactors. On the enrichment side, President Bush’s 2004 initiative to limit capabilities to current technology holders failed, not just in strategy but also in tactics. For example, Argentina, Canada, and South Africa have all expressed an interest in keeping their enrichment options open. Brazil, which is commissioning a new centrifuge enrichment plant at Resende, will likely produce more low-enriched uranium than is needed for its own consumption by 2015. By and large, these countries do not produce nuclear energy on at scale large enough to make domestic enrichment capability economic. [14] However, they have keen national interests in maintaining their right to enrich. Faced with allied objections to restricting future options, the Bush Administration folded. This is partly the reason for the impasse at the NSG on further detailed criteria restricting enrichment and reprocessing. A perception of the U.S. approach as discriminatory could open the door to further challenges. Even if piecemeal efforts to limit the number of states with uranium-enrichment or spent fuel reprocessing capabilities succeed, these could ultimately further erode the NPT by extending the existence of haves and have-nots from nuclear weapons into the nuclear fuel cycle. In the short term, efforts to limit expansion could slow some states’ implementation of the safeguards-strengthening measures in the 1997 Model Additional Protocol. In the long term, other decisions to strengthen the NPT could be jeopardized. On the reprocessing end, the United States has recently embraced spent fuel reprocessing at home and abroad. From the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) to nuclear cooperation with India, Bush administration policies supported reprocessing. This is a complete reversal from the policies adopted in the mid-1970s not to encourage the use of plutonium in the civilian fuel cycle. A nuclear renaissance that embraces reprocessing as necessary to reduce spent fuel accumulation could result in more plutonium in transit, providing more potential targets for diversion. A renaissance that includes widespread installation of fast reactors would similarly increase targets for diversion. Although GNEP advocates stress that the kind of spent fuel “conditioning” they favor would not result in the separation of plutonium, there are few assurances thus far that new techniques are any more proliferation-resistant than PUREX. As opponents like to point out, no future fuel conditioning technique in the United States will be more proliferation resistant than storing spent fuel. And while most countries are probably interested in having someone else solve the problem either of spent fuel storage or high-level waste storage, no commercial reprocessing service currently will store high-level waste. Neither the United States, nor Russia, nor France has committed to taking back spent fuel under GNEP. A further question is whether the next generation of reactors will be more or less proliferation-resistant than existing reactors. As of December 2002, the Generation IV Forum had not yet adopted a standard methodology for evaluating proliferation resistance and physical protection for the six systems under consideration. In addition, there have been a few reports that India is considering exporting its Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors. India may not be the only state in a second tier of suppliers that might be interested in exporting reactors, injecting some uncertainty into assessments. Beyond the technical realm, there are very real political questions about widespread diffusion of civilian nuclear power. Would new nuclear states would raise proliferation concerns by virtue of their geographic location, the existence of terrorist groups on their soil, or other sources of political instability? Would expanded nuclear infrastructure in Egypt, Jordan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, Nigeria, Vietnam, and the GCC countries lead their neighbors to worry about and respond to the possibility that these countries will develop weapons programs? The expansion of nuclear power would also have practical consequences for the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Additional facilities will place additional safeguards requirements on IAEA inspectors It is unclear how the IAEA will meet these requirements – will these mean more inspection days or will other approaches be used under the “integrated safeguards” program? Although reactors themselves require relatively few inspection days, there will be significant work in helping prepare new nuclear states for nuclear power programs. Already, the IAEA has conducted workshops on infrastructure requirements, including energy needs and planning considerations; nuclear security and safeguards; physical infrastructure; current and future reactor technology; experience in developing nuclear programs; human resource requirements; and public perceptions. States must also develop their states systems of accounting and control. A nuclear expansion, in particular, that results in more states with bulk-handling facilities (enrichment and reprocessing) could place significant strain on the IAEA and the inspections system. Recent experience suggest that current methods of inspection cannot provide timely detection. The fact that the IAEA’s goals for timely detection are clearly longer than material conversion times – that is, the time it would take for a proliferator to produce finished metal shapes – is a big concern. The largest enrichment and reprocessing plants under safeguards now are under EURATOM safeguards; the IAEA’s role in verifying material balances in those plants is limited by the IAEA-EURATOM agreement. The only experience in safeguarding commercial-scale enrichment and reprocessing plants outside of EURATOM in a non-nuclear-weapon state is in Japan, where incidents with significant material losses have raised questions. British commercial reprocessing at the THORP facility also has produced recurring reports of significant materials losses. Perhaps the largest question about a nuclear expansion is whether or not planned technological developments will outpace nonproliferation initiatives, such as fuel supply assurances and multinational fuel-cycle centers, voluntary export guidelines, and further restrictions within the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Criticism of the U.S. GNEP program had been aimed in part at the aggressive timeline for technology demonstration of advanced reprocessing, in contrast to developments more closely tied to nonproliferation objectives, such as supporting more proliferation-resistant reactors with sealed fuel cores that would limit handling of fuel. Already, efforts to manage expansion of the front and back ends of the fuel cycle, whether nuclear fuel assurances, fuel banks, or fuel leasing projects, have abandoned any concepts of formal restraints in favor of incentives. It is too soon to tell how compelling those incentives will be. Finally, although there is disagreement among experts about the proliferation potential of light water reactors, it is clear that the proliferation potential of a country with no nuclear expertise is lower than that of a country with nuclear power and its associated infrastructure. The current encouraging climate for nuclear energy – new cooperation agreements between France and the UAE, Libya and Algeria, and between the United States and Turkey and Jordan, for a few – suggests that regardless of global climate change concerns, or whether or not a significant expansion occurs, some states in the Middle East will develop nuclear energy. It is not clear whether new nuclear reactors in the Middle East would result in new enrichment or reprocessing plants in the Middle East. In part, much depends on the outcome of negotiations with Iran on its enrichment capabilities. If states clearly renounce making nuclear fuel and allow sufficient wide- ranging inspections to verify such pledges, the proliferation implications could be significantly diminished. The hope is that this can be accomplished with the UAE.

#### Nuclear power is necessary to avoid four degrees warming

Comeau 3-12-20’13

[Steve, a database programmer and a member of Local Motion, a Burlington-based group that promotes people-powered transportation, “Comeau: Nuclear power can be tool in avoiding global warming”, http://vtdigger.org/2013/03/12/comeau-nuclear-power-can-be-tool-in-avoiding-global-warming/]

