## 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).

### Plan – wake

#### The United States federal government should increase statutory restrictions on the War Powers authority of the President by requiring congressional approval before entering 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.”

#### Other sources fail

Cohen, 2012

[Armond, Executive Director, Clean Air Task Force, 2-13, “Decarbonization: The Nuclear Option,” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/is-america-poised-for-nuclear.php?print=true&printcomment=2161670]

Just on its face, this is a tall order. The capital investment is jaw-dropping, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to site new energy projects, regardless of whether they are solar or wind farms, transmission lines, CCS infrastructure, shale gas drilling, or nuclear facilities. More subtly, integrating these various energy sources—especially balancing output of intermittent renewables in an electric grid with no significant ability to store energy—is a major challenge; it is far from certain it can even be done at very large scale. To maximize our odds of meeting the target, we will need to prioritize development and deployment of technologies that appear capable of growing economically to full scale.Cheap unscrubbed natural gas is a “McSolution” to the problem—tempting, but probably not the healthiest long-term choice. In order to make a major contribution to climate abatement, methane emissions from natural gas production and distribution will need to be reduced, and gas-fired power plants will need to use CCS technologies. And, although gas in the United States today is sold at prices below production costs, that cannot continue for long, especially in increasingly international markets. Similarly**,** “soft energy paths” like PV power (also sometimes today sold below cost) will need significant grid support and zero-carbon balancing to generate meaningful emission reductions. The economic supply curve for large, attractive sites for these projects is bound to bend sharply upwards over time as well. In this context, nuclear power has potentially significant advantages to offer: It is demonstrably low-carbon; it provides baseload energy; unlike wind and solar, it has high power density; and, although gas is cheap today, the price of new nuclear power appears to approach that of new coal. Perhaps more importantly, the price of new nuclear plants will decline as years pass. Standardization will lead to some cost reductions; factory assembly of small, modular units could bring about further step-change reductions (as it has for automobiles and airplanes) in production costs. None of this means that nuclear is poised for a renaissance in the United States. Utilities and their regulators won’t argue with $3 gas, Congress is unwilling to put a price on carbon, and some people remain vehemently opposed to nuclear energy. Ultimately, however, nuclear energy isprobably an indispensible element of any credible plan to substantially decarbonize the country. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s recent approval of the new Westinghouse reactor design is good news in this regard, as it should help revitalize the American nuclear industry and keep it moving on a path of continuous improvement. In the longer term, a host of newer technologies, including passively cooled small reactors, gas-cooled reactors, and reactors with liquid fuels offer significant potential for further improvements in cost and safety. The country would do well to support continued development and deployment of these designs. In an ideal world, we might wait to scale up nuclear power until after we’ve exhausted all efficiency and renewables options. Unfortunately, however, we don’t have decades to do this, even if we thought traditional green sources would eventually fill the zero-carbon void, which seems unrealistic. Half of the CO2 emitted today will still be warming the planet 1,000 years from now, and these legacy emissions won’t erase themselves. We need to develop all low-carbon energy options now to hedge against the risk of serious climate consequences; nuclear power, despite its genuine challenges, cannot be left off the table.

### Contention Three: Case Outweighs

#### No great power war – organizations, alliances, diplomacy

Robb 12—Lieutenant, US Navy (Doug, Why the Age of Great Power War is Over, [www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-05/now-hear-why-age-great-power-war-over](http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-05/now-hear-why-age-great-power-war-over), CMR)

Whereas in years past, when nations allied with their neighbors in ephemeral bonds of convenience, today’s global politics are tempered by permanent international organizations, regional military alliances, and formal economic partnerships. Thanks in large part to the prevalence of liberal democracies, these groups are able to moderate international disputes and provide forums for nations to air grievances, assuage security concerns, and negotiate settlements—thereby making war a distant (and distasteful) option. As a result, China (and any other global power) has much to lose by flouting international opinion, as evidenced by its advocacy of the recent Syrian uprising, which has drawn widespread condemnation.¶ In addition to geopolitical and diplomacy issues, globalization continues to transform the world. This interdependence has blurred the lines between economic security and physical security. Increasingly, great-power interests demand cooperation rather than conflict. To that end, maritime nations such as the United States and China desire open sea lines of communication and protected trade routes, a common security challenge that could bring these powers together, rather than drive them apart (witness China’s response to the issue of piracy in its backyard). Facing these security tasks cooperatively is both mutually advantageous and common sense.¶ Democratic Peace Theory—championed by Thomas Paine and international relations theorists such as New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman—presumes that great-power war will likely occur between a democratic and non-democratic state. However, as information flows freely and people find outlets for and access to new ideas, authoritarian leaders will find it harder to cultivate popular support for total war—an argument advanced by philosopher Immanuel Kant in his 1795 essay “Perpetual Peace.”¶ Consider, for example, China’s unceasing attempts to control Internet access. The 2011 Arab Spring demonstrated that organized opposition to unpopular despotic rule has begun to reshape the political order, a change galvanized largely by social media. Moreover, few would argue that China today is not socially more liberal, economically more capitalistic, and governmentally more inclusive than during Mao Tse-tung’s regime. As these trends continue, nations will find large-scale conflict increasingly disagreeable.¶ In terms of the military, ongoing fiscal constraints and socio-economic problems likely will marginalize defense issues. All the more reason why great powers will find it mutually beneficial to work together to find solutions to common security problems, such as countering drug smuggling, piracy, climate change, human trafficking, and terrorism—missions that Admiral Robert F. Willard, former Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, called “deterrence and reassurance.”¶ As the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a formidable deterrent against unlimited war. They make conflict irrational; in other words, the concept of mutually assured destruction—however unpalatable—actually had a stabilizing effect on both national behaviors and nuclear policies for decades. These tools thus render great-power war infinitely less likely by guaranteeing catastrophic results for both sides. As Bob Dylan warned, “When you ain’t got nothing, you ain’t got nothing to lose.”¶ Great-power war is not an end in itself, but rather a way for nations to achieve their strategic aims. In the current security environment, such a war is equal parts costly, counterproductive, archaic, and improbable.

#### No nuclear war – deterrence

Tepperman 2009 [Deputy Editor at Newsweek. Frmr Deputy Managing Editor, Foreign Affairs. LLM, i-law, NYU. MA, jurisprudence, Oxford. (Jonathan, Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb, <http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome_files/nukes_Final.pdf>, CMR]

The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there’s never been a nuclear, or even a nonnuclear, war between two states that possess them. Just stop for a second and think about that: it’s hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading “nuclear optimist” and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, “We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It’s striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.” To understand why—and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way—you need to start by recognizing that **all states are rational** on some basic level. **Their leaders** may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they **tend to do things** only when **they’re** pretty **sure they can get away with** them. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it’s almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn’t think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side—and millions of innocents pay the price. Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button— and everybody knows it—the basic math shifts. Even the craziesttin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, “Why fight if you can’t win and might lose everything?” Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling, it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world’s major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight **proxy wars**, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these **never matched** the furious destruction of full-on, **great-power war** (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there’s very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring—because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both **countries** soon **stepped back** from the brink **when they recognized** that **a war would** have **mean**t curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, “It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time.” The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: **nuclear** armed **enemies** slide toward war, then **pull back**, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn’t do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other’s vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials’ thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### Nuclear war doesn’t cause extinction

Socol 2011Yehoshua (Ph.D.), an inter-disciplinary physicist, is an expert in electro-optics, high-energy physics and applications, and material science and Moshe Yanovskiy, Jan 2, “Nuclear Proliferation and Democracy”, http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/01/nuclear\_proliferation\_and\_demo.html, CMR

Nuclear proliferation should no longer be treated as an unthinkable nightmare; it is likely to be the future reality. Nuclear weapons have been acquired not only by an extremely poor per capita but large country such as India, but also by even poorer and medium-sized nations such as Pakistan and North Korea. One could also mention South Africa, which successfully acquired a nuclear arsenal despite economic sanctions (the likes of which have not yet been imposed on Iran). It is widely believed that sanctions and rhetoric will not prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and that many countries, in the Middle East and beyond, will act accordingly (see, e.g., recent Heritage report). Nuclear Warfare -- Myths And Facts The direct **consequences of** the limited **use of** **nuclear weapons** -- especially low-yield devices most likely to be in the hands of non-state actors or irresponsible governments -- **would** probably **not be great** enough to bring about significant geopolitical upheavals. Casualties from a single 20-KT nuclear device **are** estimated [1] at about 25,000 fatalities with a similar number of injured, assuming a rather unfortunate scenario (the center of a large city, with minimal warning). Scaling the above toll to larger devices or to a larger number of devices is less than linear. For example, it has been estimated that it would take as many as eighty devices of 20-KT yield each to cause 300,000 civilian fatalities in German cities (a result actually achieved by Allied area attacks, or carpet-bombings, during the Second World War). A single 1-MT device used against Detroit has been estimated by U.S. Congress OTA to result in about 220,000 fatalities. It is anticipated that well-prepared **civil defense measures**, based on rather simple presently known techniques, would **decrease** these **numbers by** maybe **an order of magnitude** (as will be discussed later). There is little doubt that **a nation determined to survive** and with a strong sense of its own destiny **would not succumb to** such **losses**. It is often argued that the **fallout** effects of even the limited use of nuclear weapons would be worldwide and would last for generations. This **is** an exaggeration. The following facts speak for themselves. -- **In Japan**, as assessed by REFR, **less than 1,000** excess **cancer cases** (i.e., above the natural occurrence) **were recorded in** over **100,000 survivors** over the past sixty years -- compared with about 110,000 immediate fatalities in the two atomic bombings. No clinical or even sub-clinical effects were discovered in the survivors' offspring. -- In the Chernobyl area, as assessed by IAEA, only fifteen cancer deaths can be directly attributed to fallout radiation. No radiation-related increase in congenital formations was recorded. Nuclear Conflict -- Possible Scenarios With reference to a possible regional nuclear conflict between a rogue state and a democratic one, the no-winner (mutual assured destruction) scenario is probably false. An analysis by Anthony Cordesman, et al. regarding a possible Israel-Iran nuclear conflict estimated that while Israel might survive an Iranian nuclear blow, Iran would certainly not survive as an organized society. Even though the projected casualties cited in that study seem to us overstated, especially as regards Israel, the conclusion rings true. **Due to the** extreme high **intensity** ("above-conventional") of **nuclear conflict**, it is nearly certain that such a war, no matter its outcome, would not lastfor years**,** as we have become accustomed to in current low-intensity conflicts. Rather, we should **anticipate** a new geo-political reality: the emergence of clear **winners** and losers within several days, or at most weeks after the initial outbreak of hostilities. This latter reality will most probably contain fewer nuclear-possessing states than the former.

