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## Port Security Affirmative

### 1AC: Inherency (1/6)

#### Nuclear port security measures failing now

Douglas Frantz, previously chief investigator for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Managing Director of Kroll’s Business Intelligence Washington office, Jul-15-2012, “Port security: U.S. fails to meet deadline for scanning of cargo containers,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/port-security-us-fails-to-meet-deadline-for-scanning-of-cargo-containers/2012/07/15/gJQAmgW8mW_story.html>. Date accessed: August 26, 2012.

The Obama administration has failed to meet a legal deadline for scanning all shipping containers for radioactive material before they reach the United States, a requirement aimed at strengthening maritime security and preventing terrorists from smuggling a nuclear device into any of the nation’s 300 sea and river ports. The Department of Homeland Security was given until this month to ensure that 100 percent of inbound shipping containers are screened at foreign ports. But the department’s secretary, Janet Napolitano, informed Congress in May that she was extending a two-year blanket exemption to foreign ports because the screening is proving too costly and cumbersome. She said it would cost $16 billion to implement scanning measures at the nearly 700 ports worldwide that ship to the United States. Instead, the DHS relies on intelligence-gathering and analysis to identify “high-risk” containers, which are checked before being loaded onto ships. Under this system, fewer than half a percent of the roughly 10 million containers arriving at U.S. ports last year were scanned before departure. The DHS says that those checks turned up narcotics and other contraband but that there have been no public reports of smuggled nuclear material. In response to the 9/11 Commission, Congress passed a law in 2007 specifying that no cargo container may enter the United States before being scanned with imaging equipment and a radiation-detection device. The administration’s failure to meet the deadline has left some members of Congress and outside experts concerned about whether the threat is being taken seriously enough. “I personally do not believe they intend to comply with the law,” Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), co-author of the 2007 law, said in an interview. “This is a real terrorist threat, and it has a solution. We can’t afford to wait until a catastrophic attack.”

#### A nuclear terror attack is imminent

Peter Goodspeed, Reporter for National Post, “Peter Goodspeed: Ongoing nuclear threat looms over Seoul summit,” National Post, Mar-24-2012, <http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2012/03/24/preventing-devastating-nuclear-terrorist-attack-aim-of-world-leaders-meeting/>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

“We believe the potential for nuclear terrorism remains high,” said Page Stoutland, vice-president for nuclear security at the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a Washington-based think-tank. “There are currently thousands of tons of nuclear materials in the world and those materials today are stored at hundreds of sites in over 30 countries.” he said. “Some of those sites are well secured. Many are not, leaving weapons-usable nuclear materials vulnerable to theft or sale on the black market to terrorist organizations. “The elements of a perfect storm are in place: an ample supply of weapons-usable nuclear materials, an expansion of the knowledge and technical know-how to build a crude nuclear bomb accessible by the Internet or through rogue scientists and the determination of terrorists organizations to do it.”

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase use of nuclear scanning technology in ports in the United States.

### 1AC: Nuclear Terrorism Advantage (2/6)

#### High probability of maritime nuclear terror attack

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The greatest threats should be addressed first. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should prioritize threats that have a relatively high probability of occurring and pose catastrophic consequences. It should then develop, acquire, and set in place the tools and techniques needed to prevent, respond, or recover from such awful scenarios. By this rubric, nowhere is it more important to develop cost-effective security plans than in the area of maritime security. According to experts, the U.S. should be concerned about nuclear attack by sea. More than 85 non-proliferation and national-security experts polled for a congressional study estimate that the risk of a WMD attack in the next decade using some sort of nuclear device is as high as 70 percent. 1 And Stephen Flynn, a Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, reported that the CIA has concluded that the most likely way weapons of mass destruction (WMD) would enter the United States is by sea. 2

#### Ports are the most likely channel for terrorists to bring in nuclear weapons

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

In one of his final interviews before leaving office, former Attorney General John Ashcroft stated that the greatest danger facing the United States in the war on terrorism is the possibility that al Qaeda or a sympathetic terrorist group could obtain a nuclear bomb.56 Security experts from the CIA, the Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, the Coast Guard, and a multitude of think tanks have repeatedly identified the maritime cargo transportation system as the most likely means by which terrorists might bring a nuclear weapon into the United States. Despite these warnings, current measures to defend against a container-borne nuclear attack remain terribly inadequate.

#### Terrorist would use a nuclear device for maximum damage

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

An act of nuclear terrorism involving a cargo container could take one of two forms: a nuclear weapon or a radiological dispersal device (commonly referred to as a “dirty bomb”). A nuclear weapon requires the presence of a critical mass of fissile nuclear material – specifically, plutonium or highly enriched uranium (HEU) – in order to achieve a nuclear chain reaction. A nuclear detonation generates extreme levels of heat and radiation, which, in a densely populated area, would result in immediate, large-scale destruction, as occurred in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. In contrast, a dirty bomb involves conventional explosives designed to spread radioactive material over a wide area. For example, a terrorist might use a fertilizer bomb, such as the one used to destroy the Alfred P. Murrah federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995, in order to disperse radioactive material in a commercial center. Although a dirty bomb could result in longlasting contamination of the affected area, its potential impact pales in comparison to that of a nuclear detonation. Thus, logistical considerations aside, a terrorist seeking to maximize damage in a nuclear attack would choose a nuclear device over a dirty bomb.

### 1AC: Nuclear Terrorism Advantage (3/6)

#### Retaliation to an nuclear attack would cause global nuclear war

Martin Hellman, Professor Engineering Stanford, Spring 2008, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence,” <http://ceenew.stanford.edu/pubs/74%20RiskAnaly%20Bent_1434.pdf>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Nuclear proliferation and the specter of nuclear terrorism are creating additional possibilities for triggering a nuclear war. If an American (or Russian) city were devastated by an act of nuclear terrorism, the public outcry for immediate, decisive action would be even stronger than Kennedy had to deal with when the Cuban missiles first became known to the American public. While the action would likely not be directed against Russia, it might be threatening to Russia (e.g., on its borders) or one of its allies and precipitate a crisis that resulted in a full-scale nuclear war. Terrorists with an apocalyptic mindset might even attempt to catalyze a full-scale nuclear war by disguising their act to look like an attack by the U.S. or Russia.

#### Independently, a nuclear terror attack would cause extinction

Reed Johnson, “The Bomb is Back,” Los Angeles Times, Jun-18-2002, <http://articles.latimes.com/2002/jun/18/news/lv-nukes18>. Date accessed: August 29, 2012.

But in the bleak months since Sept. 11, the phantom menace of nuclear catastrophe has come back with a vengeance--stalking our imaginations, confounding our leaders, confronting us with a host of atomic terrors hitherto barely imagined: hijacked airliners rammed down the throats of nuclear power plants; "dirty bombs" spraying lethal radiation and rendering huge swaths of cities uninhabitable for years to come. Looming over these lesser catastrophes is the threat of an actual nuclear weapons attack. After the lull of the '90s, we're learning to start worrying and fear The Bomb all over again. Only now America must face the possibility of dealing with more than just one or two mega-adversaries capable of sending our entire country up in a mushroom cloud. Now we're conjuring up visions of a suitcase bomb detonated at Times Square, a 10-kiloton dose of megadeath delivered in a truck to downtown Los Angeles or Chicago. Or a regional conflict, like the present one pitting India against nuclear rival Pakistan over the disputed Kashmir territory, escalating into global Armageddon. On the one hand, we're being confronted anew with the sublime terror of extinction; on the other, with the banality and ridiculousness of a threat to our lives and our civilization from something that may be lurking in a briefcase, a pair of Hush Puppies or, as in the new Hollywood blockbuster "The Sum of All Fears," a cigarette-vending machine.

#### Nuclear terrorism outweighs all other impacts, even nuclear war

Graham Allison, founding dean of Harvard's modern John F. Kennedy School of Government and Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “The Gravest Danger,” The American Prospect, Feb-21-2005, Date accessed: August 20, 2012.

The gravity of the potential consequences requires that the president give absolute priority to this challenge. In the Cold War, we recognized that preventing a global nuclear war was a necessary condition for pursuing any other objective. In Ronald Reagan's oft-quoted one-liner, "A nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought." The face of that danger today is a nuclear terrorist attack on an American city. This would be a world-altering event. The categorical imperative, therefore, is to do everything technically feasible on the fastest possible time line to prevent it.

### 1AC: Economy Advantage (4/6)

#### Terror attack would cause massive port shutdowns

Stephen E. Flynn, retired Commander of the U.S. Coast Guard (ret.), Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies, and Director of the Council on Foreign Relations Independent Task Force on Homeland Security Imperatives, Nov-2005, “What Chiefs Need to Know About Port Security,” The Police Chief, [www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display\_arch&article\_id=742&issue\_id=112005](http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=742&issue_id=112005). Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Despite our enormous dependency on ports, most remain very soft targets. Before September 11, 2001, they simply were not security priorities at the local, state, or federal levels. Few possessed the means to deter amateur thieves and thugs, never mind determined terrorists. Most ports are just at the earliest stages of putting in the kinds of protective measures these critical assets require. This translates into vulnerable ports where the consequences of a future attack would extend far beyond the confines of the city or state that bears most of the responsibility for safeguarding it. A radiation dispersal device, or dirty bomb, set off in a container while it is in a marine terminal. An explosive-laden small boat launched at the side of a moored cruise ship or an inbound oil tanker. These scenarios would produce much more than loss of life and destruction of property. Should a dirty bomb go off in a box, it would almost certainly produce a shutdown of all the container terminals in that port, and, given the uncertainty surrounding possible follow-on attacks, lead to the closure of other seaports as well. Just a few days of a national port shutdown to conduct an investigation would be an economic disaster. Just-in-time supply chains would collapse, retailer shelves would go bare, and manufacturing plants would be idled. The losses to our economy could quickly mount into the tens of billions of dollars.

#### A nuclear terrorist attack on a port would destroy the global economy

Dr. John R. Harrald, Ph.D., served as director of The George Washington University Institute of Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management, professor in the University’s Department of Engineering Management and Systems Engineering, School of Engineering and Applied Science, Fall 2005, “Sea Trade and Security: an Assessment of the Post-9/11 Reaction,” Journal of International Affairs, 59.1. Date accessed: August 15, 2012.

The scenarios are indeed horrifying. Containers, for example, maybe used as a vector for an attack involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). A nuclear device smuggled in one of millions of containers and remotely detonated could have catastrophic results. A study conducted by the Department of Transportation’s Volpe Center states that the detonation of a 10-to-20-kilotonweapon in a container would cause a disruption of trade valued at $100-$300billion, property damage of $50-$500 billion, and the loss of 50,000-1,000,000 lives.12 The report states that “global and long term effects, including the economic impacts of the pervasive national and international responses to the nuclear attack, though not calculated, are believed to be substantially greater.” According to Flynn, it would not take a WMD to wreak financial havoc: A dirty bomb smuggled in a container and set off in a seaport would likely kill only a few unfortunate longshoremen and contaminate several acres of valuable waterfront property. But if there is no credible security system to restore the public’s confidence that other containers are safe, mayors and governors throughout the country, as well as the President, will come under withering political pressure to order the shutdown of the inter-modal transportation system. Examining cargo in tens of thousands of trucks, trains and ships to ensure it poses no threat would have devastating economic consequences. When containers stop moving, assembly plants go idle, retail shelves are bare, and workers end up in unemployment lines. A three-week shutdown could well spawn a global recession.13

### 1AC: Economy Advantage (5/6)

#### Even a small attack would have crippling economic effects

Tayfur Atiok, Professor in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering and Director of the Laboratory for Port Security at Rutgers, Feb-09-2011, “Port security/safety, risk analysis, and Modeling,” <http://www.springerlink.com/content/mn653022144671u0/fulltext.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Freely ﬂowing international trade, carried predominantly by ocean-going vessels, has been a major contributor to the global prosperity experienced in the second-half of the 20th century. In the U.S. and many countries worldwide, maritime trafﬁc in ports and waterways is a critical component of national supply chains and the backbone of many economies. However, the proximity of major seaports to urban centers and the volume and diversity of seaport activities render them vulnerable targets, where even small incidents could have crippling economic effects. Increasing important is that security operations must strike a balance between providing security and impeding the movement of cargo with the attendant economic costs, as any stoppage or appreciable slow-down in port operations impacts numerous supply chains, and extended stoppages necessitate diverting vessels to other ports, as was the case in the 2003 strike of longshoremen in the port complex of LA/LB.

#### Independently, investing in port infrastructure boosts the economy

American Association of Port Authorities, “U.S. Seaports, Private-Sector Partners Plan to Invest $46 Billion By 2017 in Port Infrastructure,” Jun-18-2012, <http://www.aapa-ports.org/Press/PRdetail.cfm?itemnumber=18583>. Date accessed: August 27, **2012**.

Mr. Nagle added that, despite substantial investments by port authorities and their private-sector business partners, inadequate infrastructure connecting ports to landside transportation networks and water-side shipping lanes often creates bottlenecks, resulting in congestion, productivity losses and a global economic disadvantage for America. “These congestion issues and productivity losses have the potential to stymie America’s ability to compete internationally and to create and sustain jobs,” he said.

#### Economic collapse causes extinction

Phil Kerpen, National Review Online, Oct-29-2008, “Don't Turn Panic Into Depression,” <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/29/opinion/main4555821.shtml>. Date accessed: August 20, 2012.

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors - not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale. To be sure, Washington already has stoked the flames of the financial panic. The president and the Treasury secretary did the policy equivalent of yelling fire in a crowded theater when they insisted that Congress immediately pass a bad bailout bill or face financial Armageddon. Members of Congress splintered and voted against the bill before voting for it several days later, showing a lack of conviction that did nothing to reassure markets. Even Alan Greenspan is questioning free markets today, placing our policy fundamentals in even greater jeopardy. But after the elections, all eyes will turn to the new president and Congress in search of reassurance that the fundamentals of our free economy will be supported. That will require the shelving of any talk of trade protectionism, higher taxes, and more restrictive labor markets. The stakes couldn’t be any higher.

### 1AC: Solvency (6/6)

#### Nuclear detection technology effective

Huban Gowadia, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Acting Director, “Preventing Nuclear Terrorism: Does DHS have an Effective and Efficient Nuclear Detection Strategy,” Jul-27-2012,

<http://www.defpro.com/news/details/37971/?SID=e4a3b7d85367ebc46f8a5a1f80ad31a8>. Date accessed: August 20, 2012.

Along with intelligence and law enforcement, technology is fundamental in our ability to detect nuclear threats. In recent years, there have been dramatic advancements in nuclear detection technology. Thirty years ago, identification of detected nuclear material required laboratory specialists and large, complicated equipment. Now, newer detection materials that can be integrated into mobile and human-portable devices, coupled with advanced algorithms, allow for significantly improved operations. As a result, frontline responders and law enforcement officials now regularly use detection equipment to search for, find, and identify nuclear materials in the field. Technological advances in computing, communications, software, and hardware have also contributed to this revolution in nuclear detection technology.

#### Detection devices solve terror threats and are cheap

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

The first vital need is to protect container integrity throughout the entire global supply chain. Currently, no standard exists for a tamper-proof intermodal shipping container. Under existing port security regimes, terrorists might be able to break into and hide nuclear materials in a container from a “trusted shipper,” thus increasing their chances of escaping the scrutiny of inspectors. One possible solution is a multipurpose security device that would be required on every shipping container. Such a device would conform to internationally mandated standards and would enhance the security of a container in several ways. First, the device would have intrusion detection capability to protect the integrity of the container against unauthorized access. In addition, the device would contain basic radiation detection equipment to identify the presence of nuclear materials. Finally, the security device would also serve as a GPS-based tracking device to monitor the location of the container. The device would be assayed via radio frequency (RF) at various points during its journey, including loading, embarkation and disembarkation, to enable inspection officials to access the collected data and determine if a container posed a potential threat. According to one study, such devices could be produced at a cost of between $100 and $200 each, or roughly 2 percent of the cost of a single shipping container.49

#### The technology exists, we just have to fund it

JERROLD L. NADLER, EDWARD J. MARKEY and BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Cargo, the Terrorists’ Trojan Horse, The New York Times, Jun-26-2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/27/opinion/the-dangerous-delay-on-port-security.html>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Homeland Security says it uses a “layered, risk-based approach” to cargo scanning, which, instead of comprehensive scanning, targets specific cargo thought to be high-risk. But this approach is inadequate. Recent advances in screening technologies have undermined Homeland Security’s contention that the technology is not available to scan all cargo containers without disrupting commerce. An effective high-volume container screening system was installed in the Port of Hong Kong in 2005. Trials of new, American-made technology have demonstrated that scanning all containers would be feasible at many ports. The world’s largest marine terminal operators have offered to work with the department to put the law into effect. Cost and technology have never been the primary obstacles to meeting this mandate. What is missing is a sense of urgency and determination.

### Lack of Funding Now

#### Lack of funding for port security now

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Although the U.S. government made significant investments in national security during the first term of the Bush Administration, there is evidence to suggest that the dollars have not been allocated in proportion to the threat. According to Stephen Flynn, a Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, the CIA has concluded that the most likely way that a WMD would enter the U.S. is by sea. 28 Despite this assessment, as of September 2004, the U.S. government was spending more every three days to finance the war in Iraq than it had provided over the previous three years to improve security at all 361 U.S. seaports. 29

#### Port security funding cuts now

American Association of Port Authorities, “Maritime Security” Mar-2012, <http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/Maritime%20Security%202012.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

The Port Security Grant program continues to be a very valuable program for ports, which serve as partners with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to harden security at U.S. ports and protect our homeland. Funding/Eligibility – AAPA urges Congress to con-tinue to authorize and appropriate $400 million for the program. AAPA is concerned that last year’s drastic cuts to state homeland security grants, including the port security grant program, will threaten the ability of our nation to maintain our current capacity or expand it. For FY 2012, Congress combined all grants, cut them by 40 percent and gave DHS the authority to determine the final funding level. DHS subsequently cut the Port Security Grants further by decreasing the level of funding by 59 percent from last year’s funding level. It is currently at a level that is less than 75 percent of the authorized amount.

#### Port security funding cuts now

Maritime Activity Reports, “Ports Urge Congress to Support Port Security Grants” Mar-7-2012, <http://www.marinelink.com/news/congress-security-support342938.aspx>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

At two separate Congressional hearings, representatives of the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) emphasized the need for federal support for seaport security and maintenance and improvements to federal navigation channels. Port industry leaders illustrated the challenges underfunding security and dredging pose for national security and U.S. international competitiveness. As the House Appropriations Committee begins work on the Fiscal Year 2013 budget, AAPA executives reminded Congressional leaders of the critical role ports play for the nation – serving as a front line of defense on international borders and facilitating overseas trade, 99 percent of which moves by water. Captain John Holmes, Deputy Executive Director of Operations at the Port of Los Angeles, testified before the Homeland Security Subcommittee regarding Port Security Grants within the Federal Emergency Management Agency. “The fiscal year 2012 funding level represents a 59 percent cut from the prior year and 75 percent less than the authorized level,” Holmes stated. “This will harm our ability to expand protection of our maritime assets, carry out Port-Wide Risk Management Plans, and fund federal mandates, such as installation of TWIC readers.”

### Ports Unsafe Now

#### Only a small percentage of port containers are inspected

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Although shipping containers enter American ports at a rate of roughly twenty thousand per day, fewer than 5 percent are opened for inspection. 25 In the findings outlined in the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) of 2002, the U.S. Congress acknowledged this problem: “Current inspection levels of containerized cargo are insufficient to counter potential security risks. Technology is currently not adequately deployed to allow for the nonintrusive inspection of containerized cargo . . . Security related and detection-related equipment, such as small boats, cameras, large-scale x-ray machines, and vessel tracking devices, are lacking at many ports.” 26

#### Less than 3% of containers scanned now- creates major security risk

Congresswoman Janice Hahn, Congressional Documents and Publications, May-09-2012, “Congresswoman Laura Richardson Asks GAO to Examine Port Security Vulnerabilities,” <http://richardson.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2948&Itemid=500261>. Date accessed: August 21, 2012.

Congresswoman Janice Hahn’s bill, H.R. 4005 “Gauging American Port Security Act” or Gaps Act, today successfully passed by a unanimous vote in the Homeland Security Committee. H.R. 4005 directs the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a comprehensive classified examination of remaining gaps in port Security and prepare a plan to address them. “Pretending a threat doesn’t exist does not make it go away,” Rep. Hahn said. “The lesson of 9/11 is to be vigilant and proactive in seeking out and preventing our country’s most pressing threats. More than a decade after 9/11, our ports remain possible points of entry for terrorists and their weapons. Ports are also a key part of our economy. If an attack were ever to occur, it would cause a catastrophic loss of jobs and damage to our economic recovery. This situation requires a legislative solution and I hope that the resulting blueprint will guide Congress in creating effective legislation to help guard our ports.” Ships make 50,000 calls a year on U.S. ports, carrying two billion tons of freight and 134 million passengers. Each day our ports move both imports and exports totaling some $3.8 billion worth of goods through all 50 states. Additionally, ports move 99.4 percent of overseas cargo volume by weight and generate $3.95 trillion in international trade. Unfortunately less than 3% of cargo coming into the country is scanned, giving terrorist opportunities to smuggle themselves or their weapons into the United States with little risk of detection. An attack on the Port of Los Angeles complex, for example, would cost billions to the regional economy and put thousands of port employees out of work and cause the demise of hundreds of local businesses.

#### Ports not secure now

Mark Lowe, “Cargo Vulnerable to Terrorist,” Maritime Security Review, Feb-22-2012, <http://www.marsecreview.com/2012/02/cargo-vulnerable-to-terrorists/>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

It’s been more than a decade since Islamic terrorists attacked the U.S., yet the agency created to protect the nation from another strike is asleep at the wheel, failing to adequately screen the monstrous amounts of cargo that enter the country each day, according to a government report issued this week. “Cargo containers that are part of the global supply chain — the flow of goods from manufacturers to retailers — are vulnerable to threats from terrorists [including weapons of mass destruction],” state the government analysts who assembled data for the new report. It may seem unbelievable to most Americans that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) that more than ten years after the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history, the vast majority of cargo containers entering the U.S. go unchecked. Incredibly, it’s true and the alarming details are outlined in the GAO report published this week by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the investigative arm of the U.S. Congress.

### Port Terror Likely Now

#### Terrorists odds of being successful high now

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

This has created a situation where terrorists seeking to smuggle a nuclear weapon into the U.S. via a cargo container face highly favorable odds of escaping detection. According to one study, in fact, the probability that inspectors will detect a shielded nuclear weapon in a shipping container using the current screening system is only about 10 percent. 27 In order to decrease the likelihood of a nuclear weapon entering the U.S. in a container, the odds of detection must be significantly improved. Otherwise, terrorists will eventually attempt to exploit this system, given the relatively low risk that a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb would be detected.

#### Ports are vulnerable to terrorist attacks

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

C. Ease of attack: Commercial ports are not fortresses. The ocean itself presents a number of distinct advantages to a dedicated attacker, especially when employing maritime suicide terrorism or means to rapidly deliver large explosive force. Water is not only a tremendously efficient transport medium (allowing for rapid transit), but the large amount of legitimate commercial and recreational traffic in ports allows for an enemy to mask movements prior to an attack, making effective defense difficult. Given the importance of ports to our economy and military power, the potential for creating mass casualties, and the ease by which an enemy can attack, a strong case can be made that ports will become a target for future terrorist attacks. If this is the case, we can apply the military planning process to meeting this threat. The first step in this process is looking for lessons learned that could be used in the current scenario: have we faced this threat before, and if so, what can we learn from the experience?

#### High risk that terrorists will smuggle nuclear material through the ports

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

The threat of a nuclear attack involving a seaborne container lies at the nexus of two critically important security issues: the availability of nuclear materials and the vulnerability of cargo containers. Although the U.S. government has taken a number of steps in the past few years to secure nuclear materials and improve the security of the country’s ports, the threat of a nuclear weapon entering the United States undetected in a shipping container remains very real. Much additional work, including international standards for container security and expanded international cooperation to prevent the proliferation of nuclear materials, is necessary to prevent a catastrophe that could dwarf the tragedy of 9/11.

### Port Attacks Destroy the Economy

#### Terror attack would damage trade and the economy

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

A. Economic Impact: An unprecedented amount of trade — both imports and exports — relies on shipment by sea. A successful attack on maritime infrastructure would affect this trade in far greater proportion than the actual damage. It is likely that an attack on one port would have a cascade effect on others as increased security measures are applied nationwide. The recent impact of the London bombings can be seen as illustrative of this effect; although there was no indication of additional terrorist activity, security measures were increased at transportation hubs worldwide. Increasing security alerts at a train station is one thing; closing a huge economic entity such as a port is quite another. Delay of shipping in loading and offloading cargo is one of the most costly elements of the shipping process. We must also consider the impact to the shipping industry itself. During the Persian Gulf re-flagging operations of the late 1980s, for example, analysis showed the greatest impact to the shipping of oil was not the damage to tankers inflicted by the warring Iraqis and Iranians (which was, in fact, minimal), but the increased insurance costs of operating in that area. 3 An attack on a U.S. port could have a similar, if not larger, effect.

#### Port shutdown tanks the economy

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The second concern is that ports themselves present attractive targets for terrorists. Ports are a significant potential choke point for an enormous amount of economic activity. The 361 U.S. seaports make an immense contribution to U.S. trade and the U.S. economy. They move about 80 percent of all U.S. international trade by weight, and about 95 percent of all U.S. overseas trade, excluding trade with Mexico and Canada. By value, $807 billion worth of goods flowed through the seaports in 2003, about 41 percent of all U.S. international goods trade. This value is higher than the value of trade moved by all modes in any single leading industrial country except Germany. Temporarily shutting down a major U.S. port could impose significant economic costs throughout not only the United States but also the world. Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden has labeled the destruction of the U.S. economy as one of his goals: “If their economy is finished, they will become too busy to enslave oppressed people. It is very important to concentrate on hitting the U.S. economy with every available means.”

#### Attack on U.S. ports would disrupt global economy

Jim Giermanski, former Air Force colonel, special agent in the Air Force Office of Special Investigations, and Laura Hains, retired CBP/US Customs supervisor and law enforcement officer, “Supply Chain Security and DHS Oversight,” Homeland Security Today, Jun-5-2012, http://www.hstoday.us/blogs/guest-commentaries/blog/supply-chain-security-and-dhs-oversight/55079ca7058f8f48ad6ba50411635596.html. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Today, international trade accounts for 30 percent of the US economy. Consequently, it’s easy to see how a terrorist incident in our nation’s ports or along the cargo supply chain would have a devastating effect on our country and its economy. Indeed, given the size and magnitude of use of containers and trailers to carry weapons of mass destruction (WMD) through our sensitive and vulnerable port system, the supply chain is the single most important and potentially devastating vulnerability to a terrorist attack. Meanwhile, the vulnerability is increased by the lack of appropriate training that’s given to Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in the supply chain arena. In 2012, CBP admitted that there could be a serious vulnerability within the US in-bond cargo program regarding the contents, access and whereabouts of in-bond cargo shipments.

### Ports Key to the Economy

#### Ports key to the US economy

Michael D. Orosz, Carl Southwell, Anthony Barrett, Onur Bakir, Jennifer Chen, Isaac Maya, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System,” 12th IFAC Symposium on Transportation Systems, Sep-4-2009, Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System” <http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1108&context=nonpublished_reports>… Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Ports are major contributors to the national economy through the large value of maritime import and export trade. In addition, ports are a major provider of both direct and indirect jobs locally and nationally, and any impact on the daily operations of these ports ripples through the various layers of the economy. This is particularly true with the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Approximately 40% of the US container trade flows through the two-port complex. In addition, the POLA/LB complex supports large bulk cargo, tanker, and cruise ship operations.

#### Safe ports key to U.S. economy

Michael D. Orosz, Carl Southwell, Anthony Barrett, Onur Bakir, Jennifer Chen, Isaac Maya, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System,” 12th IFAC Symposium on Transportation Systems, Sep-4-2009, Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System” <http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1108&context=nonpublished_reports>… Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Ports are important to the US economy. This is particularly true with the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Over 40% of all containers shipped in and out of the US flow through the two-port complex. It is vital that these ports be protected from terrorist attack and other disasters. The DHS funded Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events (CREATE) at the University of Southern California is developing a port security risk management and resource allocation system (PortSec). PortSec supports both tactical day-today decision-making and long-term strategic security planning.

#### Ports key to the economy

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

In addition, maritime commerce is essential to America’s economic vitality. As the primary mode of transportation for world trade goods, ships carry more than 95 percent of the nation’s non-North-American trade by weight and 75 percent by value, and 100 percent of the foreign oil imported by the United States. 6 In 2003, waterborne trade contributed about 7.5 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. 7 Given the importance of maritime trade to the U.S. economy, disruption of that trade would have immediate and significant economic consequences in the United States and also worldwide.