Nuclear power is used to generate electricity, primarily replacing the use of coal for that purpose. In the two years since the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear facility disaster hundreds of thousands of people worldwide have died from air pollution related to burning coal. According to the World Health Organization, “Urban outdoor air pollution is estimated to cause 1.3 million deaths worldwide per year.” Much of that pollution can be attributed to coal, which accounts for over 40 percent of electricity generated in the world. Burning coal produces massive amounts of waste products including fly ash, sulfur dioxide, mercury, and other heavy metals. Burning coal is bad for the environment and human health. But the biggest issue with burning coal is that it is the largest contributor of CO2 emissions, and therefore a huge contributor to human-caused global warming. To make progress on reducing CO2 emissions related to global warming, coal needs to stay in the ground. Of course there are many political and economic forces that make this close to impossible, but it can only be done if the electricity produced by coal is replaced. The replacements available for that purpose are natural gas, renewable energy, and nuclear power. These all have issues and risks, but are far cleaner and with fewer health consequences than coal. There are many interesting developments that will allow nuclear power to be safer, produce less waste, and even use up the existing nuclear waste. Bill Gates is promoting a company called TerraPower, developing the Traveling Wave Reactor. Environmentalist Stewart Brand, editor of the Whole Earth Catalog, supports nuclear power and the development of integral fast reactors that use uranium more efficiently and can use waste from other reactors. James Hansen, a leading climate scientist and now an activist, also supports third- and fourth-generation nuclear reactors as a way to avert climate change. The projections from a variety of sources depict that CO2 emissions will decline slowly in the United States and likely continue to increase around the world — so pretty much a “business-as-usual” scenario. A report by PricewaterhouseCoopers, “Too late for two degrees,” shows that in 2001 the world energy related emissions grew by 3 percent. China’s emissions grew by 9.4 percent, but emissions in the United States dropped by 1.9 percent, in part due to a mild winter. The most revealing and useful metric is the CO2 measurements taken at the Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii since 1959. Based on the trend of the CO2 measurements over the past 20 years, the atmospheric CO2 level — currently at 396 ppm (parts per million) — will reach 450 ppm in 2034. This is approximately the level of CO2 where the average global temperature will increase by 2 degrees (3.6 degrees F) over the pre-industrial level. Based on the latest climate change science, disruptive climate change is occurring now and will continue to occur with increased warming. That part is certain. What is uncertain is the intensity and timing of the transition to dangerous climate change, the threshold which is thought to be 2 degrees C of warming over the pre-industrial level. According to a report published in November 2012 by the World Bank, titled “Turn Down the Heat — Why a 4℃ Warmer World Must be Avoided,” if the current commitments and pledges for reducing emissions are not fully implemented, warming of 4 degrees C (7.2 degrees F) could occur as early as the 2060s. This level of warming will likely produce enormous environmental harm, as well as social and economic disruption. I encourage everyone to download and read this World Bank report. We need a greater understanding and appreciation of the magnitude of the projected harm that dangerous climate change can cause. People will adapt to climate change, but that adaptation will include migration and displacement that is orders of magnitude greater than that caused by the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear facility disaster. That adaptation will include the abandonment of large cities flooded by a rising sea and migration from regions parched by drought. The warming and CO2 levels will last for centuries and change the world ecosystems. To postpone or avert the greatest harm from climate change it is necessary to accept the risks and potential harm that come with nuclear power, renewable energy, and natural gas, because the alternative is so much worse. The environmentalist positions against the energy technologies that offer effective solutions for replacement of coal are not helpful. As stated in the World Bank report: “The projected 4℃ warming must not be allowed to occur — the heat must be turned down.”

### Contention Three: Case Outweighs

#### Irrational bodies are built into prolif discourse, where “soft paths” for racism solidify into policy and affirm larger “patterns” that sustain deprivation and abandonment of the developing world – plan rearranges the institutional source of binary, exposing both of the lay of the land and thus revolutionary potential

Gusterson, 2004 [Hugh, People of the Bomb, p 25-27]

The dominant discourse that stabilizes this system of nuclear apartheid in Western ideology is a specialized variant within a broader system of colonial and postcolonial discourse that takes as its essentialist premise a profound Otherness separating Third World from Western countries.17 This inscription of Third World (especially Asian and Middle Eastern) na­tions as ineradicably different from our own has, in a different context, been labeled "Orientalism" by Edward Said. Said argues that orientalist discourse constructs the world in terms of a series of binary oppositions that produce the Orient as the mirror image of the West: where "we" are rational and disciplined, "they" are impulsive and emotional; where "we" are modern and flexible, "they" are slaves to ancient passions and routines; where "we" are honest and compassionate, "they" are treacherous and uncultivated. While the blatantly racist orientalism of the high colonial period has softened, more subtle orientalist ideologies endure in contempo­rary politics. They can be found, as Akhil Gupta has argued, in discourses of economic development that represent Third World nations as child na­tions lagging behind Western nations in a uniform cycle of development or, as Catherine Lutz and Jane Collins suggest, in the imagery of popular magazines such as *National Geographic."* I want to suggest here that an­other variant of contemporary orientalist ideology is also to be found in U.S. national security discourse.Following Anthony Giddens in his *Central Problems in Social Theory*, I define ideology as a way of constructing political ideas, institutions, and behavior that (1) makes the political structures and institutions created by dominant social groups, classes, and nations appear to be naturally given and inescapable rather than socially constructed; (2) presents the interests of elites as if they were universally shared; (3) obscures the connections between different social and political antagonisms so as to inhibit massive, binary confrontations (i.e., revolutionary situations); and (4) legitimates domination. The Western discourse on nuclear proliferation is ideological in all four of these senses: (1) it makes the simultaneous ownership of nu­clear weapons by the major powers and the absence of nuclear weapons in Third World countries seem natural and reasonable while problematizing attempts by such countries as India, Pakistan, and Iraq to acquire these weapons; (2) it presents the security needs of the established nuclear pow­ers as if they were everybody's; (3) it effaces the continuity between Third World countries' nuclear deprivation and other systematic patterns of dep­rivation in the underdeveloped world in order to inhibit a massive north- south confrontation; and (4) it legitimates the nuclear monopoly of the recognized nuclear powers.In the following pages I examine four popular arguments against hori­zontal nuclear proliferation and suggest that all four are ideological and ori­entalist. The arguments are that (1) Third World countries are too poor to afford nuclear weapons; (2) deterrence will be unstable in the Third World; (3) Third World regimes lack the technical maturity to be trusted with nu­clear weapons; and (4) Third World regimes lack the political maturity to be trusted with nuclear weapons. Each of these four arguments could as easily be turned backward and used to delegitimate Western nuclear weapons, as I show in the following commentary. Sometimes, in the specialized literature of defense experts, one finds frank discussion of near accidents, weaknesses, and anomalies in deterrence as it has been practiced by the established nuclear powers, but these admissions tend to be quarantined in specialized discursive spaces where the general public has little access to them and where it is hard to connect them to the broader public discourse on nuclear proliferation." In this chapter I retrieve some of these discussions of flaws in deterrence from their quarantined spaces and juxtapose them with the dominant discourse on the dangers of proliferation in order to destabilize its foundational as­sumption of a secure binary distinction between "the West" and "the Third World." It is my argument that, in the production of this binary distinc­tion, possible fears and ambivalences about Western nuclear weapons are purged and recast as intolerable aspects of the Other. This purging and recasting occurs in a discourse characterized by gaps and silences in its representation of our own nuclear weapons and exaggerations in its repre­sentation of those of the Other. Our discourse on proliferation is a piece of ideological machinery that transforms anxiety-provoking ambiguities into secure dichotomies. I should clarify two points here. First, I am not arguing that there are, finally, no differences between countries in terms of their reliability as custo­dians of nuclear weapons. I am arguing that those differences are complex, ambiguous, and crosscutting in ways that are not captured by a simple bi­nary division between, on the one hand, a few countries that have nuclear weapons and insist they are safe and, on the other hand, those countries that do not have nuclear weapons and are told they cannot safely acquire them. It is my goal here to demonstrate the ways in which this simple binary distinction works as an ideological mechanism to impede a more nuanced and realistic assessment of the polymorphous dangers posed by nuclear weapons in all countries and to obscure recognition of the ways in which our own policies in the West have often exacerbated dangers in the Third World that, far from being simply the problems of the Other, are problems produced by a world system dominated by First World institu­tions and states.