**No nuke winter – studies**

Seitz 2011 (Russell, Harvard University Center for International Affairs visiting scholar, “Nuclear winter was and is debatable,” Nature, 7-7-11, Vol 475, pg37, accessed 9-27-11, CMR)

Alan Robock's contention that there has been no real scientific debate about the 'nuclear winter' concept is itself debatable (Nature 473, 275–276; 2011). This **potential climate disaster**, popularized in Science in 1983, **rested on** the output of **a one-dimensional model that** was later shown to **overestimate** the smoke a nuclear holocaust might engender. More refined estimates, combined with advanced three-dimensional models (see http://go.nature.com.libproxy.utdallas.edu/kss8te), have dramatically reduced the extent and severity of the projected cooling. Despite this, Carl Sagan, who co-authored the 1983 Science paper, went so far as to posit “the extinction of Homo sapiens” (C. Sagan Foreign Affairs 63, 75–77; 1984). **Some regarded this** apocalyptic **prediction as** **an exercise in mythology**. George **Rathjens of** the Massachusetts Institute of Technology **protested: “Nuclear winter is** **the worst example of the misrepresentation of science** to the public **in my memory**,” (see http://go.nature.com.libproxy.utdallas.edu/yujz84) and **climatologist** Kerry **Emanuel** observed that the subject had **“**become **notorious** for its **lack of scientific integrity”** (Nature 319, 259; 1986). Robock's single-digit fall in temperature is at odds with the subzero (about −25 °C) continental cooling originally projected for a wide spectrum of nuclear wars. Whereas Sagan predicted darkness at noon from a US–Soviet nuclear conflict, Robock projects global sunlight that is several orders of magnitude brighter for a Pakistan–India conflict — literally the difference between night and day. Since 1983, **the** projected **worst-case** cooling has fallen from a Siberian deep freeze spanning 11,000 degree-days Celsius (a measure of the severity of winters) to **numbers** so unseasonably small as to **call** the very term **'nuclear winter' into question**.

#### Miscalc is impossible

Quinlan 2009 (Sir Michael, visiting professor at King's College London, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Ministry of Defence and former senior fellow at the International Institute of Strategic Studies, “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects,” Oxford University Press, CMR)

One special form of miscalculation appeared sporadically in the speculations of academic commentators, though it was scarcely ever to be encountered—at least so far as my own observation went—in the utterances of practical planners within government. This is the idea that nuclear war might be erroneously triggered, or erroneously widened, through a state under attack misreading either what sort of attack it was being subjected to, or where the attack came from. The postulated misreading of the nature of the attack referred in particular to the hypothesis that if a delivery system—normally a missile—that was known to be capable of carrying either a nuclear or a conventional warhead was launched in a conventional role, the target country might, on detecting the launch through its early warning systems, misconstrue the mission as an imminent nuclear strike and immediately unleash a nuclear counter-strike of its own. This conjecture was voiced, for example, as a criticism of the proposals for giving the US Trident SLBM, long associated with nuclear missions, a capability to deliver conventional warheads. Whatever the merit of those proposals (it is not explored here), it is hard to regard this particular apprehension as having any real-life credibility. The ﬂight time of a ballistic missile would not exceed about thirty minutes, and that of a cruise missile a few hours, before arrival on target made its character—conventional or nuclear—unmistakable. No government will need, and no nonlunatic government could wish, to take within so short a span of time a step as enormous and irrevocable as the execution of a nuclear strike on the basis of early-warning information alone without knowing the true nature of the incoming attack. The speculation tends moreover to be expressed without reference either to any realistic political or conﬂict-related context thought to render the episode plausible, or to the manifest interest of the launching country, should there be any risk of doubt, in ensuring—by explicit communication if necessary—that there was no misinterpretation of its conventionally armed launch.

#### Interdependence checks

Deudney 2009 (Daniel Prof of Pol Sci, and Ikenberry, Prof of International Affairs, and John, Prof of Pol Sci at John Hopkins and Prof of International Affairs at Princeton, “Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail” <http://www.nwc.navy.mil/events/csf/readings/AutocraticRevival.aspx>, CMR)

 This bleak outlook is based on an exaggeration of recent developments and ignorespowerful countervailing factors and forces. Indeed, contrary to what the revivalists describe, the most striking features of the contemporary international landscape are the intensification of economic globalization, thickening institutions, and shared problems of interdependence. The overall structure of the international system today is quite unlike that of the nineteenth century. Compared to older orders, the contemporary liberal-centered international order provides a set of constraints and opportunities — of pushes and pulls — that reduce the likelihood of severe conflict while creating strong imperatives for cooperative problem solving. Those invoking the nineteenth century as a model for the twenty-first also fail to acknowledge the extent to which war as a path to conflict resolution and great-power expansion has become largely obsolete. Most important, nuclear weapons have transformed great-power war from a routine feature of international politics into an exercise in national suicide. With all of the great powers possessing nuclear weapons and ample means to rapidly expand their deterrent forces, warfare among these states has truly become an option of last resort. The prospect of such great losses has instilled in the great powers a level of caution and restraint that effectively precludes major revisionist efforts. Furthermore, the diffusion of small arms and the near universality of nationalism have severely limited the ability of great powers to conquer and occupy territory inhabited by resisting populations (as Algeria, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and now Iraq have demonstrated). Unlike during the days of empire building in the nineteenth century, states today cannot translate great asymmetries of power into effective territorial control; at most, they can hope for loose hegemonic relationships that require them to give something in return. Also unlike in the nineteenth century, today the density of trade, investment, and production networks across international borders raises even more the costs of war. A Chinese invasion of Taiwan, to take one of the most plausible cases of a future interstate war, would pose for the Chinese communist regime daunting economic costs, both domestic and international. Taken together**,** these changes in the economy of violence mean that the international system is far more primed for peace than the autocratic revivalists acknowledge.

#### Counterforce targeting checks

Mueller 2009 (John, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies and Professor of Political Science at Ohio State University. “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda” p. 8)

To begin to approach a condition that can credibly justify applying such extreme characterizations as societal annihilation, **a full-out attack with** hundreds, probably **thousands, of** thermo**nuclear bombs** would be required. Even in such extreme cases, the area actually devastated by the bombs' blast and thermal pulse effects would be limited: 2,000 I-MT explosions with a destructive radius of 5 miles each would directly demolish less than 5 percent of the territory of the United States, for example. Obviously, if major population centers were targeted, this sort of attack could inflict massive casualties. Back in cold war days, when such devastating events sometimes seemed uncomfortably likely, a number of studies were conducted to estimate the consequences of massive thermonuclear attacks. One of the most prominent of these considered several possibilities. The most likely scenario--one that could be perhaps be considered at least to begin to approach the rational-was a "counterforce" strike in which well over 1,000 thermo nuclear weapons would be targeted at America's ballistic missile silos, strategic airfields, and nuclear submarine bases in an effort to destroy the country's strategic ability to retaliate. Since the attack would not directly target population centers, most of the ensuing deaths would be from radioactive fallout, and the study estimates that from 2 to 20 million, depending mostly on wind, weather, and sheltering, would perish during the first month.

## 2AC

### Case

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 high emission scenarios would also result in very high carbon dioxide concentrations and ocean acidification, as can be seen in Figure 25 and Figure 26. The increase of carbon dioxide concentration to the present-day value of 390 ppm has caused the pH to drop by 0.1 since preindustrial conditions. This has increased ocean acidity, which because of the logarithmic scale of pH is equivalent to a 30 percent increase in ocean acidity (concentration of hydrogen ions). The scenarios of 4°C warming or more by 2100 correspond to a carbon dioxide concentration of above 800 ppm and lead to a further decrease of pH by another 0.3, equivalent to a 150 percent acidity increase since preindustrial levels. Ongoing ocean acidification is likely to have very severe consequences for coral reefs, various species of marine calcifying organisms, and ocean ecosystems generally (for example, Vézina & Hoegh-Guldberg 2008; Hofmann and Schellnhuber 2009). A recent review shows that the degree and timescale of ocean acidification resulting from anthropogenic CO2 emissions appears to be greater than during any of the ocean acidification events identified so far over the geological past, dating back millions of years and including several mass extinction events (Zeebe 2012). If atmospheric CO2 reaches 450 ppm, coral reef growth around the world is expected to slow down considerably and at 550 ppm reefs are expected to start to dissolve (Cao and Caldeira 2008; Silverman et al. 2009). Reduced growth, coral skeleton weakening, and increased temperature dependence would start to affect coral reefs already below 450 ppm. Thus, a CO2 level of below 350 ppm appears to be required for the long-term survival of coral reefs, if multiple stressors, such as high ocean surface-water temperature events, sea-level rise, and deterioration in water quality, are included (Veron et al. 2009). Based on an estimate of the relationship between atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration and surface ocean acidity (Bernie, Lowe, Tyrrell, and Legge 2010), only very low emission scenarios are able to halt and ultimately reverse ocean acidification (Figure 26). An important caveat on these results is that the approach used here is likely to be valid only for relatively short timescales. If mitigation measures are not implemented soon to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, then ocean acidification can be expected to extend into the deep ocean. The calculations shown refer only to the response of the ocean surface layers, and once ocean acidification has spread more thoroughly, slowing and reversing this will be much more difficult. This would further add significant stress to marine ecosystems already under pressure from human influences, such as overfishing and pollution.