#### Maritime security is key to international trade

Joseph J. Cox, President, Chamber of Shipping of America, Oct-02-2001, “RAILROAD AND MARITIME SECURITY”, Senate Hearing 107-1033 From the U.S. Government Printing Office, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-107shrg89457/html/CHRG-107shrg89457.htm>. Date Accessed: August 29, 2012.

CSA traces its roots back to 1917 and the development of the first international treaty on maritime safety. Since that time, the U.S. has had extensive dealings with the international community on maritime matters. We mention this because it is critical to recognize two very important points: the maritime industry is the basic tool of international trade and the U.S. has been one of the leaders in the development of policies for this industry for decades. At the same time, we have an extensive trade in our waters among U.S. companies. The needs of the U.S. for a secure waterfront will have an impact on our ships and the ships of our trading partners. We should recognize that ships are the critical mechanism for the United States in its world trade leadership. Ships are the lifelines of trade from other nations to the U.S. and from the U.S. to the rest of the world.

### AT: Small Impact/Ports are Resilient

#### Even a single attack would completely destroy global trade and the global economy

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

What, then, is the potential impact of an attack on a major U.S. port involving a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb? Without question, the damage would be devastating. Gal Luft and Anne Korin at the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security describe a scenario where terrorists ram a cargo ship loaded with explosives, or possibly a WMD, into a major port or terminal. “Such an attack,” they state, “could bring international trade to a halt, inflicting multi-billion-dollar damage on the world economy.” 4 Robert Bonner, currently the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, painted a similarly bleak picture in August 2002: “There is virtually no security for what is the primary system to transport global trade. The consequences of a terrorist incident using a container would be profound . . . If terrorists used a sea container to conceal a weapon of mass destruction and detonated it on arrival at a port, the impact on global trade and the global economy could be immediate and devastating – all nations would be affected. No container ships would be permitted to unload at U.S. ports after such an event.”

#### Smaller and more networked ports mean that any disruption has huge effects

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

This has changed in the modern era of containerization and the increased size and technical nature of ships. In modern times ports have become centers of highly technical, well-integrated infrastructure designed for the rapid loading and unloading of cargo, an evolution that has become highly complex in the era of containerization. Commercially efficient, port cargo operations are also highly dependent on networked operations, making the disruption of the process far simpler for a potential attacker. Additionally, the complexity of this evolution, combined with the increasing size of seagoing merchant vessels (and warships), has greatly reduced the number of commercial ports available for use by global shipping. This has the duel effect of making major ports more important economically and strategically while simultaneously making them more attractive targets for offensive action.

#### Even brief port shutdowns as the result of an attack would damage the economy

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Although these assessments give a general idea of the impact of a nuclear attack, a better perspective can be achieved by quantifying the potential effects. Historical disruptions of port operations provide some indication of the potential magnitude of a large-scale shutdown of U.S. ports. In 2002, a strike by the International Longshore and Warehouse Union caused the closing of twenty-nine West Coast ports for ten days. One study estimated that the shutdown cost the U.S. economy $19.4 billion.6 If a lengthy shutdown of cargo traffic at all U.S. ports occurred in response to a container-based nuclear attack, the total costs would be staggering.

### AT: Airport/Borders Alt Cause

#### Ports are the most likely way for terrorists to smuggle in nukes

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Once nuclear materials have been obtained, a terrorist’s next challenge is avoiding detection while bringing that material into the United States. As government officials and independent security experts repeatedly point out, the easiest way for a terrorist to accomplish this is by exploiting the vulnerability of the global cargo transportation system. The efficiency of this system relies on the versatility of intermodal containers – standardized containers (usually 40 x 8 x 8 feet in size) that can travel by ship, train or truck without being repackaged or reconfigured. Every day, 30,000 trucks, 6,500 rail cars and 140 ships deliver more than 50,000 such containers to destinations within the United States. 22 Although some of these containers initially make their way into the U.S. via highway and rail, the vast majority of containers enter through one of the country’s 361 public ports, which handle over 95 percent of U.S. overseas trade. 23 As the global economy continues to expand, the total volume of goods imported and exported through U.S. ports is expected to more than double over the next twenty years, dramatically increasing the burden on inspectors tasked with securing the nation’s ports. 24

#### Other entry points are secure—ports are the weakest part of US borders

Bruce J. Carlton, Acting deputy maritime administrator before the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, United States Senate on Port and Maritime Security Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration Statement of Jul-4-2001, <http://testimony.ost.dot.gov/test/pasttest/01test/Carlton2.htm>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Terrorism is also a concern for seaport security. The threat of such activity and the vulnerability of seaports are the reasons for concern. While U.S. airports and land border crossings have well structured security measures, our ports do not enjoy the same level of security even though they offer unparalleled intermodal access to our nation’s interior. Addressing port vulnerabilities is key to ensuring that our ports are not targeted for terrorist and criminal activities. Moreover, most of the serious crimes that take place in our seaports are in fact violations of Federal law. For this reason, it makes good sense for the Federal Government to achieve coordination among the various agencies concerned with port and maritime security and to work with the ports to explore ways to minimize criminal activity.

#### Ports are the weak point in U.S. security

Stuart Flynn is Vice President at global maritime security services provider SecureWest International, Port Technology International, “Next Generation Port Security,” Feb-04-2011, <http://www.porttechnology.org/im-ages/uploads/technical_papers/PT40-25.pdf>. Date accessed: August 26, 2012.

As time has elapsed, this security spotlight has fallen sharply on the maritime sector (through which the vast majority of the world trade mentioned above is moved). The result has been the exposure of a series of weak points in the industry, some of which are ripe for exploitation by various groups including terrorists. Whatever the chosen method is, two facts stand out. Firstly, there is no doubt that ports present attractive targets for potential attacks. Human costs aside, a terrorist attack that shuts down a major port would do significant harm to national economies. Secondly, security at ports is vital as a first line of defense. Yet port security remains weak in many countries, having had comparatively little financial support in the post 9/11 years. Even in the U.S., port security has been described by Dr. Stephen Flynn, Snr Fellow for National Security Studies at the Council for Foreign Relations, as ‘grossly under funded’, with some major U.S. ports receiving over the past six years roughly what has been spent every 2.5 hours in the Iraq war.

### AT: Terrorists Can’t Get Nukes

#### Nuclear material is readily available for terrorists

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

A fundamental factor contributing to the threat of a container-based terrorist attack is the disturbing availability of nuclear materials, which include unsecured nuclear weapons, fissile nuclear material and other sources of radioactivity. As previously stated, given a choice, a terrorist would opt for a nuclear device over a dirty bomb in order to maximize casualties and damage to physical infrastructure. The first obstacle a potential nuclear terrorist faces is the acquisition of a functional nuclear weapon. There are more than two hundred locations worldwide where a would-be terrorist could acquire a nuclear weapon or the fissile material to make one.14 The area of greatest concern is Russia, which may still possess as many as twelve thousand low-yield tactical nuclear weapons that are often kept in less secure conditions than the weapons in the nation’s strategic arsenal.15 Fortunately, a nuclear bomb in a terrorist’s hands has thus far been only the subject of spy thrillers and Hollywood productions rather than a live CNN newscast.

#### Terrorists would steal nuclear material

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

If the theft of a complete nuclear weapon proved too difficult, terrorists could attempt to steal or purchase the necessary fissile material and construct a bomb on their own. The minimum amount of weapons-grade fissile material required for a nuclear detonation varies with bomb design but can be as little as twelve kilograms of uranium- 235 or four kilograms of plutonium-239. Terrorists seeking this path might look to one of the 130 research reactors in more than 40 countries worldwide that use highly enriched uranium (HEU) as fuel. 16 Attempted thefts of materials from such facilities occur with disturbing frequency. In the first three years after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, for example, the German government reported more than seven hundred incidents of attempted nuclear sales, including sixty cases that involved seizure of nuclear materials. 17 Furthermore, the Database on Nuclear Smuggling, Theft and Orphan Radiation Sources (DSTO), compiled by researchers at Stanford University’s Center for International Security and Cooperation, has documented twenty-five “highly-credible” incidents involving the trafficking of weapons-grade plutonium or HEU since 1992. 18 Fortunately, in all but one of these cases, the stolen nuclear material was recovered by law enforcement officials. Although open-source literature may offer little evidence of successful thefts involving significant amounts of weapons-usable nuclear material, the potential existence of unreported or as yet undiscovered thefts is sufficient cause for concern.

#### Terrorists can get nukes

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The secrets of nuclear weapon design were revealed long ago. Today, the only significant barrier to building a weapon of mass destruction remains access to fissile (highly enriched uranium and plutonium) and radiological materials. Terrorists have two options. They could either acquire a complete, ready-to-use weapon or they could acquire the materials and components to build the weapon themselves. While the first scenario cannot be ruled out, the second scenario is more likely. According to Captain Joseph Bouchard, a retired Navy Officer and an expert on nuclear devices, nuclear and radioactive material is considerably more difficult to acquire in the United States than overseas. 31 The rest of the materials required to assemble a bomb, however, could be acquired in the U.S. Consequently, the most likely scenario is that terrorists would get dangerous fissile materials abroad, smuggle them into the U.S., and then assemble the bomb here.

### Nuclear Detection Technology Works

#### Nuclear detection works

Huban Gowadia, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Acting Director, “Preventing Nuclear Terrorism: Does DHS have an Effective and Efficient Nuclear Detection Strategy,” Jul-27-2012,

<http://www.defpro.com/news/details/37971/?SID=e4a3b7d85367ebc46f8a5a1f80ad31a8>. Date accessed: August 20, 2012.

Over the past decade, DHS has made considerable progress in deploying systems at our borders and seaports to scan cargo and vehicles for radiological and nuclear threats. Through the Radiation Portal Monitor (RPM) program, detection equipment is procured and installed at domestic ports of entry to scan containerized cargo for radiological and nuclear threats, addressing the requirements of the Security and Accountability For Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 (Pub. L. No. 109-347). Our ongoing work with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to facilitate container security has resulted in the scanning of over 99 percent of all incoming containerized cargo for radiological and nuclear threats entering via truck at our land borders and at our seaports, utilizing RPMs. RPMs, coupled with handheld radioisotope identification devices (RIIDs), are the workhorses of our on-going deployments. Scanning of containerized cargo at seaports of entry will continue, in accordance with SAFE Port Act requirements. However, given the current fiscal environment, DNDO and CBP, working together, will continue to work to balance risk reduction, effectiveness of radiological and nuclear scanning, flow and volume of commerce, and life cycle costs when determining RPM deployment priorities.

#### Security technology solves

Michael D. Orosz, Carl Southwell, Anthony Barrett, Onur Bakir, Jennifer Chen, Isaac Maya, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System,” 12th IFAC Symposium on Transportation Systems, Sep-4-2009, Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events, “PortSec: Port Security Risk Management and Resource Allocation System” <http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1108&context=nonpublished_reports>… Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

To address the vulnerabilities of ports to terrorist and other catastrophes, the US government unveiled several initiatives to secure incoming cargo. Customs-Trade Partnership against Terrorism (C-TPAT), which is administered by Department of Homeland Security (DHS), was announced in November 2001 in an effort to leverage the private sector and its global suppliers to address security concerns en route to the ports. In 2002, the Container Security Initiative (CSI) was launched by Customs and Border Protection (CBP) with the goal of identifying and prescreening containers that pose risks of terrorism at the port of origin, as well as promoting the development of smart (tamper-resistant) containers Use of technology such as state-of-the-art inspection equipment, electronic tags, smart seals and in-box sensors have been encouraged through these initiatives to minimize the risk of arrival of a container with harmful cargo at a US port of entry.

### Nuclear Terror Impact Calculus

#### The huge magnitude of a nuclear attack outweighs consideration of risk—biggest impact

Paul W. Parfomak and John Frittelli, Resources, Science, and Industry Division, Congressional Research Service, Maritime Security: Potential Terrorist Attacks and Protection Priorities, Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, May-14-2007, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RL33787.pdf>. Date accessed: August 14, 2012.

Other experts concede that evaluating the likelihood of nuclear terrorism is inherently uncertain, but that such potential attacks warrant attention even if they are unlikely. The probability of a terrorist attack with an actual nuclear weapon cannot be reliably estimated, and it is surely lower than the probability of virtually any other type of terrorist attack. But the devastation from such an attack would be so overwhelming that, based on expected damages — the probability multiplied by the consequences — this threat must be considered one of the greatest dangers America faces....76

#### Huge magnitude means we should do everything we can to avoid it

Graham Allison is the director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, the Douglas Dillon Professor of Government and the faculty chair of the Dubai Initiative at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, The Three 'Nos' Knows, Nov-12-2007, <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16004>. Date accessed: August 17, 2012.

MUELLER IS entitled to his opinion that the threat of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism is “exaggerated” and “overwrought.” But analysts of various political persuasions, in and out of government, are virtually unanimous in their judgment to the contrary. As the national-security community learned during the Cold War, risk = likelihood x consequences. Thus, even when the likelihood of nuclear Armageddon was small, the consequences were so catastrophic that prudent policymakers felt a categorical imperative to do everything that feasibly could be done to prevent that war. Today, a single nuclear bomb exploding in just one city would change our world. Given such consequences, differences between a 1 percent and a 20 percent likelihood of such an attack are relatively insignificant when considering how we should respond to the threat.

#### Huge magnitude eclipses low risk

Matthew Bunn is an Associate Professor at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, “Securing the Bomb 2008,” Nov-2008, <http://www.nti.org/e_research/Securing_the_bomb08.pdf>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

Even a 1 percent chance over the next ten years would be enough to justify substantial action to reduce the risk, given the scale of the consequences. No one in their right mind would operate a nuclear power plant upwind of a major city that had a 1 percent chance over ten years of blowing sky-high—the risk would be understood by all to be too great. But that, in effect, is what we are doing—or worse—by managing the world’s nuclear stockpiles as we do today. The nuclear security improvements and nuclear material removals that have been accomplished in recent years— along with the disruption of al-Qaeda’s central command—have reduced the risk. But the danger remains very real.

### LNG Add-On

#### LNG ports will be attacked

Cindy Hurst, U.S. Army's Foreign Military Studies Office analyst, “The Terrorist Threat to Liquefied Natural Gas: Fact or Fiction?” The Cutting Edge News, Jun-2-2008, <http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=529>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

There reportedly have been indications of terrorists planning to hit LNG tankers. In November 2002, the capture of Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri, al-Qaeda’s operational commander in the Gulf region, brought to light the idea that terrorists were already planning to go after such targets. Nashiri, allegedly a specialist in maritime operations, had already played a key role in the attack on the USS Cole and the Limburg. According to a Western counterterrorism official during an interrogation, Nashiri indicated that al-Qaeda had information on the vulnerability of supertankers to suicide attacks and the economic impacts they would have. The official informed The Daily Star that al-Qaeda had a naval manual describing “the best places on the vessels to hit, how to employ limpet mines, fire rockets or rocket-propelled grenades from high-speed craft, and [how to] turn LNG tankers into floating bombs. They (terrorists) are also shown how to use fast craft packed with explosives, and the use of trawlers, or ships like that, that can be turned into bombs and detonated beside bigger ships, or in ports where petroleum or gas storage areas could go up as well. They (manuals) even talk of using underwater scooters for suicide attacks.”

#### LNG explosion is equivalent to nuclear war

Amory B. Lovins and L. Hunter Lovins, Rocky Mountain Institute chief scientist, “Brittle Power: Energy Strategy for National Security,” 2001, <http://files.uniteddiversity.com/Energy/BrittlePower.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

About nine percent of such a tanker load of LNG will probably, if spilled onto water, boil to gas in about five minutes.3 (It does not matter how cold the water is; it will be at least two hundred twenty-eight Fahrenheit degrees hotter than the LNG, which it will therefore cause to boil violently.) The resulting gas, however, will be so cold that it will still be denser than air. It will therefore flow in a cloud or plume along the surface until it reaches an ignition source. Such a plume might extend at least three miles downwind from a large tanker spill within ten to twenty minutes.4 It might ultimately reach much farther—perhaps six to twelve miles.5 If not ignited, the gas is asphyxiating. If ignited, it will burn to completion with a turbulent diffusion flame reminiscent of the 1937 Hindenberg disaster but about a hundred times as big. Such a fireball would burn everything within it, and by its radiant heat would cause third-degree burns and start fires a mile or two away. An LNG fireball can blow through a city, creating “a very large number of ignitions and explosions across a wide area. No present or foreseeable equipment can put out a very large [LNG]... fire.”7 The energy content of a single standard LNG tanker (one hundred twenty-five thousand cubic meters) is equivalent to seven-tenths of a megaton of TNT, or about fifty-five Hiroshima bombs.

### Military Readiness Add-On

#### Port security key to military readiness

John Frittelli, Specialist in Transportation Resources, Science, and Industry Division, “Port and Maritime Security: Background and Issues for Congress,” May-27-2005, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA453735>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

National Security Importance. In addition to its economic significance, the marine transportation system is vital for national security. The Departments of Defense and Transportation have designated 17 U.S. seaports as strategic because they are necessary for use by DOD in the event of a major military deployment. Thirteen of these ports are commercial seaports. During Desert Storm, 90% of all military equipment and supplies were shipped from U.S. strategic ports. The deployment required over 312 vessels from 18 commercial and military ports in the United States. As the GAO has reported, “If the strategic ports (or the ships carrying military supplies) were attacked, not only could massive civilian casualties be sustained, but DOD could also lose precious cargo and time and be forced to rely heavily on its overburdened airlift capabilities.”18

#### Readiness solves global wars

Jack Spencer, Research Fellow at Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, “The Facts About Military Readiness”, Heritage Foundation, Sept-15-2000, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

America’s national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has little saliency. The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America’s national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States “must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames.”4According to some of the military’s highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services’ ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America’s ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6 Military readiness is vital because declines in America’s military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### Power Projection Add-On

#### Safe ports are key to power projection

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Throughout its history, the United States has been a global maritime nation, dependent upon the oceans for economy, welfare, and defense. In the modern era emphasis on globalization and the world economy has increased this dependence considerably. There are some 95,000 miles of United States’ coastline and 3.4 million square miles of territorial seas and exclusive economic zones in the U.S. maritime domain. 1 Connecting the continental United States to this zone are over 1,000 harbors and ports, 361 of which are cargo capable. Through these ports enter approximately 21,000 containers daily, representing ninety-five percent of the nation’s overseas cargo, including 100 percent of U.S. petroleum imports. 2 In addition to commerce, there are seventy-six million recreational boaters in the United States. Six million cruise ship passengers visit U.S. ports annually. In the strategic/military sense, a substantial portion of U.S. national power relies on the sea, both in the form of traditional Navy Carrier Strike groups that deploy from ports in the continental United States and the subsequent ability to reinforce deployed forces overseas. Without unimpeded access to the sea, the ability of the United States to project national power is extremely limited.

#### Power projection solves regional conflict and miscalc

Stephen Walt, Professor of International Relations at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, 2002, “American Primacy: Its Prospects and Pitfalls” Naval War College Review, <http://live.belfercenter.org/files/american_primacy_prospects_pitfalls.pdf>. Date accessed: August 26, 2012.

A second consequence of U.S. primacy is a decreased danger of great-power rivalry and a higher level of overall international tranquility. Ironically, those who argue that primacy is no longer important, because the danger of war is slight, overlook the fact that the extent of American primacy is one of the main reasons why the risk of great-power war is as low as it is. For most of the past four centuries, relations among the major powers have been intensely competitive, often punctuated by major wars and occasionally by all-out struggles for hegemony. In the first half of the twentieth century, for example, great-power wars killed over eighty million people. Today, however, the dominant position of the United States places significant limits on the possibility of great-power competition, for at least two reasons. One reason is that because the United States is currently so far ahead, other major powers are not inclined to challenge its dominant position. Not only is there no possibility of a “hegemonic war” (because there is no potential hegemon to mount a challenge), but the risk of war via miscalculation is reduced by the overwhelming gap between the United States and the other major powers. Miscalculation is more likely to lead to war when the balance of power is fairly even, because in this situation both sides can convince themselves that they might be able to win. When the balance of power is heavily skewed, however, the leading state does not need to go to war and weaker states dare not try.

### Ext: Attack Will Damage Economy and Power Projection

#### Terrorists attack will destroy the economy and US power projection

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Access to the sea is vital for economic expansion and as a means to project national power. Ports are essential in maintaining this link. But ports are not fortresses; as open industrial and commercial centers, port infrastructure is particularly vulnerable to a dedicated enemy. An effective attack against critical maritime infrastructure has the potential to cause major economic disruption nationwide, create mass casualties, and limit or halt deployment of naval power. As such, ports are logical targets for terrorists bent on striking at vulnerabilities; the destruction of ports would have significant impact on our nation.

#### Port attacks will damage econ and power projection

Robert Watts, Chief of drug and migrant interdiction at Coast Guard Headquarters, Fall 2005, “Maritime Critical Infrastructure Protection: Multi-Agency Command and Control in an Asymmetric Environment,” Homeland Security Affairs, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=1.2.3/>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Maritime infrastructure is crucial in maintaining this link to the sea. From naval bases to commercial ports, maritime infrastructure is well developed nationwide and is crucial to both the economic sector and military strategy. Maritime infrastructure is critical to the employment of national maritime power and as such is a logical (if not desirable) target for acts of terrorism by our enemies. A successful attack against a port could incur serious economic and military damage, present an enemy with the opportunity to inflict mass casualties, and have serious long-term detrimental effects on our national economy.

#### Attack would destroy power projection

Bruce Taylor, Antony Pate, and Bruce Kubu, “Protecting America’s Ports: Promising Practices,” Nov-20-2007, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221075.pdf>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

The U.S. Navy has considerable assets stationed in or near several American ports, most notably Norfolk, Virginia and San Diego, California. Although the Navy has primary responsibility for protecting these ships, other port interests also have concerns about the possibility of terrorists damaging or sinking one of these vessels, particularly those that are nuclear-powered. Finally, 17 ports have been designated “strategic” by the Department of Defense and the Department of Transportation. 12 They are so designated because in the event of a large-scale military deployment, DOD would transport more than ninety-five percent of all equipment and supplies needed for military operations by sea. These ports are therefore vital to national security. If the strategic ports (or the ships carrying military supplies) were attacked, not only could massive civilian casualties result, but also valuable cargo and time could be lost, as military mobilization would be forced to rely on already overburdened airlift resources.

### AT: Topicality

#### Port security is transportation infrastructure

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), “FY 2012 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP),” Jun-13-2012, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/psgp/>. Date accessed: August 30, 2012.

Purpose: Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) provides funding for transportation infrastructure security activities to implement Area Maritime Transportation Security Plans and facility security plans among port authorities, facility operators, and state and local government agencies required to provide port security services. The purpose of the FY 2012 PSGP is to support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; expansion of port recovery and resiliency capabilities; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices and other non-conventional weapons; and competitively award grant funding to assist ports in obtaining the resources required to support the National Preparedness Goal’s associated mission areas and core capabilities.

Ports are TI

Industry Today, “Association: American Association of Port Authorities,” Vol. 14, Issue 3, 2012, <http://www.industrytoday.com/article_view.asp?ArticleID=F370>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

The burning question on the mind of many US lawmakers, administration officials and others is how best to stimulate the economy and spur job creation. The answer lies in focusing scarce federal resources in areas that will have the greatest impact on economic growth, immediate and long-term job creation, national security, and our current and future competitiveness in the global economy. Enhancements in seaport-related infrastructure should be a high priority among the limited investment options. For centuries, US seaports – and the connecting waterways – have served as a vital economic lifeline, bringing goods and services to people around the world and delivering prosperity to our nation. They facilitate trade and commerce, create jobs, secure our borders, support our military and serve as stewards of valuable coastal environmental resources. Seaports are the primary gateway for overseas trade. They’re essential to economic security. As such, federal funding for infrastructure in and around ports pays dividends. Deep-draft coastal and Great Lakes ports are the nexus of critical transportation infrastructure that connects America’s exporters with markets overseas, and they provide access for imports of raw materials, components and consumer goods that are a key part of US manufacturing and help define our standard of living. Investments in America’s port infrastructure and the intermodal connections that serve seaports – both land and waterside – foster prosperity and provide an opportunity to bolster the country’s economic and employment recovery.

#### Transportation infrastructure includes ports

Susan Trimbath, former Senior Research Economist in Capital Market Studies at Milken Institute, 2011, “Transportation Infrastructure: Paving the Way,” <http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/issues/infrastructure/files/2009TPI_Update_Economics_White_Paper_110712.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Most of the other research papers we reviewed and included in the references in our September 2010 report are also in the RAND review. The RAND report has more references for "roads" because they did not include the other pieces of "transportation infrastructure" – the US Chamber’s TPI encompasses roads, transit, waterways (ports), airports, and railroads. The RAND study notes as we did that there is a lack of comprehensive transportation infrastructure research: it's either just roads or it includes roads with other infrastructure pieces described as "public capital" (i.e., roads lumped in with sewers, schools and parks). Finally, the RAND report concludes by emphasizing the need for research measuring all parts of transportation infrastructure, which is what the US Chamber’s TPI project does. As Shatz et. al. point out a comprehensive examination is needed to get a better picture of the true, long-run economic impact of transportation infrastructure performance. As we wrote in September 2010, the TPI allowed us to do just such an examination.

### AT: Spending Disad

#### Costs will be spread out and long term

Todd Konkel, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, 2005, “Container Security: Preventing a Nuclear Catastrophe,” <http://irps.ucsd.edu/assets/004/5372.pdf>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Any solution to improve the security of containerized cargo must take into account the commercial nature of the shipping industry. Although a $200 device may initially seem costly in an industry that already faces relatively low margins, the cost of a security device will be spread over multiple shipments over an extended period of time. One way to mitigate the economic impact of new security measures is to ensure that none of the stakeholders in the maritime shipping industry are forced to bear an unfair share of the costs. Shippers are unlikely to adopt any solution that will inhibit their ability to compete in the marketplace. One way to achieve this is by instituting mandatory international standards for container security, so that no shipper can obtain a competitive advantage by opting out of security enhancements. Current initiatives, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, are largely voluntary in nature, and firms that choose not to participate may possess a cost advantage over their competitors that do participate. Mandatory standards address the challenge of enlisting the cooperation of profit-oriented businesses that are reluctant to do anything, even for the sake of security, that will place them at a disadvantage.

#### Scanning technology cost estimates are overblown

Douglas Frantz, previously chief investigator for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Managing Director of Kroll’s Business Intelligence Washington office, Jul-15-2012, “Port security: U.S. fails to meet deadline for scanning of cargo containers,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/port-security-us-fails-to-meet-deadline-for-scanning-of-cargo-containers/2012/07/15/gJQAmgW8mW_story.html>. Date accessed: August 26, 2012.

Markey and some counterterrorism experts say that the costs of checking every U.S.-bound container could be substantially lower than the DHS estimate and that the necessary measures could be easier to implement than the agency has suggested. Research by scholars at the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School indicate that 100 percent of containers could be screened much more inexpensively with existing methods. A number of companies also are developing cheaper new screening technology.

#### Turn—Port attacks would cost billions

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

To conclude, a crude estimate of the direct cost of immediate deaths and destruction of 11 city blocks due to the use of a one-kiloton nuclear weapon would be $1.1 trillion in New York City, $217 billion in Chicago, $158 billion in Washington D.C., and $134 billion in Los Angeles. Of course, this number is a gross underestimate of the total cost—though the order of magnitude is correct—since it does not consider indirect costs from cleanup, economic disruption, and injuries after the explosion, or treatment for all the people exposed to radiation during the attack whom would develop serious diseases several years down the road.22 These costs would be huge.

### AT: Politics Disad

#### Port security is bipartisan

Robyn Kapperman, Port and Maritime Security Online, “Overview of Port Security Regulations,” Feb-20-2012, <http://www.pmso.net/OverviewPortSecurityRegulatinsKappermann.html>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

In the years immediately following the new regulatory mandates of MTSA, gaps in the regulation became apparent (Price 1). Congress introduced additional policy changes applicable to the port community. The SAFE Port Act of 2006 was enacted on October 13, 2006. The new legislation included over 90 regulatory mandates providing new program development, and additional financial resources to address the gaps. The main three areas the act addressed were port readiness, supply chain security enhancements, and creating interagency operation centers to promote cooperation and information sharing among public and governmental port stakeholders (Security and Accountability for Every Port Act). The newest round of bipartisan legislation enhanced the existing port and maritime security regulations in the U.S. expanding upon previous initiatives (Grant).

#### Port security legislation is bipartisan

Mickey McCarter, “Aviation, Port Security Bills Enjoy Bipartisan Support from House Lawmakers,” Jul-02-2012, [www.hstoday.us/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house-lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html](http://www.hstoday.us/single-article/aviation-port-security-bills-enjoy-bipartisan-support-from-house-lawmakers/8774d00b80793d7b125324dc9dad3510.html). Date accessed: August 30, 2012.