#### Challenging the way elites defer to market-based solutions reveals the legal and social premises of hierarchies that sustain white privilege – the aff policy design resuscitates discussion of global warming policy that acknowledges whiteness as part of the problem

Mandell 2008 [Bekah, A.B., Vassar College; J.D., Boston College Law School; Director of the Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity Fair Housing Project, “Racial Reification and Global Warming: A Truly Inconvenient Truth,” Boston College Third World Law Journal Volume 28 | Issue 2 Article 3, 4-1-2008, <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1046&context=twlj> ]

Fear of eroding the hierarchies that define race explains why politicians and other elites have consistently championed ineffectual “market-based approaches” to global warming.36 By focusing public and private energy on relatively insignificant individual behavior changes, the ¶ Bush administration and other privileged elites are able to maintain the ¶ racial hierarchy that consolidates their economic and social power.37¶ Politicians know that “[w]ithout white-over-black the state withers ¶ away.”38 Therefore, they have a profound incentive to maintain the racial hierarchy. Unsurprisingly, “because th[ese elites] accrue social and ¶ economic benefits by maintaining the status quo, they inevitably do.”39¶ This white consensus to maintain the spatial and mobility hierarchies ¶ that reify race is possible because, “[w]hite privilege thrives in highly ¶ racialized societies that espouse racial equality, but in which whites will ¶ not tolerate being either inconvenienced in order to achieve racial ¶ equality . . . or being denied the full benefits of their whiteness . . . .”40¶ With so much white privilege to lose, it becomes clear why even most ¶ passionate environmental advocates are far more willing to call for, and ¶ make, small non-structural changes in their behavior to ameliorate global warming, but are unwilling to embrace significant or meaningful ¶ actions to address the crisis.41¶ Even as global warming is starting to become the subject of increasing media coverage and as more environmental groups call for ¶ action to halt the crisis, most activism is limited to changes that maintain the existing spatial, social, economic and legal framework that defines American society.42 Despite knowing for decades that we have ¶ been living unsustainable lifestyles, and “hav[ing] had some intuition ¶ that it was a binge and the earth couldn’t support it, . . . aside from the ¶ easy things (biodegradable detergent, slightly smaller cars) we didn’t ¶ do much. We didn’t turn our lives around to prevent it.”43¶ Greenhouse emissions reduction challenges have cropped up on ¶ websites across the country, encouraging Americans to change their ¶ light bulbs, inflate their tires to the proper tire pressure to ensure optimal gas mileage, switch to hybrid cars, run dishwashers only when full, ¶ telecommute, or buy more efficient washers and dryers.44 However, ¶ popular emissions challenge web sites are not suggesting that Americans give up their cars, move into smaller homes in more densely populated urban neighborhoods near public transportation, or take other ¶ substantive actions to mitigate the global climate crisis.45 Even Al Gore the most famous voice in the climate change movement, reminds his ¶ fellow Americans that “[l]ittle things matter . . . buy a hybrid if you can, ¶ buy a flex-fuel car if you can. Get a higher mileage car that’s comfortable for your needs.”46 “[M]any yuppie progressive ‘greens’ are the ones who drove their SUVs to environmental rallies and, even worse, ¶ made their homes at the far exurban fringe, requiring massive car dependence in their daily lives,” taking residential segregation and racial ¶ and spacial hierarchies to previously unimagined dimensions.47 This ¶ focus on maintaining one’s privileged lifestyle while making minimal ¶ changes reflects the power of the underlying structural impediments ¶ blocking a comprehensive response to global climate change in the ¶ United States.48¶ It is not just political inaction that prevents a meaningful response. ¶ Millions of Americans do not demand a change in environmental policy because, just as with political elites, it is against the interestsMARK of those ¶ enjoying white privilege to take genuine ~~steps~~ to combat climate ¶ change.49 Real climate action would ultimately require relinquishing ¶ the spatial, social, and economic markers that have created and protected whiteness and the privilege it confers.50 Although “we too often ¶ fail to appreciate how important race remains as a system for amassing ¶ and defending wealth and privilege,” the painfully slow reaction of the ¶ American public to the growing dangers of global warming highlights ¶ just how important racial privilege remains and how reluctant its beneficiaries are to give it up.51 Elite reformists make meaningful change ¶ even more remote as they push for behaviors to tweak, but not to ¶ change the existing social, economic, and legal hierarchy in the face of “problems, [like global warming] that arise to threaten the predominance of the traditionalist, capitalist ruling class.”52

## 2AC

### Demands on the State

#### Yes demands on the state are dumb – we don’t think it will happen – we have made an argument about why the state is doing something bad and defended our method in this debate

### Apoc

#### Understanding extinction risks is good – shouldn’t be excluded

Veldman 12 – doctoral candidate in the Religion and Nature program at the University of Florida (Robin Globus, “Narrating the Environmental Apocalypse”, Volume 17, Number 1, Spring 2012, Ethics & the Environment, online, MCR)

Environmental Apocalypticism and Activism¶ As we saw in the introduction, critics often argue that apocalyptic rhetoric induces feelings of hopelessness or fatalism. While it certainly does for some people, in this section I will present evidence that apocalypticism also often goes hand in hand with activism.¶ Some of the strongest evidence of a connection between environmental apocalypticism and activism comes from a national survey that examined whether Americans perceived climate change to be dangerous. As part of his analysis, Anthony Leiserowitz identified several “interpretive communities,” which had consistent demographic characteristics but varied in their levels of risk perception. The group who perceived the risk to be the greatest, which he labeled “alarmists,” described climate change [End Page 5] using apocalyptic language, such as “Bad…bad…bad…like after nuclear war…no vegetation,” “Heat waves, it’s gonna kill the world,” and “Death of the planet” (2005, 1440). Given such language, this would seem to be a reasonable way to operationalize environmental apocalypticism. If such apocalypticism encouraged fatalism, we would expect alarmists to be less likely to have engaged in environmental behavior compared to groups with moderate or low levels of concern. To the contrary, however, Leiserowitz found that alarmists “were significantly more likely to have taken personal action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” (ibid.) than respondents who perceived climate change to pose less of a threat. Interestingly, while one might expect such radical views to appeal only to a tiny minority, Leiserowitz found that a respectable eleven percent of Americans fell into this group (ibid).¶ Further supporting Leiserowitz’s findings, in a separate national survey conducted in 2008, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, and Leiserowitz found that a group they labeled “the Alarmed” (again, due to their high levels of concern about climate change) “are the segment most engaged in the issue of global warming. They are very convinced it is happening, human-caused, and a serious and urgent threat. The Alarmed are already making changes in their own lives and support an aggressive national response” (2009, 3, emphasis added). This group was far more likely than people with lower levels of concern over climate change to have engaged in consumer activism (by rewarding companies that support action to reduce global warming with their business, for example) or to have contacted elected officials to express their concern. Additionally, the authors found that “[w]hen asked which reason for action was most important to them personally, the Alarmed were most likely to select preventing the destruction of most life on the planet (31%)” (2009, 31)—a finding suggesting that for many in this group it is specifically the desire to avert catastrophe, rather than some other motivation, that encourages pro-environmental behavior. Taken together, these and other studies (cf. Semenza et al. 2008 and DerKarabetia, Stephenson, and Poggi 1996) provide important evidence that many of those who think environmental problems pose a severe threat practice some form of activism, rather than giving way to fatalistic resignation.