**Extinction**

Kristof 6 (NICHOLAS D. KRISTOF, American journalist, author, op-ed columnist, and a winner of two Pulitzer Prizes, “Scandal Below the Surface”, Oct 31, 2006, http://select.nytimes.com/2006/10/31/opinion/31kristof.html?\_r=1, CMR)

If you think of the earth’s surface as a great beaker, then it’s filled mostly with ocean water. It is slightly alkaline, and that’s what creates a hospitable home for fish, coral reefs and plankton — and indirectly, higher up the food chain, for us. But scientists have discovered that the carbon dioxide **(CO2) we’re spewing** into the air doesn’t just heat up the atmosphere and lead to rising seas. Much of that carbon is absorbed by the oceans, and there it produces carbonic acid — the same stuff found in soda pop. That **makes oceans** a bit **more acidic**, impairing the ability of certain shellfish to produce shells, which, like coral reefs, are made of calcium carbonate. A recent article in Scientific American explained the indignity of being a dissolving mollusk in an acidic ocean: “Drop a piece of chalk (calcium carbonate) into a glass of vinegar (a mild acid) if you need a demonstration of the general worry: the chalk will begin dissolving immediately.” The more acidic waters may spell the end, at least in higher latitudes, of some of the tiniest variations of shellfish — certain plankton and tiny snails called pteropods. **This would** **disrupt the food chain,** possibly killing off many whales and fish, and **rippling up all the way to humans**. We stand, so to speak, on the shoulders of plankton. “There have been a couple of very big events in geological history where the carbon cycle changed dramatically,” said Scott Doney, senior scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution in Massachusetts. One was an abrupt warming that took place 55 million years ago in conjunction with acidification of the oceans and **mass extinctions**. Most scientists don’t believe we’re headed toward a man-made variant on that episode — not **yet**, at any rate. But many worry that **we’re hurtling into unknown dangers.** “Whether in 20 years or 100 years, I think marine **ecosystems are going to be dramatically different** by the end of this century, **and that’ll lead to extinction events**,” Mr. Doney added. “This is the only habitable planet we have,” he said. “The damage we do is going to be felt by all the generations to come.” So that should be one of the great political issues for this century — the vandalism we’re committing to our planet because of our refusal to curb greenhouse gases. Yet the subject is barely debated in this campaign. Changes in ocean chemistry are only one among many damaging consequences of carbon emissions. Evidence is also growing about the more familiar dangers: melting glaciers, changing rainfall patterns, rising seas and more powerful hurricanes. Last year, the World Health Organization released a study indicating that climate change results in an extra 150,000 deaths and five million sicknesses each year, by causing the spread of malaria, diarrhea, malnutrition and other ailments. A report prepared for the British government and published yesterday, the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, warned that inaction “could create risks of major disruption to economic and social activity, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and the economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.” If emissions are not curbed, climate change will cut 5 percent to 20 percent of global G.D.P. each year, declared the mammoth report. “In contrast,” it said, “the costs of action — reducing greenhouse gas emissions to avoid the worst impacts of climate change — can be limited to around 1 percent of global G.D.P. each year.” Some analysts put the costs of action higher, but most agree that it makes sense to invest far more in alternative energy sources, both to wean ourselves of oil and to reduce the strain on our planet. We know what is needed: a carbon tax or cap-and-trade system, a post-Kyoto accord on emissions cutbacks, and major research on alternative energy sources. But as The Times’s Andrew Revkin noted yesterday, spending on energy research and development has fallen by more than half, after inflation, since 1979.

### K

#### 1. Our interpretation is that the aff gets to weigh the plan against a competitive alternative

#### a. Predictability – there are millions of representations that we can’t predict – the resolution says USFG so we should debate that – predictability is key to fairness

#### b. Education – deliberation about policy options in terms of climate science is critical to motivate the public to get on board with carbon reductions – any alternative makes debate meaningless

#### 2. Perm do the plan and withdrawal from the system in order to create new democratic socialist relations

#### 3. Case is a Disad to the Alt – Global warming makes extinction inevitable and only reducing carbon emissions solves - simple rejection fails

Stewart, 2003 (Keith, PhD on environmental politics in Ontario and currently works for the Toronto Environmental Alliance, “If I Can't Dance: Reformism, Anti-Capitalism and the Canadian Environmental Movement”, Canadian Dimension, Vol. 37, No. 5)

Typically this action initially takes the form of seeking out practical, achievable solutions like the Kyoto Protocol, a ban in your community on the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes, or saving the local wetland. These "reformist" solutions are not to be despised, for you can't build a movement without victories. Indeed, to dream of a movement that suddenly overthrows the existing order and replaces it with a socially and environmentally superior alternative without having won any victories along the way to inspire the collective imagination and from which to learn practical lessons is ludicrous.¶ When Reform Becomes Transformative¶ The real question is whether the victories of a movement — how the problem is framed, what solutions are proposed, how political pressure is brought to bear and the nature of the alliances and the enemies you make along the way — add up to a broader project of social change. The verdict is still out on whether Kyoto evolves into a techno-fix or becomes part of a broader transformation of the way we live, work and play together. But there is at least some promise in the struggle, so far.

#### 4. Cap is Sustainable

#### a. Capitalism is resilient – it’ll bounce back

Foster 09 (JD, Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of fiscal policy – Heritage Foundation, "Is Capitalism Dead? Maybe," 3-11, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=101694302)

Capitalism is down. It may even be out. But it's far from dead. Capitalism is extremely resilient. Why? Because here, as in every democratic-industrial country around the world, it has always had to struggle to survive against encroachments — both benign and malevolent — of the state. At the moment, capitalism is losing ground most everywhere. But when the economic crisis passes, capitalism and the freedoms it engenders will recover again, if only because freedom beats its lack. It is said that the trouble with socialism is socialism; the trouble with capitalism is capitalists. The socialist economic system, inherently contrary to individual liberties, tends to minimize prosperity because it inevitably allocates national resources inefficiently. On the other hand, a truly capitalist system engaged in an unfettered pursuit of prosperity is prone to occasional and often painful excesses, bubbles and downturns like the one we are now experiencing globally. When capitalism slips, governments step in with regulations and buffers to try to moderate the excesses and minimize the broader consequences of individual errors. Sometimes these policies are enduringly helpful. Severe economic downturns inflict collateral damage on families and businesses otherwise innocent of material foolishness. Not only are the sufferings of these innocents harmful to society, but they are also downright expensive. A little wise government buffering can go a long way. The trick, of course, is the wisdom part. A good example of a wise government buffer is deposit insurance at commercial banks. Without it, depositors would have withdrawn their funds en masse, leading to a rapid collapse of the banking system. It happened in years gone by. But today, deposits have flowed into the banking system in search of safety, helping banks staunch their many severe wounds. Yet for every example of helpful government intervention, there are many more that do more harm than good. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac leap to mind. These congressional creatures helped create, then inflate the subprime market. When that balloon popped, it triggered a global economic meltdown. The current financial crisis clearly has capitalism on its back foot. Government ownership of the largest insurance company, the major banks, and Fan and Fred are awesome incursions into private markets. But, as President Obama has underscored, these incursions are only temporary. In time, these institutions — even Fan and Fred — will be broken up and sold in parts. It will leave government agents with stories to tell their grandkids, and taxpayers stuck with the losses. But the power of the state will again recede, and another new age of freedom and capitalism will arrive and thrive… until we repeat the cycle again sometime down the road.

#### b. Capitalism isn’t collapsing – financial crises create a demand for the market – this is empirically proven

Zakaria, ’09 [Fareed, Editor of Newsweek International, Former managing editor of Foreign Affairs, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed is Good” http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935]

Consider our track record over the past 20 years, starting with the stock-market crash of 1987, when on Oct. 19 the Dow Jones lost 23 percent, the largest one-day loss in its history. The legendary economist John Kenneth Galbraith wrote that he just hoped that the coming recession wouldn't prove as painful as the Great Depression. It turned out to be a blip on the way to an even bigger, longer boom. Then there was the 1997 East Asian crisis, during the depths of which Paul Krugman wrote in a Fortune cover essay, "Never in the course of economic events—not even in the early years of the Depression—has so large a part of the world economy experienced so devastating a fall from grace." He went on to argue that if Asian countries did not adopt his radical strategy—currency controls—"we could be looking at the kind of slump that 60 years ago devastated societies, destabilized governments, and eventually led to war." Only one Asian country instituted currency controls, and partial ones at that. All rebounded within two years. Each crisis convinced observers that it signaled the end of some new, dangerous feature of the economic landscape. But often that novelty accelerated in the years that followed. The 1987 crash was said to be the product of computer trading, which has, of course, expanded dramatically since then. The East Asian crisis was meant to end the happy talk about "emerging markets," which are now at the center of world growth. The collapse of Long-Term Capital Management in 1998—which then–Treasury secretary Robert Rubin described as "the worst financial crisis in 50 years"—was meant to be the end of hedge funds, which then massively expanded. The technology bubble's bursting in 2000 was supposed to put an end to the dreams of oddball Internet startups. Goodbye, Pets.com; hello, Twitter. Now we hear that this crisis is the end of derivatives. Let's see. Robert Shiller, one of the few who predicted this crash almost exactly—and the dotcom bust as well—argues that in fact we need more derivatives to make markets more stable. A few years from now, strange as it may sound, we might all find that we are hungry for more capitalism, not less. An economic crisis slows growth, and when countries need growth, they turn to markets. After the Mexican and East Asian currency crises—which were far more painful in those countries than the current downturn has been in America—we saw the pace of market-oriented reform speed up. If, in the years ahead, the American consumer remains reluctant to spend, if federal and state governments groan under their debt loads, if government-owned companies remain expensive burdens, then private-sector activity will become the only path to create jobs. The simple truth is that with all its flaws, capitalism remains the most productive economic engine we have yet invented. Like Churchill's line about democracy, it is the worst of all economic systems, except for the others. Its chief vindication today has come halfway across the world, in countries like China and India, which have been able to grow and pull hundreds of millions of people out of poverty by supporting markets and free trade. Last month India held elections during the worst of this crisis. Its powerful left-wing parties campaigned against liberalization and got their worst drubbing at the polls in 40 years.

#### 5. Inherent equality of all beings requires utilitiarianism

Cumminsky, 1996 (David, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Bates College and Ph.D. from UM, “Kantian Consequentialism”, p. 145-146)

In the next section, I will defend this interpretation of the duty of beneficence. For the sake of argument, however, let us first simply assume that beneficence does not require significant self-sacrifice and see what follows. Although Kant is unclear on this point, we will assume that significant self-sacrifices are supererogatory. Thus, if I must harm one in order to save many, the individual whom I will harm by my action is not morally required to affirm the action. On the other hand, I have a duty to do all that I can for those in need. As a consequence **I am faced with a dilemma: If I act, I harm a person in a way that a rational being need not consent to; if I fail to act, then I do not do my duty to those in need and thereby fail to promote an objective end.** Faced with such a choice, which horn of the dilemma is more consistent with the formula of the end-in-itself? **We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract “social entity.” It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive “overall social good.”** Instead, **the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons.** Robert Nozick, for example, argues that “**to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he [or she] is a separate person, that** ~~his~~ **is the only life he [or she] has.” But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction.** In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? **A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself.”** Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. **If one truly believes that all** rational beings **have an equal value then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many** rational beings **as possible**. **In order to avoid this** conclusion, **the non-consequentialist** Kantian **needs to justify agent-centered constraints.** As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian **deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non-value based rationale.** But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? **If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have “dignity,** that is, **an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value, but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others. The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others**. If on focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then **equal consideration suggests that one may have to sacrifice some to save many**.