Democrats applauded last week the passage by the House of several homeland security bills designed to strengthen aviation and port security. The bills, including the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act (HR 1447), the Securing Maritime Activities through Risk–based Targeting (SMART) for Port Security Act (HR 4251) and the Gauging American Port Security (GAPS) Act (HR 4005) enjoyed bipartisan support.

#### Bipartisan support for port security

Security Director News, “New Congressional group to support port security,” Oct-31-2011,

<http://www.securitydirectornews.com/public-sector/new-congressional-group-support-port-security>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

Two members of Congress last week created a new bipartisan caucus to promote the growth and security of the United States' 350 commercial sea and river ports. Rep. Janice Hahn (D-CA) and Rep. Ted Poe (R-TX) announced on Oct. 25 the formation of the bipartisan House Ports Opportunity, Renewal, Trade, and Security (PORTS) Caucus, according to a press release. U.S. ports support 13.3 million jobs and account for $3.15 trillion in business activity to the economy.

### AT: Elections Disad

#### Public would like the plan—they fear for the safety of our ports

Randall Beisecker, Research Assistant, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Mar-01-2006, “DP World and U.S. Port Security”, <http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/dp-world-and-us-port-security/>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Although the U.S. public appears to understand the strategic importance of ports, unlike airports, trains, and highways, few Americans have a deep understanding of the complex systems at work moving cargo from sea to land. The maritime sector is often invisible, and so the details surrounding port security are more difficult to grasp than aviation security, for example. Effective public demonizing of the UAE combined with the general population's lack of understanding of port security created a generic feeling of anxiety surrounding the ports deal. As Marshall Wittmann, senior fellow at the Democratic Leadership Council stated, "There's an inherent American fear that their ports are vulnerable and they are made even more so by this deal. Whether it's based on facts or fears is another matter, but it's real and it's bipartisan and it's visceral."[26]

#### Plan would be popular--viewed as counter-terrorism

Colonel Drefus Lane Sr., “U.S. SEAPORT SECURITY: CRITICAL CHALLENGE FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,” Feb-04-2009, USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA499287>. Date accessed: August 24, 2012.

The 9/11 terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York and on the Pentagon instantly created a new American consciousness of the homeland’s vulnerability to terrorism. Political will rose to an unprecedented level to address the nation’s new priority of protecting the homeland. In the aftermath of 9/11, the President then created the Department of Homeland Security to develop and implement a comprehensive national strategy for homeland security. The 2004 Presidential Directive for Maritime Security Policy mandated that the collaboration between state, local, and private sector entities be conducted at the federal level to achieve complete and unified maritime security programs and initiatives. 1 Thus, U.S. seaports have been designated vital to the US economy and national security strategy. The maritime transportation system was identified as an easy target as a result of the 9/11 commissions investigations. Seaports were considered to be the most vulnerable sectors that could affect U.S. economy. 2 This SRP contributes to port security awareness of maritime programs by providing a preliminary assessment of U.S. seaports security.

### AT: States CP

#### Federal Coast Goard oversight key and states would run out of money

Richard Waino, Port Director and CEO-Tampa, “House Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications Hearing “Ensuring the Efficiency, Effectiveness and Transparency of Homeland Security Grants (Part II): Stakeholder Perspectives,” Apr-26-2012, <http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/TPADOCS-.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

The plan to consolidate the Port Security Grant Program into one National Preparedness Grant Program ultimately administered by each individual state is extremely counterproductive. History has proven that interaction and oversight by the local U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port assured that funds were being distributed in a manner that best benefitted each geographic area. The U.S. Coast Guard has the training, expertise and systems in place to assess risk, threat and vulnerability; and apply this information to grant submissions. Through no fault of their own, most states do not possess this capability. Further, as state homeland grant funding diminishes, states might be tempted to stretch the intent of the port security grants to meet needs that may not be the most productive use of funds targeting the safety and security of the maritime transportation system.

#### Federal action for best security improvements and avoiding funding pitfalls

National Conference of State Legislatures, “2011-2012 Policies for the Jurisdiction of the Transportation Committee,” 2012, <http://www.ncsl.org/state-federal-committees.aspx?tabs=855,30,674#674>. Date accessed: Augus 29, 2012.

Port security is a state-federal partnership that is critical to the nation’s homeland security strategy. The states need clear federal direction to ensure that resources are focused on the most needed security improvements. Ninety-five percent of overseas cargo and millions of cruise and ferry passengers transit through ports each year. Ports are spending enormous sums to harden these vulnerable targets and need federal assistance. NCSL supports the Department of Homeland Security’s Port Security Grant Program, which is vital to ports’ abilities to make improvements quickly and comply with the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002. States have been directed to enhance the security of publicly operated ferries and provide for the inspection of vehicles and freight. In some cases, federal directives have preempted state laws and policies to the extent of superseding state constitutional provisions. Federal assistance should fund these requirements to avoid unfunded mandates.

#### Federal government key to port security—states don’t solve

Testimony of Captain John M. Holmes, Deputy Executive Director of Operations Port of Los Angeles Before The United States House of Representatives Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security, “Budget Hearing - Federal Emergency Management Agency – Director and State & Local Witnesses,” American Association of Port Authorities, Mar-07-2012, <http://appropriations.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hhrg-112-ap15-jholmes-20120307.pdf>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Moving the funding to the states is also a big concern for AAPA. Port security is focused on protecting international borders. This is a federal responsibility, not a state responsibility. Many States don’t have the personnel or expertise to evaluate maritime risks or determine how ports should be prioritized against other homeland security priorities in the state. The risk evaluations for ports are made at the federal level by the U.S. Coast Guard and other federal agencies. We are also concerned that this would increase the complexity in grant management and slow a process that is already recognized as cumbersome. Not only does a second or potentially third pass-through layer (the State or municipal government, respectively) mandate its own sets of compliance requirements on top of Code of Federal Regulations and Office of Management and Budget Circulars, it also creates unnecessary cogs in the administration that slows down our ability to spend, execute, and deliver. Moving funds to the states would compromise program efficiency and effectiveness. If, however, a decision is made to consolidate the program and move it to the states, AAPA strongly urges your Committee to allocate a set amount of funding for the program to ensure that funding for port security is not diluted further.

### AT: Federalism Disad

#### Long history of federal action in ports

Robyn Kapperman, Port and Maritime Security Online, “Overview of Port Security Regulations,” Feb-20-2012, <http://www.pmso.net/OverviewPortSecurityRegulatinsKappermann.html>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Congress enacting port specific regulations and acts to secure U.S. seaports is not a new concept. In 1776, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton implemented the Revenue Marine Cutter Service. The primary duty of the service members was to prevent shippers from smuggling cargo into ports to avoid paying customs taxes to the U.S. government (Corbett and Firestone 420). During WWI, Congress enacted the Espionage Act of 1917 to secure the U.S. coastline and waterfront facilities against potential sabotage (Corbett and Firestone 411). Congress added detailed port security provisions and guidelines aimed at U.S. ports in the Magnuson Act of 1950 (Berinato). The Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 introduced additional regulations authored by Congress and tasked selected government agencies to regulate U.S. ports, navigable waterways, ships, and port facilities by enforcing required procedures to prevent accidents, negligence, and sabotage (Berinato).

#### Coast Guard has primary jurisdiction over ports

Betty P. Kelepecz, Chief of Police (Retired), San Diego Harbor Police Department, Nov-2005, “What Chiefs Need to Know About Port Security” The Police Chief, [www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display\_arch&article\_id=742&issue\_id=112005](http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=742&issue_id=112005). Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Ports and waterways are regulated by a number of local, state, and federal agencies. The primary agency responsible for overall national maritime and port security is the U.S. Coast Guard, formerly within the Department of Transportation but now part of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). It is the lead federal agency for maritime homeland security and its mission is to protect the public, the environment, and U.S. economic interests in the nation’s ports and waterways, along the coast, on international waters, or in any maritime region as required to support national security. Today, maritime homeland security represents about 25 percent of the U. S. Coast Guard’s mission. The specific statutory authority for the U.S. Coast Guard’s law enforcement mission is given in 14 U.S.C. 2: “The Coast Guard shall enforce or assist in the enforcement of all applicable laws on, under, and over the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.”In addition, 14 U.S.C. 89 provides the authority for U.S. Coast Guard’s active duty commissioned, warrant, and petty officers to enforce applicable U.S. law. It authorizes Coast Guard personnel to enforce federal law on vessels subject to U.S. jurisdiction including U.S., foreign, and stateless vessels. The U.S. Coast Guard regulates maritime cargo, recreational, cruise, and transportation entities through the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) much as the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) regulates airports and air carriers through the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA). Consequently, any law enforcement agency in a port environment shares jurisdiction with the U.S. Coast Guard and must follow its mandates. Although some believe that the U.S. Navy shares federal law enforcement jurisdiction in a strategic port, the U.S. Navy is not a law enforcement agency. The U.S. Navy has only military jurisdiction on its bases and around its vessels. However, other federal entities enforce federal laws in port environments, such as the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). But the primary federal regulator is the U.S. Coast Guard.

### AT: Privatization CP

#### No incentive for private investment in port security tech

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Finally, government can focus its development efforts on those technologies that commercial sources are least likely to develop. Private businesses are keen to adopt and use tracking technology so that they know where goods are and whether they are being pilfered. However, private businesses are not so interested in producing technology that will detect threats to the entire maritime system or to the economy as a whole, that will help the entire supply chain operate through a terrorist attack, or that will allow it to be reconstituted quickly—the benefits are too diffuse for any single business to profit from them. However, the benefits are large for society, suggesting that government should pay special attention to technologies such as those that can remotely sense the presence of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents.

#### Government action key—market failures likely

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The dual security threat—to ports themselves and to the country as a whole through the ports—makes port security susceptible to elements of three market failures, which in turn suggests a role for government financing or regulation. These market failures include the provision of a public good, national security; a negative externality, the danger introduced to the rest of the country by maritime activities; and the absence of a market through which the ports could insure against terrorism related damages.

#### Private sector fails at port security

Port and Maritime Security Working Group, in coordination with the California Maritime Academy,“Protecting America’s Ports: Are We There Yet?” Oct-2007, [www.hsdl.org/?view&did=24892](http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=24892). Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

Today’s domestic maritime security efforts in the local operational environment reside under a changed emphasis where the private sector carries a larger portion of the maritime security burden under both international and domestic regulation and doctrine – although they neither have the necessary understanding, practical intelligence information, education, training, motivation, desire or the willingness to effectively and fully engage in this critical role. The primary motivational role of business is “business” and to effect change in the allocation of funds and resources in the maritime business environment requires clear evidence that a) the threat, risk and vulnerability are all considerably too great to accept so that b) the potential for loss and liability warrants full assumption of the role and responsibility being thrust upon them by government. This case has yet to be effectively made and is more and more difficult as we move further and further away from the 9/11 events without the commission of a terrorist act along the waterfront. Leadership on the part of the federal and state governments establishing unambiguous standards, policies and expected implementation of Best Security Practices is required within the MTS – but is currently underemphasized and unevenly enforced.

## Port Security Negative

### Terrorism Frontline

#### Terrorists won’t target ports

Tamara Renee Shie, former visiting fellow at the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, “Ships and Terrorists – Thinking Beyond Port Security,” Oct-15-2004, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/pac0445a.pdf>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

Third, as major ports increase security, terrorists will look for other maritime targets or other means to target those ports. Terrorists are increasingly aiming at soft targets. Attacking maritime targets has never been particularly easy, often requiring a greater sophistication in planning, training, and coordination than those aimed at many land-based facilities. This is why maritime terrorism is rather rare, and why terrorists are less likely to attack a more secure major port. Yet in considering maritime terrorist threat scenarios – using a ship to smuggle goods or weapons, sinking a vessel in a major shipping thoroughfare, using a ship as a weapon, or even targeting maritime vessels – none require access to a major port or a shipping container to carry out a strike. There remain numerous small ports and small vessels not covered under the new security initiatives. The ISPS Code for instance only covers ships of 500 tons or more and port facilities that serve large international-bound vessels. The Code would not have protected the USS Cole.

#### Increasing security at ports will just cause terrorists to change targets

Stephen E. Flynn, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow for National Security Studies, “Maritime Transportation and Port Security,” Apr-11-2002, [www.cfr.org/terrorism/maritime-transportation-port-security/p4547](http://www.cfr.org/terrorism/maritime-transportation-port-security/p4547). Date accessed: Augusts 30, 2012.

(1) Seaports cannot be separated from the international transport system to which they belong. Ports are in essence nodes in a network where cargo is loaded on or unloaded from one mode—a ship—to or from other modes—trucks, trains, and, on occasion, planes. Therefore, seaport security must always be pursued against the context of transportation security. In other words, efforts to improve security within the port requires that parallel security efforts be undertaken in the rest of the transportation and logistics network. If security improvements are limited to the ports, the result will be to generate the “balloon effect”;i.e., pushing illicit activities horizontally or vertically into the transportation and logistics systems where there is a reduced chance of detection or interdiction.

#### Port terror highly unlikely

James Jay Carafano, Deputy Director, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Director, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies; and Robert Quartel, former Member of the US Federal Maritime Commission, “Contain yourself,” The Heritage Foundation, Jul-5-2006, <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2006/07/contain-yourself>. Date accessed: August 15, 2012.

Some politicians want to require inspectors to look inside each container before it's shipped to U.S. ports. Supposedly, this would prevent terrorists from smuggling in a weapon of mass destruction or a "dirty" bomb (a large, conventional explosive laced with radiological material). But in reality, we'd be wasting our time and money. While it's true that a terrorist could put a bomb in a box, it's neither likely nor logical. In the case of all but a nuclear device, it would be easier and more certain to just build the weapon here. That's especially true for conventional explosives. Biological weapons can be produced with materials and equipment bought off the Internet or shipped here via any number of cargo delivery services. Potential chemical weapons surround us: chlorine tankers, gasoline trucks, pipelines and storage facilities. All a terrorist group needs for a dirty bomb is some low-grade radioactive material stolen from a hospital or a watch factory. Even the machines used to scan containers have radioactive material. Besides, if terrorists had a nuclear weapon, it's not at all clear why they would risk allowing it to leave their control. After all the time and trouble required to build a bomb, would they really wave good-bye and hope it gets to the right place? The terrorists would be far better off to hide their bomb in a private vessel (if they can afford a nuclear weapon, they can afford a boat to carry it in), a truck coming across from Canada, or a small tramp ship operating out of the Caribbean destined for, say, the Port of Richmond. If terrorists wanted to target a port, they would more likely use a truck, train or small boat. A McVeigh-style truck bomb, constructed domestically, would do the trick. And it would be much easier to approach a port from the land than from the sea. Finally, if foreign ports did attempt to screen every container of sneakers coming to America, they would likely fail. There aren't enough people and computers to scrutinize the millions of records that would be produced in real time before the containers reach their destination. It also isn't clear if any technology is fast, accurate and cheap enough to do the job with any degree of confidence.

### Ext: Terrorists Won’t Attack Ports

#### Risk of port attacks low—historically proven

Peter Chalk, political scientist at the RAND corporation, 2008, “The Maritime Dimension of International Security: Terrorism, Piracy, and Challenges for the United States,” <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG697.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Historically, the world’s oceans have not been a major locus of terrorist activity. Indeed, according to the RAND Terrorism Database, strikes on maritime targets and assets have constituted only two percent of all international incidents over the last 30 years. To be sure, part of the reason for this relative paucity has to do with the fact that many terrorist organizations have neither been located near coastal regions nor possessed the means to extend their physical reach beyond purely local theaters. There are also several problems associated with carrying out waterborne strikes which have, at least historically, helped to offset some of the tactical advantages associated with esoteric maritime environments outlined in Chapter Two. Most intrinsically, operating at sea requires terrorists to have mariner skills, access to appropriate assault and transport vehicles, the ability to mount and sustain operations from a non-land–based environment, and certain specialist capabilities (for example, surface and underwater demolition techniques).1 Limited resources have traditionally prevented groups from accessing options.

#### Terrorists won’t attack ports because they’re less likely to get media attention

Peter Chalk, political scientist at the RAND corporation, 2008, “The Maritime Dimension of International Security: Terrorism, Piracy, and Challenges for the United States,” <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG697.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

A further consideration has to do with the nature of maritime targets themselves: Because they are out of sight, they are generally out of mind (this is particularly true of commercial vessels). Thus, an attack on a ship is less likely to elicit the same publicity—either in scope or immediacy—as a strike on land-based targets, which, because they are ﬁxed and typically located near urban areas, are far more media- accessible (although, as argued below, this point may not apply with respect to contingencies involving heavily-laden cruise liners and ferries). This consideration is important because terrorism, at root, is a tactic that can only be eﬀective if it is able to visibly demonstrate its salience and relevance through the propaganda of the deed. Rather like the philosopher’s tree silently falling in the forest, if no one observes the event, does it have any reason for being?

#### Extremely low probability of port terrorism

Stew Magnuson, “Former Customs and Border Protection Chief Slams Congress,” National Defense Magazine, Nov-2010,

<http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2010/November/Pages/FormerCustomsandBorderProtectionChiefSlamsCongress.aspx>. Date accessed: August 28, 2012.

The "nuke in a container" scenario would be a high consequence attack, and the "sum of all fears," but "if you actually look at the intelligence," there is a low probability that it would happen, he said. It's unlikely that a terrorist group. - if it could actually put its hands on a nuclear device - would allow it to leave its control by placing it on a shipping container where it would be handed off to a trucking company, a freight forwarder, terminal operator, vesset operator and longshoremen in the United States.

### Ext: Terrorists Will Adapt

#### Increased port security will just push terrorists to other targets

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

But let’s imagine that DHS effectively secures the cargo of a ship en route to the U.S. so that no nuclear weapons are introduced in the cargo after departure from the foreign port. The probability of successfully using the maritime system to cause nuclear damage in the U.S. or in a U.S. port is significantly reduced. It means that terrorists have a strong incentive to find an alternative to introduce nuclear materials into the U.S. They can try to smuggle it through the Canadian or Mexican borders in trucks. They can try to hide the nuclear material in a plane. They can leverage the techniques used by the drug dealers who introduce hundreds of metric tons of cocaine and heroin into the United States each year.

#### More port security will cause terrorists to change their targets

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Second, there has been recognition throughout the process that strengthening one target necessarily means making other potential targets more vulnerable. Increasing the difficulty of slipping a bomb into a container increases the likelihood that someone might try to bring it into the United States in a yacht, or ship it to Mexico and bring it into the country by truck. Or, with strong enough port security measures, terrorists might change their target focus from ports to the rail system or to shopping malls.

#### Securing ports will push terrorists to the other parts of the supply chain

Stephen E. Flynn, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow for National Security Studies, “Maritime Transportation and Port Security,” Apr-11-2002, [www.cfr.org/terrorism/maritime-transportation-port-security/p4547](http://www.cfr.org/terrorism/maritime-transportation-port-security/p4547). Date accessed: Augusts 30, 2012.

(2) Port security initiatives must be harmonized within a regional and international context. Unilateral efforts to tighten security within U.S. ports without commensurate efforts to improve security in the ports of our neighbors will lead shipping companies and importers to “port-shop”;i.e., to move their business to other market-entry points where their goods are cleared more quickly. Thus the result of unilateral, stepped-up security within U.S. ports could well be to erode the competitive position of important America ports while the locus of the security risk simply shifts outside of our reach to Canada, Mexico, or the Caribbean to ports such as Halifax, Montreal, Vancouver, and Freeport. (3) Since U.S. ports are among America’s most critical infrastructure, they should not be viewed as a primary line of defense in an effort to protect the U.S. homeland. The last place we should be looking to intercept a ship or container that has been co-opted by terrorists is in a busy, congested, and commercially vital seaport.

### Economy Frontline

#### Economy is resilient—losses tend to be overestimated

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast and Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, “Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic,” in “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” **2006**, Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Another form of secondary losses comes from all the costs that individuals bear to prevent or to insure against future damage. It is easy, however, to overestimate these secondary effects. We have to be careful about distinguishing between events that cause business to be delayed and those that cause business to be cancelled. Very short-run disruptions to trade—whether by severe weather, traffic problems at the port, or a small terrorist attack—have almost no net effect on the economy, since the disruptions caused are little more than what happens during the normal, random, day-to-day life of commerce. Small delays have no measurable effect, and firms very often have excess capacity in order to deal with unexpected fluctuations in demand. And although consumers might stop flying as a result of an incident, they may instead begin to buy more cars with the money they did not spend on air travel. Losses in one place may be offset by gains elsewhere. Only sustained shocks to the economy will have any permanent effect on the economy, and here we must be careful to recognize that the economy is composed of conscious agents who will adjust plans and use resources in different ways to mitigate damages. We must not underestimate the resilience of a free-enterprise economy.

#### Terror attack wouldn’t fully shutdown or disrupt port systems

Peter Chalk, political scientist at the RAND corporation, 2008, “The Maritime Dimension of International Security: Terrorism, Piracy, and Challenges for the United States,” <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG697.pdf>. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Although it is true that very little redundancy (in the form of surplus supply) is built into the contemporary international trading system, it would be extremely diﬃcult to decisively disrupt its operation through a campaign of terrorism. Major ports such as Rotterdam, Vancouver, Singapore, New York, and Los Angeles are both expansive and highly secure, making them extremely diﬃcult to fully close down. Even if an attack did result in the wholesale suspension of all loading/oﬄoading functions, ships could be fairly easily diverted (albeit at a cost) to alternative terminals, thus ensuring the continued integrity of the inter-modal transportation network. Successfully blocking a SLOC to all through traﬃc would be similarly diﬃcult, not least because it would require a group to scuttle several large vessels at the same time—a formidable and technically demanding undertaking. Moreover, very few maritime choke points are truly nonsubstitutable for ocean-bound freight. Bypassing the Malacca Straits in Southeast Asia (one of the world’s busiest maritime corridors), for instance, would require only an extra three days of steaming, and other than oil and certain perishable goods, most commodities would not be unduly aﬀected by short delays in delivery.

### Ext: Economy Adapts

#### Port interruptions won’t tank the economy

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast and Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, “Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic,” in “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” **2006**, Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

This is testimony partly to the great resilience of a modern economy. Short interruptions to supply chains can be mitigated fully by drawing down inventories, especially if they were built up in anticipation of the event. When inventories are depleted and delivery essential, cargo can be shifted to air or land through a neighboring economy. Somewhat longer interruptions can be compensated for through a temporary shift to domestic suppliers—an especially easy alternative if supply chains have built-in redundancies that allow the needed flexibility. Some consumers at the end of the supply chain may have to wait a while or pay higher prices. The sale—and profits—may be postponed, but they are not prevented.

#### Economy will adapt to port shutdowns

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast and Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, “Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic,” in “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” **2006**, Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

This leads to the second reason why the shutdowns did not have much of an effect: Businesses and consumers are adaptable. When faced with the inability to bring a product through a port, a business will work to find another supply source—by importing from a different place, using a different mode of transport, or finding a domestic substitute. Consumers are similarly adaptable. If they cannot buy one product or service because of a temporary shortage, they will buy different products and goods or simply wait a month until the product they want becomes available again.

#### Economy would adapt to a port closure

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

In Chapter 2, Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg argue that the actual costs of an attack on the Los Angeles–Long Beach port complex may not be as high as many fear. For example, if a port is closed, many shippers will reroute their shipments through other ports. In addition, displaced workers will seek alternative employment. As a result, the economy will adjust. Some output will be lost, but it may be so small in magnitude that it will not reveal itself in data that track national or even regional macroeconomic trends.

### Ext: Ports are Resilient

#### Ports can easily survive an attack

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast and Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, “Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic,” in “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” **2006**, Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

A cursory look would seem to portend a dramatic, dangerous scenario, but a closer look at the facts suggests otherwise. From an input-output perspective, a wide variety of holes would be quickly created in the flow of production that would seem to lead to a very sharp downturn in economic activity. But our economy is not a mechanical system; it is an organic self-healing system, much like that of a human being: Large injuries take time to heal, but for the most part they do eventually heal. To continue the analogy, a port attack is only a cut on the arm—quickly healed with little noticeable effect on the day-to-day functioning of the person.

#### No port shutdown—ports are big and have excess capacity

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast and Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, “Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic,” in “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” **2006**, Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Although the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach certainly represent a primary infrastructure target in the United States, a complete shutdown of the ports is highly unlikely as a direct result of some physical attack. There are two reasons for this: the sheer physical scale of the facilities and the large amount of excess physical capacity (as opposed to human capital capacity) currently in place. As shown in the port map on p. xxiii, the two facilities take up approximately 12 square miles of space in a six-by-four-mile area. The complex is broken into a number of separate yards, each completely controlled by a number of independent, competing major shipping lines, each of which have substantial investment in the physical cranes and equipment on their property. Some of these yards are on Terminal Island, connected to the mainland by three road bridges and a railroad; others are on the mainland itself. There are multiple access points into the area as the map shows, including two highways. Even if these roads were shut down, it would be relatively simple to construct a temporary bridge to the island, and although it might have some implications for the movement of ships, no yard would be effectively isolated.3

#### Economic activity would only be delayed, not destroyed

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The more sanguine estimate of the economic effects, in Chapter 2, results from an evaluation of the observed economic disruption from previous similar events. This more direct examination of the economic evidence indicates that in many cases, particularly port closures of relatively short duration, economic activity is more delayed than disrupted. The authors find that consumers and producers wait out the strike, storm, or other disruption, all the while accumulating demand that occurs in a flurry once the flow of goods resumes. The evidence indicates that for longer disruptions, economic agents are very creative and can find ways to work around a bottleneck such as a closed port.

### Solvency Frontline (1/2)

#### Other parts of the supply chain will remain insecure

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Each container trip to the United States has, on average, 17 different stops, or points at which the container’s journey temporarily halts. 14 The adage “goods at rest are goods at risk” readily applies to the terrorist threat. The container will be at rest at any point in the journey that involves a change in mode of transportation. While at rest, the container is vulnerable to thieves and terrorists alike. Providing port security therefore involves closely scrutinizing activities not only at the port but at points all along the shipping chain. The truck driver picking up the container at the U.S. port, often poorly paid and possibly an illegal immigrant not well integrated into U.S. society, may himself represent a vulnerability in the system.

#### **Mass-scanning** technology doesn’t exist and wouldn’t work

James Jay Carafano and Jessica Zuckerman, Deputy Director, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Director, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies and Research Associate, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, “Maritime Cargo Scanning Folly: Bad for the Economy, Wrong for Security,” Heritage foundation, Feb-2-2012, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/maritime-cargo-port-security-and-the-100-percent-screening-mandate>. Date accessed: August 24, 2012.

While screening calls for cargo to be assessed for risk on the basis of contents, origin, and other attributes, scanning means that each of the approximately 11.6 million maritime cargo security containers entering U.S. ports each year must be physically scanned. With many maritime cargo increasingly containerized in recent decades, typical maritime cargo containers often measure some 40 feet in length. One key issue regarding maritime cargo screening is, therefore, one of scale. While the basic technology exists to effectively screen cargo containers, the expanded technology necessary to perform this function on large containerized cargo largely does not. Cost and infrastructure are also important factors. A single x-ray scanner, the most common technology used for cargo screening, can have a price tag of $4.5 million, plus an estimated annual operating cost of $200,000, not to mention the roughly $600,000 per year for the personnel required to run the equipment and examine the results.[3] Likewise, the mere placement of scanners can also prove to cause logistical problems, as many ports were not built with natural bottlenecks through which all cargo passes. With today’s economy relying heavily on the timely and efficient movement of goods, and such logistical delays could amount to around $500 billion in total profit loss. And once scanning technology is installed, it may encounter multiple problems, such as incompatibility with previous technologies, frequent outages due to weather, and insufficient communication infrastructure to transmit electronic data to the U.S. National Targeting Center-Cargo, where it is assessed.

#### Securing ports isn’t enough—once terrorists are in U.S. waters its too late

Wendy J. Keefer, “Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain” Campbell Law Review, Apr-21-2008, http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Annually, more than nine million containers enter United States ports and most ships carrying these containers are foreign owned, foreign registered and operated by foreign crews. 39 Thus, any threat of terrorist use of shipping containers or container carrying vessels does not merely arise upon entry into a United States port. Rather, it is too late to combat the threat once the vessel on which terrorists, their supplies or weapons are loaded sail into domestic waters. It is one goal of port security to prevent terrorist entrance into United States waters altogether.