#### Specific policy actions must be taken – our method of challenging whiteness at both a level of policy and ideology is ciritical

Stepp, 11/5/2012 (Matthew, Contributor and Senior Policy Analyst of the D.C.-based think tank the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, “Climate Hawks and 'Reverse Tribalism': How Our Policy Choices Are Fueling Climate Inaction”, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewstepp/2012/11/05/climate-hawks-and-reverse-tribalism-how-are-policy-choices-are-fueling-climate-inaction/)

A self-aware and important discussion has emerged among climate advocates on ‘reverse tribalism’: the process by which some within the climate community scold climate hawks for making exaggerated claims about climate change and extreme weather (see Hurricane Sandy). As Grist writer Dave Roberts puts it, these ‘climate scolds’ believe they, “are saving the [climate hawk] activists from themselves,” by keeping them within the bounds of peer-reviewed science and not allowing their alarming message to be used against them to create climate denial and spurn policy action.¶ **But this process** of reverse tribalism **exists** in the first place **because climate advocates are supporting the wrong policy choices**. In other words, reverse tribalism isn’t a communications issue, it’s a policy issue and it’s at the heart of solving climate change.¶ On paper, making the connection between specific extreme weather events like Hurricane Sandy and climate change is seen as a communications strategy. It’s a way for climate hawks (and I consider myself one) to convey a visceral sense of what climate change means and even feels like. If Americans connect the images of flooded subways, long gas station lines, and washed away neighborhoods to human-driven climate change, then they’re more likely to support climate policy.¶ For communicators like Roberts, it’s the best way to get their point across. And I couldn’t agree more that climate change is an urgent, society-threatening problem that requires aggressive attention over many decades.¶ The problem is that making the extreme weather-climate change connection isn’t working, reverse tribalism or not. It didn’t work after Hurricane Katrina. Or after another year of historic droughts and wildfires. And it probably won’t work after Hurricane Sandy.¶ Sure, Sandy’s devastating impacts on New Jersey and New York are helping spark a long overdue discussion on climate change within the parameters of the Presidential election (if we count NYC Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s endorsement of President Obama on climate grounds as a national discussion), but this shows the limits of it as a communications strategy. Policy elites will discuss climate change, reporters will challenge politicos with climate questions, and cover stories will be written, but more likely than not anything actionable will come from it. I am not suggesting the discussion of climate change isn’t important, but don’t expect Hurricane Sandy to be the proverbial foot to the policymakers backside.¶ **Jarring images of extreme weather aren’t sparking action because ‘climate scolds’ are muddying the messaging.** No, as I wrote in Sunday’s Washington Post the images aren’t sparking action because the policy options most climate advocates and environmentalists are selling the public are bankrupt:¶ “Many environmentalists argue that the best way to address climate change is for Americans to change their lifestyles and make sacrifices for the good of the planet. Americans are told they must consume less, waste less and spend more to buy clean energy. While David Brooks’s “Bourgeois Bohemians” may be able to retrofit their homes with solar panels and drive Chevy Volts, most of us can’t.”¶ Shifting from using fossil fuels to clean energy isn’t an obvious or easy economic choice for most Americans. Clean energy technologies like wind, solar, nuclear, and electric vehicles are more expensive than carbon-intensive alternatives and suffer from limited performance and intermittency problems. As a result, the dominant climate policies emphasized by advocates and environmentalists are like selling nothing more than a bill of goods. Preferred government mandates like Clean Energy Standards or regulatory schemes like cap-and-trade will raise energy prices. In absence of mandates, significant tax-payer subsidies are required to spur even modest clean energy deployment. As I put it in the same piece in the Post, climate change policy has:¶ “…become a hair shirt that Americans are expected to wear for the ‘good of the planet.’ Middle America has long been told what not to do: not to buy incandescent light bulbs, drive gas-guzzling cars and trucks, or use dirty energy.”¶ If Americans were offered clean energy options that were affordable and better than gasoline, coal, and natural gas, much of the derision towards clean energy would go away. Only then would mandates accelerate the deployment of cheap, clean energy rather than force more expensive clean energy technologies on the market. Only then would long-term subsidies not be needed for the clean energy industry to simply survive. And the need to constantly harp on every extreme weather event as one more reason for Americans to sacrifice for the public good becomes less of an issue, as does reverse tribalism.¶ To remove these cost and technology performance barriers – and therefore the major barrier to mitigating climate change – climate advocates should be discussing how best to support clean energy innovation to develop cheaper, better clean energy options. It’s clear that we can’t put the deployment cart before the development horse without feeding the very derision that climate advocates hope to overcome by connecting extreme weather to climate change. It’s an endless positive feedback loop and a vicious one at that.¶ Many fellow climate hawks will respond by saying that I have it all wrong. We just need better messaging. The aforementioned ‘climate scolds’ need to back off the reverse tribalism. Or even more wonky, I shouldn’t bash deployment policies to elevate clean energy innovation – it’s not an either/or proposition. By which they really mean “clean energy R&D is okay, but what is really important is deploying the clean tech we have today.”¶ But the reality is that clean energy is not ready for prime time and all the deployment in the world won’t make it so. One hundred more lithium ion car battery factories won’t get us batteries that cost $100/kWh and have 5 times more storage capacity. Only R&D-based innovation will get us that. The same is true with other key clean energy technologies. Most climate advocates have it wrong by overwhelmingly emphasizing deployment.¶ What we need today – and what Americans would get behind as ‘climate policy’ – is an aggressive clean energy innovation strategy aimed at developing cheaper and better technology options. Smarter deployment policies may be needed down the road to scale better technologies, but they would come with less baggage than the blunt deployment policies used today. Climate advocates and environmentalists need to forget about messaging and start innovating.

### O/V

#### The effects of global warming outweigh the K because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The G’wychin in Alaska are losing their land and livelihoods by the melting of ice in the Arctic and the shifting of Caribou migratory patterns. Islands in the Pacific are literally being sucked up by the sea. Agriculture is suffering in countries without the privilege of complex irrigation systems. And worst of all, nobody gives a shit because we can just turn up the AC without thinking about the way that electricity produced or sustained. It is this complacency in the systems of energy production that makes our interrogation of the topic specifically important in challenging climate change and a form of privilege that THEY have failed to recognize in this debate space.

#### My affirmation of the topic engages in a process of inverse double consciousness- to recognize the construction of American society (and thus the self) from the position of the oppressed. This makes complicity in the machinery of whiteness explicit and lays the foundation for the recognition of the autonomy of others and works towards decolonizing the white mind and structures of racist oppression.