#### 6. Short-term market mechanisms are the only solution to environmental destruction---the alt is ideological blindness which justifies the status quo – only risk of policy failure is if you vote neg

Bryant 12—professor of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, We’ll Never Do Better Than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity, 5/11/12, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/)

Somewhere or other Latour makes the remark that we’ll never do better than a politician. Here it’s important to remember that for Latour– as for myself –every entity is a “politician”. Latour isn’t referring solely to those persons that we call “politicians”, but to all entities that exist. And if Latour claims that we’ll never do better than a politician, then this is because every entity must navigate a field of relations to other entities that play a role in what is and is not possible in that field. In the language of my ontology, this would be articulated as the thesis that the local manifestations of which an entity is capable are, in part, a function of the relations the entity entertains to other entities in a regime of attraction. The world about entities perpetually introduces resistances and frictions that play a key role in what comes to be actualized. ¶ It is this aphorism that occurred to me today after a disturbing discussion with a rather militant Marxist on Facebook. I had posted a very disturbing editorial on climate change by the world renowned climate scientist James Hansen. Not only did this person completely misread the editorial, denouncing Hansen for claiming that Canada is entirely responsible for climate change (clearly he had no familiarity with Hansen or his important work), but he derided Hansen for proposing market-based solutions to climate change on the grounds that “the market is the whole source of the problem!” It’s difficult to know how to respond in this situations.¶ read on! ¶ It is quite true that it is the system of global capitalism or the market that has created our climate problems (though, as Jared Diamond shows in Collapse, other systems of production have also produced devastating climate problems). In its insistence on profit and expansion in each economic quarter, markets as currently structured provide no brakes for environmental destructive actions. The system is itself pathological.¶ However, pointing this out and deriding market based solutions doesn’t get us very far. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that 1) we currently live in a market based world, 2) there is not, in the foreseeable future an alternative system on the horizon, and 3), above all, we need to do something now. We can’t afford to reject interventions simply because they don’t meet our ideal conceptions of how things should be. We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here. And here it’s crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn’t work for producing that other world. It just means that we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us.¶ It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for “purity”, were asking for “ponies and unicorns”. This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible. The tragedy was that he didn’t use that power, though he has gotten better.¶ I do not wish to denounce others and dismiss their claims on these sorts of grounds. As a Marxist anarchists, I do believe that we should fight for the creation of an alternative hominid ecology or social world. I think that the call to commit and fight, to put alternatives on the table, has been one of the most powerful contributions of thinkers like Zizek and Badiou. If we don’t commit and fight for alternatives those alternatives will never appear in the world. Nonetheless, we still have to grapple with the world we find ourselves in. And it is here, in my encounters with some Militant Marxists, that I sometimes find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are unintentionally aiding and abetting the very things they claim to be fighting. In their refusal to become impure, to work with situations or assemblages as we find them, to sully their hands, they end up reproducing the very system they wish to topple and change. Narcissistically they get to sit there, smug in their superiority and purity, while everything continues as it did before because they’ve refused to become politicians or engage in the difficult concrete work of assembling human and nonhuman actors to render another world possible. As a consequence, they occupy the position of Hegel’s beautiful soul that denounces the horrors of the world, celebrate the beauty of their soul, while depending on those horrors of the world to sustain their own position. ¶ To engage in politics is to engage in networks or ecologies of relations between humans and nonhumans. To engage in ecologies is to descend into networks of causal relations and feedback loops that you cannot completely master and that will modify your own commitments and actions. But there’s no other way, there’s no way around this, and we do need to act now.

### XO

#### Perm do both

#### Object fiat – reject the team – they blur the controversy, warps 2AC time and offense – err aff even if they are “just” TOO CLOSE, practical fairness controls precision on questions of cp theory

#### “Of the President” is an adjective phrase – particularizes “authority”

David Megginson, University of Ottawa, Department of English, 2007. “The Function Of Phrases” writingcentre.uottawa.ca/hypergrammar/phrfunc.html

An adjective phrase is any phrase which modifies a noun or pronoun. You often construct adjective phrases using participles or prepositions together with their objects: I was driven mad by the sound of my neighbour's constant piano practising. In this sentence, the prepositional phrase "of my neighbour's constant piano practising" acts as an adjective modifying the noun "sound."

#### Future Presidents prevent solvency

Friedersdorf, 2013 (Conor, The Atlantic, “Does Obama Really Believe He Can Limit the Next President’s Power?” The Atlantic, May 28, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/05/does-obama-really-believe-he-can-limit-the-next-presidents-power/276279/)

Over at Fox News, Chris Wallace and Brit Hume are musing about President Obama's aims on national security. What exactly does he hope to accomplish before leaving office in January 2017? Let's listen in: Chris Wallace: It's been suggested that that's exactly what the president wants to do. He wants to leave a different national-security structure, different rules of the road, different limits, for the next president than what he inherited when he came in. Brit Hume: Not only what he inherited, but what he made generous use of for the purposes of fighting this conflict. There's an odd quality, Chris, to this whole thing. And it its almost like he's saying with regard to the drone policy, 'We need something to stop me before I kill again.' You see that in his support -- on an unrelated matter -- of this shield law for journalists. He's carried out these oversteps in pursuing journalists who are doing their jobs. And now he says, 'We need a shield law,' as if to say, a law to protect them from us. I think it's peculiar. I admit to being a bit puzzled myself, if for slightly different reasons. It's perfectly understandable to serve in a position, appreciate its power, and believe it should be limited by outside constraints, even when they'd constrain you. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson both felt that way at times. If Obama feels that way about a shield law, good for him. And it isn't as if he personally approves every interaction the Department of Justice has with journalists. But something puzzles me about his behavior with regard to the War on Terrorism. It does sometimes appear, as Wallace suggests, that he wants to leave a different national-security structure to his predecessor that limits him or her more than Obama himself was limited in 2009. Administration officials have said as much. A disposition matrix! Strict protocol for putting an American citizen on the kill list! That sort of thing. There was talk, before Election 2012, of Team Obama hurriedly developing changes just in case. So unlike Hume, I don't think it's "stop me before I kill again," so much as, "I trust myself with this power more than anyone. You won't always be so lucky as to have me, but don't worry, I'm leaving instructions." Will anyone follow them? That's what I don't understand. Why does Obama seem to think his successors will constrain themselves within whatever limits he sets? Won't they just set their own limits? Won't those limits be very different? What would Chris Christie do in the White House? I have no idea, but I'm guessing that preserving the decisionmaking framework Obama established isn't what he'd do. Does anyone think Hilary Clinton would preserve it? Obama doesn't seem to realize that his legacy won't be shaped by any perspicacious limits he places on the executive branch, if he ever gets around to placing any on it. The next president can just undo those "self-imposed" limits with the same wave of a hand that Obama uses to create them. His influence in the realm of executive power will be to expand it. By 2016 we'll be four terms deep in major policy decisions being driven by secret memos from the Office of Legal Counsel. The White House will have a kill list, and if the next president wants to add names to it using standards twice as lax as Obama's, he or she can do it, in s0065cret, per his precedent. Some new John Brennan-like figure, with different values and a different personality, will serve as Moral Rectitude Czar. Even ending torture was done by executive order. The folks guilty of perpetrating it weren't punished. Congress wasn't asked to act. (There was an ambitious domestic agenda to focus on!) So who knows what we'll get next, save for a new president who witnessed all the previously unthinkable things post-9/11 presidents got away with so long as they invoked fighting "terror." The fact that every new president is likely to be a power-seeking egomaniac seems like too obvious a flaw in Obama's plan for a smart guy like him not to see it. So what gives? Is all the talk of limiting the executive branch just talk? But why even talk at this point, if so? He isn't running again. Yet if he really does think his office wields too much power, why is he putting in place safeguards the next president can and probably will undo instead of zealously trying to get Congress to act? Yet he does seem to be concerned. Here's Peter Baker reporting in The New York Times: For nearly four years, the president had waged a relentless war from the skies against Al Qaeda and its allies, and he trusted that he had found what he considered a reasonable balance even if his critics did not see it that way. But now, he told his aides, he wanted to institutionalize what in effect had been an ad hoc war, effectively shaping the parameters for years to come "whether he was re-elected or somebody else became president," as one aide said. Ultimately, he would decide to write a new playbook that would scale back the use of drones, target only those who really threatened the United States, eventually get the C.I.A. out of the targeted killing business and, more generally, begin moving the United States past the "perpetual war" it had waged since Sept. 11, 2001. Whether the policy shifts will actually accomplish that remains to be seen, given vague language and compromises forced by internal debate, but they represent an effort to set the rules even after he leaves office. "We've got this technology, and we're not going to be the only ones to use it," said a senior White House official who, like others involved, declined to be identified talking about internal deliberations. "We have to set standards so it doesn't get abused in the future." There's that same obvious flaw, but everyone seems oblivious to it. The standards you're setting? The next president can just change them. In secret, even! That's the problem with extreme executive power: It is capricious, prone to abuse, and difficult to meaningfully check. Does Obama think the next man or woman will just behold the wisdom of his approach and embrace it? That error, unthinkable as it seems, would not be without precedent for this president.