### Solvency Frontline (2/2)

#### Terrorists can get around detection

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Considering the extreme difficulty of interdicting drug smugglers, it seems that determined smugglers with a nuclear device would have little trouble circumventing the nation’s border protection and control, particularly because they would be able to leverage the techniques used successfully by drug smugglers. Further lowering their probability of being caught is the fact that, according to a series of experts testifying 11 before Congress in July 2005, terrorists could easily shield the highly enriched uranium and avoid detection from radiation detectors. 34

#### Inefficient spending practices mean funding won’t increase security

Joseph Bouchard, Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense of Zel Technologies, Center for American Progress, “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy,” Jun-15-2005, <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

The implicit assumption underlying the current vulnerability-based approach is that each and every port facility is equally likely to be attacked by terrorists and would generate the same consequences in terms of loss of life and loss to the American economy. This, of course, is nonsensical and demonstrates a disturbing lack of understanding of the threat posed by global extremist terrorist groups like al Qaeda. All facilities are vulnerable to some degree and there is no end to the wildly imaginative threat scenarios that can be generated to justify channeling scarce funds in one direction or another. This is the essence of the political tension within Congressional oversight committees over funding for urban vs. rural states, for example. All states are theoretically at risk, but terrorism risk does not apply to all states equally. Without such a strategic approach based on the actual threat and the likely consequence of a terrorist attack, strenuous efforts and extravagant expenditures will end up contributing little to enhancing maritime transportation and more broadly our national security.

#### Compliance problems mean plan wouldn’t solve

Jon D. Haveman is the Director of the Economy Program at the Public Policy Institute of California and has been a Senior Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Howard J. Shatz is a senior economist at the RAND Corporation and a professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, 2006, “Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_606jhr.pdf). Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Compliance is the weaker link. The Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, for example, depends on U.S. Customs and Border Protection validation of security plans for thousands of companies. However, given a lack of enforcement mechanisms, there is no guarantee that firms, once validated, will continue to carry out their security plans and procedures. Likewise, the Container Security Initiative depends on the cooperation of foreign governments. In some cases, foreign governments decline to inspect containers that U.S. authorities deem high-risk. The United States can then order the containers not to be loaded onto the ship at the foreign port or can inspect the container in its U.S. port of arrival. However, even with these options, some high-risk containers go uninspected (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2005b). Even full compliance will not guarantee success. As part of the Container Security Initiative, oceangoing ship operators must provide the manifest, or list of the contents of ship cargo, to U.S. officials in advance. However, the carrier has no way of knowing the accuracy of the manifest, since it gets the information from the individual companies shipping the goods.

### Ext: Alt Causes

#### Alt cause—there are risks at every point in the supply chain

Wendy J. Keefer, “Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain” Campbell Law Review, Apr-21-2008, http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

The way in which containers are used to pack and carry cargo complicates container security. A single container may contain cargo from many different companies and shippers. These containers are typically loaded somewhere other than the port (e.g., at company ware- houses). Each cargo shipment may involve numerous persons and numerous stops from the actual exporter and importer to the various transportation providers that carry the cargo to and from the ports. Each time a container is transferred or opened a risk of tampering or the loading of dangerous cargo exists. Moreover, given economic concerns, attacks targeting United States interests need not occur at or near any of the over three hundred domestic ports; such attacks could occur among ports of foreign nation trading partners.4 °Containers discharged at ports outside the United States, such as Canadian ports, may ultimately be transferred via truck or train into the United States. At all stages of shipment, security measures are needed and the cooperation of public and pri- vate parties in both the United States and abroad is vital. It is in every trading country's interest to participate in efforts to secure these shipments.4'

#### There are several threats to container security that port defense can’t solve

Wendy J. Keefer, “Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain” Campbell Law Review, Apr-21-2008, http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

The use of containers in the global supply chain involves a complex network of manufacturers, exporters, importers, brokers, carriers and foreign customs and port officials. What ultimately arrives in a shipping container shipped to a United States port depends on the actions and information provided by these numerous entities and individuals. Everyone from manufacturers to land carriers to middlemen freight forwarders to customs brokers, terminal operators and port employees (including management, stevedores, and longshoremen) at every port entered by the carrying vessel play a role in securing the cargo and the locations to which it is sent. 17 The many hands that access a single container create a number of significant container security issues. Opportunities for security breaches occur primarily in the following stages of the shipping process: (1) the packing process at the foreign warehouse or factory; (2) the transport of the packed goods from that location to the foreign port at which the goods will be loaded; and (3) the preparation of the cargo manifest setting forth the contents and other information about the goods being shipped. 18 Given these opportunities to tamper with the shipment process, container security efforts focus in large part on container inspection and documentation, container seals, and the secure storage of containers.

#### Ports not key to container security

Tamara Renee Shie, former visiting fellow at the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, “Ships and Terrorists – Thinking Beyond Port Security,” Oct-15-2004, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/pac0445a.pdf>. Date accessed: August 25, 2012.

First, the emphasis on upgrading the security of major ports neglects the fact that these represent only a single link in the transportation chain. A shipping container may pass through some 15 physical locations and some two dozen individuals and/or companies while traveling from departure point to destination. Because containers are only searched at the major port, there is no guarantee they cannot be waylaid in route after that point.

### Ext: Port Technology Doesn’t Work

#### Detection methods worse—false alarms neutralize their effectiveness

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Each false alarm must be investigated, which exacts a high cost in terms of time, money, and security. Based on an extremely conservative estimate of 10 minutes per follow-up inspection—and assuming that monitor operations are fully staffed— investigating 300 false alarms a day would take at least 50 man-hours per day. Since 95 percent of international goods that come into the country enter through America’s 361 ports, screening all cargo with RPMs could drastically slow down shipping. The negative economic impact could be immense. The security impact could also be significant: as a consequence of the already-high false alarm costs, some port officials have decreased the detection sensitivity of the radiation monitors to cut down on the number of disturbances, further reducing the probability of detecting dangerous devices. Technology is only as effective as the people operating it. Even if radiation detection were 100 percent effective, it would be constrained by the lack of competent personnel to operate them. Some reports also point to border agents improperly handling radiation detectors.

#### Current scanners can’t detect nuclear material

Douglas Frantz, previously chief investigator for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Managing Director of Kroll’s Business Intelligence Washington office, Jul-15-2012, “Port security: U.S. fails to meet deadline for scanning of cargo containers,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/port-security-us-fails-to-meet-deadline-for-scanning-of-cargo-containers/2012/07/15/gJQAmgW8mW_story.html>. Date accessed: August 26, 2012.

The DHS says monitors scan 99 percent of the containers for radiation after they arrive at U.S. ports. But experts say the monitors at U.S. ports are not sophisticated enough to detect nuclear devices or highly enriched uranium, which emit low levels of radiation. The Government Accountability Office has warned that a nuclear device could be detonated while at a port — containers often sit for days awaiting radiation checks — causing billions of dollars in damage in addition to the loss of life. Estimates of damage caused by a nuclear detonation at a major port range from tens of billions of dollars to $1 trillion. Shipping containers are potentially ideal for smuggling weapons, people and other illicit cargo; ensuring the integrity of the contents is difficult and costly. The standard container is 40 feet long and 8 feet high and holds more than 30 tons of cargo. A large vessel carries 3,000 or more containers from hundreds of different shippers and many ports. And a single container can hold cargo from many customers.

#### Terrorists can get around port detection

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

On the whole, the cost effectiveness of RPMs seems dubious. Moreover, even if the system could detect every type of nuclear material, it would be useless if terrorists did not bring the nuclear devices through the fixed ports of entry where the monitors are usually located. In fact, it would be easy for terrorists to evade the RPMs by shipping a nuclear weapon—whole or in parts—on a yacht or in a truck, or even by carrying it in piece by piece in backpacks, or smuggling it across any number of unprotected sections of the northern and southern borders. 82 In the June edition of National Journal, journalists Gorman and Freedberg added that “Uranium, ironically, is so low in radioactivity that it is safe to handle without gloves, so a bomb’s worth could even be broken in hundreds of half-pound chunks and smuggled into the country in people’s pockets.”

### Ext: Detection Fails

#### Detection fails

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Finally, the fourth best solution is direct onsite detection at local ports. This is the least cost effective measure because, according to experts, it is hard to detect highly enriched uranium and almost impossible to detect anything if it is shielded. As such, the effectiveness of the detection devices we have now is dubious. However, even if the detection devices were capable of detecting dangerous material, it would still be riskier than the three other solutions because the stakes are so high: if the system fails, the illicit material ends up inside the country.

#### Terrorists can use their legitimate vessels to escape detection

Wendy J. Keefer, “Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain” Campbell Law Review, Apr-21-2008, http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

Moreover, entire vessels are actually controlled by Al Qaeda. This terrorist organization may use those vessels for legitimate trade to raise funds or to carry out further terrorist activities. 48 The ease with which Farid clearly used a container for his own transport— only discovered when he attempted to widen ventilation holes with port employees nearby— is disturbing. 49 This successful concealment of container contents, along with potential Al Qaeda control of entire vessels able to carry thousands of shipping containers, is particularly troubling when the total volume of maritime container shipments in need of security screening is considered.

#### Effective nuclear detection is impossible

Veronique de Rugy, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University,“Is Port Security Funding Making Us Safer?”, MIT Center for International Studies, Nov-2007, <http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit_11_07_derugy.pdf>. Date accessed: August 23, 2012.

The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) received $535 million in 2007.14 DNDO’s mission addresses a broad spectrum of radiological and nuclear protective measures, but is focused exclusively on domestic nuclear detection.15 The fundamental problem is that DNDO relies on radiation portal monitors that have been proven unable to detect shielded nuclear material essentially rendering them useless.16 Besides, even if the system could detect every dangerous item, it is ineffective unless the nuclear material is brought through the fixed ports of entry where the monitors are located. With thousand of miles of unguarded borders—and no cost effective way to address the issue—smugglers can easily find positions to bring illicit goods inside the country. Consider the country’s long standing War on Drugs and the inability to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the country.

### Ext: Funding Doesn't Solve

#### Spending on container security fails

Alane Kochem, Policy Analyst for National Security in the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies at The Heritage Foundation, “Taking a Global Approach to Maritime Security,” Heritage Foundation, Sep-22-2005, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2005/09/taking-a-global-approach-to-maritime-security)

Some security analysts argue that container security should receive special consideration because a container could possibly be used to smuggle a nuclear weapon into the country. To counter this threat, they propose spending billions of dollars on container and port security. This argument fails on four counts. First, the nuke-in-box is an unlikely terrorist tactic. If an enemy wanted to smuggle a bomb into the United States, a private watercraft would be a safer and more secure way to transport the weapon, either directly to the target (e.g., a port) or indirectly by landing it in Mexico and then driving it across the border. Second, while nuclear smuggling is possible, so are dozens of other attack scenarios. It is dangerously myopic to overinvest in countering one tactic when the terrorists could easily employ another tactic. Third, searching every container and hardening every port is extremely inefficient and expensive way to stop terrorists from using cargo containers. Fourth, there is no viable busi¬ness case for many of the proposed solutions for "hardening" shipping containers. These measures would provide only minimal utility at the cost of billions of dollars in new duties or taxes.

#### Funding is misallocated

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Allocating money efficiently means that the money appropriated must be spent based on risk analysis. To be most effective, the money should first go to programs preventing devastating terrorist attacks, i.e., intelligence programs. And if experts are correct about the probability of a nuclear attack in our country then the federal government should make protection of stockpiles of fissile materials a priority. Within maritime security, funds should also fund the highest priorities first, like keeping nuclear weapons and terrorists outside of our ports.

#### Increased security won’t make a difference in the case of an attack

Veronique de Rugy, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University,“Is Port Security Funding Making Us Safer?”, MIT Center for International Studies, Nov-2007, <http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit_11_07_derugy.pdf>. Date accessed: August 23, 2012.

More telling is the fact that the $1.1 billion we spend on denying terrorists access to nuclear weapons and material pales in comparison with the amounts we spent each year on much less catastrophic threats. For example, in airline security, improved cockpit security has limited the worst-case scenario witnessed on 9/11 to the destruction of a plane and loss of approximately 300 passengers. Yet, we will spend $5.8 on baggage screening for airlines in FY 2008 and over $3 billion to help state and local government build their response capacity.22 First responder grant programs are predicated on the notion of cleaning up after terrorists have successfully attacked and hence are not making us more secure. Furthermore, nuclear experts predict that these investments will be irrelevant if we are actually attacked with a WMD weapon.23 In the end much of the money spent on port security goes to lower priority programs, as does much of our homeland security funding. It adds little value to the nation’s security. Thankfully, a successful nuclear attack remains a very low probability event. Yet, it only takes one success to create significant damages. Do we really need the deaths of 200,000 people to move the nuclear threat to the top of the priority list?

### Spending Disad Links

#### Scanning technology costs millions of dollars per unit

James Jay Carafano and Jessica Zuckerman, Deputy Director, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Director, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies and Research Associate, Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, “Maritime Cargo Scanning Folly: Bad for the Economy, Wrong for Security,” Heritage foundation, Feb-2-2012, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/02/maritime-cargo-port-security-and-the-100-percent-screening-mandate>. Date accessed: August 24, 2012.

Cost and infrastructure are also important factors. A single x-ray scanner, the most common technology used for cargo screening, can have a price tag of $4.5 million, plus an estimated annual operating cost of $200,000, not to mention the roughly $600,000 per year for the personnel required to run the equipment and examine the results.[3] Likewise, the mere placement of scanners can also prove to cause logistical problems, as many ports were not built with natural bottlenecks through which all cargo passes. With today’s economy relying heavily on the timely and efficient movement of goods, and such logistical delays could amount to around $500 billion in total profit loss. And once scanning technology is installed, it may encounter multiple problems, such as incompatibility with previous technologies, frequent outages due to weather, and insufficient communication infrastructure to transmit electronic data to the U.S. National Targeting Center-Cargo, where it is assessed.

#### Port security would cost billions to be effective

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The stated objective of the Port Security Grant Program is to fund security upgrades to help protect ports in case of a terrorist attack. According to an estimate by the Coast Guard, the cost for enhancing security at America’s 361 maritime facilities would be $1.5 billion in the first year, plus an additional $7.3 billion over the next decade. 61 Thus, if the goal is to enhance security in our ports, $140.9 million is likely to be inadequate. That remains true even if we include the $706 million in direct grants already allocated to ports to improve their physical and operational security and spending. 62

#### Plan would cost billions

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

According to experts, the level and depth of the investment spent on screening efforts in foreign ports are insufficient. Port security expert Stephen Flynn estimates that deploying a screening system that would run every container through both radiation and gamma-ray density sensors (which would detect shielding efforts on the part of terrorists) and then take a picture of the container’s identification numbers to match against databases for additional screening at every port in the world would cost roughly $1.5 billion. 103

### Politics Disad Links

#### Port security unpopular with Republicans

Judd Legum, Correspondent for ThinkProgress Security, “Right-Wing Blocks Funding For Port Security, Disaster Preparedness,” Think Progress, Mar-16-2006, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2006/03/16/4272/port-security-funding/>. Date accessed: August 29, 2012.

Moments ago, the House of Representatives narrowly defeated an amendment proposed by Rep. Martin Sabo (D-MN) that would have provided $1.25 billion in desperately needed funding for port security and disaster preparedness. The Sabo amendment included: – $300 million to enable U.S. customs agents to inspect high-risk containers at all 140 overseas ports that ship directly to the United States. Current funding only allows U.S. customs agents to operate at 43 of these ports. – $400 million to place radiation monitors at all U.S. ports of entry. Currently, less than half of U.S. ports have radiation monitors. – $300 million to provide backup emergency communications equipment for the Gulf Coast. Meanwhile, the Bush budget – which most of the members who voted against this bill will likely support – contains an increase of $1.7 billion for missile defense, a program that doesn’t even work.

#### Port security funding causes fights in Congress

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

The total amount allocated to port security grants over four years is $706 million. In addition, the Transit Grant Program for ferry security received an additional $5 million in FY2005. 44 Interestingly, the Port Security Grant Program represents a small portion of port security money—les than a percent—and is only 0.3 percent of homeland security spending government wide. Yet, each year, the House and the Senate fight over the amount this program will receive. This year was no exception. In other words, the Port Security Grant Programs is a very political program because it is a very visible program that Congressmen like to use to show their commitment to homeland security and to their constituents.

### States CP

#### States are best—the feds’ communication infrastructure for ports fails

Randall Beisecker, Research Assistant, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Mar-01-2006, “DP World and U.S. Port Security”, <http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/dp-world-and-us-port-security/>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

The cases submitted by the state of New Jersey and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey raise the question of how much communication should there be between the federal government and state and local governments on issues that are likely to affect local security. A common complaint of local port officials is that they are never privy to the kind of sensitive information they need in order to be effective at securing their ports. Part of the problem stems from the lengthy protocols and expense in getting security clearances for local law enforcement and port officials. This lack of inter-agency communication is a systemic problem throughout the federal government. Put bluntly, with federal agencies unable to communicate relevant intelligence amongst themselves, there is little reason to believe that the federal government has the ability to create effective lines of communication with lower levels of government. Creating these necessary channels to communicate sensitive intelligence is perhaps the biggest challenge to improving the security of locally administered critical infrastructure assets, ports included.

#### Federal government too uncoordinated—doesn’t solve nuclear detection tech

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Also, testifying before Congress in June, a GAO representative testified that “the common problem faced by the U.S. programs to combat nuclear smuggling is the lack of effective planning and coordination among responsible agencies.” 93 The good news is that a government-wide plan to guide U.S. efforts is on its way and some of the many duplicative programs are being consolidated. However, at the domestic level, DHS still fails to coordinate with other agencies on longer-term objectives such as attempting to improve the radiation detection technology used in portal monitors. 94

#### States comparatively better than federal government for port security

Randall Beisecker, Research Assistant, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Mar-01-2006, “DP World and U.S. Port Security”, <http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/dp-world-and-us-port-security/>. Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Despite DP World's attempt to diffuse, or at least delay the controversy, lawmakers remain indignant that they were left out of the loop on such a hot-button issue as national security, and are seizing this opportunity to introduce legislation prohibiting state-controlled companies from operating in U.S. ports. In addition, Congress wants greater legislative oversight over the workings and decisions of CFIUS. The danger is that Congress may overstep its bounds in its zealous desire to react. Instead, Congress should listen to the states and port employees and focus on how it can improve communications with other levels of government, improve the capacity of programs and legislation already in place, and work with the CFIUS process to reflect current concerns over national security.

### Federalism Links

#### Port management is a states right

Wendy J. Keefer, “Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain” Campbell Law Review, Apr-21-2008, http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf. Date accessed: August 31, 2012.

The United States is served by more than 360 commercial ports that provide approximately 3,200 cargo and passenger handling facilities, according to the U.S. Coast Guard. Depending on the individual port facilities, they may accommodate anything from recreational watercraft, to barges, ferries, and ocean-going cargo and passenger ships. Governance of these ports in the United States is a function of various state and local public entities, such as port authorities, port navigation districts and municipal port departments. Currently, there are more than 160 cargo- and passenger-handling ports under the jurisdiction of 126 public seaport agencies located along the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf and Great Lakes coasts, as well as in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Many of these seaport agencies are governed by an elected and/or appointed body, such as a port commission.

#### States control ports

Rexford B. Sherman, Director of Research and Information Services at the American Association of Port Authorities, 2002, “Seaport Governance in the United States and Canada,” [www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance\_uscan.pdf](http://www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance_uscan.pdf). Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Constitutional Parameters: The U.S. Constitution does grant the federal government exclusive jurisdiction over the navigable waters of the United States, including its deepdraft channels and harbors--authority delegated primarily to the Coast Guard and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But federal jurisdiction over harbors stops at the water's edge. Port authorities in the United States are instrumentalities of state or local government established by enactment or grants of authority by the state legislature. Neither Congress nor any federal agency has the power, or even the right, to appoint or dismiss port commissioners or staff members, or to amend, alter or repeal a port authority charter. Certain port activities are, of course, subject to federal law and jurisdiction, particularly those pertaining to foreign and interstate commerce.

#### Ports are under state jurisdiction

Rexford B. Sherman, Director of Research and Information Services at the American Association of Port Authorities, 2002, “Seaport Governance in the United States and Canada,” [www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance\_uscan.pdf](http://www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance_uscan.pdf). Date accessed: August 27, 2012.

Introduction: To observers from abroad, even experienced port specialists, the seaport system of the United States might seem at first glance to be anything but a system. In other countries, port systems are typically small by comparison and commonly subject to direct control by national authority. The situation in the United States differs in several crucial respects. First is simply the size of the industry itself--183 commercial deepdraft ports dispersed along the U.S. Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific and Great Lake coasts. Included in that number, too, are the seaports of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Saipan and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Here, unlike many countries, there is no national port authority. Rather authority is diffused throughout all three levels of government-federal, state and local. That stems from the federal character of the U.S. Constitution, which reserves certain powers for the national government and others strictly for the states. The Canadian system, by contrast, is subject to the general purview of the central government and more specifically to enactments of the national parliament. The enactment in June 1998 of the Canada Marine Act changed somewhat the character of the federal port system and permits the divestment of many ports previously administered by the Ministry of Transport to non-federal public and private entities. However, the nation’s major seaports are governed and managed by federal port authorities and ultimate statutory authority constitutionally remains with Parliament.

### Privatization CP

#### Private investment key to solve port security

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Despite this policy improvement, a more fundamental issue still needs to be addressed: whether the federal government should even be involved in upgrading port security. Public seaports are generally owned and operated by local governments through a port authority; however, large portions of seaport real estate are leased to the private sector with the local government operating as a landlord. In addition, there are many privately owned and operated terminals within seaports that exist independently of the local port authority. Where do the private, state, and local sectors’ responsibilities for preventing terrorism end and where does the federal government’s begin? As mentioned earlier, none of the prevention techniques used in ports is a public good: the cost to the port would be the same as the cost to the government. And as with other government spending, the local or private decision-maker is in a better position to determine local needs and the most effective way to meet them. Accordingly, all such spending should be local, e.g., paid for from taxes and fees charged by the port in question.

#### Private authorities spend money more efficiently and assess risk accurately

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Having port authorities and the private sector responsible for the direct defense of ports would guarantee a more responsible use of the money. When port security is federalized, a given port authority official and the state’s Congressmen have no incentive to admit that the port is not a likely target or that if it ever were a target, damages would be limited. By contrast, when port security programs are the responsibility of states and port authorities, officials have an incentive to assess risk and potential damages accurately.

#### Private actors better with planning port security

Veronique de Rugy, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, “Is Port Security Spending Making Us Safer?,” American Enterprise Institute, Sep-07-2005,

<http://cip.management.dal.ca/publications/Is%20Port%20Security%20Spending%20Making%20Us%20Safer.pdf>. Date accessed; August 31, 2012.

Moreover, once port security is the responsibility of port authorities, they have an incentive to identify the most cost effective measures. They are also the best suited to identify how much should be spent on each measure. If, for instance, they measure that the biggest expected cost from an attack is not the loss of the inventory stored in the port but the number of days that the port is unable to operate, port authorities will lower the expected damage by developing plans for the aftermath of an attack. They will focus on evacuating civilians and personnel, placing emergency equipment within easy reach, training personnel to handle emergencies and attacks, and planning for business continuity to allow the port to get up and running quickly after an attack.

## Guam Neg

### Guam Relocation Alt-Causes

#### No Guam relocation – lacks funding

Hiroshi Ito, 7-26-2010, “Marines' transfer may be delayed,” <http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201007250291.html>, da 8-31-2012

The relocation of U.S. Marines from Okinawa Prefecture to Guam may be delayed until 2017 or later, according to a report published by the United States House Committee on Appropriations on Friday. The delay is likely to set back plans to transfer the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma, in Ginowan, Okinawa Prefecture, to the Henoko district of Nago in the same prefecture. The original deadline for moving the 8,000 Marines and 9,000 family members to Guam was 2014. Although the White House has not backed away from that date, which was stipulated under a 2006 Japan-U.S. agreement on realigning forces, the appropriations committee has authorized a budget outlay for the Guam transfer which is roughly 64 percent less than the funding sought by the Obama administration. The appropriations committee plays a key role in setting budgets for government departments and programs. In its opening remarks, the committee stressed that it remained supportive of the plan to relocate Marines stationed in Okinawa to Guam. However, the same report referred to a Department of Defense preliminary environmental impact assessment issued in November 2009.

#### Guam relocation is delayed in the status quo --- Camacho’s opposition is centered around a lack of funding

Haidee V. Eugenio, Reporter for the Saipan Tribune, 2-10-2010, “Social, economic impacts of Guam buildup are the 'biggest concerns,” <http://www.saipantribune.com/newsstory.aspx?cat=1&newsID=97128>, da 8-31-2012

Guam Gov. Felix P. Camacho and CNMI Gov. Benigno R. Fitial cited socio-economic impacts as the “biggest” concerns about the massive military buildup in the region, including the lack of funding sources to cushion negative effects to the civilian community worth at least $3 billion in Guam alone and an expected decrease in tourist arrivals on Tinian as a result of increased military presence there. Guam and the CNMI are racing against time to beat the Feb. 17 deadline for submitting comments on the military buildup's draft environmental impact statement. The general concern so far is the socio-economic impacts to both Guam and the CNMI, followed by environmental concerns, Camacho and Fitial said. “We need to be very careful and understand what we are getting into. We don't want to rush into something we don't understand,” Fitial said. He said the CNMI is “lucky” that it is “learning from Guam's experience.” 'High speed vessels' Fitial, at the same time, responded to a letter from Guam Sen. Judith Guthertz, who asked whether the CNMI government is interested in having Army joint high speed vessels stationed on Saipan. “The CNMI will continue to work with and support the territory of Guam in regards to all of the upcoming military realignment in the Pacific region. I will gladly consider having the CNMI as the homeport for stationing and operations of the [joint high speed vessels],” Fitial told Guthertz. The U.S. Army Environmental Command has opened the public comment period for the preparation of a programmatic environmental impact statement in 2010 for the proposed stationing and operation of up to 12 joint high-speed vessels. These are strategic transport vessels designed to support the rapid transport of military troops and equipment in the U.S. and abroad. A copy of the Army's notice of intent is available at www.aec.army.mil. 'Lack of funding sources' Camacho, who was on Saipan for hours yesterday, said although billions of dollars in construction projects in Guam are promised, “there's no guarantee they will be there tomorrow.” “There's no funding source to mitigate the impact to our territory,” he said, adding that past experiences resulted in huge debts incurred by Guam that it has come to a point where the island no longer has capability to borrow money. Camacho said Guam needs a minimum of $3 billion to mitigate the social-impacts of the buildup, but he said no money has been set aside to address these impacts.

#### Guam base can’t move forward without funding – government won’t provide it

UPI, 8-8-2010, “Loan for Okinawa base move shaky,” <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2010/08/08/Report-Loan-for-Okinawa-base-move-shaky/UPI-60631281287198/>, da 8-31-2012

Plans to relocate U.S. Marines from Okinawa have hit a snag over the financing of new infrastructure on the island of Guam, sources told a Japanese newspaper. Yomiuri Shimbun said Sunday the Japanese government will likely decline to provide 63.2 billion yen ($740 million) in loans to the Guam utility company for upgrades to the sewage-treatment facilities because of a high probability of default. Sources said revenue projections for the project indicate it will lose money, leaving the company, Guam Waterworks Authority, unable to pay back the loans. The project is considered a necessary step if the Marines are to ever move out of their longtime Okinawa home under a U.S.-Japanese accord signed in 2006. The plan would have the relocation take place in 2014; however, the new obstacle could delay the move until 2020, the newspaper said.

### Transportation Infrastructure Not Key

#### Transportation infrastructure isn’t key – it’s things like sewers

Hiroshi Ito, 7-26-2010, “Marines' transfer may be delayed,” <http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201007250291.html>, da 8-31-2012

It raised questions about the feasibility of the department's Guam construction plans and whether the government would be able to contain damage to the environment caused by an increase in the population on the island, a U.S. protectorate. A U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) study has noted that the island's current water and sewage system would not be able to handle the influx of people. Explaining why it had set back the expected completion date of the transfer to 2017 or later, the House committee report noted that the schedules for completion of related military facilities were now set for after 2014. In a separate briefing on Thursday, an outline of the final Defense Department's environmental impact assessment report, which is scheduled for July 30, indicated that construction work on Guam was expected to be slower than originally planned. The number of personnel projected to be involved in construction in 2014 is put at 41,000. That is about half the 79,000 stated in the November preliminary assessment. Insufficient water and sewage facilities to handle the influx of Marines and their families are cited as the biggest reason for the delay. EPA officials have noted that the infrastructure currently does not meet U.S. standards, and that the system will likely collapse. Guam's governor Felix Camacho reportedly demanded a delay to construction because of the issue.

#### Guam troop relocation is being delayed because of ALL infrastructure, not just transportation

Satoshi Ogawa, 7-29-2010, “U.S. to delay Guam troop move,” Daily Yomiuri, <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/world/20100729TDY01T06.htm>, da 8-31-2012

A planned transfer of about 8,000 U.S. marines from Okinawa Prefecture to Guam could be delayed beyond the 2014 target, perhaps by up to six years, according to an office of the U.S. Defense Department. A final environmental impact statement released by the department's Joint Guam Program Office on Tuesday includes a proposal to delay the transfer of the troops and their dependents to as late as 2020 to reduce environmental impact from the personnel relocation and associated construction projects. However, the statement said a new time frame would be decided later. To address the impact on the environment, the statement discusses two mitigation methods. The first is "force flow reduction" or rescheduling the arrival of marines and their dependents. The second is "adaptive program management," which adjusts the tempo and sequence of transfer-related construction due to infrastructure limitations in Guam. "Extending the arrival of the military population over a greater period of time (e.g. beyond 2014) would lessen the need for various infrastructure upgrades to meet peak loading demand in 2014," the statement said. "The proposed force flow reduction mitigation measure would both lower the overall peak population and decrease the rate of short-term population increase resulting from the proposed action, thereby reducing demands on utilities and many island services."