Martinot 2010

[Steve, Adjunct Professor San Francisco State University*,The Machinery of Whiteness: Studies in the Structure of Racialization*, Temple University Press, 2010, pg 185-186, modified for ableist language]

Perhaps, as an alternative to trying to construct an anti-racist whiteness, a first ~~step~~ toward decolonizing the United States, and the white mind, and ~~weakening~~ its cultural structures of racialization can be made by adopting an inverse form of DuBoisian double consciousness. DuBois theorized the notion of a double consciousness as the condition under which black people found themselves. For him, it meant always ~~seeing~~ oneself through the eyes of others. A black person was both excluded from being American by being black and striving to transcend the white-imposed mark of being black in order to be American. Each black person is judged in advance by those other ~~eyes~~, and always already rendered guilty in both the white ~~gaze~~ and one’s own interiorization of it. Yet one remains guilty of nothing more than having been ~~seen~~, of having been noticed because rendered noticeable by the other’s racialization of oneself. That is, a black person is noticed by whites because of something whites do to themselves, through which the black person is then ~~seen~~, and oppressed by being ~~seen~~ and socially categorized by the whites’ act of noticing. A reverse double consciousness for whites, as a ~~step~~ toward a decolonizing anti-racism, would be to ~~see~~ [recognize] themselves as they are ~~seen~~ [understood] by the oppressed, by those they racialize. The dominant tend to ~~see~~ [recognize] themselves as the norm, as simply human. Thus, a double consciousness would entail ~~seeing~~ [recognizing] themselves not as the norm but rather as the oppressors that they are in the eyes of those they oppress and racialize. It would be to see their hegemony, their dominance, their pretense to privilege through the eyes of those who suffer from it. This is not a question of guilt, but rather of ~~seeing~~ who one is, and who one is made to be, by one’s position, one’s role, and one’s complicity in the machinery of whiteness. Three things would happen. First, for a person to ~~see~~ [recognize] himself as he or she is ~~seen~~ [understood] by another would be to grant that other person a subjectivity, an autonomy of consciousness that is denied to that other by racism and white supremacy. One would have to ~~see~~ oneself as judged by that other, not as an individual but as a part of a social machine. Part of the purpose of the vilifi cation of the victims of racist violence is to de-authorize the racialized from rendering such judgments. Second, since white identity is based on the ability of whiteness to objectify those it racializes for itself, to ~~see~~ [recognize] oneself as ~~seen~~ [understood] by those racialized would dispel both the other’s objectifi cation by one’s white identity and one’s own ability to use them for white identity construction. One’s white identity, which depends on that objectifi cation, would unravel. And third, one would become an object (in one’s own mind) because one had become an object for those others. But one would become an object whose nature, in its capacity or potentiality to dominate, would be ~~seen~~ [understood] as other, as objectifi ed, by oneself. One could ~~see~~ [recognize] the dehumanization one had imposed on others in oneself. One could then ~~see~~ [recognize] the modes by which one dominates or oppresses simply by being white, because ~~seen~~ as such by those whom whites have racialized. It might be a place to start.

### 2AC

#### Our framework is that the aff and neg should defend competing methods – we’ve taken the position that the 1AC is a response to the Ideology of the status quo that requires we defend negative state action – any other framework is worse for debates.

#### Makes true offense impossible – shifts the debate to impact claims which allows one position to take the moral high ground by saying something like global warming is bad without a method to challenge that

#### Method is everything – Our Gusterson evidence says that ideologies are sustained by the policies that are implemented – the Mandel evidence says that these specific energy policies are the product of whiteness and we need to challenge those

### Perm

#### Perm do the plan and resist proximate violence – our methods are not incompatible – this is not to say we should coopt their method but that voting for the perm is to say both things have value

#### The Permutation is the most ethical option – the 1AC is consistent with their criticisms of the way that social norms imprison people in the status quo

#### We think there are a multiplicity of political actions and theories in place, we must be able to see the relays that can make our affirmative strategy the most successful

Connolly 1999 [William, prof of poli sci at john Hopkins, Assembling the Left *Boundary 2* 26.3 (1999) 47-54]

Fraser goes on to say that gay and lesbian issues conform best to the model of cultural politics, and class to that of distributive politics, [End Page 50] whereas race and gender fall in between as “bivalent” (19) modes. But I find her exploration of gender politics to be richer than her readings of the two types said to best fit her distinctions. What is for her a bivalence in gender that cuts across the analytical model is for me a condition that reveals the deficiency of the model. To Fraser, one line of correspondence is marked by “socioeconomic injustice,” “political-economic structure,” and “redistribution,” while the other is constituted by “representation, interpretation, and communication,” and “cultural or symbolic change.” But no politics anywhere seems to me to fit this division as she characterizes it. Such a division, first, understates the role that the politics of interpretation plays on the distributive side. Mobilization of energies for the reduction of income inequality, for instance, involves a whole series of changes in patterns of self-interpretation now deeply entrenched in the culture: the state as the primary site of ineptness and source of dislocations in the corporate economy; the market as a vehicle of rationality and freedom that must not be tampered with to promote redistribution; the primacy of individual responsibility for unemployment and welfare dependence; the displacement of Keynesianism by Friedmanite manipulation of the monetary system; and so on. To reduce economic inequality not only requires macropolitical action at the level of the state and interstate system; such macropolitical action requires extensive seeding and support by micropolitical engagements on a number of fronts. As one acknowledges how significantly cultural self-interpretation helps to constitute macro-institutional practices and priorities, one, first, restrains the tendency to place macropolitics on the side of distribution and micropolitics on the side of recognition, and, second, sets the stage to scramble further the analytical divide Fraser constructs between distribution and recognition. On the recognition side of Fraser’s scheme, the reduction of recognition to the symbolic underplays both the dense materiality of culture and its constitutive role in institutional life. Even to learn a language, for instance, is to inscribe its forms into the fine muscles of your jaw, mouth, lips, and tongue. The accents we display when we speak a second language convey this incorporation of culture into our organs of hearing and muscles of articulation. Fraser, it turns out, is not materialist enough for me. Moreover, a sensual orientation—orthodox or heterodox—is located not merely in a symbolic dimension but in complex relays between the symbolic and specific corporealizations of thought-imbued feelings of attraction, disgust, indifference, aversion, and identification. Not only “homosexuality” and “heterosexuality” but multiple differences in attraction to muscular or [End Page 51] slender types, blondes or brunettes, humorous or ironic individuals are incorporated. No ethnic, religious, sexual, or gender identity would *be* without a complex of corporeal orientations, even though none is reducible to a set of stereotyped gestures. But that means that a softening of relations between antagonistic constituencies of difference often involves complex work on the visceral register of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. That is why Foucauldian arts of the self and Deleuzian micropolitics are so pertinent to politics: Politics often involves work on the complex cultural relays between argument, images, intensities, and feelings. Deliberative democracy, as it were, is relevant but insufficient to materialization of an egalitarian ethos of pluralism. Finally, Fraser’s “pure” example of the politics of recognition—gay and lesbian politics—is intimately bound up with corporate, family, military, academic, and state institutions. To “recognize” same-sex marriage, for instance, would be to change innumerable laws, habits, and customs about who gets married, the terms of medical coverage, eligible life insurance beneficiaries, the types of affiliation exemplified in novels and films, street displays of affection, laws of inheritance, and so on. Any significant change in relations between constituencies involves a series of changes in institutional practice and corporeal orientation. So by the time Fraser is ready to unfold a middle position that “reconciles” the critical theory of Seyla Benhabib with the deconstructive perspective of Judith Butler, I have already jumped the ship of reconciliation. I see no reason for Butler to accept analytical distinctions inadvertently devaluing priorities that grip her profoundly. And while I feel confident that I would dissent from the metaphysics of Benhabib, I think she is wise to keep reflection alive on that register. For this is a persistent area of contestation within the Left. It seems unlikely to me, then, that Fraser, Butler, Benhabib, and I will ever achieve harmony. Nonetheless, while I oppose Fraser’s depreciation of micropolitics and arts of the self, while I find these modes to be very pertinent to a culture of pluralization and economic egalitarianization, I still imagine I would be aligned with some of Fraser’s macropolitical strategies of income distribution if we could get them on the radar screen of public engagement. It also seems likely to me that I will coalesce with Benhabib and Butler on numerous occasions as well. At some point in time, all four of us may join the same coalition, even though we will draw on different sources of ethics and strategic priorities in doing so. You might even glimpse a small, rhizomatic assemblage forming around these four nodal points, without a definitive center at which all the parties converge. [End Page 52] My conviction is that the materialization of a generous ethos of multidimensional pluralism—an ethos itself drawn from several ethical sources—also sets a key condition of possibility for the reduction of economic inequality.[4](http://muse.uq.edu.au/journals/boundary/v026/26.3connolly.html#NOTE4#NOTE4) And vice versa.[5](http://muse.uq.edu.au/journals/boundary/v026/26.3connolly.html#NOTE5#NOTE5) The potential for synergy on the Left, then, may reside in the production of multiple relays between constituencies who locate their priorities differently, more than in the formation of a single block in which members agree on what priorities all must adopt with respect to both. Indirect evidence for this thesis can be found on right-wing TV talk shows. Every time it appears possible to generalize medical care, increase welfare, or improve urban education, the Right campaigns against these changes by blaming the poor for their condition and by showing how homosexuals, AIDS victims, unwed mothers, drug addicts, or nihilists might benefit from the proposed policies. That strategy of division would not succeed if a generous ethos of pluralism were materialized. So the ethos sets a condition of possibility for a reduction of inequality in income and job security. I have no doubt that many on the democratic Left disagree with my convictions on this score. But it still seems probable that many of us can find specific occasions to band together across these differences. [End Page 53] The academic Left will continue to debate metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and strategic issues even as its participants, hopefully, soften the intensity of these debates and seek points of connection across them. A preliminary objective might be to outgrow the exclusionary politics that haunts journals and academic enclaves on the Left by letting go of the fantasy of defining a hegemonic position to which all true leftists must subscribe. The need today is, rather, construction of a series of alliances across multiple lines of difference in assumption, priority, ethical source, and modes of politics. As we establish relations of agonistic respect across differences, we can also hope to strengthen our hand in the academy and improve communications with sympathetic parties in the media, churches, street movements, and labor groups.