#### Perm do the CP

#### Plan key to effective signaling – only internal link to our offense

Scheuerman, 2012 (William, Professor of Political Science and Western European Studies at Indiana University, “Review Essay: Emergencies, Executive Power, and the Uncertain Future of US Presidential Democracy”, Law & Social Inquiry, 37 Law & Soc. Inquiry 743, Lexis)

Posner and Vermeule rely on two main claims. First, even if the president constitutes the dominant actor in a legally unchecked administrative state, he or she has to gain elite and public support to get things done and stand for election. So how can political actors decide whether or not the executive is performing well? Posner and Vermeule tend to hang their hats on "executive signaling": presidents can send signals to voters communicating that they are "well-motivated," and that in fact many voters might make the same (or at least similar) decisions if they possessed the information the president typically has. By communicating in a certain way (e.g., by appointing members of the opposing party to his or her cabinet, promising to accept the recommendations of an independent commission, or by making decisions as transparent as possible), presidents can gain credibility, and voters might thereby come to acknowledge the plausibility--if not necessarily the substantive Tightness--of what the executive is doing (2010, 137-53). However, as Schmitt aptly grasped, even formally free elections potentially become charades when the executive effectively exercises legally unconstrained power (e.g., in Peronist Argentina, or Putin's Russia). Posner and Vermeule never really provide enough evidence for us to dismiss this possibility. Since the president in our system is only subject on one occasion to reelection, it is unclear how their proposals might meaningfully check the executive, particularly during a second term. The fact that executive signaling represents a form of self-binding hardly seems reassuring, either (2010, 135). Nor does the book's highlighting of the possible dangers of different forms of executive signaling (e.g., too much transparency, or an excessive subservience to independent agencies) help very much on this score (2010, 142-46). Why should we expect to get presidents who know how to engage in executive signaling in just the right way? The familiar reason the executive needs elite and popular support, of course, is that it still relies on a popularly elected Congress and other institutional players to get things done: this is why describing such dependence as intrinsically political and "nonlegal" seems odd. For that matter, the relationship between what we traditionally have described as a normative theory of political legitimacy and executive signaling mechanisms--whereby the executive gains popular credibility--remains ambiguous. Is their theory of executive signaling and credibility meant to stand in for a normative theory of legitimacy? If so, one might worry. We can easily imagine an executive diligently doing many of the things prescribed here yet nonetheless pursuing policies deeply at odds with the common good, or at least with what a democratic community under more ideal conditions might determine to be in its best interests. Depending on one's normative preferences, some of the examples provided of executive signaling (e.g., FDR and Obama naming Republicans to their cabinets) might legitimately be taken as evidence for presidential Machiavellianism, rather than as solid proof that the presidents in question were well-motivated and thereby somehow politically acceptable. [\*758] Presidential "signaling" seems like a pale replacement for liberal legalism and the separation of powers.

#### Conditionality is bad – it disincentivizes offense because it takes too long and they can kick it – allows them to read contradictory positions kills education – dispo solves

#### Executive self-binding fails to send an appropriate signal, Legal action is critical

Pildes, 2012 (Richard, Sudler Family Professor of Constitutional Law at NYU School of Law, “Book Review: Law and the President”, Harvard Law Review, 125 Harv. L. Rev. 1381, Lexis)

That Posner and Vermeule miss the role of legal compliance as a powerful signal, perhaps the most powerful signal, in maintaining a President's critical credibility as a well-motivated user of discretionary power is all the more surprising in light of the central role executive self-binding constraints play in their theory. After asserting that "one of the greatest constraints on [presidential] aggrandizement" is "the president's own interest in maintaining his credibility" (p. 133), they define their project as seeking to discover the "social-scientific microfoundations" (p. 123) of presidential credibility: the ways in which presidents establish and maintain credibility. One of the most crucial and effective mechanisms, in their view, is executive self-binding, "whereby executives commit themselves to a course of action that would impose higher costs on ill-motivated actors" (p. 137). As they also put it, "a well-motivated president can distinguish himself from an ill-motivated president by binding himself to a policy position that an ill-motivated president would reject" (p. 135). By complying with these constraints, presidents signal their good faith and accrue more trust to take further action. Most importantly from within Posner and Vermeule's theory, these constraints, many self-generated through executive self-binding, substitute for the constraints of law. Law does not, or cannot, or should not constrain presidents, in their view, but rational-actor presidents recognize that [\*1408] complying with constraints is in their own self-interest; presidents therefore substitute or accept other constraints. Thus, Posner and Vermeule recognize the importance of "enabling constraints" n78 in effective mobilization and maintenance of political power; that is, they recognize that what appear to be short-term constraints on the immediate preferences of actors like presidents might actually enable long-term marshaling of effective presidential power. Yet they somehow miss that law, too, can work as an enabling constraint; when it comes to law, Posner and Vermeule seem to see nothing but constraint. Indeed, this failing runs even deeper. For if presidents must signal submission to various constraints to maintain and enhance their credibility - as Posner and Vermeule insist they must - Posner and Vermeule miss the fact that the single most powerful signal of that willingness to be constrained, particularly in American political culture, is probably the President's willingness to comply with law.

### DA

#### No bioterror impact

John Mueller, Professor, Political Science, Ohio State University, OVERBLOWN: HOW POLITICIANS AND THE TERRORISM INDUSTRY INFLATE NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS, AND WHY WE BELIEVE THEM, 2009, p. 21-22.

For the most destructive results, biological weapons need to be dispersed in very low-altitude aerosol clouds. Because aerosols do not appreciably settle, pathogens like anthrax (which is not easy to spread or catch and is not contagious) would probably have to be sprayed near nose level. Moreover, 90 percent of the microorganisms are likely to die during the process of aerosolization, and their effectiveness could be reduced still further by sunlight, smog, humidity, and temperature changes. Explosive methods of dispersion may destroy the organisms, and, except for anthrax spores, long-term storage of lethal organisms in bombs or warheads is difficult: even if refrigerated, most of the organisms have a limited lifetime. The effects of such weapons can take days or weeks to have full effect, during which time they can be countered with medical and civil defense measures. And their impact is very difficult to predict; in combat situations they may spread back onto the attacker. In the judgment of two careful analysts, delivering microbes and toxins over a wide area in the form most suitable for inflicting mass casualties—as an aerosol that can be inhaled—requires a delivery system whose development "would outstrip the technical capabilities of all but the most sophisticated terrorist" Even then effective dispersal could easily be disrupted by unfavorable environmental and meteorological conditions." After assessing, and stressing, the difficulties a nonstate entity would find in obtaining, handling, growing, storing, processing, and dispersing lethal pathogens effectively, biological weapons expert Milton Leitenberg compares his conclusions with glib pronouncements in the press about how biological attacks can be pulled off by anyone with "a little training and a few glass jars," or how it would be "about as difficult as producing beer." He sardonically concludes, "The less the commentator seems to know about biological warfare the easier he seems to think the task is.""

#### No existential crises

#### We Control Link UQ - Legislative constraints are inevitable – only question is whether approval takes place

Barron and Lederman, 2008 (David, Professor of Law at Harvard Law School; Martin, Visiting Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center; “The Commander in Chief at the Lowest Ebb – A Constitutional History”, Harvard Law Review, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 941, Lexis)

In a companion Article, we described many of the structural forces responsible for this shift in the ground of debate. n2 Collectively, they strongly suggest that the prevailing paradigm of congressional abdication - developed at a time when bold claims of presidential authority to act without express legislative approval occasioned all the attention - no longer illuminates the main battle lines in constitutional struggles over the exercise of war powers. Among the most important of these forces is the peculiar nature of the war on terrorism. Its unusual entwinement with the home front, its heavy focus on preemptive action and intelligence collection, and its targeting of a diffuse, non-state enemy, all guarantee that presidential uses of force are likely to be conducted for years to come in a context that is thick with statutory restrictions. But even beyond the war on terrorism, the "lowest ebb" issue is likely to take on added significance, if only because of the increased willingness of Presidents to deploy force abroad. There is mounting evidence that the reduction in legislative participation at the front end of these conflicts is being counterbalanced to some extent by a legislative willingness to intervene at the back end if the campaign goes poorly or if the public begins to doubt certain of the President's decisions about how it should be prosecuted.

#### No link that says restrictions spillover – that’s obviously not intrinsic with the plan

#### The DA is wrong – presidents can’t act quickly and congressional action solves

Pearlstein, 2009 (Deborah, Visiting Scholar and Lecturer in Public and International Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public & International Affairs at Princeton University; “Form and Function in the National Security Constitution”, Connecticut Law Review, 41 Conn. L. Rev. 1549, Lexis)

This brings us to the new functionalists' role effectiveness approach. For whatever one researcher (especially, the new functionalists would suggest, legal researchers) might find in the empirical literature informing the nature of security threats and emergency responses, the new functionalists' more forthright argument is that institutional competences make the executive better positioned to consider this information and make decisions accordingly. Indeed, in a linear comparison of institutional competences, the differences among the branches that flow from institutional structure are of course real. The judiciary, for example, can only act in the event of a case or controversy. The administrative agency and national security apparatus may put information, in the first instance, in the hands of the executive rather than Congress or the courts. Moreover, the new functionalists add, the judiciary lacks the expertise and the procedural and evidentiary resources to make good judgments in an emergency; judicial resources are too scarce to require individualized determinations as to many hundreds or thousands of detainees it is assumed, as a matter of raw effectiveness, it will be necessary to detain. And given its own resource constraints and motives, the executive is [\*1598] unlikely to exaggerate the danger posed by an individual, or detain too many people. n168 Accordingly, the new functionalists tend to favor a decision- making structure with loose (if any), emergency-driven congressional engagement and deferential (if any) judicial review. But such comparative competence accounts are misleading in several ways. They ignore the complexity of current government decision-making structures. The vast executive branch decision-making apparatus means decisions rarely come down to the speed possible with one man acting alone, and Congress and the courts have at their institutional disposal multiple means to enable the sharing of information among the branches. Such accounts also critically ignore the possibility of collective organizational capacity, a notion Justice Jackson's Youngstown concurrence seemed squarely to contemplate. n169 The executive acting alone may be better than the courts acting alone in some circumstances, but the executive plus the courts (or Congress) may be more effective than the executive alone. Perhaps most important, the new functionalist role effectiveness view ignores the structural reality that national security policy (indeed all government decision- making) is channeled through a set of existing organizations, each with its own highly elaborated set of professional norms and responsibilities, standard procedures and routines, identities and culture, all of which constrain and guide behavior-often in ways that centrally affect the organization's ability to perform its functions. Considering how such pathologies affect decision-making, one may find a far more sophisticated-and more meaningful-set of comparisons between decision-making structures than asking, for example, whether the executive can make decisions faster than courts. The next section explores a role effectiveness approach that could take this reality into account.