#### Laundry list of needed infrastructure in Guam for military expansion

Guam EB5, 2010, “Business Investment Opportunities,” <http://www.guameb5.com/business_investment_opportunities.asp>, da 8-31-2012

The target industries for investment opportunities within Guam’s growing military presence are plentiful. They include: Providing food and dry goods (supplying the full range of food and consumer products required by the current 16,400 personnel and the 17,000 Marines and dependents scheduled to be relocated to Guam) Security (armed and unarmed security personnel at military facilities) Building and grounds maintenance (to provide both preventive maintenance as well as repair services for U.S. military facilities, housing and grounds) Morale, recreation and welfare services (including public and commercial recreation opportunities offered on-base at both the Navy and Air Force installations) and Public works projects and services (engineering, construction and maintenance of civil works required for the planned expansion of U.S. military facilities).

### Relocation Doesn’t Solve

Plan is insufficient to solve – have to close Futenma

Fox News, 2-8-2012, “US, Japan pave way to send Okinawa Marines to Guam,” <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2012/02/08/us-japan-pave-way-to-send-okinawa-marines-to-guam/#ixzz20MR6AFyk>, da 8-31-2012

TOKYO-- Japan and the United States agreed Wednesday to proceed with plans to transfer thousands of U.S. troops out of the southern Japanese island of Okinawa, leaving behind the stalled discussion of the closure of a major U.S. Marine base there. The transfer, a key to U.S. troop restructuring in the Pacific, has been in limbo for years because it was linked to the closure and replacement of the strategically important base, which has been fiercely opposed by Okinawa residents. The announcement Wednesday follows high-level talks to rework a 2006 agreement for 8,000 Marines on Okinawa to move to the U.S. territory of Guam by 2014 if a replacement for the base -- Marine Corps Air Station Futenma -- could be built. That agreement has been effectively scuttled by opposition on Okinawa, where many residents believe the base should simply be closed and moved overseas or elsewhere in Japan. More than half of the 50,000 U.S. troops in Japan, including 18,000 Marines, are stationed on Okinawa, taking up around 10 percent of the island with nearly 40 bases and facilities. In a joint statement Wednesday, the two governments said the transfer of thousands of U.S. Marines to Guam would not require the prior closure of Futenma, as in the original pact. Details of the realignment will be discussed further, but about 10,000 troops will remain on Okinawa, as in the original agreement.

#### Moving to Guam doesn’t solve the alliance

Travis J. Tritten, 4-26-2012, “Realignment would shift 9,000 marines across pacific,” <http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/realignment-would-shift-9-000-marines-across-pacific-1.17567>, da 8-31-2012

The Futenma base, located in the middle of a densely populated urban area, has long been a major irritant for Okinawans. The U.S. and Japan reiterated their intention to close the Futenma air station, as well as about five other American military facilities on Okinawa. The closures were also part of the stalled 2006 realignment agreement. But the planned relocation of the Futenma base to Camp Schwab, a Marine base further north on the island, has generated fierce opposition from local residents, who fear the noise and damaging environmental impacts they believe would result. The prefecture’s governor has indicated he will not approve the necessary environmental permits that would allow the relocation to proceed. U.S. officials, however, reiterated their insistence that the relocation of Futenma to Camp Schwab must go forward.

#### Guam doesn’t solve relations

Krista Mahr, 2-7-2012, “Why Okinawa Won’t Be Celebrating,” Time World, <http://world.time.com/2012/02/07/why-okinawa-wont-be-celebrating-if-4700-u-s-marines-move-to-guam/#ixzz20Dvc9cnw>, da 8-31-2012

Whatever it is, it’s not going to go down well on Okinawa, despite the fact that many on the island have been fighting for the Marines and all other U.S. military members to leave the island for years. Why? By detaching the Marine relocation from the 2006 deal – part of the U.S. “pivot to Asia” strategy of installing more smaller and nimble forces around the Pacific from Hawaii to Darwin to Guam – Okinawans may have lost whatever bargaining chip they had left with Tokyo. The incentive to find a good solution to the Futenma relocation now comes down to good faith, which isn’t to say that the U.S. and Tokyo are not committed to making Okinawans, who were occupied by the U.S. until 1972, more comfortable with the arrangement. It’s just that Okinawans might not see it that way. (MORE: Read about U.S. foreign policy under President Obama) While Guam, which has been waiting to receive the influx of Marines for years now, has for the most part been looking forward to the boom of a military buildup, Okinawans are fed up with hosting half the American forces in Japan.

### US-Japan Relations Resilient

#### US-Japan security alliance is unbreakable – and relations are resilient

National Journal, 9-1-2011, “Japanese Elections Complicate East Asia Policy,” p. np

For starters, the DPJ win isn't a rejection of Tokyo's cozy relationship with Washington. More than 73 percent of Japanese feel very warm or somewhat warm towards the U.S., according to a poll conducted last year by the Japanese government, and in Pew's Global Attitudes survey from July, 59 percent of Japanese respondents viewed the U.S. favorably -- up from 50 percent a year before. More than that, a rising China, Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions and a renaissance of Russian power all provide incentives for the DPJ to keep U.S.-Japan defense cooperation in good working order. "Under these conditions, the alliance is like an insurance policy for which the premium is relatively modest -- a good deal for both parties," said Michael Armacost, who served as ambassador to Japan from 1989 to 1993.

#### US-Japan alliance is unbreakable

Yukio Okamoto, president of Okamoto Associates and special adviser to Japanese PM, 2002, “Japan and the United States,” Washington Quarterly 25.2, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/washington_quarterly/v025/25.2okamoto.html>, da 8-31-2012

Given the magnitude of the danger that an end of the alliance would pose to both Japan and the United States, both sides will likely want to maintain their security relationship for many years to come. A completely new world would have to emerge for Japan and the United States to no longer need each other. Despite frictions over trade, supposed Japanese passivity, purported U.S. arrogance, and the myriad overwrought "threats to the alliance," the truth is that this military alliance between two democratic states is well-nigh unbreakable--because there are no acceptable alternatives.

#### US-Japan relations are resilient

Consulate General of Japan in Seattle, 1-1-2008, “Greetings,” <http://www.seattle.us.emb-japan.go.jp/about/consul.htm>, da 8-31-2012

I trust that you are all in good health in welcoming the New Year. The relationship between Japan and the U.S. has reached a new era in regards to leadership as of last November, when the new Prime Minster Yasuo Fukuda met with President George W. Bush. At this meeting, the two leaders confirmed the solid and resilient Japan-U.S. alliance, which has been built over the course of more than half a century, overcoming occasional challenges through mutual cooperation. The leaders also agreed upon recognizing the fact that the Japan-US alliance plays a crucial role in tackling a variety of global issues.

### AT: Economy Advantage

#### Guam base isn’t good for their economy – just redistributional growt

Catherine Lutz, Anthropology prof @ Brown, 7-26-2010, “The Bases of Empire,” Asia-Pacific Journal, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=20405>, da 8-31-2012

What are the economic effects of bases? Three major factors can be identified. First, the economic effects are primarily redistributional rather than generative (unlike, for example, manufacturing or education jobs). Certain sectors atrophy and others grow in military districts, often in very strong fluctuations. In 2007 in Guam, for example, “While employment in manufacturing, transportation and public utilities and retail trade decreased, increases were seen for jobs in the service sector and public sector; with the construction sector experiencing the largest increase, that is, 1,450 jobs, or 35 per cent.”8 Usually, retail jobs are the main type of work created around military bases. Unfortunately, those jobs pay less than any other category of work, accelerating the growth of inequality in military communities. Second, the military is a highly toxic industrial operation and it externalizes many of its costs of operation to the communities that host it and serve it. These costs include such things as environmental waste, PTSD in returning war veterans and high rates of domestic violence, rapid deterioration of roads and other public amenities, and, in many communities, decline in human capital development of populations that have gone into the military (Lutz and Bartlett 1995, Lutz 2001). JROTC, for example, only appears to add resources to school districts while it in fact draws on significant local education resources, while serving as recruiting devices. The math on these costs – the subtraction from the general welfare and general public funds – is rarely done. Finally, military economies are volatile. While the “war cycle” is different than the business cycle, it also has booms and busts. For example, businesses in military personnel cities like Fayetteville, North Carolina regularly go under when service members are deployed to US war zones. Any major deployment from Guam’s bases can be expected to significantly harm local enterprise dependent on military business. Moreover, a volatile real estate market catering to foreign military personnel sends property prices spiralling and forces local working families into more substandard housing.

#### Prefer our evidence – their advantage is military hype

Catherine Lutz, Anthropology prof @ Brown, 7-26-2010, “The Bases of Empire,” Asia-Pacific Journal, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=20405>, da 8-31-2012

In this final section, the economic impact of bases is examined, as this has been crucial in Guam and elsewhere for the arguments made for military expansion. Obviously the health and wellbeing of people affected by military basing are crucial, but the economic effects have been the primary thing that people in many base communities have focused on. This is so for two reasons. The first is that the military itself publicizes its arrival or expansion as an economic boon, noting the dollars brought in via soldier’s salaries, civilian work on post, and construction and other sub-contracts that could provide jobs. So the First Hawaiian Bank published a Guam Economic Forecast that claimed “The military expansion is anticipated to benefit Guam’s economy in the amount of $1.5 billion per year once the process begins.”6 The second reason for the economic focus is that they appear overall to be positive, unlike the environmental, sovereignty, cultural, crime, and noise effects. But one of the reasons they look positive is because the powerful benefit and have the resources to convince others that they, too, benefit even when they palpably do not. Moreover, the military has large numbers of personnel, military and civilian, doing public relations work with media and communities to make their case for simple economic positives. In addition, those locals who are most likely to benefit financially have the funding and motivation to do similar public relations work. For example, the Chamber of Commerce funded a 2008 survey that found that “71 per cent of Guam residents supported an increase in the United States military presence, with nearly 80 per cent of the view that the increasing military presence would result in additional jobs and tax revenue; according to the poll, 60 per cent felt the additional Marines on the island would have a positive effect and would ultimately improve the island’s quality of life.”7 This poll was as much an attempt to create reality as to reflect it. It builds on an existing cultural narrative, one that is purchased with media time and power, a narrative that says “you will all benefit.”

#### Economic benefits are overestimated—base will net-hurt the local economy

Lisa Natividad, Ph.D., Guam University Social Work Assistant Professor, and Kirk, Ph.D., Oregon University Women's and Gender Studies Faculty, 5-14-2010, “Fortress Guam resists US military buildup,” http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/LE14Dh04.html, da 8-31-2012

An economist at the University of Guam, Claret Ruane, published a paper examining the macroeconomic multipliers used in the DEIS to compute projected economic growth as a result of the military buildup. It states, " ... that economic studies that use Hawaii's spending multiplier tend to present a rosier picture of the positive economic impacts of proposed changes". Ruane recomputes the multiplier and suggests that while the DEIS reflects the highest gains at $1.08 billion in 2014, a more realistic estimate is $374 million in the same year. It is noteworthy that 2014 is the year with the highest expected impact on the Gross Island Product.The Guam Economic Development Authority estimated costs to local government at around $1 billion although the governor has said this is more likely to be $2-3 billion. More recently, it has been reported that the island will need $3-4 billion to upgrade its utilities infrastructure. While grants have recently been awarded to the Government of Guam for infrastructural upgrades, they do not begin to cover the costs necessary for the anticipated population influx. Additional negative impacts include increased noise, worse traffic congestion, and higher rental prices. As local people earn considerably less than military personnel, they will be crowded out of the rental market. Other potential problems include the likely increase in crime and prostitution, increased dependence on the US, and an undermining of Chamorro culture and right to self-determination.

### Yes Guam Economy

#### Guam econ up – solar investments

Louella Losinio, staff writer, 6-29-2012, “Guam solar energy contract signed,” <http://www.mvariety.com/cnmi/cnmi-news/local/47609-guam-solar-energy-contract-signed.php>, da 8-31-2012

“We are taking a quantum leap for the island. Our IRP this summer will help us address the cost of energy, and help us diversify our fuel source and add additional renewables, both in the supply side and with the customer side. There are a lot of efforts coming together,” Consolidated Utility Services General Manager John M. Benavente said during the signing of the contract. With the new project, Benavente said the GPA will be converting oil to jobs, and circulate money within the economy by hiring people to construct, operate and maintain the solar energy facilities. For his part, GPA General Manager Joaquin Flores said: “We are helping stimulate the economy — not to stimulate the Singapore economy, but the Guam economy.” He said it took the team more than a year to finalize the project. “Next year, we will see the first kilowatt hour generated from this facility,” Flores proudly said before the contract signing. Consolidated Commission on Utilities Chairman Simon Sanchez emphasized that the project is an attempt to diversify away from oil after realizing the non-renewable energy source creates a very “expensive proposition” for the island. “While solar energy will not necessarily bring your bill down right away, they have the potential to become cheaper than oil in the long run. We want therefore to invest on renewable energy,” Sanchez said.

#### Guam econ up now – free trade

Judi Won Pat, 6-27-2012, Pacific News Center, <http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=24944:speakers-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156>, da 8-31-2012

Buenas yan Hafa Adai! This past week the Guam delegation to the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures (APIL) was successful in securing the support of regional nation states and territories for several important initiatives that are meant to stimulate and sustain local and regional economic growth. I led a delegation of Guam Senators at the APIL’s 31st General Assembly on Saipan this past week and together we were successful in securing support from ten nation states and territories for the Guam-CNMI Visa-Waiver program and a regional Free Trade Agreement.

#### Guam’s economy is resilient

Wali M. Osman, PhD, May 2004, “An Update on the economies off Guam and commonwealth of the northern mariana islands”, <http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Osman/Osmanreports/An%20Update%20on%20the%20Guam%20and%20CNMI%20Economies.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Following several years of stagnation and decline, Guam’s economy is headed for recovery and growth. The levels of activity in the two main engines of growth, tourism and national defense, are rising, although for different reasons and with different effects on Guam’s economy, the labor market and public finances. While benefiting hotels, restaurants, shopping malls and other facilities catering mainly to tourists, increases in tourist traffic without discernible increases in the average tourist spending tend to have subtle and gradual effects on the economy, government finances and the labor market. With Guam’s hotel occupancy rates averaging in the 50-60 percent range during most of the last 3-4 years, currently projected increases in tourist traffic are a long way from bringing financial strength to local hotels and making a visible impact on the rest of the economy. At such an early stage of recovery and expansion, gains in tourist traffic have to be registered for several months to be considered a turning point from the current stage of the business cycle. By contrast, increases in defense spending, especially in force and personnel, refurbishment of base facilities and new construction projects tend to have a more perceptible effect, as some of these create immediate work opportunities. Now that both tourism and defense outlays are rising simultaneously, the prospect for recovery in Guam’s economy is better than in several years.

### AT: Deterrence Advantage

#### Guam can’t solve deterrence – not enough space

Guam EIS, July 2012, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation,”

<http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume_3/Vol_03_Ch01_Purpose_Of_and_Need_For_Actions.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Training operations proposed on Tinian would support individual up to company level sustainment training for the relocated Marines. Sustainment training is training that enables Marine Corps forces to maintain combat readiness. The individual and crew-served weapons qualification ranges are proposed for Guam (refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Section 2.3). The training that would take place on Tinian is essential to the end-state of sustaining combat readiness of Guam-based Marines. The proposed Tinian ranges are for training Marines with use of weapons similar to the Guam ranges (5.65 mm and below) but in tactical scenarios. Individual-level training would occur on Guam as travel distances and logistics to Tinian would not be practical for individual-level training. Training in tactical scenarios requires larger areas than is available on Guam. Training units would include ground elements that would enable three of the four components of the Marine Air Ground Task Force (Command, Ground, Air, and Logistics) to accomplish weapons training tasks according to Mission Essential Task List, as designated by appropriate commanders

#### Plan doesn’t solve readiness – no space

Shirley A. Kan, specialist in Asian Security affairs, 3-29-2012, “Guam: US Defense Deployments”, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Tinian. The study also found that Guam cannot accommodate all training for the relocated marines, and the nearby island of Tinian (100 miles away) could help to provide land for their training. There would be a challenge for sustaining operational readiness in training while limiting the time and expense to travel to train. The study found that “the training ranges currently planned for Guam and Tinian only replicate existing individual-skills training capabilities on Okinawa and do not provide for all requisite collective, combined arms, live and maneuver training the Marine Corps forces must meet to sustain core competencies. As with Marine Corps forces currently in Okinawa who must now travel to mainland Japan, other partner nations, and the U.S. to accomplish this requisite core competency training, the Marine Corps forces relocating from Okinawa to Guam would also have to use alternate locations to accomplish requisite core competency training

#### Guam is worse for deterrence

Shirley A. Kan, specialist in Asian Security affairs, 3-29-2012, “Guam: US Defense Deployments”, Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

A concern is that Guam’s higher military profile could increase its potential as a strategic target for terrorists and adversaries during a conflict. For example, potential PRC and DPRK missile attacks could raise Guam’s need for missile defense. Still, when he worked in Guam in 1974, Senator James Webb wrote that “as long as the U.S. maintains and communicates a credible military presence and capability, Guam is under no greater threat, in reality, than any other part of the U.S.” 21 China is believed to have deployed ballistic missiles that could target Guam, considered by China as part of the “Second Island Chain” from which it needs to break out of perceived U.S.-led “containment.” China’s missiles that could target forces based at Guam include the DF-3A (CSS-2) medium-range ballistic missile (MRBM). China also has developed an extended-range DH-10 ground-launched land-attack cruise missile (LACM) and the world’s first anti-ship ballistic missile (ASBM), the DF-21D ASBM, to target aircraft carriers and other ships. While the DF-21D’s initial range could be 1,500-2,000 km (930-1240 mi), a more advanced variant could extend the range to about 3,000 km and reach Guam. 22 In addition, the DPRK has developed an intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) with a range over 2,000 miles.

### AT: Asian War Impacts

#### No Asian military conflict – nations won’t chose force, economic interdependence

Muthia Alagappa, Distinguished Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, 2008, “The Long Shadow,” p. np

Despite this, the role of force in Asian international politics is becoming more limited due to a number of developments. First, the traditional need for force to protect the territorial integrity of states has declined in importance. With Iesv exceptions (Taiwan, North Korea, and South Korea) state survival is not problematk. The Asian political map is for the most part Internationally accepted. although some boundaries are still in dispute. Such disputes are being settled through negotiations or shelved in the interest of promoting better bilateral relations (Wang 2003) Second, the political, diplomatic. strategic, military, and economic cost of using force has increased dramatically. Over the past several decades, a normative framework has developed in Asia that delegitimizes the use of force to invade and occupy another country or to annex territory that is internationally recognized as belonging to another state. The use of force to invade and occupy another country or to annex territory will incur high costs. For example. if’China were to invade Tai’an without serious provocation, it can expect civil and military resistance in Taiwan, U.S. military intervention, international condemnation, and a setback to its image as a responsible power. Such action would also incur huge economic costs resulting from international and domestic disruptions. Unless military action were swift and surgical, it would also result iii substantial physical damage that would only increase as Asian countries continued to modernize and urbanize.

#### Economic interdependence checks risk of Asian war

Muthia Alagappa, Distinguished Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, 2008, “The Long Shadow,” p. np

Economic growth. modernization, and growing economic interdependence have increased the cost of the force option and restrained the behavior of states even when major political issues are at stake, as for example in cross-Strait relations. Economic interdependence does not close the force option in all cases, hut the high costs of economic disruption can restrain military action, Further, force is no longer relevant for the attainment of economic goals such as access to resources, labor, and markets, Energy security, (‘or example, is sought through the market, national stockpiling. and sourcing arrangements. Finally, resolution of existing disputes through the use of force is not practical. Except for the United States, none of the Asian states can niarshil the necessary military power to impose a settlement by force. The experience in Iraq and Afghanistan suggests that even the United States suffers limitations and that the use of force carries much risk. These considerations explain the reluctance of the United States to undertake preventive action against North Korea, the reluctance of China w carry out its threat of using force to unify Taiwan with the PRC, and the continuing stalemate in the India-Pakistan confiict over Kashmir. Force may still be used iii these cases, but the attendant strategic, political, diplomatic, and economic costs and risks are high.

#### Nukes check conflict in Asia

Muthia Alagappa, Distinguished Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, 2008, “The Long Shadow,” p. x

study argues that although it is possible to envisage destabilizing situations and consequences, thus far nuclear weapons have had a stabilizing effect in the Asian security region. They have contributed to regional stability by assuaging the national security concerns of vulnerable states, strengthening deterrence and the status quo. inducing caution, preventing the outbreak and escalation of major hostilities, and reinforcing the trend in the region that deemphasizes the offensive role of force and increases the salience of defense, deterrence, and assurance. Extended deterrence and assurance continue to be crucial in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to additional states.

### Guam Bad – US-China War

#### Guam relocation in the short term ensures escalation to US China war over North Korea – undercuts military flexibility necessary to contain the conflict

Marianas Variety, 6-4-2010, “Hatoyama’s fall and Guam’s reprieve,” <http://mvguam.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12549:-hatoyamas-fall-and-guams-reprieve&Itemid=13>, da 8-31-2012

And last but not last, there is the geopolitical angle. Tensions are again ratcheting up in the Korean peninsula and the two Koreas are almost on the brink of war. In case war does break out, the US needs its forces to be in Okinawa, not Guam, so that they can be deployed more swiftly. In fact, the gathering war clouds in Korea was the reason cited by Hatoyama for his decision to backtrack on his original campaign promise of kicking out U.S. forces in Okinawa. Any conflict in Korea would surely bring in the involvement of China and from that point, things can escalate and grow out of control pretty fast. With Japan still dependent on the U.S. for its defense, it cannot afford to have a decrease in the American military's presence in their soil, at least for now. And as Hatoyama's resignation showed, Japanese officialdom seems to still prefer a U.S. military presence, even with all its irritants, to a situation where Japan stands alone, without the U.S. security umbrella.

#### The bases in Guam would be extremely vulnerable to a variety of attacks

Shirley Kan, Specialist in Asian Security Affairs, and Larry Niksch, specialist in Asian Affairs, 5-22-2009, Congressional Research Service, “Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments,” p np

Guam’s higher military profile could increase its potential as an American target for terrorists and adversaries during a possible conflict. China has a variety of ballistic missiles that could target Guam. North Korea reportedly developed a new intermediate range ballistic missile (Taepodong- X) that could reach Guam. In February 2009, South Korea’s 2008 Defense White Paper reported that North Korea completed the deployment of such new missiles that could threaten Guam.13 Any such vulnerabilities could raise requirements for both counter-terrorism measures and missile defense. Also, some say that Guam is still too distant from flash points in the Asia and advocate closer cooperation with countries such as Singapore, Australia, the Philippines, and Japan.14 Building up the U.S. presence in those countries could enhance alliances or partnerships, increase interoperability, and reduce costs for the United States.

#### US-China war escalates – goes nuclear – accidental warfare extremely likely

Max Fisher, associate editor at the Atlantic, 10-31-2011, “5 Most Likely Ways the U.S. and China Could Spark Accidental Nuclear War” <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/10/5-most-likely-ways-the-us-and-china-could-spark-accidental-nuclear-war/247616/>, da 8-31-2012

After 10 years of close but unproductive talks, the U.S. and China still fail to understand one another's nuclear weapons policies, according to a disturbing report by Global Security Newswire. In other words, neither the U.S. nor China knows when the other will or will not use a nuclear weapon against the other. That's not due to hostility, secrecy, or deliberate foreign policy -- it's a combination of mistrust between individual negotiators and poor communication; at times, something as simple as a shoddy translation has prevented the two major powers from coming together. Though nuclear war between the U.S. and China is still extremely unlikely, because the two countries do not fully understand when the other will and will not deploy nuclear weapons, the odds of starting an accidental nuclear conflict are much higher. Neither the U.S. nor China has any interest in any kind of war with one other, nuclear or non-nuclear. The greater risk is an accident. Here's how it would happen. First, an unforeseen event that sparks a small conflict or threat of conflict. Second, a rapid escalation that moves too fast for either side to defuse. And, third, a mutual misunderstanding of one another's intentions.

### Guam Bad – North Korea

#### Guam redeployment kills aircraft access to North Korea during a crisis

Bruce Klingner, Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, 2009, Defence Viewpoints, <http://www.defenceviewpoints.co.uk/articles-and-analysis/u-s-should-stay-firm-on-implementation-of-okinawa-force-realignment>, da 8-31-2012

Redeploying to Guam Would Weaken Alliance Capabilities Okinawa's strategic location contributes to potent U.S. deterrent and power projection capabilities as well as enabling rapid and flexible contingency response, including to natural disasters in Asia. Marine ground units on Okinawa can utilize Futenma airlift to deploy quickly to amphibious assault and landing ships stationed at the nearby U.S. Naval Base at Sasebo, Nagasaki Prefecture. Okinawa has four long runways: two at Kadena Air Base, one at Futenma, and one at Naha civilian airfield. The Futenma runway would likely be eliminated after return to Okinawa control to enable further civilian urban expansion. The planned FRF would compensate by building two new (albeit shorter) runways at Camp Schwab. However, if the Futenma unit redeployed to Guam instead, no new runway on Okinawa would be built. Japan would have thus lost a strategic national security asset, which includes the capability to augment U.S. or Japanese forces during a crisis in the region. Not having runways at Futenma or Schwab would be like sinking one's own aircraft carrier, putting further strain on the two runways at Kadena. Redeploying U.S. forces from Japan and Okinawa to Guam would reduce alliance deterrent and combat capabilities. Guam is 1,400 miles, a three-hour flight, and multiple refueling operations farther from potential conflict zones. Furthermore, moving fixed-wing aircraft to Guam would drastically reduce the number of combat aircraft sorties that U.S. forces could conduct during crises with North Korea or China, while exponentially increasing refueling and logistic requirements.

#### Japanese basing is critical to deter North Korea – irreplaceable by Guam

Bruce Klingner, 1-25-2010, “Okinawan Election Threatens,” The Foundry, <http://blog.heritage.org/?p=24523>, da 8-31-2012

Although the Okinawan election will make implementing the bilateral agreement even more difficult, the Obama Administration must remain resolute on the need to implement the force realignment agreement, especially maintaining U.S. Marine Corps air units on Okinawa. To garner increased Japanese support for the realignment plan, Washington should boost public diplomacy efforts to better educate Japanese officials and the populace on the necessity of forward-based U.S. forces to not only defend Japan but to also maintain peace and stability in Asia. Despite its shortcomings, the alliance is critical to fulfilling current U.S. strategic objectives, including maintaining peace in the region. The forward deployment of a large U.S. military force in Japan deters military aggression by North Korea, signals Washington’s resolve in defending U.S. allies, and provides an irreplaceable staging area should military action be necessary.

#### North Korea war causes nuclear destruction

Lee Wha Rang, Korea Web Weekly, September 13, 1999, http://www.kimsoft.com/1997/lee0913.htm, da 8-31-2012

Meanwhile, Kim Dae Jung should tell his Japanese friends to keep their mouth shut and tone down their anti-North Korea rhetoric. Kim should hire specialists on American legal terms - fight fire with fire - lawyers against lawyers. As long as Kim is represented by amateurs, he will be clobbered by America's Harvard lawyers - the most bright, cunning and vicious negotiators on Earth, the consummate masters of forked-tongues. **The Korean peninsula sits on an atomic powder keg and any misstep will ignite it into a global NBC war and tens of millions of people** - Koreans, Japanese, Chinese and Americans - **will die** horrible death. The Earth day after will not be suitable for human habitation.