#### The analysis of state action is critical – we don’t defend the state but we do think that ideological challenges should include a challenge to policy in order to be effective

Ashley W. Doane 3 Associate Dean for Academic Administration and Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Hartford and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva is Associate Professor of Sociology at Texas A and M University, White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism, 2003, p. 36-37

A crucial initial step toward reviving the term, then, would be establishing the simple sociological and political truth – not exactly unknown to the Western sociopolitical tradition – that power relations can survive the formal dismantling of their more overt supports. Even for postapartheid South Africa, where whites are a minority, it should be obvious that their strategic economic and bureaucratic power will continue to give them differential power. For the United States, where racialized and vastly disproportionate concentrations of wealth, cultural hegemony, and bureaucratic control are of course reinforced by white political majoritarianism, the case should – were it not for ideological ~~blinders~~ – be much easier to make. So the argument would be that American white supremacy has not vanished but has changed from a de jure to de facto form. The merely formal rejection of white-supremacist principles will not suffice to transform the United States into a genuinely racially egalitarian society, since the actual social values and enduring politico-economic structures will continue to reflect the history of white domination (Crenshaw 1988:1336). White supremacy thus needs to be conceptualized in terms broader than the narrowly juridical. Frances Lee Ansley suggests the following definition: “a political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings” (1989:1024n). Through white-black racial domination has clearly been central to this system, a comprehensive perspective on American white supremacy would really require attention to, and a comparative analysis of, white relations with other peoples of color also: Native Americans, Mexican Americans, and Asian-Americans (Takaki 1990 [1979]; Okihiro 1994; Almaguer 1994; Foley 1997).

#### Policies are the markers of ideology in the status quo – attacking whiteness at that level is critical

Mutimer 2k - Ph.D., Political Science, York University

[David, “The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security”, p 93-95]