### Politics

#### Their O/W warming ev is citing robok – Seitz ev says he’s wrong

#### No risk of Israeli strike – all hype and no risk of real action

Tepperman, 7/26 (Jonathan, Managing Editor of Foreign Affairs, “Israel vs. Iran, Again”, New York Times, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/27/opinion/global/israel-vs-iran-again.html)

Earlier this month, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel went on American television to remind the world (in case anyone had forgotten) that the threat from Iran remains very much alive. Speaking on “Face the Nation,” Netanyahu warned that the Islamic Republic is once again approaching a nuclear redline, and hinted that if the United States doesn’t take action soon, he will. Expect to hear more of this in the weeks ahead; Bibi’s TV appearance was reportedly just the opening shot in a new campaign to push the spotlight back on Iran. But don’t expect Washington or the international community to leap into action. Netanyahu won’t — and shouldn’t — get the kind of response he’s hoping for. Simply put, that’s because both his language and Israel’s behavior are make it harder and harder to take his warnings seriously. The problem starts with just how familiar Israel’s warnings on Iran have become. Netanyahu went through a similar exercise, remember, last summer. And the summer before that. In fact, Israeli leaders have been issuing such alarms for almost a decade now. That repetition wouldn’t necessarily be a problem if just what they’ve been warning about hadn’t also shifted so much. Consider: Back in 2004, when Prime Minister Ariel Sharon raised the issue of Iran’s nuclear program, he said the point of no return would come when Iran came close to developing the technical capacity to enrich uranium. Months later, however, Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz said no, the real danger would come when Iran started enriching fuel on its own soil. Then, in 2006, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert said the fatal moment would actually come when Iran started running a certain number of enrichment cascades. And then last year, Ehud Barak (Bibi’s defense minister at the time) said the real red line would be crossed when Iran entered the “zone of immunity” — the point at which its nuclear program would be so advanced or well defended that it couldn’t be disabled by attack. What’s confusing about this litany is that Iran has blown by each red line in turn, yet the supposed disaster has yet to materialize. So Bibi now has a boy-who-cried-wolf problem. But there’s a deeper flaw in his case against Iran, and that’s intellectual incoherence. Netanyahu insists that the Islamic Republic must be stopped before it builds a bomb because it couldn’t be trusted not to use it. Iran, in other words, is undeterrable. But for that to be true, the country’s leaders would have to be more evil and less rational than Stalin or Mao, whose crimes were infinitely greater, yet against whom deterrence worked just fine. That claim is tough enough to accept on its face. It gets even tougher when you remember that Iran has apparently slowed down its uranium enrichment in the last year. Tehran did so in response to concerted threats and sanctions — the very definition of rational behavior. Now, let me be clear: I’m not trying to argue that Israel doesn’t have any reason to worry about Iran. Given Israel’s size and location, the Obama administration’s current preoccupation with Egypt and Syria, and Washington’s seeming willingness to engage Iran’s new president in yet another round of talks, Netanyahu’s anxiety is understandable (if excessive). What’s not understandable, however, is how he’s dealing with it. Were his government truly determined to stop Iran’s nuclear program, it would be acting very differently in a few key respects. First, in order to build broad international support for action, it would be doing everything — everything — in its power to make peace with the Palestinian Authority and thereby remove the biggest irritant in its relations with Europe and the Arab world. Instead, Bibi is doing effectively nothing on that front. Don’t be fooled by the recent U.S. announcement that peace talks might soon resume. The fact that the Israeli side will be led by Tzipi Livni — a coalition partner Netanyahu doesn’t like or trust — and that, even before the talks were announced, another of his cabinet members anonymously declared them little more than a ruse — shows how seriously Bibi takes them. Second, if Jerusalem really wanted to stop Iran from getting a bomb, it would put its own on the table. This might sound outlandish, but consider what merely offering to establish a regional nuclear-free zone would buy Israel. Netanyahu could insist on the most intrusive verification mechanisms imaginable — Israeli inspectors on the ground at Fordow or Natanz, say. Iran would refuse, but it wouldn’t matter; Jerusalem would have put Tehran on the defensive and bought some of the international support it desperately needs. Yet rather than take such bold steps, Netanyahu has resorted to an old tactic and is beating the drum in Washington instead. Which points to a cynical but unavoidable conclusion: that what he really wants is for the rest of the world to take care of his Iran problem for him. It’s not that Netanyahu wouldn’t rather the mullahs were stopped from building a bomb. Of course he would. He’s just not willing to pay much of a price — such as offering painful concessions — to make it happen. But if he’s not, why should anyone on the outside do it for him?

#### Bill dead – no AIPAC push and GOP will defer to Obama

Mark Landler 2/5 “Pro-Israel group holds less sway in Washington”, The Sydney Morning Herald,

<http://www.smh.com.au/world/proisrael-group-holds-less-sway-in-washington-20140205-hvb7k.html>

Washington: The last time the nation's most potent pro-Israel lobbying group lost a major showdown with the White House was when President Ronald Reagan agreed to sell AWACS surveillance planes to Saudi Arabia over the group's bitter objections.¶ Since then, the group, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, has run up an impressive record of legislative victories in its quest to rally US support for Israel, using a robust network of grass-roots supporters and a rich donor base to push a raft of bills through Congress. Typically, they pass by unanimous votes.¶ But now AIPAC, as the group is known, once again finds itself in a very public standoff with the White House. Its top priority, a Senate bill to impose new sanctions on Iran, has stalled after stiff resistance from President Barack Obama, and in what amounts to a tacit retreat, AIPAC has stopped pressuring Senate Democrats to vote for the bill.¶ Officials at the group insist it never called for an immediate vote and say the legislation may yet pass if Mr Obama's effort to negotiate a nuclear agreement with Iran fails or if Iran reneges on its interim deal with the West. But for the moment, Mr Obama has successfully made the case that passing new sanctions against Tehran now could scuttle the nuclear talks and put the US on the road to another war.¶ Advertisement ¶ In doing so, the president has raised questions about the effectiveness of AIPAC's tactics and even its role as the unchallenged voice of the pro-Israel lobby in Washington. Jewish leaders say that pro-Israel groups disagreed on how aggressively to push the legislation, even if all the groups favour additional sanctions.¶ "Some of us see the object as being to target Iran," said Abraham H. Foxman, the national director of the Anti-Defamation League. "We're not out there to target the president; we're out there to target Iran."¶ With neither side spoiling for a fight or ready to back down, Mr Foxman said, the sanctions campaign is stalled. Lawmakers confirm that the political climate on Capitol Hill has changed since the bill's sponsors and AIPAC made their push before Christmas.¶ Senator Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut, a staunch supporter of Israel, is one of 16 Democrats who signed on to the bill, along with 43 of the Senate's 45 Republicans, bringing it to within a few votes of a veto-proof majority. Now Senator Blumenthal says the Senate should hold off on a vote to give Obama breathing room for diplomacy.¶ "There's been an unquestionable, undeniable shift in the perception of national security," Senator Blumenthal said. "I'm sensitive to the feelings, the resistance, the aversion of the general public to any kind of American military engagement."¶ On Monday, 70 House Democrats sent Mr Obama a letter backing his diplomatic efforts and opposing new sanctions. And former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton added her voice to those urging no legislation. The bill's chief sponsors insist they are not retreating. "The American people - Democrats and Republicans alike - overwhelmingly want Iran held accountable during any negotiations," said Senator Mark S. Kirk, a Republican from Illinois, who is a lead co-sponsor, along with Senator Robert Menendez, a Democrat of New Jersey.¶ But AIPAC's headaches go beyond Iran. In September, it threw an army of lobbyists behind an effort to win a congressional mandate for Mr Obama's threatened military strike on Syria. Facing certain failure in Congress, the president pulled the plug on the effort.¶ Earlier last year, it came under fire from the right for not publicly opposing Mr Obama's nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defence, because of what critics said was his anti-Israel record.¶ None of this will prevent AIPAC from drawing 14,000 supporters and a who's who of speakers from the White House and Congress when it holds its annual meeting here next month. But this year's meeting could be more complicated than the one in 2012, when Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel and a stream of congressional backers turned out to demand that Mr Obama threaten Iran with a military strike if it produced a nuclear weapon. The president, appearing as the keynote speaker, promised that he would keep all options on the table, including military action, to curb Iran's ambitions.¶ AIPAC officials said that their fundraising is at record levels and that the March meeting will be the largest in its history. The group has helped secure $US3.1 billion in US aid for Israel and largely framed the public debate over Iran's nuclear program.¶ "Under any other circumstances, having 59 senators from both parties supporting a bill that has this type of opposition is extraordinary," said a spokesman for AIPAC, Marshall Wittmann. "For someone to describe this as a setback is completely preposterous."¶ Mr Wittmann disputed suggestions that the group had been weakened by its support for the abortive military action against Syria or its decision not to lobby against Hagel. Mr Obama's threat of force, he said, helped get chemical weapons out of Syria. As for Senator Hagel, Mr Wittmann said, "our focus is on the policy."¶ Still, in its zeal to pass the bill, AIPAC may have overreached. Last month, a regional director for the group came to the defence of Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Florida, the chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee, after AIPAC sent a letter urging its members to demand that she clarify her support for sanctions.¶ In the follow-up letter, emailed to AIPAC members in Florida, a national board member, Ike Fisher, declared, "congresswoman Wasserman Schultz has a strong record of support for the US-Israel relationship." Ms Wasserman Schultz declined to comment.¶ In another small but telling contretemps, a group of prominent liberal Jews sent a letter last week to Mayor Bill de Blasio of New York, rebuking him for speaking last month at a closed-door gathering of AIPAC, which they said "speaks for Israel's hard-line government and its right-wing supporters."¶ Founded in 1951, a few years after the state of Israel, AIPAC says its mission is to "strengthen, protect and promote the US-Israel relationship," regardless of the governments in either country.¶ "The source of AIPAC's power is its ability to generate bipartisan votes," said Steven J. Rosen, a former senior official at the group, who was forced out in 2005 after being caught up in an espionage case.¶ The trouble is, AIPAC's fervent push on Iran sanctions has increasingly allied it with Mr Netanyahu and against Mr Obama. J Street, a more dovish pro-Israel group, has lobbied vigorously against the bill, underscoring divergent views within the pro-Israel lobby.¶ "You're seeing, in the American Jewish community, an engagement in the debate in a more complex way," said Representative Peter Welch, a Vermont Democrat. "Some say they want sanctions, but some say they support the White House."¶ Even AIPAC's efforts to support the president have been troubled. It had deep reservations about Mr Hagel, which officials shared privately with lawmakers. But it did not publicly oppose his nomination, in part because White House officials said the president would not forget it.¶ "A lot of this has been about Obama," said Steve Rabinowitz, who worked in the Clinton administration and advises Jewish groups. "The good news is that his foreign-policy cred has strengthened, and there is increasing deference to the president on foreign policy."¶ Senator Christopher S. Murphy, a freshman Democrat from Connecticut, embodies this trend. After voting for sanctions in the House, he opposed the Senate bill because, he said in an interview, the whole point of sanctions was to force Iran to the bargaining table.