### Guam Bad – Japan Prolif

#### Withdrawal from Japan sends signal of weakness to key Asian allies

Michael Auslin, AEI Fellow, 2010, U.S.-Japan Relations: Enduring Ties, Recent Developments, House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, <http://www.aei.org/speech/100130>, da 8-31-2012

Despite this litany of problems both real and perceived, the U.S.-Japan alliance, and the broader relationship it embodies, remains the keystone of U.S. policy in the Asia-Pacific region. There is little doubt that America and Japan share certain core values that tie us together, including a belief in democracy, the rule of law, and civil and individual rights, among others, which should properly inform and inspire our policies abroad. Moreover, after the cataclysm of World War II, we have worked together to maintain stability in the western Pacific, throughout the Cold War and after. Without the continued Japanese hosting of U.S. forces, our forward-based posture is untenable, particularly in a period of growing Chinese military power in which the acquisition of advanced weapons systems indicates increased vulnerability of U.S. forces over time. There are over 35,000 U.S. military personnel in Japan, and another 11,000 afloat as part of the 7th Fleet, while three-quarters of our military facilities are in Okinawa. Maintaining this presence is a full-time job for officials on both sides of the Pacific. Both Washington and Tokyo have revised the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) governing the U.S. military in Japan to respond to local concerns over judicial access to U.S. service members, and domestic pressures to reduce Japan's $4 billion annual Host Nation Support (HNS) are a continuing feature of bilateral discussions. The new Japanese government has indicated its desire to consider further revision of SOFA and HNS, which portends continued, sometimes difficult negotiations between both sides, though I would be surprised by any significant changes in either. It is clear, however, that the presence of U.S. military forces is welcomed by nearly all nations in the Asia-Pacific region and sends a signal of American commitment to the region. From a historical standpoint, the post-war American presence in the Asia-Pacific has been one of the key enablers of growth and development in that maritime realm. And today, for all its dynamism, the Asia-Pacific remains peppered with territorial disputes and long-standing grievances, with few effective multilateral mechanisms such as exist in Europe for solving interstate conflicts. Our friends and allies in the area are keenly attuned to our continued forward-based posture, and any indications that the United States was reducing its presence might be interpreted by both friends and competitors as a weakening of our long-standing commitment to maintain stability in the Pacific. The shape of Asian regional politics will continue to evolve, and while I am skeptical of what can realistically be achieved by proposed U.S.-Japan-China trilateral talks, it seems evident that we must approach our alliance with Japan from a more regionally oriented perspective, taking into account how our alliance affects the plans and perceptions of other nations in the region.

#### Withdrawal magnifies threat from North Korean nukes – leads to Asian arms race

Jiji Press Ticker 10 U.S. Commander Stresses Importance of Okinawa Base, Lexis

A U.S. Marines commander on Wednesday emphasized the significance of the Marines staying in Okinawa, the southernmost prefecture in Japan, in terms of quick reactions to contingencies in East Asia. In a speech in Tokyo, Lt. Gen. Keith Stalder, commanding general for U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific, said that the U.S. military "must be based in Okinawa" to maintain security in a region where there are potential threats to Japan, including North Korea's nuclear and missile programs. Regarding the controversial relocation of the Marines' Futenma airfield in Ginowan, Okinawa, he stressed that "it is not just about a local base issue," given the importance of the Japan-U.S. alliance for regional stability and economic prosperity. The Japanese government has been looking into an alternative site, as part of a review to the 2006 bilateral agreement to move the Futenma base to the Marines' Camp Schwab in Nago in the same prefecture. Regarding calls by some members of Japan's ruling coalition for the Futenma military facility to be moved out of the prefecture, or even out of Japan, Stalder warned that if countries in the region begin to see the U.S. military presence in Japan receding, they would "drastically increase their defense budgets...leading to a regional arms race."

#### Nuclear War

Van Jackson, Exec. Ed. Of Asia Chronicle, 5-8-2009, “Can U.S. Nuclear Plan Prevent Asian Arms Race?” YPFP, <http://www.ypfp.org/content/can-us-nuclear-plan-prevent-asian-arms-race>, da 8-31-2012

One of the myriad fears associated with North Korea’s possession of nuclear weapons is the potential for it to spark a nuclear arms race in Asia. The doomsday scenario plays out rather intuitively: 1) North Korea confirms unequivocally that it will be keeping its existing nuclear weapons or possibly adding to its stockpile; 2) Japan, which has repeatedly mentioned its belief that a nuclear North Korea is a threat to Japanese security, dramatically builds up its defensive and offensive military capability, possibly developing its own nuclear program while it pushes for greater involvement in transnational security issues such as terrorism; 3) China, continuing to see Japan as the only near-peer realistically capable of challenging its regional leadership, is threatened by Japan’s remilitarization and responds by increasing its own military spending; 4) Partly in response to China’s increased military expenditures and partly in response to nagging historically based concerns over Japan’s remilitarization, both South Korea and Taiwan build up their own conventional armaments, potentially engaging in secret nuclear programs as well. Under such circumstances, political risk indicators would shoot through the roof and foreign direct investment inflows of capital would quickly dry up as multinational corporations seek a safer, more stable region in which to do business. The region’s resulting economic contraction would place increasing pressure on national governments to pander to xenophobic and nationalistic sentiments, as has been done many times before, thus stoking the fire of conflict. The region, in sum, would become a powder keg. This is not overly pessimistic hyperbole but a realistic scenario according to the classic literature on security dilemmas.[1] Just imagine a world where the most powerful countries in Asia all either possess nuclear weapons or are engaged in covert programs to develop a nuclear weapons capability, each in the name of its own security. Such a dreadful possibility is exactly what the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was designed to prevent.

### Guam Bad – Genocide

#### Guam base shift causes genocide of the indigenous population

Agence France Presse, staff writer, 6-22-2010, "US military build-up on Guam worries islanders," <http://www.asiaone.com/News/AsiaOne+News/World/Story/A1Story20100122-193753.html>, da 8-31-2012

Residents of the US territory of Guam fear the planned influx of thousands of American troops and their families will leave their Pacific island home swamped. Around 19,000 personnel and their families are set to relocate to Guam from southern Japan in a move that will treble the US military presence on the island. But despite proclaimed economic benefits, not all of the 178,000-strong population is looking forward to the troops' arrival. "This proposed military build-up, with our current political status, will result in the cultural and racial genocide of the Chamorro people," said Frank J. Schacher, chairman of the Chamorro Tribe Inc., a group representing the island's indigenous people, who make up a third of the population. "It is our island, our ancestral remains, our sacred artifacts, our waters, our culture, and our right to exist as a race that would be destroyed by these intended actions."

#### Guam basing shift results in the cultural genocide and elimination of the Chamorro people

Greg Schacher, Chamorrow Tribe Vice Chairman, 12-22-2009, "Cultural Genocide and Racism: the American Way," http://chamorrotribe.webs.com/inthenews.htm, da 8-31-2012

We are currently facing a very important event concerning our island and the existence of our culture as well as our race. That is of course the planned military build-up. The relocation of 78,000 non-Chamorro to our island without the institution and enforcement of laws protecting our lands, our water, our culture, and our inherent right to exist, as a race would result in the genocide of our culture and our race. Yet our Territorial Government leaders and the Department of Defense continue to ignore this fact. Although the Chamorro people have been designated as Native Americans, and those Federal Laws already in place, protect the rights of Native Americans, they choose to ignore those laws as well as our inherent rights, while they are busy playing the “who gets what game”. Even more appalling than this situation is the fact that the Department of Interior, who has been assigned Administrative Authority over our island, as well as the responsibility to protect Native Americans, also ignores those laws, our designated status and our inherent aboriginal rights. A classic example of this is the Draft E.I.S., where in all of the listed concerns which directly involves those aboriginal and inherent rights are to be mitigated with the Government of Guam, not the Native Inhabitants or the Tribe, as ruled by the Supreme Court. By continuing to ignore our status as Native Americans and continuing to deny us the same rights, protections, and privileges as all other Native Americans, the Departments of Interior and Defense are racially discriminating against the Chamorro people of Guam and promoting the cultural and racial genocide of our people, all with the full support of the Territorial Government of Guam. It’s time for all Chamorro people to pay attention and stand up for our rights. If we don’t fight now, our children won’t have a future.

#### Guam basing results in cultural genocide

Joseph Gerson, 2007, "Ten Reasons to Withdraw all US Foreign Military Bases," www.ipb.org/i/pdf-files/Gerson-Forum-Military-Bases.pdf, da 8-31-2012

Bases Hurt Democracy and Human Rights

The US has supported or imposed dictators and other repressive governments to gain or preserve access to military bases. For more than a decade, Presidents Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan supported the brutal Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines to preserve the US hold on strategically located air and naval bases. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the US has defended repressive monarchies to secure its military bases as well as privileged access to oil reserves. The presence of US military bases contributes to the cultural genocide of indigenous peoples in Hawai'i and Guam.

### Guam Bad – Coral Reefs

#### Guam shift destroys coral reefs – global effects

Lisa Natividad, Ph. D is an Assistant Professor with the Division of Social Work at the University of Guam, and Gwyn Kirk, is visiting faculty in Women’s and Gender Studies at University of Oregon (2009-10) and a founder member of Women for Genuine Security, 5-8-2010, “Fortress Guam: Resistance to US Military Mega-Buildup,” Asia Pacific Journal, p. np

Another highly controversial proposal is the creation of a berth for a nuclear aircraft carrier, which will involve the detonation and removal of 70 acres of vibrant coral reef in Apra Harbor. Environmentalists and local communities oppose this on the grounds that coral provides habitat for a rich diversity of marine life and is endangered worldwide. Environmentalists also question how the disposal of huge quantities of dredged material would affect ocean life and warn that such invasive dredging may spread contaminants that have been left undisturbed in deep-water areas of the harbor. Opposition to this plan has been expressed by the Guam Fishermen’s Cooperative and the U.S.-based Center for Biological Diversity. On February 24, 2010, Guam Senator Judith Guthertz wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Ray Mabus, reiterating her proposal that the existing fuel pier that has been used by the USS Kitty Hawk be used as the site for the additional berthing to avoid the proposed dredging of Apra Harbor. Such an alternative plan would avoid the destruction of acres of live coral.

#### Extinction

Peter Jacques, is finishing his Ph.D. at Northern Arizona University in global environmental politics, 2002, International Journal of Humanities and Peace, p. np

Coral reefs receive particular attention for several reasons in biodiversity discussions. First, they are among the oldest forms of life on earth going back 2.5 million years in some cases. Second, they entertain more species than any biome on earth, including tropical rain forests. One quarter of all known fish species use coralreefsas habitat, and make up about 9 million metric tons of the world marine wild fish catch (12%). The loss of reefs has been quantified at US$6,075 for the ecological goods and services they provide, and loss of coral reef may be more than US$36.5 billion per year (Costanza 2000). The loss of these reefs, is, then, a matter of biological survival, food security for people depending on fish, and economic dependence.

#### Guam base kills coral and spreads ocean pollutants

Lisa Natividad, Ph.D., Guam University Social Work Assistant Professor, and Kirk, Ph.D., Oregon University Women's and Gender Studies Faculty, 5-14-2010, “Fortress Guam resists US military buildup,” http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/LE14Dh04.html, da 8-31-2012

Another highly controversial proposal is the creation of a berth for a nuclear aircraft carrier, which will involve the detonation and removal of 70 acres of vibrant coral reef in Apra Harbor. Environmentalists and local communities oppose this on the grounds that coral provides habitat for a rich diversity of marine life and is endangered worldwide. Environmentalists also question how the disposal of huge quantities of dredged material would affect ocean life and warn that such invasive dredging may spread contaminants that have been left undisturbed in deep-water areas of the harbor. Opposition to this plan has been expressed by the Guam Fishermen's Cooperative and the US-based Center for Biological Diversity. On February 24, 2010, Guam Senator Judith Guthertz wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Ray Mabus, reiterating her proposal that the existing fuel pier that has been used by the USS Kitty Hawk be used as the site for the additional berthing to avoid the proposed dredging of Apra Harbor. Such an alternative plan would avoid the destruction of acres of live coral.

### Agenda Politics Links

#### Congress hates funding Guam infrastructure

Sydney J. Freedberg Jr., 7-27-2012, "Pentagon, Congress Must Break 'Logjam' Over Japan, Guam Bases: CSIS,” <http://defense.aol.com/2012/07/27/pentagon-congress-must-break-logjam-over-japan-guam-bases-c>, da 8-31-2012

The Senators' statement was silent on another part of the study, however: CSIS also challenges Capitol Hill and the administration to compromise on stalled plans to move Marines from Okinawa to Guam. "These plans are at the center of a logjam between DoD [the Department of Defense], which would like to implement them, and the Congress, which is reluctant to authorize funding absent better details about cost and long-term master plans." The report argues that decades-long commitments to Japan and Korea have resulted in a Pacific posture that puts too many forces in the north of the region and not enough in the south, where China has become increasingly aggressive towards its maritime neighbors in the South China Sea, especially the Philippines. Shifting forces from Okinawa to Guam would help correct that imbalance, and China, our allies, and neutral parties are all watching for signs of US clarity and resolve: "The current impasse between DoD and the Congress is not cost-free in terms of US strategic influence in the region," the report warns.

#### Plan costs capital

Peter Ennis, Pacific Forum CSIS, 5-25-2011, “Pressure Builds for US Shift on Okinawa,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533>, da 8-31-2012

Several factors have converged to give the issue new urgency. **Opposition remains strong on Okinawa to construction of a new facility in the Henoko Bay area**, to replace US Marine Air Station Futenma, which has been slated for closure since 1995. **There is no momentum in Japan to move forward with the project**, a situation made more stark by the Great Eastern Earthquake of March 11. Tokyo is intensely focused on reconstruction efforts; **neither the financial nor political capital is available to push the Henoko project through.** Meanwhile, **construction delays and cost overruns** [**continue**](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533) **to bedevil a critical, related portion of the plan: the relocation of over 8,000 Marines and 9,000 family members from Okinawa to Guam. In Washington, an increasingly debt-weary Congress is asking whether it is worth the cost of building the new Henoko facility and the new Marine housing and related facilities on Guam, when cheaper force configurations more conducive to strategic needs in Asia might be found.** Diplomats are under stress to find some answers because of plans for a “2+2” meeting of defense and foreign ministers from the two countries, to be followed by a summit meeting between President Barack Obama and Prime Minister Kan Naoto. With leaders in Japan tied down with reconstruction efforts, no schedule has yet been set for either meeting, though staging both by the end of June has been discussed.

#### Obama has to push the plan

Peter Ennis, Pacific Forum CSIS, 5-25-2011, “Pressure Builds for US Shift on Okinawa,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533>, da 8-31-2012

The skeptical view Some **sources** very close to the situation **are skeptical that the Obama administration will shift Okinawa policy any time soon**. According to this view, it makes sense that the administration would seek to kick the Futenma-Henoko issue down the road a while longer. Pushing back the 2014 deadline would amount to acknowledging the obvious, and acknowledging the difficulties to proceed so soon after the March 11 natural disasters would also buy more time to find a permanent solution. But Webb is proposing a wholesale rethinking of US strategy and force structure in the Western Pacific, and **only the Secretary of Defense and/or the president himself can make those kinds of decisions. Without that heavy push from the White House, according to this view, it would not be possible to shake the bureaucracy out of its policy rut.** From a strategy standpoint, opponents of a shift in Okinawa policy will argue that it would signal a US retreat from Asia, and reduce the US deterrence of China.

### 1NC EB-5 CP

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase the number of available employment based investor EB-5 visas for the Guam Strategic Development Regional Center.

#### Increased EB-5’s in the Guam Regional Center solves – key to the success of military relocation plans

Guam EB5, 2010, “EB-5,” <http://www.guameb5.com/eb5.asp>, da 8-31-2012

Currently, approximately 40 regional centers exist within various jurisdictions throughout the United States, and in August 2009 the Guam Strategic Development regional center was approved. Commercial business targets for the Guam Regional Center include retail trade, hotels, restaurants, warehousing and distribution, offices, and mixed use development. The initial projects under consideration are bonded warehousing, a commercial complex for professionals in the Island’s capital, luxury shoreline condominiums, multi-use commercial and industrial development, and construction. Properties for these projects are already under the control of Guam Strategic Development. The indirect employment factors for all industries are determined by an economic Input-Output Model that we have created for Guam and approved by USCIS. It was formulated for us by Dr. Michael Evans, a nationally eminent economist. Any investor in a Guam Strategic Development Regional Center project must be able to make the requisite $1,000,000 investment to qualify for EB-5 legal permanent resident status, and must understand that the money will be used in the project only, from which he or she will take a limited partnership interest. The money invested must be considered to be “at risk” and that no guarantees can be made for any future return of the funds invested. In addition, the investor will be required to pay a $30,000 subscription fee to become a limited partner of the project in which he or she invests, for operation of the limited partnership. Overall, the work of the Guam EB- 5 regional center coincides with US government plans for a dramatic build-up of American military forces on Guam, and EB-5 investment projects will be tailored to capture this opportunity. This multi-billion dollar, multi-year US military investment program will offer multiple investment opportunities across the private sector, including residential housing, construction for military installations, infrastructure, and massive road works. The Guam regional center is especially well positioned to fashion its projects in a manner best suited to seize this dramatic, once in a lifetime, economic opportunity.

### Ext – EB-5 CP Solvency

#### Lots of EB-5 investment opportunities in Guam because of the military base

Guam EB5, 2010, “Business Investment Opportunities,” <http://www.guameb5.com/business_investment_opportunities.asp>, da 8-31-2012

Concurrent with the stable growth of Guam’s tourism industry and military installations, other sectors of the island’s economy will expand due to the increase in population and the new dollars circulating in the local economy. The U.S. Census Bureau estimated that Guam’s population would be 180,692 in year 2010, a jump of nearly 17% for the decade. However, that projection did not account for the Islandwide build–up generated by the 17,000 Marines and dependants to be arriving between years 2010 and 2014 as well as other military personnel to be deployed to Guam, nor the complementary workers (and their families) involved with preparing for those relocations. Consequently, recent Government of Guam projections show Guam’s population at 215,000 by year 2013 and at 231,000 by year 2015. The target industries for investment opportunities within the general economy are, therefore, plentiful. They include: Housing construction (single family residences, townhouses, condominiums, apartments); and General community businesses (laundromats, convenience stores, DVD and video rentals, grocery stores, gas stations, pharmacies, toy stores, sporting goods stores, air conditioning sales and repair, used vehicle sales, vehicle repairs and servicing, warehousing, furniture sales, electronics sales, appliances sales, building materials sales, apparel sales, shipping and transportation services, agriculture and aquaculture, insurance, real estate, rental and leasing services, business support services, nursing and residential care services, fast food outlets, and restaurants.

#### Investors would take advantage of EB-5’s to invest in Guam’s infrastructure

Marianas Variety, 12-22-2010, “Fitial: Investors can also apply for EB-5 visa,” <http://www.mvariety.com/2010122132902/local-news/fitial-investors-can-also-apply-for-eb-5-visa.php>, da 8-31-2012

ASIDE from the E-2 CNMI Investor Visa, Gov. Benigno R. Fitial believes potential investors can also apply for the EB-5 immigrant investor visa, which is another visa category in the federal immigration system. Fitial in an interview on Monday said EB-5 is the “biggest thing” that is happening in the federalization of the CNMI immigration system. EB-5, according to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services website, is the fifth employment-based visa preference category available to immigrants seeking to invest in the U.S. The investment must be a new commercial enterprise that will benefit the U.S. economy and create at least 10 full-time jobs. Created by the U.S. Congress in 1990, the EB-5 visa has eligibility criteria which include an investment of at least $1 million. But if the investment will do business in a jurisdiction defined by law as “a rural area or an area that has experienced high unemployment,” the minimum investment requirement will be reduced to $500,000. A resident, who declined to be identified, said: “If a foreign investor has $500,000 or $1 million why would he invest in the CNMI? [t]He[y] would want to invest on Guam or in the states where the economy is much better compared to ours.” Fitial said unlike the E-2 visa, which is only until 2014 and requires a $50,000 investment, the EB-5 visa can result to permanent residency and eventual U.S. citizenship. “They can be in all kinds of businesses — real estate, gaming, even movie production,” he said.

#### EB-5 investment is usually in things like construction, not hi-tech – job requirements

Gwen Moran, 10-31-2010, “The Startup Visa,” MSNBC Entrepreneur, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/39676983/ns/business-small_business/>, da 8-31-2012

It could be next year by the time the bill sees any sort of real action in Congress, but it's already spurring plenty of discussion both on and off Capitol Hill. Attorney Angelo Paparelli, a partner in the immigration practice of law firm Seyfarth Shaw LLP's Los Angeles office, says the proposed changes would make it possible for entrepreneurs in a wider range of fields to start business under this provision and qualify for citizenship Traditionally, he says, the EB-5 has benefitted entrepreneurs starting retail, hospitality, and commercial construction enterprises. Sectors like technology typically run lean and "don't employ 10 or more employees in the start-up phase," he says. Paparelli also likes that the Startup Visa Act requires investors who have a track record and licensure with the SEC. This may encourage immigration officials, who may not be fully versed in business theory and may reject business proposals they don't understand, to be more lenient in their approvals.

## De-Development DA

### 1NC De-Dev DA 1/2

#### Growth is unsustainable – resource depletion, environment, and finances

Richard Heinberg, Senior Fellow @ Post Carbon INst., 11-12-10, “The End of Growth: Adapting to Our New Economic Reality,” New Society Publishers, <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/178709-the-end-of-growth>, accessed 8-30-12

Many financial pundits point to profound problems internal to the economy—including overwhelming, un-repayable levels of public and private debt, and the bursting of the real estate bubble—as immediate threats to the resumption of economic growth. The assumption generally is that eventually, once these problems are dealt with, growth can and will pick up again. But the pundits generally miss factors external to the financial economy that make a resumption of conventional economic growth a near-impossibility. This is not a temporary condition; it is essentially permanent. Altogether, as we will see in the following chapters, there are three primary factors that stand firmly in the way of further economic growth: The depletion of important resources including fossil fuels and minerals; The proliferation of environmental impacts arising from both the extraction and use of resources (including the burning of fossil fuels)—leading to snowballing costs from both these impacts themselves and from efforts to avert them and clean them up; and Financial disruptions due to the inability of our existing monetary, banking, and investment systems to adjust to both resource scarcity and soaring environmental costs—and their inability (in the context of a shrinking economy) to service the enormous piles of government and private debt that have been generated over the past couple of decades. Despite the tendency of financial commentators to focus only on the last of these factors, it is possible to point to literally thousands of events in recent years that illustrate how all three are interacting, and are hitting home with ever more force.

#### Unchecked growth will cause extinction – economic collapse now is better than collapse later

Glen Barry, PhD in Land Resources and MA Biology from U Wisc., January 2008, “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology,” <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html>, accessed 8-30-12

Given widespread failure to pursue policies sufficient to reverse deterioration of the biosphere and avoid ecological collapse, the best we can hope for may be that the growth-based economic system crashes sooner rather than later. Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition.

### 1NC De-Dev DA 2/2

#### Collapse now solves – ensures survival

Glen Barry, PhD in Land Resources and MA Biology from U Wisc., January 2008, “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology,” <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html>, accessed 8-30-12

Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

#### Economic crisis can spark transition – movements exist now

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 83

The seriousness of looming environmental threats is slowly sinking in, driven largely by the climate issue but also informed by the outpouring of serious books and articles pointing out that various breakdowns and collapses are actually possible. In the right hands, crises and calamities related to environment can generate positive change, as Hurricane Katrina could have. We can also see the beginnings of social change in the eff orts of some consumers to downshift and go green, in the anti-corporate-abuse stirrings of some communities, and in the proliferation of initiatives involving new forms of business ownership and management. Polls suggest that the public is distressed by runaway materialism, and there are signs that student activism is reawakening and that faith communities are taking up environmental causes. Religion can help us see that the challenges we face are moral and spiritual and that sin is not strictly individual but is also social and institutional, and it can call us to refl ection, repentance, and resistance. And there is growing strength in the worldwide social movement 235 described by Paul Hawken in Blessed Unrest. From huge nonprofi ts to home-based causes, the groups in this movement are emerging as a creative and infl uential global force. And, of course, there is the hope that springs from today’s young people. We see their commitment in the demand for the greening of our colleges and universities and in the growing student activism and political mobilization. Concerns have been expressed that they are the “quiet generation,” too on-line, but climate threats and social justice issues are now spurring a new, activist youth-led movement for change.

### Growth Unsustainable – Resources Finite

#### Collapse is inevitable – host of pressures

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. np

That is but a sample of the “collapse” books now on the market. Each of these authors sees the world on a path to some type of collapse, catastrophe, or breakdown, and they each see climate change and other environmental crises as leading ingredients of a devil’s brew that also includes such stresses as population pressures. peak oil and other energy supply problems, economic and political instabilities. terrorism, nuclear proliferation, the risks of various twenty-first-century technologies, and similar threats. Some think a bright future is still possible if we change our ways in time; others see a new dark ages as tile likely outcome. For Sir Martin Rees, “the odds are no better than fifty—fifty that our present civilization on earth will survive to the end of the present century “ Personally, I cannot imagine that the risks are so great, but Rees is a thoughtful individual. In any case, it would be foolish to dismiss these authors. They provide a stark warning of what could happen.

#### Growth unsustainable – resource depletion

Tom Murphy, PhD Physics, 3-29-2012, “Resource Depletion Is A Bigger Threat Than Climate Change,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/james-burgess/resource-depletion-is-a-b_b_1385397.html>, accessed 8-31-2012

I see climate change as a serious threat to natural services and species survival, perhaps ultimately having a very negative impact on humanity. But resource depletion trumps climate change for me, because I think this has the potential to effect far more people on a far shorter timescale with far greater certainty. Our economic model is based on growth, setting us on a collision course with nature. When it becomes clear that growth cannot continue, the ramifications can be sudden and severe. So my focus is more on averting the chaos of economic/resource/agriculture/distribution collapse, which stands to wipe out much of what we have accomplished in the fossil fuel age. To the extent that climate change and resource limits are both served by a deliberate and aggressive transition away from fossil fuels, I see a natural alliance. Will it be enough to avert disaster (in climate or human welfare)? Who can know -- but I vote that we try real hard.

#### Can’t keep growing – economic growth models are off

Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability, 12-09-2005, “Eliminating the Need for Economic Growth,” <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/climatechange_feasta.pdf>, accessed 8-31-2012

Whichever is the case, economic growth should be halted now because the changes that the OECD countries are making to achieve it make them less able to adapt to a low-fossil-fuel-use world. This is because, at present, they are generating their growth primarily by technologies that substitute fossil energy for that from the sun and human and animal sources. This confers a massive competitive advantage upon them and other industrialised countries since one litre of petrol can do as much work (in the sense of lifting a load a certain distance) as a man can do in a hundred hours. They are applying fossil energy in two ways to achieve this growth. One is as capital, the energy embodied in buildings, infrastructure and equipment. The other is as income, the amount of energy needed to operate and maintain the capital stock. Consequently, as they grow economically, they become increasingly dependent on energy use. Even if they can avoid collapse if no growth happens, they need a lot of energy to maintain their current methods of production and distribution and hence their income levels. This will be an enormous burden in future since all types of energy are likely to become considerably more expensive in relation to labour whether or not an effective climate treaty comes into force because of the rapid depletion of supplies of oil and gas.

### Growth Unsustainable – General

#### Complexity ensures growth collapse

Debora MacKenzie, Science journalist, 4-5-2008, “Are we doomed?” New Scientist, p. 1

Others think our problems run deeper. From the moment our ancestors started to settle down and build cities, we have had to find solutions to the problems that success brings. "For the past 10,000 years, problem solving has produced increasing complexity in human societies," says Joseph Tainter, an archaeologist at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies. If crops fail because rain is patchy, build irrigation canals. When they silt up, organise dredging crews. When the bigger crop yields lead to a bigger population, build more canals. When there are too many for ad hoc repairs, install a management bureaucracy, and tax people to pay for it. When they complain, invent tax inspectors and a system to record the sums paid. That much the Sumerians knew. There is, however, a price to be paid. Every extra layer of organisation imposes a cost in terms of energy, the common currency of all human efforts, from building canals to educating scribes. And increasing complexity, Tainter realised, produces diminishing returns. The extra food produced by each extra hour of labour - or joule of energy invested per farmed hectare - diminishes as that investment mounts. We see the same thing today in a declining number of patents per dollar invested in research as that research investment mounts. This law of diminishing returns appears everywhere, Tainter says. To keep growing, societies must keep solving problems as they arise. Yet each problem solved means more complexity. Success generates a larger population, more kinds of specialists, more resources to manage, more information to juggle - and, ultimately, less bang for your buck. Eventually, says Tainter, the point is reached when all the energy and resources available to a society are required just to maintain its existing level of complexity. Then when the climate changes or barbarians invade, overstretched institutions break down and civil order collapses. What emerges is a less complex society, which is organised on a smaller scale or has been taken over by another group.

#### Complexity makes growth unsustainable

Debora MacKenzie, Science journalist, 4-5-2008, “Are we doomed?” New Scientist, p. 1

In imposing new complex solutions we will run into the problem of diminishing returns - just as we are running out of cheap and plentiful energy. "This is the fundamental challenge humankind faces. We need to allow for the healthy breakdown in natural function in our societies in a way that doesn't produce catastrophic collapse, but instead leads to healthy renewal," Homer-Dixon says. This is what happens in forests, which are a patchy mix of old growth and newer areas created by disease or fire. If the ecosystem in one patch collapses, it is recolonised and renewed by younger forest elsewhere. We must allow partial breakdown here and there, followed by renewal, he says, rather than trying so hard to avert breakdown by increasing complexity that any resulting crisis is actually worse. Lester Brown thinks we are fast running out of time. "The world can no longer afford to waste a day. We need a Great Mobilisation, as we had in wartime," he says. "There has been tremendous progress in just the past few years. For the first time, I am starting to see how an alternative economy might emerge. But it's now a race between tipping points - which will come first, a switch to sustainable technology, or collapse?