 The U.S. military appears to have been central in the construction of a new category of threat, the rogue state governed by an outlaw regime. The timing of that construction was unfortunate for Iraq. As has been widely reported, U.S. Ambassador to Iraq April Glaspie met the Iraqi leadership a few days before the invasion of Kuwait. The message of that meeting seems to have been that the United States was not overly concerned with Iraq's border dispute with Kuwait. Even if the meeting could not be read as a tacit approval of the invasion (and it is not impossible to read it that way), it did not indicate the sort of response the United States mounted after 2 August." The problem is that the Rogue Doctrine was a construction of the military and had not yet been formally announced. It is reasonable to assume that a diplomat in a relatively minor posting would not be aware of the reworking of U.S. military doctrine the president was about to announce. There is, of course, a much more cynical interpretation of these events, which would argue that the United States sought a convenient illustration of its newfound enemy. Either way, in July 1990 there were no rogue states because the category had not been articulated. In July 1990, as Glaspie met Hussein, Iraq was a regional power that had been employed by both superpowers during the Cold War and that had a not unreasonable grievance with one of its neighbors. On 2 August President Bush announced a new category, a new set of markers by which the identity of states could be interpreted. On 2 August Iraq acted in a fashion that fit this contemporaneously articulated set of markers. Other Iraqs, rogues, and outlaws are now the currency of the international discourse of proliferation that grew out of the Western response to the Gulf War. These are the labels, drawn from the debate in the United States, applied to states whose behavior causes serious concern to the Western powers in their supplier groups. What sort of labels are they? What lines of difference do these labels establish? To answer these questions, we can look at rogues and outlaws as metaphors that link the proliferation image to other, more widespread discourses and discover the entailments they draw from these discourses. Rogues and outlaws are used similarly in everyday language. A rogue is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as: "\. One belonging to a class of idle vagrants or vagabonds. ... 2. A dishonest, unprincipled person; a rascal. ... 5. An elephant driven away, or living apart from, the herd and of a savage or destructive disposition." Similarly, an outlaw is "one put outside the law and deprived of its benefits and protection .... More vaguely: One banished or proscribed; an exile, a fugitive." Both rogues and outlaws are used in everyday language to identify criminals, although generally not the worst and most hardened criminals. Indeed, a certain romanticism is attached to both the rogue and the outlaw. The rogue is one who steps outside the limits of acceptable behavior but in a way that tends to be appealing to those who do not dare to commit such transgressions-thus, for example, the definition of rogue as rascal. Similarly, the outlaw is a common figure in U.S. romantic Western literature. Outlaws roamed the frontiers of the central United States, at once dangerous and admired for the rugged individualism they portrayed. Little of this romanticism seems to remain in the use of rogues in official discourse, however. U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher did not seem to admire the rugged individualism of potential rogues, for instance, when he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "nuclear weapons give rogue states disproportionate power, destabilize entire regions, and threaten human and environmental disasters. They can turn local conflicts into serious threats to our security. In this era, weapons of mass destruction are more readily available-and there are fewer inhibitions on their use."39 Nevertheless, the use of rogue carries with it marked condescension. Rogues are, as often as not, young men, indeed even little boys, who are acting naughtily-in the former case often in a sexual manner. One of the many ironies that emerge in stories of proliferation is that at the same time the primary international rogue, Iraq, was under intense U.S. pressure because of its refusal to allow UNSCOM unfettered access to its presidential palaces, the U.S. president was being labeled a rogue for reports that he had perhaps allowed too much access to presidential parts. "Some of the President's intimates note his remarkable ability to compartmentalize his life: The policy wonk who genuinely admires his wife resides in onc space; the rogue who risks political standing through personal indiscretion occupies another."4o Put another way, the mature adult resides on the one side and the rather indiscreet little boy on the other. The use of rogue to label states behaving in ways deemed unacceptable identifies those states as immature compared with the mature states doing the labeling-foremost among these the United States. Such an entailment fits well with the practices established for proliferation control. The mature elders gather together to determine which states are sufficiently responsible to be trusted with advanced technologies and military equipment-indeed, the practice smacks of Star Trek's Prime Directive. This notion of maturity is then reflected in academic commentary on contemporary security, as Charles Krauthammer's characterization of the weapon state threat illustrates: "relatively small, peripheral and backward states will be able to emerge rapidly as threats not only to regional, but to world, security."41 Similarly, a repeated concern in the literature has been that new nuclear states would lack the maturity to control their weapons adequately, unlike the old nuclear states.42 Perhaps the most interesting definition of rogue and outlaw is the one they share: both terms are used to describe members of a community expelled from that community or no longer living within the constraints of communal life. In medieval Europe the outlaw was outcast, placed beyond Entailing Self and Other 95 the protection the law provided as punishment. Later, the outlaw in the mythology of the American West fled from life within the community to escape the (often rough) justice of the frontier. Similarly, the rogue animal is one that has been forced from the herd or that for some reason has left the herd, Evoking these terms in the proliferation discourse clearly marks the logic of identity and difference, of inside and outside, which were evident in the practices examined earlier. For there to be rogues and outlaws there must also be a larger, settled community whose rules the outlaws refuse to follow. It would seem that the U.S. military's concern with defending its budget following the Cold War threw up a powerful new marker of identity/difference for the contemporary practice of international security. The idea of the rogue state has achieved wide currency in popular discussion of international affairs. Klare cites a U.S. Congress study to the effect that in major newspapers and journals, the use of rogue nation, rogue state, and rogue regime increased more than 1,500 percent between 1990 and 1993.43 The label originally devised to categorize potential military opponents was quickly drawn into the construction of the new proliferation control agenda following the Gulf War, as Iraq was identified as the first of the rogues. The notion of the rogue state provides agency in an image of an international security problem largely devoid of agency. The term is used to label states whose behavior causes serious concern to the members of the supplier group, identifying them as outsiders, immature states unable or unwilling to follow the rules of civilized state action rules policed by that same core of supplier states.

#### Permutation is best – the world is interconnected but we don’t have to forgo local identification

Nussbaum 94 [Professor of Law and Ethics at University of Chicago Law School (Martha, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” The Boston Review,  www.soci.niu.edu/~phildept/Kapitan /nussbaum1.html]

The Stoics stress that to be a citizen of the world one does not need to give up local identifications, which can frequently be a source of great richness in life. They suggest that we think of ourselves not as devoid of local affiliations, but as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. The first one is drawn around the self; the next takes in one's immediate family; then follows the extended family; then, in order, one's neighbors or local group, one's fellow city-dwellers, one's fellow countrymen -- and we can easily add to this list groupings based on ethnic, linguistic, historical, professional, gender and sexual identities. Outside all these circles is the largest one, that of humanity as a whole. Our task as citizens of the world will be to "draw the circles somehow toward the center" (Stoic philosopher Hierocles, 1st 2nd CE), making all human beings more like our fellow city dwellers, and so on. In other words, we need not give up our special affections and identifications, whether ethnic or gender-based or religious. We need not think of them as superficial, and we may think of our identity as in part constituted by them. We may and should devote special attention to them in education. But we should work to make all human beings part of our community of dialogue and concern, base our political deliberations on that interlocking commonality, and give the circle that defines our humanity a special attention and respect.

### Violence

#### I don’t think the 1AC glosses over anything – the 1AC is a counter story about the status quo – the way that proliferation threats are policed by white norms created by the US is wrong and instead the story should be one of environmental problems

### Prison Mentality

#### I don’t think this link argument makes much sense in the context of the 1AC – we have said that the norms created by the US are racist and perpetuate global warming – yes anthropocentrism is a problem at the root of global warming – another norm the 1AC challenges – that we should focus on threats that are “human” whilst ignoring the ways in which

### Interconnectedness

#### And understanding the interconnectedness of environmental problems is necessary – yes locally people are affected differently by different norms but we must focus on those connections

Held 98 (David, Professor of Politics and Sociology – Open U., “Democracy and Globalization”, Re-Imagining Political Community, Ed. Archibugi, p. 19-20)

Contemporary environmental problems are perhaps the clearest and starkest examples of the global shift in human organization and activity, creating some of the most fundamental pressures on the efficacy of the nation-state and state-centric politics. There are three types of problems at issue. First, there are shared problems involving the global commons, that is, fundamental elements of our ecosystem. The clearest examples of the environmental commons are the atmosphere, the climate system and the oceans and seas. And among the most fundamental challenges here are global warming and ozone depletion. A second category of global environmental problems involves the interlinked challenges of demographic expansion and resource consumption. An example of the profoundest importance under this category is desertification. Other examples include questions of biodiversity and challenges to the very existence of certain species. A third category of problems is transboundary pollution of various kinds, such as acid rain or river pollutants. More dramatic examples arise from the siting and operation of nuclear power plants, for instance, Chernobyl. In response to the progressive development of, and publicity surrounding, environmental problems, there has been an interlinked process of cultural and political globalization as illustrated by the emergence of new cultural, scientific and intellectual networks; new environmental movements with transnational organizations and transnational concerns; and new institutions and conventions like those agreed in 1992 at the Earth Summit in Brazil. Not all environmental problems are, of course, global. Such an implication would be quite false. But there has been a striking shift in the physical and environmental circumstances - that is, in the extent and intensity of environmental problems - affecting human affairs in general. These processes have moved politics dramatically away from an activity which crystallizes simply around state and interstate concerns.It is clearer than ever that the political fortunes of communities and peoples can no longer be understood in exclusively national or territorial terms.