#### Sanctions dead – no backing

Noah Silverman 2/7 (congressional affairs director for the Republican Jewish Coalition) “RJC: Obama pressure forces AIPAC reversal on Iran”, <http://www.sdjewishworld.com/2014/02/07/rjc-obama-pressure-forces-aipac-reversal-iran/>

The Obama White House’s tactics have been disgraceful. But they’ve clearly had an effect. Democratic Kirk-Menendez cosponsors endorsed delaying a vote on the legislation they ostensibly support. Liberal news outlets attacked Republicans as ‘partisan’ for demanding a vote on bipartisan legislation.¶ And now the most prominent organization in the coalition of activist groups supporting Kirk-Menendez – the American Israel Public Affairs Committee – has reversed itself and is calling for Senate action on Kirk-Menendez to be delayed.

#### Sanctions shelved – no search for new co-sponsors

Steve Benen 2/4 “Senate effectively scraps Iran sanctions bill”, <http://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/senate-effectively-scraps-iran-sanctions-bill>

The tide turned quickly. Last week, some of the Senate Democrats who had endorsed the legislation began backing off. And this week, supporters effectively shelved the entire bill.¶ Proponents of Iran sanctions have all but abandoned their search for a highly symbolic 60th co-sponsor who would give their bill a filibuster-proof majority and reverse the push against immediate action.¶ ¶ The number of Democrats and Republicans on the bill has been stuck at 59 for more than three weeks, with the White House effectively locking up the Democratic Caucus with a threat to veto a bill it says could doom nuclear talks and precipitate war.¶ Even the list of 59 co-sponsors is misleading given recent developments. Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) told MSNBC’s Chris Matthews last week, “I did not sign it with the intention that it would ever be voted upon or used upon while we were negotiating,”, adding, “[W]e’ve got to give peace a chance here and we’ve got to support this process.” Soon after, Sens. Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.) said they, too, were prepared to give the Obama administration time to pursue a peaceful solution. By the end of the weeks, Sens. Ben Cardin (D-Md.) and Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.) were also comfortable with a delay.¶ ¶ All are technically still considered co-sponsors, but it’s clear that support for the sanctions bill has slowly collapsed. It’s not that the legislation is poised for defeat; it’s that the measure won’t even get a vote anytime soon.

#### Fights over, NO chance for DEM splintering – UQ overwhelms

Stacy Kaper 2/2, National Journal, "How Obama Won the War on Iran Sanctions", 2014, [www.nationaljournal.com/defense/how-obama-won-the-war-on-iran-sanctions-20140202](http://www.nationaljournal.com/defense/how-obama-won-the-war-on-iran-sanctions-20140202)

The push for new sanctions on Iran has stalled. The Democrats who bucked President Obama to back the sanctions bill are backpedaling mightily—no longer even pretending they're pushing Harry Reid to hold a vote on the measure. And while there's still plenty of chest-pounding and posturing, the debate's end result seems clear: The Senate will wait, at least so long as the negotiations move in the right direction.¶ That's a full flip from just more than a month ago. Before the December recess, the Senate's pro-sanctions faction was surging. Senators—including Democrats who are typically Obama loyalists—were agreeing with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's claim that the nuclear negotiations with Iran bordered on capitulation.¶ So how did Obama—a supposedly feckless president when it comes to handling Congress—turn the tide?¶ Obama's in-person, all-hands-on-deck advocacy campaign with the Senate appears to have advanced his cause, but it's not that simple.¶

#### No chance for a vote – Reid will NOT splinter

Josh Rogin, Daily Beast, 2/5/14, GOP Will Force Reid to Save Obama’s Iran Policy—Over and Over Again, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/05/gop-will-force-reid-to-save-obama-s-iran-policy-over-and-over-again.html

Dozens of Republican senators joined Wednesday to demand that Harry Reid allow a floor vote on § Marked 19:35 § a new Iran sanctions bill. If he doesn’t, they are planning to make his life miserable.¶ The Republican Senate caucus is planning to use every parliamentary trick in the book to push Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to allow a floor vote on a new Iran sanctions bill that the Obama administration strenuously opposes. The Obama White House has succeeded in keeping most Democrats in line against supporting quick passage of the “Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act,” which currently has 59 co-sponsors, including 13 Democrats. Reid has faithfully shelved the bill, pending the outcome of negotiations between Iran and the world’s major powers—the so-called “P5+1.” But tomorrow, Republicans plan to respond by using an array of floor tactics—including bringing up the bill and forcing Reid to publicly oppose it—as a means of putting public pressure on Reid and Democrats who may be on the fence. “Now we have come to a crossroads. Will the Senate allow Iran to keep its illicit nuclear infrastructure in place, rebuild its teetering economy and ultimately develop nuclear weapons at some point in the future?” 42 GOP senators wrote in a letter sent to Reid late Wednesday and obtained by The Daily Beast. “The answer to this question will be determined by whether you allow a vote on S. 1881, the bipartisan Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act, which is cosponsored by more than half of the Senate.” The GOP letter calls on Reid to allow a vote on the bill during the current Senate work period—in other words, before the chamber’s next recess. Senate GOP aides said that until they get a vote, GOP senators are planning to use a number of procedural tools at their disposal to keep this issue front and center for Democrats. Since the legislation is already on the Senate’s legislative calendar, any senator can bring up the bill for a vote at any time and force Democrats to publicly object. Senators can also try attaching the bill as an amendment to future bills under consideration. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell has been a harsh critic of Reid’s shelving of the bill, so he could demand a vote on it as a condition of moving any other legislation. If those amendments are blocked by Reid, Senators can then go to the floor and make speech after speech calling out Reid for ignoring a bill supported by 59 senators—and calling on fence-sitting Democrats to declare their position on the bill. “This letter is a final warning to Harry Reid that if Democrats want to block this bipartisan legislation, they will own the results of this foreign policy disaster,” one senior GOP senate aide said. The Republican senators believe, based on recent polls, that the majority of Americans support moving forward with the Iran sanctions bill now. They also believe that if Reid did allow a vote, the bill would garner more than the 59 votes of its co-sponsors and that Democrats vulnerable in 2014 races would support it, pushing the vote total past a veto-proof two-thirds supermajority.

**War power losses won’t affect PC**

Perry **Bacon 9/9**/13, “Losing the Syria vote does not turn Obama into a lame duck”, http://thegrio.com/2013/09/09/no-losing-the-syria-vote-does-not-turn-obama-into-a-lame-duck/, CMR

McDonough ducked the question, preferring to focus on the substance of the administration’s case for military action. But to be clear, **no**, **Obama losing** a vote on Syria **does not turn him into a lame duck**.¶ Would the defeat be bad for the president? Of course. Polls show majorities of not only conservatives, who oppose much of what Obama does on every issue, but also liberals and moderates disagree with the president on intervening in Syria. If a vote gets to the House of Representatives, there’s a chance it will be defeated with large blocs of liberals and black members of Congress voting against a president who they have strongly supported for much of the last five years. The White House would have made an all-out blitz to win the support of American voters and Congress and lost.¶ A defeat would show Obama’s words on chemical weapons and perhaps other foreign policy ideas won’t be supported by deeds. It would also illustrate Americans are even more wary of intervention in other nations than was generally believed and likely block Obama from any kind of military action in the future, even the kind of limited steps he took in Libya two years ago.¶ But **the presidency is not one issue, or just about foreign policy**. **If the House or** the **Senate** **blocks** action in **Syria, Republicans still would be wise to back** the **immigration** bill the Senate passed earlier this year, giving Obama a major victory but also making it easier for the GOP to win Latino votes in the future. **House Republicans**, **divided** **internally on that issue**, **have been delaying consideration** of the bill, and **that process is unaffected by what happens on Syria**.¶ The **Obama** administration, **even if it does not act in Syria, will still be implementing** a far-reaching **health care** law that could provide health insurance to millions of Americans. The president will still have the use of the bully pulpit, to make the case against America’s growing income inequality and urge our society to focus more on the specific challenges faced by African-American males, as Obama suggested he would do after the George Zimmerman verdict. **The administration can still fight** controversial voting laws passed in Republican-led states, urge fewer prosecutions of non-violent drug offenders and support the growing American acceptance of gay marriage.¶ And it wasn’t as if Obama’s agenda had been moving quickly through Congress before he starting talking about Syria. Republicans in the Senate had blocked his gun control push, the House delayed the immigration bill and members of both parties were not fully on board with his economic agenda. Before Syria was in the headlines, the administration was planning to spend September pushing for Congress to approve government funding for the next year and raise the federal debt limit, the kind of necessary but unexciting lawmaking that Obama has been limited to since Republicans won control of the House of Representatives in 2010.¶ That’s **the key factor here: Republican control of the House**. **Much speculation has centered on Obama losing his “political capital”** or his ability to influence Congress and the public over the last three years. But **the evidence is fairly clear; Obama has struggled to get legislation through Congress since its membership came to include many more Republicans**, who disagree with him on most issues. If Obama wanted to cut taxes on the wealthy Americans or allow the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, both ideas Republicans strongly support, they could easily be passed in Congress.¶ **A loss by Obama** on Syria **won’t change the views of Republicans, who were already against most of what Obama proposed, or congressional Democrats, who won’t suddenly stop supporting** Obamacare or **other presidential initiatives**.¶ **If the president is barred** from attacking Syria by Congress, **that will not be the last real day of his presidency.** The next day will not be the first day of the 2016 campaign, which has long been underway anyway. President George W. **Bush’s poll numbers dropped** quickly **after** his **mishandling** of the aftermath of Hurricane **Katrina**, and **it was considered the end of presidency. But he still managed to implement** a whole **new strategy in Iraq and** **loan billions** of taxpayer dollars **to American banks and auto companies** in his last two years in office — **hardly** the stuff of **a man who was powerless**.¶ **No matter what happens** in Syria, Barack **Obama will still have** more than 1200 days to make **an impact** on American public policy and culture.