#### Economic collapse is inevitable

John Cobb, Prof @ Claremont, 2006, “Democratizing the Economic Order,” The American Empire and the Commonwealth of God, p. 95-6

Financial capitalism may be even more dependent on growth, and if expansion ceases, it may be seriously upset. Problems internal to financial capitalism may combine with problems generated by increasing national debt to make it impossible for the United States to continue to fund its imperial expansion. This is especially true because of the dependence of the United States on other countries and their citizens to fund the debt. The falling value of the dollar may make investments in U.S. securities less attractive to outsiders. The economic future of the United States is precarious. How should we evaluate the prospect of such a collapse? From the point of view of the long-term prospects of the earth as a whole, it is one of the more hopeful scenarios. It is a way to end American imperial expansion. But that, too, needs to be set in a still wider context. It will slow down the suicidal human degradation of the natural environment. One reason for opposing imperial policy is that it runs counter to the global adjustments so clearly required to avoid ecological catastrophe. The collapse of the present order is inevitable. The global economy, especially with the added burden of enormous use of resources for military purposes, is radically unsustainable. It is rapidly exhausting the earth’s resources and polluting the environment. Its effects on the climate and weather patterns are still unpredictable in detail, but all the likely scenarios are frightening. Humanity does not have a century to reorder its affairs. Unless the present course of development is derailed fairly soon, the resulting ecological collapse will be far more terrible than a financial collapse..

### Growth Unsustainable – AT: Tech Solves

#### New tech doesn’t solve – growth collapse inevitable

Debora MacKenzie, Science journalist, 4-5-2008, “Are we doomed?” New Scientist, p. 1

Tainter is not convinced that even new technology will save civilisation in the long run. "I sometimes think of this as a 'faith-based' approach to the future," he says. Even a society reinvigorated by cheap new energy sources will eventually face the problem of diminishing returns once more. Innovation itself might be subject to diminishing returns, or perhaps absolute limits. Studies of the way by Luis Bettencourt of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, support this idea. His team's work suggests that an ever-faster rate of innovation is required to keep cities growing and prevent stagnation or collapse, and in the long run this cannot be sustainable.

#### Tech doesn’t solve resource use

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 55-56

Another reason for concern about the growth coming our way is the absence of adequate natural self-correcting forces within the economy. One area of hope in this regard has been the natural evolution of technology. The economy of the future will not be identical to that of the past because technology is changing. It is creating opportunities to reduce materials consumed and wastes produced per unit of output; it is opening up new areas and new products that are lighter, smaller, more efficient. Clearly these things are happening. Resource productivity is increasing. There is a large literature on these trends. The principal finding is reflected in the conclusion of a 2000 report of five major European and U.S. research centers: “Industrial economies are becoming more efficient in their use of materials, but waste generation continues to in- crease. . . . Even as decoupling between economic growth and resource throughput occurred on a per capita and per unit GDP basis, overall resource use and waste flows into the environment continued to grow. We found no evidence of an absolute reduction in resource throughput. One half to three quarters of annual resource inputs to industrial economies are returned to the environment as wastes within a year.”19

#### Tech doesn’t solve – only levels off high consumption rates

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 55-56

Tellingly, one review of a large number of countries found that “with the exception of one specific case, no absolute decline of direct material input of industrial economics took place as those economies grew…[T]he trend of material use in industrial countries is relatively steady.” It also found that, as economies grow, pressures on domestic resources are reduced by shifting the burden abroad to developing economies.2° More resource-intensive goods are imported. Another major review of studies of “dematerialization” found that “there is no compelling macroeconomic evidence that the U.S. economy is ‘decoupled ‘ from material inputs, and we know even less about the net environmental effects of many changes in materials use. We caution against gross generalizations about materials use, particularly the ‘gut’ feeling that technical change, substitution, and a shift to the information age inexorably lead to decreased materials intensity and reduced environmental impact.”21 Technology expert Arnulf Grubler has noted, “At best, dematerialization has led to a stabilization of absolute material use at high levels. Improved materials and increased environmental productivity have substantially lessened the environmental impacts of output growth, even if, to date, output growth has generally outstripped improvements.”22

### Growth Unsustainable – Yes Peak Oil

#### Peak oil ensures economic collapse

George Monbiot, climate and peak oil enthusiast, writer, syndicated journalist published in the Guardian UK, 18 December, 2008, “Peak Oil: At Last, A Date” <http://www.countercurrents.org/monbiot181208.htm>, date accessed 8-31-2012

So the IEA had better bloody well be right. In the report on peak oil commissioned by the US Department of Energy, the oil analyst Robert L.Hirsch concluded that “without timely mitigation, the economic, social and political costs” of world oil supplies peaking “will be unprecedented.”(4) He went on to explain what “timely mitigation” meant. Even a worldwide emergency response “10 years before world oil peaking”, he wrote, would leave “a liquid fuels shortfall roughly a decade after the time that oil would have peaked.”(5) To avoid global economic collapse, we need to begin “a mitigation crash program 20 years before peaking.”(6) If Hirsch is right and if oil supplies peak before 2028, we’re in deep doodah.

#### Peak Oil is coming – ensures collapse of growth

George Monbiot, climate and peak oil enthusiast, writer, syndicated journalist published in the Guardian UK, 18 December, 2008, “Peak Oil: At Last, A Date” <http://www.countercurrents.org/monbiot181208.htm>, date accessed 8-31-2012

So burn this into your mind: between 2007 and 2008 the IEA radically changed its assessment. Until this year’s report, the agency mocked people who said that oil supplies might peak. In the foreword to a book it published in 2005, its executive director, Claude Mandil, dismissed those who warned of this event as “doomsayers”. “The IEA has long maintained that none of this is a cause for concern,” he wrote. “Hydrocarbon resources around the world are abundant and will easily fuel the world through its transition to a sustainable energy future.”(7) In its 2007 World Energy Outlook, the IEA predicted a rate of decline in output from the world’s existing oilfields of 3.7% a year(8). This, it said, presented a short-term challenge, with the possibility of a temporary supply crunch in 2015, but with sufficient investment any shortfall could be covered. But the new report, published last month, carried a very different message: a projected rate of decline of 6.7%, which means a much greater gap to fill(9). More importantly, in the 2008 report the IEA suggests for the first time that world petroleum supplies might hit the buffers. “Although global oil production in total is not expected to peak before 2030, production of conventional oil … is projected to level off towards the end of the projection period.”(10) These bland words reveal a major shift. Never before has one of the IEA’s energy outlooks forecast the peaking or plateauing of the world’s conventional oil production (which is what we mean when we talk about peak oil).

#### Peak Oil dieoff is coming

Peter Goodchild, oil journalist, 1-5-2009, “Peak Oil And The Century Of Famine” <http://www.countercurrents.org/goodchild050109.htm>, accessed 8-31-2012

Around the beginning of the twenty-first century, there began a clash of two gigantic forces: overpopulation and oil depletion. The event went unnoticed by all but a few people, but it was quite real. As a result of that clash, the number of human beings on Earth must one day decline in order to match the decline in oil production. Unfortunately, there seems to be no way to get those two giant forces into equilibrium in any gentle fashion, because in every year that has gone by for the last few thousand years — and every year that will arrive — the human population of Earth is automatically adjusted so that it is roughly equal to the planet’s carrying capacity. Like so many other animals, human beings always push themselves to the limits of that carrying capacity. The Age of Petroleum made us no wiser in that respect, and in fact dependence on fossil fuels has led us to a crisis far greater than any in the past. For the average human being, life has always been a matter of bare survival, and the same is true now. Population growth is soaring, whereas oil production is declining. If, at the start of any year, the world’s population is greater than its carrying capacity, only basic arithmetic is needed to see that the difference between the two numbers means that mortality will be above the normal by the end of that year. In fact, a simple calculation shows that before the year 2050 there will be about 3 billion deaths above normal, with a grand total of about 4 billion by the end of the century. Whether there are any partial solutions to that crisis is something to be considered at the end of this argument.

### Collapse Now Better Than Later

#### Collapse now is key to maintain resources

Glen Barry, PhD in Land Resources and MA Biology from U Wisc., January 2008, “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology,” <http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html>, accessed 8-30-12

Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist.

#### Sooner is better than later – collapsing the whole system is the only way

Dmitry Orlov, writer for Energy Bulletin and speaker for the Community Solutions Conference in Michigan, 13 November, 2008, “The Five Stages Of Collapse” <http://www.countercurrents.org/orlov131108.htm>, da 8-31-2012

I don't mean to imply that every part of the country will suddenly undergo a spontaneous existence failure, reverting to an uninhabited wilderness. I agree with John-Michael Greer that the myth of the Apocalypse is not the least bit helpful in coming to terms with the situation. The Soviet experience is very helpful here, because it shows us not only that life goes on, but exactly how it goes on. But I am quite certain that no amount of cultural transformation will help us save various key aspects of this culture: car society, suburban living, big box stores, corporate-run government, global empire, or runaway finance. On the other hand, I am quite convinced that nothing short of a profound cultural transformation will allow any significant number of us to keep roofs over our heads, and food on our tables. I also believe that the sooner we start letting go of our maladaptive cultural baggage, the more of a chance we will stand. A few years ago, my attitude was to just keep watching events unfold, and keep this collapse thing as some sort of macabre hobby. But the course of events is certainly speeding up, and now my feeling is that the worst we can do is pretend that everything will be fine and simply run out the clock on our current living arrangement, with nothing to replace it once it all starts shutting down.

#### Collapse is the only hope – status quo anti-warming movements can’t solve fast enough

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 55-56

But it is easy to be caught up in the moment. It is critical to remember how far the United States still has to go to forge both an effective national climate program and a framework for a sustainable energy future, and bow far the international community has to go to agree internationally on an effective post-Kyoto climate regime. The practical effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions has hardly begun. It is also worth remembering what it has taken to build the current momentum: after a quarter century of neglect, societies now risk ruining the planet. And although the threat of disastrous climate disruption does seem to be motivational at last, many other environmental risks continue to be largely ignored.

### De-Dev Good – Environment

#### Growth kills the environment

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 55-56

The relation between economic gains and environmental losses is close, as McNeill notes. The economy consumes natural resources (both renewable and nonrenewable resources), occupies the land, and releases pollutants. As the economy has grown, so have resource use and pollutants of great variety. As Paul Ekins says in Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability, “the sacrifice of the environment to economic growth . . . has unquestionably been a feature of economic development at least since the birth of industrialism.” 1 We saw in detail in Chapter 1 that this sacrifice has been and remains enormous.

#### Economic growth kills biodiversity

Shahid Saleem**,** Pakistan Engineering Congress, June 2010, “BIODIVERSITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH”, <http://pecongress.org.pk/images/upload/books/Biodiversity%20and%20Economic%20Growth.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Economic growth is a process whereby an economy’s real national income increases over a long period of time and if its rate of growth of national income is higher than its rate of growth of population, its per capita income also increases. In order to increase the national income the resources of the economy, that is the natural, human and the financial resources must be utilized in the best possible way. However, during the process of production depletion of resources does take place. There is sufficient historical evidence to prove that economic growth results in greater levels of biodiversity loss and environmental degradation.

#### Laundry list of environmental consequences.

Geoff Riley, Economics prof @ Eton, September 2006, “Disadvantages of Economic Growth,” Tutor2U, <http://tutor2u.net/economics/revision-notes/as-macro-economic-growth.html>, accessed 8-31-2012

Environmental concerns: Growth cannot be separated from its environmental impact. Fast growth of production and consumption can create negative externalities (for example, increased noise and lower air quality arising from air pollution and road congestion, increased consumption of de-merit goods, the rapid growth of household and industrial waste and the pollution that comes from increased output in the energy sector) These externalities reduce social welfare and can lead to market failure. Growth that leads to environmental damage can have a negative effect on people’s quality of life and may also impede a country’s sustainable rate of growth. Examples include the destruction of rain forests, the over-exploitation of fish stocks and loss of natural habitat created through the construction of new roads, hotels, retail malls and industrial estates.

### De-Dev Good – AT: Growth Key Environment

#### Growth isn’t good for the environment – their inverted U models are wrong

Marco Bagliani, et. al. Inst. On Sustainability @ U. Torino, 4-15-2008, “A consumption-based approach to environmental Kuznets curves using the ecological footprint indicator,” Ecological Economics 65.3, p. 1

The analysis proposed in this paper leads to conclude that, when using the ecological footprint as dependent variable to investigate the relationship between economic growth and the environment, one does not find evidence in favour of an inverted-U behaviour. As a whole, rather than the decoupling of impact from GDP per capita, the scenario supported by our statistical evidence is one of an unbounded growth of environmental pressure as GDP per capita rises. In the OLS and WLS regressions on the non-logarithmic models, a cubic functional form is always the one with the best fit. The only exception is in the OLS analysis of the single EF components, where one case (energy EF) shows evidence of an inverted U-shape. The analysis on the logarithmic specification, where the prevailing model is always linear, reinforces these results. The nonparametric regression as well shows a monotonically increasing behaviour of environmental degradation vs. GDP per capita. Ours adds to the large number of recent studies that do not find support for the EKC hypothesis (e.g. [Azomahou et al., 2006], [Deacon and Norman, 2006] and Richmond and Kaufmann, 2006 A.K. Richmond and R.K. Kaufmann, Energy prices and turning points: the relationship between income and energy use/carbon emissions, Energy Journal 27 (4) (2006), pp. 157–180. View Record in Scopus | Cited By in Scopus (2)[Richmond and Kaufmann, 2006]) in contrast with, among many, Panayotou (1993), Grossman and Krueger (1995), Paudel et al. (2005), Mazzanti et al. (2006).

#### Their models don’t assume pollution pushed out on the third world

Marco Bagliani, et. al. Inst. On Sustainability @ U. Torino, 4-15-2008, “A consumption-based approach to environmental Kuznets curves using the ecological footprint indicator,” Ecological Economics 65.3, p. 1

National environmental policies may result in a simple export of environmental pressures with no net gain in the overall conservation of nature. Our concern is not arguing the superiority of one or the other between consumption and production-based approaches. Production-based and consumption-based indicators, both useful depending on the aim of the analysis, simply imply a different choice on where to ascribe the responsibility for the generation of environmental impact. Rather, we aim at drawing the attention to the different conclusions stemming from the two approaches when applied to testing an EKC hypothesis. The crucial difference between them is the fact that a consumption-based approach captures the potential delocalisation effects that remain hidden in production-based analyses. In order to claim that economic growth is the road to a clean environment one would need empirical evidence on the existence of an inverted U-shaped relationship between per capita income and consumption-based environmental indicators, condition that would guarantee an actual reduction in environmental impact. In our study, the absence of an inversion in trend in ecological footprint when GDP per capita rises appears to indicate that indefinite economic growth within a clean environment cannot be achieved simultaneously by the whole planet, since it can only work locally until there are countries whose environment is allowed to deteriorate.

#### Growth destroys the environment

Tim Everett, et al, March 2010, Defra Evidence and Analysis Series Paper 2, <http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13390-economic-growth-100305.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

While economic growth has produced many benefits – raising standards of living and improving quality of life across the world – it has also resulted in the depletion of natural resources and the degradation of ecosystems. There has been much debate over whether or not it is possible to achieve economic growth without unsustainably degrading the environment, and a growing realisation that economic growth at the current rate of depletion and degradation of environmental assets cannot continue indefinitely. For example, the increase in CO2 levels in the atmosphere as a result of human activity means that the world is already locked into some climate change, and faces a major challenge to keep global temperature rises to below two degrees. In the context of environmental resources more generally, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2003) found that 15 out of the 24 ecosystems services it examined were being degraded or used unsustainably, and the use and consumption of natural resources such as minerals and metals continues at an increasing pace. Some take the view that the finite resources of the Earth place limits on the extent to which economies can keep expanding in the long-term10 . Others believe that using environmental resources sustainably is consistent with continued economic growth, with the costs of inaction likely to be far greater than the cost of acting now.

### Environment Impacts

#### Environment collapse causes extinction

Robert Wolff, prof @ Amherst, 8-18-2010, “Is there an Alternative to Constant Economic Growth?” <http://www.opednews.com/articles/1/Is-there-an-alternative-to-by-robert-wolff-100818-489.html>, da 8-31-2012

And, of course, our economy is not the only aspect of our lives that is threatening our survival. More important perhaps is our continuing fouling of the air and water of the planet, and the plunder of our and other people's resources. In the last sixty years we have made more changes to the planet than were changed in the previous 200,000 years. Our western so-called civilization has so changed the planet that the climate is changing, and changing much more rapidly than we thought twenty years ago, more even than what scientists thought last year. A warmer world, a warmer, more acid ocean are dangers that effect all Life. Perhaps what is most dangerous is the increasing reduction of biodiversity, caused by our thoughtless destruction of rain forests, fouling rivers and the ocean, all of which threatens the planetary ecology. America now is perhaps the only country in the world where more than half of the people do not believe in global warming, climate change.

#### Biodiversity key to check extinction

Bruce E. Tonn, Urban Planning Prof @ Tennessee, November 2007, Futures v. 39, no. 9, “Futures Sustainability”, p. np

The first principle is the most important because earth-life is needed to support earth-life. Ecosystems are composed of countless species that are mutually dependent upon each other for nutrients directly as food or as by-products of earth-life (e.g., as carbon dioxide and oxygen). If the biodiversity of an ecosystem is substantially compromised, then the entire system could collapse due to destructive negative nutrient cycle feedback effects. If enough ecosystems collapse worldwide, then the cascading impact on global nutrient cycles could lead to catastrophic species extinction. Thus, to ensure the survival of earth-life into the distant future the earth's biodiversity must be protected.

#### Bio-D key to extinction

Richard **Margoluis**, Biodiversity Support Program, 1996, <http://www.bsponline.org/publications/showhtml.php3?10>, da 8-31-2012

Biodiversity not only provides direct benefits like food, medicine, and energy; it also affords us a "life support system." Biodiversity is required for the recycling of essential elements, such as carbon, oxygen, and nitrogen. It is also responsible for mitigating pollution, protecting watersheds, and combating soil erosion. Because biodiversity acts as a buffer against excessive variations in weather and climate, it protects us from catastrophic events beyond human control. The importance of biodiversity to a healthy environment has become increasingly clear. We have learned that the future well-being of all humanity depends on our stewardship of the Earth. When we overexploit living resources, we threaten our own survival.

### De-Dev Good – Warming

#### Dedev solves warming

Science Daily, 5-1-2012 – “Global Warming: New Research Blames Economic Growth”, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/05/120501134327.htm>, da 8-12-2012

It's a message no one wants to hear: To slow down global warming, we'll either have to put the brakes on economic growth or transform the way the world's economies work. That's the implication of an innovative University of Michigan study examining the most likely causes of global warming. The study, conducted by José Tapia Granados and Edward Ionides of U-M and Óscar Carpintero of the University of Valladolid in Spain, was published online in the peer-reviewed journal Environmental Science and Policy. It is the first analysis to use measurable levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide to assess fluctuations in the gas, rather than estimates of CO2 emissions, which are less accurate. "If 'business as usual' conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2," said Tapia Granados, who is a researcher at the U-M Institute for Social Research. For the study, the researchers assessed the impact of four factors on short-run, year-to-year changes in atmospheric concentrations of CO2, widely considered the most important greenhouse gas. Those factors included two natural phenomena believed to affect CO2 levels -- volcanic eruptions and the El Niño Southern oscillation -- and also world population and the world economy, as measured by worldwide gross domestic product. Tapia Granados and colleagues found no observable relation between short-term growth of world population and CO2 concentrations, and they show that incidents of volcanic activity coincide with global recessions, which may confound any slight volcanic effects on CO2. With El Niño outside of human control, economic activity is the sole modifiable factor. In years of above-trend world GDP, from 1958 to 2010, the researchers found greater increases in CO2 concentrations. For every $10 trillion in U.S. dollars that the world GDP deviates from trend, CO2 levels deviate from trend about half a part per million, they found. Preindustrial concentrations are estimated to be 200-300 parts per million. To break the economic habits contributing to a rise in atmospheric CO2 levels and global warming, Tapia Granados says that societies around the world would need to make enormous changes. "Since the mid 1970s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth," Tapia Granados said.

#### Dedev key to solve warming

Lee Siegel, 11-22-2009, “Is Global Warming Unstoppable? Theory Also Says Energy Conservation Doesn't Help,” <http://www.unews.utah.edu/p/?r=112009-1>, da 8-31-2012

In a provocative new study, a University of Utah scientist argues that rising carbon dioxide emissions - the major cause of global warming - cannot be stabilized unless the world's economy collapses or society builds the equivalent of one new nuclear power plant each day. "It looks unlikely that there will be any substantial near-term departure from recently observed acceleration in carbon dioxide emission rates," says the new paper by Tim Garrett, an associate professor of atmospheric sciences. Garrett's study was panned by some economists and rejected by several journals before acceptance by Climatic Change, a journal edited by renowned Stanford University climate scientist Stephen Schneider. The study will be published online this week. The study - which is based on the concept that physics can be used to characterize the evolution of civilization - indicates: •Energy conservation or efficiency doesn't really save energy, but instead spurs economic growth and accelerated energy consumption. •Throughout history, a simple physical "constant" - an unchanging mathematical value - links global energy use to the world's accumulated economic productivity, adjusted for inflation. So it isn't necessary to consider population growth and standard of living in predicting society's future energy consumption and resulting carbon dioxide emissions. •"Stabilization of carbon dioxide emissions at current rates will require approximately 300 gigawatts of new non-carbon-dioxide-emitting power production capacity annually - approximately one new nuclear power plant (or equivalent) per day," Garrett says. "Physically, there are no other options without killing the economy."

#### Dedev is the only way to stop warming

Lee Siegel, 11-22-2009, “Is Global Warming Unstoppable? Theory Also Says Energy Conservation Doesn't Help,” <http://www.unews.utah.edu/p/?r=112009-1>, da 8-31-2012

Garrett says often-discussed strategies for slowing carbon dioxide emissions and global warming include mention increased energy efficiency, reduced population growth and a switch to power sources that don't emit carbon dioxide, including nuclear, wind and solar energy and underground storage of carbon dioxide from fossil fuel burning. Another strategy is rarely mentioned: a decreased standard of living, which would occur if energy supplies ran short and the economy collapsed, he adds. "Fundamentally, I believe the system is deterministic," says Garrett. "Changes in population and standard of living are only a function of the current energy efficiency. That leaves only switching to a non-carbon-dioxide-emitting power source as an available option." "The problem is that, in order to stabilize emissions, not even reduce them, we have to switch to non-carbonized energy sources at a rate about 2.1 percent per year. That comes out to almost one new nuclear power plant per day." "If society invests sufficient resources into alternative and new, non-carbon energy supplies, then perhaps it can continue growing without increasing global warming," Garrett says. Does Garrett fear global warming deniers will use his work to justify inaction? "No," he says. "Ultimately, it's not clear that policy decisions have the capacity to change the future course of civilization."

### De-Dev Good – Solves Extinction From Warming

#### Economic collapse solves climate change and extinction

Guy McPherson, natural resources prof @ Arizona, 12-1-2010, “The road to nowhere,” <http://transitionvoice.com/2010/12/the-road-to-nowhere/>, da 8-31-2012

When I wrote about the topic of global climate change in this space a mere two months ago, the situation was dire. Each of a series of assessments indicated an increasingly disturbing outcome for global average temperature. The latest of those assessments, based on more data and more sophisticated models than prior efforts, suggest we have passed tipping points that may lead to the extinction of our own species, along with many others. A global average increase of two degrees Celsius likely leads to runaway greenhouse. This means destruction of most human habitat on Earth. About six weeks after my brief review graced Transition Voice, the situation took a turn for the worse. The International Energy Agency’s World Energy Outlook was released in early November. It contains a shocking assessment: We’re headed for a global average temperature increase of 3.5 C by 2035. If an increase of two degrees spells runaway greenhouse, you can bet the consequences of a 3.5 degree increase within 25 years is catastrophic. The upside On the other hand, I also pointed out unexpectedly good news in my previous essay. Completion of the ongoing collapse of the world’s industrial economy might prove sufficient to save the planet and us. Although climate-change assessments fail to incorporate positive geo-physical feedbacks such as the release of methane hydrates and decreased albedo, they also leave out the negative feedback of world economic collapse. Yet it appears a single path — collapse of the world’s industrial economy — allows us to avoid runaway greenhouse and the associated extinction of Homo Sapiens. Fortunately for us, we’re inadvertently following that path. Assuming we transition from economic collapse to economic growth or to a steady-state economy, what are the likely outcomes? If we could wrest control of policy from the corporations who currently run the government, what choices would be wisest? What are the costs and consequences of choosing to pursue action on the climate-change front?

#### Dedev is key to solve extinction from warming and species loss

Guy McPherson, natural resources prof @ Arizona, 12-1-2010, “The road to nowhere,” <http://transitionvoice.com/2010/12/the-road-to-nowhere/>, da 8-31-2012

Pull the plug, save the patient Only by terminating the world’s industrial economy is there any hope for the thousands of species we drive to extinction every year. Only by terminating the world’s industrial economy is there any hope for the people in non-industrialized countries we oppress to prop up economic growth in the “developed” world. As a consequence, only by terminating the world’s industrial economy is there any hope for the future of our own species to squeeze through the Sixth Great Extinction. The second outcome, if we take action, is the potential for averting runaway greenhouse. Please read the prior paragraph again. All the benefits listed there are realized anew in light of the ongoing and accelerating climate-change apocalypse. Further, averting climate chaos, if it’s possible at this late date, spares us environmental catastrophe in the near term. Averting climate chaos, if it’s possible at this late date, spares us catastrophic hurricanes, wildfires, floods, dust bowls, famines, epidemics, and climate refugees. Averting climate chaos, if it’s possible at this late date, spares us miserable lives and untimely deaths for the 205,000 new people we add each day to an overshot planet. Resistance against the imperialism of never-ending economic growth is imperative, and not merely for our privileges. Our very survival as a species hangs in the balance. For those of us young enough to anticipate being alive in 2035, our survival as individuals is at stake.

#### Warming causes extinction

Oliver Tickell, Climate Researcher and Author, 2008, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare For is Extinction”, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>, da 8-31-2012

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a [4C rise](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/07/carbonemissions.climatechange) is absurd and dangerous. [Global warming](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/climatechange) on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term [sea level rises](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/gallery/2007/dec/05/climatechange.flooding?picture=331454811) of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, [floods](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/08/climatechange.flooding) and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die.

### Warming Impacts

#### Warming causes extinction. [Gender Paraphrased]

Bill Henderson, Environmental Scientist, 8-16-2006, Counter Currents, “Runaway Global Warming Denial,” <http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm>, da 8-31-2012

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of [hu]man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

#### Global warming leads to extinction

David Stein, Science editor for The Guardian, 7-14-2008, “Global Warming Xtra: Scientists warn about Antarctic melting,” <http://www.agoracosmopolitan.com/home/Frontpage/2008/07/14/02463.html>, da 8-31-2012

Global Warming continues to be approaches by governments as a "luxury" item, rather than a matter of basic human survival. Humanity is being taken to its destruction by a greed-driven elite. These elites, which include 'Big Oil' and other related interests, are intoxicated by "the high" of pursuing ego-driven power, in a comparable manner to drug addicts who pursue an elusive "high", irrespective of the threat of pursuing that "high" poses to their own basic survival, and the security of others. Global Warming and the pre-emptive war against Iraq are part of the same self-destructive prism of a political-military-industrial complex, which is on a path of mass planetary destruction, backed by techniques of mass-deception."The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction", reported Bill Henderson in *CrossCurrents.* If strict global environmental security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of humankind's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

### De-Dev Good – Overpop

#### Growth will put us over the carrying capacity now

Paul B. Farrel, PhD, 8-23-2011, “A ‘no-growth’ boom will follow 2012 global crash”, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-08-23/commentary/30755764_1_catastrophe-global-economy-global-population>, da 8-31-2012

Massive denial of global catastrophe dead ahead And yet, the facts about the coming catastrophe are so obvious. Just apply a little grade-school math and economic common sense: Our planet’s natural resources can reasonably support about 5 billion people. That’s a fact. Another: Today we have 7 billion. That’s a problem, 2 billion too many. We’re consuming commodities and natural resources at a rate of 1.5 Earths, according to estimates by the Global Footprint Network of scientists and economists. Flash forward: This scenario gets scarier than a horror film, very fast. United Nations demographers warn the Earth’s population will reach 10 billion in just one generation, around 2050. That’s two times the 5 billion the Earth can reasonably support. But the equation gets even scarier: Those 10 billion people will demand lifestyle improvements. That increases their consumption of scarce resources by 300% per person. Bottom line: 10 billion people will be consuming the equivalent of six Earths. Very bad news.