#### Privileging lived experience fails

Boor Tonn 2005 – Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland (Mari Boor Tonn, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public” Rhetoric& Public Affairs Vol. 8, No. 3)

Third, whereas in social and therapeutic talk, personal experience, opinion, and individual well-being reign supreme, the force of "opinion" in a democracy demands allegiance both to reasonableness and to the larger collective good. Unlike certain postmodern dialogic therapists, responsible public deliberators view neither facts as inescapably elusive nor appeals to the rational uniformly suspect. Rather, democratic arguers apply rigorous standards for evidence and, above all, writes Schudson, subscribe to "norms of reasonableness." 36 A key groupthink feature-uncritical, self-righteous faith in the group's inherent morality and traditions-is nourished by privileging lived experiences and personal opinions, the primary content of social and therapeutic talk. As Donal Carbaugh points out, because the "self" becomes the "locus of conversational life," conversationalists may "disprefer consensual truths, or standards of and for public judgment," which they view to "unduly constrain 'self.'"37 Such an egocentric focus can enable members of deliberative bodies to discount crucial, formal types of external evidence that counters existing personal and group assumptions, resulting in what Lisa M. Gring- Pemble characterizes as forming public policies such as welfare reform "by anecdote."38 Fourth, a communicative model that views public issues through a relational, personal, or therapeutic lens nourishes hegemony by inviting political inaction. Whereas the objective of conventional public argument is achieving an instrumental goal such as a verdict or legislation, the aim of social conversation generally stops with self-expression. As Schudson puts it, "Conversation has no end outside itself."39 Similarly, modeling therapeutic paradigms that trumpet "talking cures" can discourage a search for political solutions to public problems by casting cathartic talk as sufficient remedy. As Campbell's analysis of consciousness-raising groups in the women's liberation movement points out, "[S]olutions must be structural, not merely personal, and analysis must move beyond personal experience and feeling . . . Unless such transcendence occurs, there is no persuasive campaign . . . [but] only the very limited realm of therapeutic, small group interaction."40

#### Reliance on personal experience fractures coalitions

Kruks 1995 [SONIA Hypata vol. 10, no. 2 (Spring 1995) Identity Politics and Dialectical]

As a political critique of global-difference feminism, identity politics is indubitably valid. Since women are never women rout court, hut are always situated also as members of a class, a race, an ethnic grouping, a sexual orientation, an age grade, and so on, it is dangerous to assume that the inequities and power relations that pertain to those other dimensions of social situation will not play our also between women. However, in its attempts to refute falsely universalizing knowledge claims, identity politics sometimes tends to replicate those aspects of global-difference feminism which have stressed the radical incommunicability of women’s experience to men. Identity politics tends toward an excessive particularization and partitioning of knowledge, but now along the lines of race or ethnicity, for example, as well as gender. For such experience-based accounts of knowledge imply an epistemology of provenance: that is, the claim that knowledge arises from an experiential basis that is fundamentally group-specific and that others, who are outside the group and who lack its immediate experiences, cannot share that knowledge. As a corollary it is generally claimed that outsiders have no basis from which they can legitimately evaluate the group’s claims about its knowledge, or those political or moral positions that it takes on the basis of that knowledge. In short, only those who live a particular reality can know about it; and only they have the right to speak about it. § Marked 14:36 § Many groups that practice identity politics also advocate a politics of alliance or coalition with other groups, invoking the ideal of “bridging” differences once they are recognized and respected.5 Commitments to coalition-work, to alliance, to solidarity across groups are, I believe, vital for any effective progressive politics in this day and age. However, the implications of an epistemology of provenance, if consistently pursued, threaten to undercut coalition politics or other forms of solidarity among women. The unintended end-point of an epistemology of provenance can be an acute and politically debilitating subjectivism, which belies the possibility of communication and common action across differences. It is this apparent contradiction within identity politics (and other forms of multiple-difference feminism) that concerns me in this essay.

## 1AR

### Criticism

#### Our act of criticism allows us to transcend old politics – we have to be deconstruct power relations to open up new understandings of state relations

Phillip **Darby** Department of Political Science at the University of Melbourne July 22, **2010**

Pursuing the Political: A Postcolonial Rethinking of Relations International

Positioning the two systems in relation to each other also enables us better to see, shades of empire,15 that the public face of the world order at the approach of the millennium was relatively benign. That is to say, inducement loomed larger than force. The new international had transcended the old politics. States had less visibility. Enemies were being replaced by problems. In time, the South would join the North. Such notions floated more easily on the surface of public consciousness because the processes of sanctions and reward which link different peoples and regions appeared much less sharply defined than before. The exercise of power, it was widely observed, had become diffuse, opaque, spectral, illegible.16 The old ways of reading how domination is secured seemed less persuasive; the points of vulnerability more obscure. Clearly there had been transformations, most evidently those relating to speed and mobility, but there were also important continuities which should not be overlooked. It was Adam Smith after all who wrote about the invisible hand of capitalism, and there is now a large literature on the significance of colonial subjectivity and its construction through textual and other representations. What this underlines, it seems to me, is the strategic role to be played by discursive criticism in revealing the power relations embedded in knowledge and discourse. This cannot be done solely by interrogating international doctrines and practices; such work must be partnered by research into the ways our construction of what is local or domestic shield from view the processes through which the international comes to reside within societies. The most powerful lock on opening-up these processes is deeply ingrained understandings of the space of the nation.

#### We must analyze both the personal and systematic processes of domination and oppression – this academic inquiry resists the hegemonic structures of whiteness

Gustavo E. Fischman, He actively collaborates on projects in the United States, Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico, and he is the author of several books and numerous articles on critical pedagogies, teacher education, and gender issues in education. 2005

[http://amadlandawonye.wikispaces.com/2005,+McLaren+and+Fischman,+Gramsci,+Freire,+Organic+Intellectuals](http://amadlandawonye.wikispaces.com/2005%2C%2BMcLaren%2Band%2BFischman%2C%2BGramsci%2C%2BFreire%2C%2BOrganic%2BIntellectuals) “McClaren and Fischman, Gramsci, Freire, Organic Intellectuals” accessed 10/6/2008

We wish to expand on the role of the organic intellectual by suggesting that the resisting, hegemonized, and fragmented subaltern needs to function not as a critically superconscious “organic intellectual” but as a committed one (Fischman, 1998). The committed intellectual is sometimes critically self conscious and actively engaged but at other times is confused or even unaware of his or her limitations or capacities to be an active proponent of social change. Or as Paulo Freire (1989) has noted, “conscientization is not exactly the starting point of commitment. Conscientization is more of a product of commitment. I do not have to be already critically self-conscious in order to struggle. By struggling I become conscious/aware” (p. 46). Critical consciousness always implies that the subject has some awareness of the immediate world that concerns him or her. As Freire (1989) came to recognize, a deep understanding of the complex processes of oppression and domination is not enough to guarantee personal or collective praxis. What must serve as the genesis of such an understanding is an unwavering commitment to the struggle against injustice. Only by developing an understanding that is born of a commitment to social justice can such an understanding lead to the type of conscientization necessary to challenge the hegemonic structures of domination and exploitation. The globalization of capital can be challenged and even defeated not simply by understanding its formation and dissembling operations but also by developing the will and the courage—the commitment—to struggle against it.