**Fiat solves the link — it’s instant — no political effect – most logical because congress is the agent of the resolution this year**

**---Plan splits the GOP**

**Corn 13** – David Corn, Reporter at Mother Jones, "Obama, Syria, and Congress: Why Did He Go There?", Mother Jones, 9-6, <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/09/why-obama-sought-congressional-authorization-syria>, CMR

**With his decision to seek congressional approval** for an attack, **Obama created a political whirlpool**. **He exacerbated the growing schism on the right that pits tea party isolationists**—led by possible presidential candidate Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.), with Sens. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), other likely 2016ers, rushing to catch up—**versus** the coalition of **hawks** commanded by Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and neocons who yearn for a deeper and larger intervention in Syria than the president envisions. **This** split **has the potential to turn into an ideological civil war within the GOP** during the next presidential campaign. Meanwhile, **House Republicans are deeply divided** (unlike during the run-up to the Iraq war), with Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and his leadership crew on the president's side and rank-and-file House GOPers, enwrapped in Obama hatred, accusing the president of misleading the world and engaging in conspiratorial warmongering.

**---Key to the agenda**

**Dickerson 13** (John, Slate, Go for the Throat21, 1/18, [www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/01/barack_obama_s_second_inaugural_address_the_president_should_declare_war.single.html), CMR)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. **Gridlock** over the fiscal cliff **preceded** it and **gridlock** over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, **the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that** the president's **clashes with** House Republicans **will end soon**. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. **The challenge for** President **Obama’s** speech is the challenge of his **second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires** something **more than** simply the clever application of **predictable stratagems**. Washington’s **partisan rancor**, the size of the problems facing government, **and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president** who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation **can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP**. If he wants to transform American politics, **he must go for the throat**. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack **Obama** of the first administration **might have approached the task by finding** some **Republicans to deal with and** then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would **win some of their votes**. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. **That's the old way. He has abandoned that.** **He doesn't think it will work** and **he doesn't have the time.** As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the **Republicans are dead set on opposing him**. **They cannot be unchained by schmoozing**. **Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation**. **Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges** in 2014 **are not going to be willing partners.** He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. **Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize**. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. **Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to** either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or **cause a rift in the party that will leave it**, at least temporarily, **in disarray**.

***Ideology outweighs* and *no spillover***

**Edwards 3** – George C. Edwards, Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Texas A26M University and Former Director of the Center for Presidential Studies, "Riding High in the Polls: George W. Bush and Public Opinion", [www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley/conferencepapers/Edwards.PDF-http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley/conferencepapers/Edwards.PDF](http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley/conferencepapers/Edwards.PDF-http%3A//www.clas.ufl.edu/users/rconley/conferencepapers/Edwards.PDF), CMR

**Passing legislation** **was** **even more difficult on** the **divisive domestic issues** that¶ remained on Congress’s agenda, including health care, environmental protection, energy,¶ the economy, the faith-based initiative, corporate malfeasance, judicial nominees, and¶ taxes. The **politics of the war on terrorism did not fundamentally alter** the **consideration of**¶ **these issues,** which continued to divide the public and their representatives in Congress as¶ they had before. The **inevitable differences** between the parties **emerged** predictably,¶ exacerbated by the narrow majorities in each chamber and the jockeying for advantage in¶ the midterm elections.¶ Bipartisanship **in** **one arena** (the war on terrorism) **does not** necessarily **carry over**¶ **in another**. As the parties in Congress have become more homogeneous over time and as¶ the number of competitive seats has shrunk, especially in the House, the differences¶ between the parties have increased. The opposition party is not very fertile ground for¶ presidents on most issues – even during wartime. Thus, the president failed to obtain¶ many of his priority items in 2002, including making the 2001 tax cuts permanent and¶ passing his fiscal stimulus program, a robust faith-based initiative, and drilling rights in the¶ Artic National Wildlife Reserve. No progress was made on partially privatizing Social¶ Security, banning cloning and certain kinds of abortion, and passing private-school tax¶ credits, and the president experienced plenty of frustration on obtaining confirmation of¶ his judicial appointees. He also had to sign a farm bill that was much more costly than he¶ wanted.¶ In December 2001, the president concluded quiet negotiations with the Democrats¶ led by Senator Edward Kennedy and signed a bill on education reform. The president was¶ able to claim a victory on one of his priority issues, even though he had to give up many of¶ the most controversial elements of his original proposal. It is significant that to¶ accomplish even this much, the president chose to stay private rather than go public.¶ The modest impact of Bush’s approval is not surprising. **The president’s** public¶ **support must compete for influence with other**, **more stable factors that affect voting in**¶ **Congress, including ideology, party, personal views and commitments on specific policies,**¶ **and constituency interests.** **Although constituency interests may seem to overlap with**¶ **presidential approval, they should be viewed as distinct**. **It is quite possible for**¶ **constituents to approve of the president but oppose him on particular policies**, and it is¶ opinions on these policies that will ring most loudly in congressional ears. **Members of**¶ **Congress are unlikely to vote against the clear interests of their constituents or the firm**¶ **tenets of their ideology solely in deference to a widely supported chief executive**.45

**Obama won’t push, dodges fights**

Jack **Goldsmith 13**, Henry L. Shattuck Professor at Harvard Law School, Feb 13 2013, "The President’s SOTU Pledge to Work With Congress and Be Transparent on National Security Issues," [www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/the-presidents-sotu-pledge-to-work-with-congress-and-be-transparent-on-national-security-issues/](http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/the-presidents-sotu-pledge-to-work-with-congress-and-be-transparent-on-national-security-issues/) CMR

**As for a broader and sturdier congressional framework** for the administration’s growing forms of secret war (not just targeted killing, but special forces activities around the globe, cyber attacks, modern forms of covert action, etc.) along the lines that I proposed last week, I also don’t think much will happen. **Friends and acquaintances** in and **around** the **Obama** administration **told me** they would cherish such a new statutory framework, but argued that **Congress is too political**, and executive-congressional relations too poisonous, **for** **anything** like this **to happen**. There is some truth in this charge, although I sense that Congress is preparing to work more constructively on these issues. But even in the face of a very political and generally unsupportive Congress, Presidents tend to get what they want in national security when they make the case publicly and relentlessly. (Compare the Bush administration’s successful push for FISA reform in the summer of 2008, when the President’s approval ratings were below 30%, and Democrats controlled both houses of Congress; or FDR’s push in late 1940 and early 1941 – against popular and congressional opposition – to secure enactment of Lend-Lease legislation to help to British fend off the Nazis; or the recent FISA renewal legislation.) And of course the administration can never succeed if it doesn’t try hard. Not fighting the fight for national security legal reform is just another way of saying that **the matter is not important enough to the administration to warrant a fight**. **The administration’s failure to** date to **make a sustained push** before Congress **on these issues reveals a preference for reliance on** ever-more-tenuous **old authorities** and secret executive branch interpretations in areas ranging from drones to cyber, **and a**n implicit **judgment that the political** and legal **advantages** that would flow **from a national debate** and refreshed and clarified authorities **are** simply **not worth the effort**. The administration might be right in this judgment, at least for itself in the short run. But the President has now pledged something different in his SOTU address. We will see if he follows through this time. Count me as skeptical, but hopeful that I am wrong.

## 1AR

### Transportation

#### Electricity Sector is the driver of global warming

Mormann, 2011 (Felix, Fellow at the Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance at Stanford Law School, Ecology Law Quarterly, Vol. 38:903, http://www.boalt.org/elq/documents/elq38\_4\_03\_2012\_0808.pdf)

Renewable sources of energy are relevant not only to electricity generation ¶ but also to other sectors of the energy market, such as heat and transport. The ¶ latter especially features prominently in the public debate over ever stricter ¶ fuel-economy standards mandated by the U.S. Environmental Protection ¶ Agency (EPA).¶ 29¶ Notwithstanding the importance of renewable energy sources ¶ for heat and transport, this Article focuses on reducing greenhouse gas ¶ emissions as necessary to mitigate climate change through the timely transition ¶ to renewables in the electricity sector. From 1990 to 2008, electricity ¶ generation accounted for 32 percent of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, ¶ placing the electricity sector at the top of the emitters’ list, ahead of the ¶ transport sector, which is responsible for 27 percent of all U.S. greenhouse gas ¶ emissions.¶ 30¶ Globally, the energy sector accounts for 73 percent of greenhouse ¶ gas emissions, with the agricultural sector assuming a distant second place ¶ responsible for 16 percent.¶ 31¶ With U.S. and global electricity generation expected to increase by 22 ¶ percent and 74 percent respectively until 2030,¶ 32¶ any effort to significantly ¶ reduce greenhouse gas emissions must include major reforms in the electricity ¶ sector. A timely shift to renewable sources is the only long-term sustainable ¶ solution presently available.¶ 33¶ Moreover, the projected growth in electricity ¶ generation will easily be surpassed if the current trend towards electric vehicles ¶ (e.g., plug-in hybrids) continues.¶ 34¶ The resulting large-scale electrification of the transport sector would further increase the need for a timely ¶ decarbonization of the electricity sector. Otherwise greenhouse gas emissions ¶ may merely move from one sector (transport) to another, only slightly less ¶ carbon-intensive sector (electricity). While improvements in energy efficiency ¶ will also be important,¶ 35¶ the timely shift to renewables is essential if current ¶ efforts in climate change mitigation are to be successful.¶ 36

### Solvency

#### Their sufficiency arguments are dumb – all of our perception arguments should be treated as 100% because if they don’t send the right signal then no one invests in nuclear power

Moss, 2008 (Kenneth, professor at and chairman of the Department of National Security Studies at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, “Undeclared War and the Future of U.S. Foreign Policy”, pg 222-223)

Congress certainly understands this last factor, but if Congress is determined to restore a better balance in presidential and congressional control over using force, senators and representatives must realize that failure to do so could further divide the United States from some international allies and friendly states. Much of that community is watching the 2007-8 debates to ascertain whether Congress will reject assertive presidential claims and reestablish a better balance in the process by which the United States decides to use military force. They see such steps as correcting independent, impulsive features of U.S. decision making. Admittedly, some American observers believe that such distance may be inevitable, even desirable, particularly if other governments are more concerned with how the United States adheres to international law when it makes decisions rather than the intent and outcome that Americans may see as justifying their actions. Fairly or not, a sizable sector of informed opinion in allied capitals judges the United States not only for its policies but also for inattention, even disregard, of its own constitution in both war and peace.