#### Growth will put us over carrying capacity

Ted Trainer, Lecturer @ NSW, 10-22-2009 “The simpler way: an outline of the global situation, the sustainable alternative society, and the transition to it,” <http://socialsciences.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TSWmain.html>, da 8-31-2012

The foregoing argument has been that the way of life we have in rich countries is grossly unsustainable and unjust and inevitably damage the quality of life. Some of the core lines or argument indicate that we should be trying to reduce per capita resource consumption by 90% or more. Nothing like this can be done without huge and radical change to new systems. The crucial point here is that the problems cannot be fixed in a consumer-capitalist society. That kind of society creates the problems. If for example you have a growth economy that will inevitably generate a problem of resource depletion and environmental destruction. A sustainable society must have a zero-growth economy. If you let market forces determine production, distribution and exchange and development you will inevitably deprive most people of a fair share. A just society must allow need not profit or, market forces to determine distribution and development. Easily overlooked is the fact that there is no possibility of a peaceful world if all strive for greater affluence and increased GDP and therefore compete more and more fiercely for resources. “If you want affluence then arm heavily.” You can only solve these problems if you change to a very different kind of society

#### Growth kills the environment

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. 57

To sum up, we live in a world where economic growth is generally seen as both beneficent and necessary—the more, the better; where past growth has brought us to a perilous state environmentally; where we are poised for unprecedented increments in growth; where this growth is proceeding with wildly wrong market signals, including prices that do not incorporate environmental costs or reflect the needs of future generations; where a failed politics has not meaningfully corrected the market’s obliviousness to environmental needs; where economies are routinely deploying technology that was created in an environmentally unaware era; where there is no hidden hand or inherent mechanism adequate to correct the destructive tendencies. So, right now, one can only conclude that growth is the enemy of environment. Economy and environment remain in collision.

### Overpop Impacts

#### Overpopulation causes biodiversity loss and human extinction

Edward Otten, Professor of Emergency Medicine and Pediatrics at the University of Cincinnati, 2000-2001, <http://www.ecology.org/biod/population/human_pop1.html>, da 8-31-2012

The exponential growth of the human population, making humans the dominant species on the planet, is having a grave impact on biodiversity. This destruction of species by humans will eventually lead to a destruction of the human species through natural selection. While human beings have had an effect for the last 50,000 years, it has only been since the industrial revolution that the impact has been global rather than regional. This global impact is taking place through five primary processes: over harvesting, alien species introduction, pollution, habitat fragmentation, and outright habit destruction.

#### Overpopulation causes nuclear war – text modified

Paul Ehrlich & Anne Ehrlich, Stanford Biologists, The Population Explosion, 1990p 174-5

The population explosion contributes to international tensions and therefore makes a nuclear [war] holocaust more likely. Most people in our society can visualize the horrors of a large‑scale nuclear war followed by a nuclear winter.' We call that possible end to our civilization "the Bang." Hundreds of millions of people would be killed outright, and billions more would follow from the disruption of agricultural systems and other indirect effects largely caused by the disruption of ecosystem services. it would be the ultimate "death‑rate solution" to the population problem‑a stunning contrast to the humane solution of lowering the global birthrate to slightly below the death rate for a few centuries. As this is written (mid‑1989), it fortunately seems that the chances of the Bang have lessened. New‑minded leadership in the Soviet Union is for the moment in the ascendancy. President Mikhail Gorbachev, along with a few other world leaders, seems to be aware that environmental security is at least as important as military strength in providing security to nations, and appears to be doing everything possible to damp down the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. An apparently more pragmatic government also is in place in the United States, although it is still too soon to tell whether the superpowers are on the road toward massive nuclear‑arms reduction and true reconciliation. What is certain is that the structure of military forces around the world still provides plenty of chances for local conflicts to escalate into Armageddon even in the face of growing East‑West rapprochement. There remains the problem that, as the world gets further and further out of control, crazies on both the left and the right may exert increasingly xenophobic pressures on national governments. The rise of fundamentalism in both East and West is a completely understandable but not at all encouraging sample of what the future may hold in terms of conflict. Those struggling to achieve a permanently peaceful world still have much work to do, especially as growing and already overpopulated nations struggle to divide up dwindling resources in a deteriorating global environment.

#### Overpopulation threatens agricultural collapse and humanity’s extinction

Mona L. Hymel, Associate Professor of Law, University of Arizona College of Law, November 1998, North Carolina Law Review, p. np

As the twentieth century draws to a close, humanity faces the daunting prospect of supporting its population without inducing catastrophic and irreversible destruction on Earth's life-support systems. Human and agricultural fertility are on a collision course: the stork is threatening to overtake the plow. [1](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=53f8e2735043eb254e522ad1cedefcee&docnum=63&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAB&_md5=0c09a1dc3eac686a39f569e47dffa1dc#n1) More than 600 of the world's most distinguished scientists, including a majority of the living Nobel laureates in the sciences, issued a warning to humanity in 1992. [2](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=53f8e2735043eb254e522ad1cedefcee&docnum=63&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAB&_md5=0c09a1dc3eac686a39f569e47dffa1dc#n2) They warned that only a few decades remained to stop unrestrained population growth and environmentally devastating economic practices before efforts to achieve a sustainable future "will be lost and prospects for humanity immeasurably diminished." [3](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=53f8e2735043eb254e522ad1cedefcee&docnum=63&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAB&_md5=0c09a1dc3eac686a39f569e47dffa1dc#n3) In 1994, the world's scientific academies echoed this warning. [4](https://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=53f8e2735043eb254e522ad1cedefcee&docnum=63&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLbVlb-zSkAB&_md5=0c09a1dc3eac686a39f569e47dffa1dc#n4) The very rapid rates of human-induced climate change, combined with fragmentation of natural habitats for agriculture and development activities, are unprecedented.

### De-Dev Good – Democracy

#### Growth hurts democracy

Gang Guo, Poly Sci Prof @ Rochester, 2005, “Democracy or Non-Democracy- From the Perspective of Economic Development”, <http://home.olemiss.edu/~gg/paperhtm/dmcrecnm.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Some authors hold that democracy and economic development have a reciprocal effect on each other. A classical example is Friedman, Justin's favorite. Friedman believes that more democratic political rights will reinforce economic rights and therefore will be beneficial to economic development; on the other hand, the assurance of the individual's economic freedom results in, and is predicted upon, the maintenance of a free-enterprise exchange economy that constitutes an ideal economic arrangement for a free society (Friedman 1962). Although he also stressed that some activities of the democratic government, such as income redistribution, would tend to retard economic development, these activities are not peculiar to democracies. In Friedman's opinion, what retards economic development is not democracy, but governmental interference. (I owe this point to Justin Fox). Some scholars view the favorable effects between democracy and economic development as single-directional; that is, economic development leads to democracy, but democracy retards economic development. Therefore democracy would be directly related with economic level, but inversely related with economic growth, since wealthy countries might have reached high economic level for other reasons, but would slow down after democracy is established, while for poor countries economic development has not create a favorable environment for democracy but thus they would also enjoy economic growth not retarded by democracy. Almost all the advanced economies of the world, including the United States, Japan, Germany, Great Britain, Russia, etc., and also almost all the emerging economies in contemporary world, made their initial take-off and fastest growth under non-democracy, or at least not under the kind of democracy we have in mind today. This view can be stretched as far as stating that "dictatorships are needed to generate development" (Przeworski and Limongi 1997:177). The third hypothesis is quite close to the second one, but in this hypothesis economic level is controlled for and the relationship between democracy and economic growth is non-linear, or curvilinear. That is, at lower stages of economic level, democracy would be unfavorable to economic development, while at the higher level, democracy would do a better job than non-democracy in encouraging economic development. Another way to put this curvilinear relationship is to control for level of democracy. As Barro concluded, "the middle level of democracy is most favorable to growth, the lowest level comes second, and the highest level comes third"(Barro 1996:14).

#### US is key

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. np

Indeed, this book focuses heavily on the very rich United States. America is large and influential. The U.S. government and U.S. corporations are leading forces in international trade and the globalization of the world economy. The United States and other developed countries are setting the terms for much of the world, spreading cultural and other norms, and driving much of the economic growth occurring abroad as well as-at home. The world needs America to be a leading part of the answer, but we Americans have a long way to go to claim that role. Moreover, for many of the topics reviewed here, the United States is an extreme case among the developed countries. In America’s individualism, consumerism, acceptance of market forces, commitment to capitalism and globalization, lack of social and public services, and in many other ways, the country tends consistently toward one end of the spectrum of the well-to-do. If answers can be found here, perhaps they can be found anywhere.

#### Extinction

Larry Diamond, Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, October 1995, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s,” http://www.carnegie.org//sub/pubs/deadly/dia95\_01.html, accessed on 8-31-2012

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

### AT: Econ Collapse 🡪 War – Statistics

#### Historical data proves the Depression didn’t spark WWII

Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University, September/October 2006. “The Next War of the World.” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 85, Iss. 5; pg. 61

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Decline empirically doesn’t cause war

Fareed Zakaria, ed. Newsweek, 12-12-2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>, da 8-31-2012

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Morris Miller, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” V. 25, Iss. 4, p 1

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

### AT: Econ Collapse 🡪 War – AT: Diversionary Theory

#### Diversionary theory is wrong – empirics prove

William D. Baker, Politics Prof @ Arkansas, May 2004, “The Dog That Won't Wag: Presidential Uses of Force and the Diversionary Theory of War,” Strategic Insights, 3.5, <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/2004/may/bakerMay04.asp>, da 8-31-2012

The diversionary theory of war, the widely held belief that presidents will be predisposed toward uses of force in militarized interstate disputes as a means of boosting their own public approval ratings, diverting public attention from domestic political or economic troubles, or to influence impending elections, assumes, of course, that the rally effect is in fact real, or at least that presidents believe that it is. However, key elements of the diversionary theory of war have been brought into question as a result of this research. Despite popular presumptions to the contrary, presidents are in fact not more likely to become involved in crises when their popularity is low, and actually are more likely to enjoy higher than average public approval levels prior to becoming involved in militarized disputes. The economic data presented also suggest that presidents are not more inclined to seek out foreign military diversions when the consumer confidence in the health of the economy is low, but that in fact consumer confidence and expectations tend to be higher than average prior to a dispute. Similarly, the proximity of elections does not appear to be a factor in the onset of militarized interstate disputes either.

#### Diversionary theory is untrue – cooperation is more likely

M. Taylor Fravel, Poly Sci Prof @ MIT, 2010, “The Limits of Diversion: Rethinking Internal and External Conflict”, Security Studies. Volume 19, Issue 2, . 307

However, a historical model cannot simply be applied to contemporary problems of sustainability without adjustment for cumulative information and increasing possibilities for popular participation. Between the 14th and 18th centuries, Western Europe responded to environmental crises by innovation and intensification; such modernization was decentralized, protracted, flexible, and broadly based. Much of the current alarmist literature that claims to draw from historical experience is poorly focused, simplistic, and unhelpful. It fails to appreciate that resilience and readaptation depend on identified options, improved understanding, cultural solidarity, enlightened leadership, and opportunities for participation and fresh ideas. Duration of the processes favoring decline or recovery helps to identify the processes of devolution as well as the elasticity of resilience. Drawing from the experience of the historical case studies, Fig. 1 suggests that a preconditioning economic decline typically spans decades or centuries. Contrary to frequent claims of “abrupt” collapse, the triggers that bring economic crisis are more likely to operate at a multidecadal scale. The first stage of stabilization or instability may also be fairly rapid, whereas a more complex reconstitution or complete breakdown is likely to span a century or more. Time frames would also be affected by the absence of rapid or sustained means of communication in earlier historical eras.

#### Diversionary theory wrong – growth causes more war

John R. O’Neal, IR Prof @ Alabama, and Jaroslav Tir, Poly Sci Prof @ UGA, 2006, “Does the Diversionary Use of Force Threaten the Democratic Peace? Assessing the Effect of Economic Growth on Interstate Conflict”, International Studies Quarterly Volume 50, Issue 4, p. 755

Our analyses of five prominent, powerful democracies raise further doubts about the substantive importance of diversionary uses of force. Military action for political reasons is most feasible for the leaders of powerful democracies. Most previous research has focused on the United States, at least in part, for this reason, but the United States has been significantly more likely to initiate conflict when its economy was strong, not weak. The evidence regarding Britain is inconclusive, while India and France have also exhibited behavior inconsistent with theoretical expectations. Only Israeli leaders seem to have been susceptible to diversionary pressures (Barzilai and Russett 1990; Spracher and DeRouen 2002). Thus, there is little evidence in this important subset of cases that military force is used to divert attention away from a poor economy.

### Growth Bad – War

#### Growth causes war

Charles R. Boehmer, Poly Sci Prof @ UT, 2007, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict", Politics and Policy 35.4, p. 774

All leaders depend on a constituency of some sort (Bueno de Mesquita et al. 1999) and always face potential opposition to their policies (Hagan 1994; Heldt 1999; Miller 1995, 1999; Richards et al. 1993). In democratic systems, opposition parties may seek to exploit foreign policies that they will argue are not in the best interest of the nation, resulting in higher constraints on such executives relative to their authoritarian counterparts. However, during times of economic prosperity, society is less likely to be influenced by the rhetoric of parties and factions that stand in opposition to the leader. Assuming that popularity ratings are higher than would be the case during economic recession or depression, leaders should be more apt to initiate or join foreign military actions. Economic growth should reduce societal resistance to conflict. This may seem like a counterintuitive proposition that people who are relatively better off and happy during periods of prosperity would allow leaders to opt for foreign conflicts. However, people may become more nationalistic during times of prosperity and more optimistic that success could be achieved in foreign conflicts. Accordingly, Blainey (1988) claims that anything that increases optimism and state strength should be thought of as causes of war. It is plausible that this effect heightens the risk of interstate conflict by reducing constraints placed on executives. For example, would the Clinton Administration have been able to commit U.S. troops to conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo—areas where U.S. interests were debatable—without stauncher Republican resistance in Congress, if the economy had not experienced prolonged prosperity and economic growth?

#### Econ collapse causes focus inwards – stops wars

Daniel Deudney, Fellow @ Princeton, April 1991, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 47.3, p. np

In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil. then war. If groups at all levels of affluence protect their standard of living by pushing deprivation on other groups class war and revolutionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market systems could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.9 If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are warprone because of their ideological fervor and isolation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modein era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930 increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem.

#### Growth takes resources – decline doesn’t cause conflict

Daniel Deudney, Fellow @ Princeton, April 1991, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 47.3, p. np

Power Wars. A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs firther. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War 11, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products and surplus wealth.

### Collapse 🡪 Transition

#### Collapse is key – their authors are just in denial

Paul B. Farrel, PhD, 8-23-2011, “A ‘no-growth’ boom will follow 2012 global crash”, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-08-23/commentary/30755764_1_catastrophe-global-economy-global-population>, da 8-31-2012

“You really do have to wonder whether a few years from now we’ll look back at the first decade of the 21st century,” writes Thomas Friedman, a New York Times columnist and author of “Hot, Flat, Crowded,” “when food prices spiked, energy prices soared, world population surged, tornados plowed through cities, floods and droughts set records, populations were displaced and governments were threatened by the confluence of it all — and ask ourselves: What were we thinking? How did we not panic when the evidence was so obvious that we’d crossed some growth/climate/natural-resource/population redlines all at once?” Friedman quotes Paul Gilding, the veteran Australian environmentalist-entrepreneur, who described this moment in a new book called “The Great Disruption: Why the Climate Crisis Will Bring On the End of Shopping and the Birth of a New World.” “The only answer can be denial,” says Gilding. “When you are surrounded by something so big that requires you to change everything about the way you think and see the world, then denial is the natural response. But the longer we wait, the bigger the response required.” Forget global warming — it’s too late Gilding’s “Great Disruption” is an eye-opener. But have no illusions that his or any book will be the wake-up call that will force us to plan ahead for a catastrophe. A former chief executive of Greenpeace, he admits screaming for 30 years to get the public’s attention. He now confesses that his efforts had little impact. Why? The world is too deep in denial. So, finally, he gave up. Nothing was working: “We tried. We failed.” Today his message is simple and blunt: “It’s time to stop worrying about climate change. Instead we need to brace for impact.” Yes, an economic asteroid is closing fast. What will trigger “The Crash” he sees coming? “If you grow an economy or any system up against its limits, it then stops growing and either changes form or breaks down … As our system hits its limits, the following pressures will combine, in varied and unpredictable ways, to trigger a system breakdown and a major economic crisis (or series of smaller crises) that will see us slide into a sustained economic downturn and a global emergency lasting decades.”

#### Collapse works – mindset shift would happen

Joel Jay Kassiola, 1990, The Death of Industrial Civilization, p 171-172)

Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that the end or death of industrial civilization will not necessarily bring the apocalyptic termination of life on earth! It will mean the end of the world, but only one world; it could mean merely the end of a particular (and defective) social order! For people who have absorbed its worldview uncritically and completely, and furthermore, who have adjusted successfully to the resulting social structure and values, the impending loss of a civilization does appear to be terrifying. They will experience the death of the only desirable-and for the industrial elite, self-serving-world they know as a totally destructive, and therefore traumatic, phenomenon rather than what it actually is: the passing of a specific, elite-benefitting world that indeed can and should be transformed. When the flaws of a social order are understood, and its fantastic elements and promises (like industrialism's unlimited economic growth) are recognized and appreciated for what they are-impossible dreams preserving the ruling group's control and benefits-they should be cast aside. The loss of social fantasies causes immediate despair but the mourning period, for their death should be temporary and surmountable. As both Slater and Harman emphasize, such despair is both appropriate and necessary to the achievement of social and individual transformation.

#### Collapse would transform society

Johnny Djordjevic, UC Irvine, 1998, “Sustainability” <http://www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html>, da 8-31-2012

Despite all the gloomy facts and sad stories, there is a solution, to create a sustainable society. Rather than being greedy and only thinking about the self, each individual must realize the impacts of his/her selfish tendencies, and disregard their former view of the world. One must come into harmony with what is really needed to survive, and drawn a strict distinction between what is necessity and what is luxury. Not every family needs three cars, or five meals a day or four telephones and two refrigerators. Countries do not need to strive for increasing growth, less materials could be imported/exported and international tension could be greatly reduced. The major problems seem not to step from the determination of what a sustainable society is, but on how to get people to change their values. This task is not an easy one. People must be forced to realize the harmful and catastrophic consequences lie in their meaningless wants and greed. The problem of cognitive dissonance is hard to overcome, but it is not impossible. The solution to this dilemma lies in castastrophe. The only event that changes people's minds is social trauma or harm. The analogy is that a person who refuses to wear a seat belt and one day gets thrown through his/her windshield will remember to wear the seat belt after the accident. The logic behind this argument is both simple and feasible. So the question of dissonance is answered in part, but to change a whole society obviously takes a bigger and more traumatic event to occur. An economic collapse or ice age would trigger a new consciousness leading to a sustainable society. The power of an idea should never be underestimated. Hitler's idea of the Aryan race lead to the Holocaust, Marx's idea of socialism lead to Stalin's reign and the deaths of over 50 million people. But ideas change be changed, disregarded and adopted. As developed countries find themselves engaging in a greedy philosophy, once that realization is made, the first step to a better society is taken. Our current path will lead to massive suffering all across the world, with extinction a distinct possibility. Global sustainability must be adopted by every person on the planet, (starting in the developed world), otherwise the world will cease to support life.

## De-Development DA Answers

### Growth Sustainable – Tech

#### Empirics prove tech outpaces resource use

William J Baumol, professor of economics at NYU, Robert E. Litan, Senior Fellow of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institute, and Carl J. Schramm, President and chief executive officer of the Kauffman Foundation,” 2007, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, p. np

There is good reason to hope that this process can and will continue, though there are some lurking dangers, including foolish actions by governments. But should growth continue? What about the supplies of energy that will be depleted in the process or the pollution that will be generated as ever more things are produced and used? Curiously, economists who tend to be quite rational in their lives urge the worriers to have faith—faith that continued technological progress powered by market incentives will ease these concerns. As it turns out, however, economists’ faith has roots in historical fact. In the early 1800s, Thomas R. Malthus famously predicted that the world’s population would eventually starve or, at the least, live at a minimal level of subsistence because food production could not keep pace with the growth of population. Technological advances since that time have proved him wrong. Through better farming techniques, the invention of new farming equipment, and continuing advances in agricultural science (especially the recent “green revolution” led by genetic engineering), food production has increased much more rapidly than population, so much so that in “real terms” (after adjusting for inflation), the price of food is much lower today than it was two hundred years ago, or for that matter, even fifty years ago. Farmers, who once accounted for more than 0 percent of the population at the dawn of the twentieth century in the United States, now comprise less than a percent of population—and are able to grow far more food at the same time.

#### Growth is sustainable – don’t believe their doomsaying

William J Baumol, professor of economics at NYU, Robert E. Litan, Senior Fellow of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institute, and Carl J. Schramm, President and chief executive officer of the Kauffman Foundation,” 2007, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, p. np

One line of skepticism about growth arises from individuals and groups who worry that as the world’s population increases and economic growth continues, societies will use up scarce resources and, at the same time, degrade the environment. In the early 1970s, a group called the “Club of Rome” expressed such worries, fearing that eventually (and rather soon) the world would run out of energy and some commodities, so that growth couldn’t continue at anything like the existing pace. Today, there are those who believe, for similar reasons, that growth shouldn’t continue. The doomsayers who projected that economic growth would come to a standstill were wrong. Since 1975, total world economic output has increased more than sevenfold.2 On a per capita basis, world output is more than five times higher than it was thirty years ago. Growth in output, and therefore income, per person throughout the world advanced at a far more rapid pace (nearly ninefold) in the twentieth century than in any other century during the previous one thousand years (to the extent these things can be measured).3 Per capita output continues to increase because firms around the world continue to make more use of machines and information technology that enable workers to be more productive and because technology itself continues to advance, making it possible for consumers to use new products and services.

#### It’s possible to dematerialize the economy and keep growth going

James Gustave Speth, Law Prof and former Dean, former chair of Council on Env. Quality to the Prez, 2008, The Bridge at the Edge of the World, p. np

That is why I and many others have called for policies that promote an environmental revolution in technology—an urgent ecological modernization of the economy that would include both the transformation of existing capital stocks and, through innovation and entrepreneurship, the creation of new environmentally friendly industries, products, and services.8 A major way to reduce pollution and consumption of natural resources while experiencing economic growth is to bring about a wholesale transformation in the technologies that today dominate manufacturing, energy, construction, transportation, and agriculture. The twentieth-century technologies that have contributed so abundantly to today’s problems should be phased out and replaced with twenty-first-century technologies designed with environmental sustainability and restoration in mind. The economy should be “dematerialized” to the fullest possible extent through a new generation of technologies that sharply reduces the consumption of natural resources and the generation of residual wastes per unit of economic output.

### Growth Sustainable – Infinite Resources

#### Resources aren’t finite – we constantly improve

Beth Haynes, Econ Prof @ BYU, 8-19-2008, “Finite Resources vs. Infinite Resourcefulness”, <http://wealthisnottheproblem.blogspot.com/2008/08/finite-resources-vs-infinite.html>, da 8-31-2012

It’s common sense. Save today in order to have some available tomorrow. It’s how our bank accounts work, so it seems logical to apply the same reasoning to resource use. But there is a catch. All of economic history, up to and including today, demonstrates that the more we exploit our natural resources, the more available they become. (3-7) How can this possibly be? If we use our “limited, non-renewable resources” we have to end up with less, right? Actually, no. And here is why. We don’t simply “use up” existing resources; we constantly create them. We continually invent new processes, discover new sources, improve the efficiency of both use and extraction, while at the same time we discover cheaper, better alternatives. The fact that a particular physical substance is finite is irrelevant. What is relevant is the process of finding ways to meet human needs and desires. The solutions, and thus what we consider resources, are constantly changing.

#### Innovation ensures infinite resource use

Beth Haynes, Econ Prof @ BYU, 8-19-2008, “Finite Resources vs. Infinite Resourcefulness”, <http://wealthisnottheproblem.blogspot.com/2008/08/finite-resources-vs-infinite.html>, da 8-31-2012

More people, and increased income, cause resources to become more scarce in the short run. Heightened scarcity causes prices to rise. The higher prices present opportunity and prompt inventors and entrepreneurs to search for solutions. Many fail in the search, at cost to themselves. But in a free society, solutions are eventually found. And in the long run, the new developments leave us better off than if the problems had not arisen, that is, prices eventually become lower than before the scarcity occurred. (9) This idea is not just theory. Economists and statisticians have long been analyzing the massive amounts of data collected on resource availability. The conclusion: our ability to solve the problems of human existence is ever-expanding. Resources have become less scarce and the world is a better place to live for more and more people. (3-7) Overall, we create more than we destroy as evidenced by the steady progress in human well being and there is no evidence for concluding that this trend can't and won't continue. Doomsday predictions have been with us since ancient times and they have consistently been proven wrong.

#### Resources aren’t finite

Jerry Taylor, CATO, 8-26-2002, “Sustainable Development: A Dubious Solution in Search of a Problem”, [www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa449.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa449.pdf), da 8-31-2012

If resources are growing more abundant while the concentration of pollutants in air sheds and watersheds continues to decline, how can we explain the proliferation of various stylized sustainability indices that point to a deterioration of the planet’s resource base? There are five common weaknesses with such reports. First, they are almost always built upon a selective but fundamentally arbitrary or irrelevant set of indicators. Second, they are often built not upon actual resource data but upon hypotheses or theories about resource health that do not comport with the data or that rest upon highly suspect data fundamentally inconsistent with the larger data sets available to analysts. Third, they ignore the well-documented propensity of capitalist societies to create and invent new resources when old resources become relatively more scarce (that is, they assume that resources are fixed and finite when they are not). Fourth, they are highly aggregated and often subjective calculations of data sets that lack common denominators. Finally, they are frequently heavily biased by ideological assumptions about politics and government action. Accordingly, they provide little help to policy analysts or political leaders.

### Growth Good – Environment

#### Economic growth is the only way to improve environmental quality

George Economides, Assistant Professor of International and European Economic Studies, and Apostolis Philippopoulos, Professor in the Department of Economics, Athens University of Economics and Business, 1-2008, “Growth enhancing policy is the means to sustain the environment,” Review of Economic Dynamics, vol 11 no 1, p. np

By contrast, in a first-best situation, the social planner first hits a relatively high growth rate, and in turn allocates some of the available social resources to the environment, where the degree of allocation increases with how much we value the environment relative to consumption or other goods. Therefore, not only there is no tradeoff between economic growth and environmental quality in the long run, but also only growing economies can afford to improve environmental quality. This is consistent with the general belief that to fund the governments’ policy goals on health, redistribution, the environment and the rest, we need tax receipts and this can be achieved by growth-enhancing policies.2

#### Economic growth is key to improving the environment

Sean Hackbarth, Communications Advisor for the Senate Republican Conference, 4-29-2007, “The Environment’s Best Friend: Economic Growth,” The American Mind, <http://www.theamericanmind.com/2007/04/23/the-environments-best-friend-economic-growth/>, da 8-31-2012

Did you know the air was getting cleaner before the first Earth Day in 1970? Indur Goklany writes, Between 1957 and 1970, particulate matter concentrations in urban areas declined 15 percent, while sulfur dioxide concentrations peaked in 1963, declining 40 percent between 1962 and 1969. Environmental diseases like malaria and typhoid decreased. How could it be that people decided to improve their environment without a call to action from environmental groups or government edict? We got richer. As the U.S. improved economically people no longer had to worry about making enough money to keep from starving and protected from the weather. With those needs satisfied people could move to satisfying desires that used to be luxuries. People got tired of smog-filled air, damaged lakes, and species near extinction. They reached a point where they could afford to protect their environment better. New technologies were employed to continue economic growth while reducing harm to the planet. The battle between the environment vs. the economy doesn’t exist. People need to reach a level of economic prosperity to care about cleaning up the world around them. Economic growth, then, is key to improving the environment. Free trade, well-defined property rights, and the rule of law won’t just make the impoverished better off, more healthy, and longer-living. It will give them the resources and desire to improve the environment.

#### Only growth can solve the environment

Martin Lewis professor in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke University. Green Delusions, 1992 p18-19

Our alternative is to continue to struggle within nature, and in so doing to distort its forms by our inescapably unnatural presence. Finally, where radical greens often emphasize philosophical (or even spiritual) purity this work stresses pragmatic gains. Since the anarchic utopianism that marks the dominant strains of radical environmental­ism stands little chance of gaining public acceptance, much less of creating a feasible alternative economy an emphasis on the purity of ideals can lead only to the frustration of goals. I would suggest that a pragmatic approach stands a much better chance of accomplishing our shared ends. The prospect of humankind someday coexisting easily with the earth’s other inhabitants—a vision entertained by Arcadian and Promethean environmentalists alike—can best be achieved through gradual steps that remain on the track of technological progress. As noted above, I believe that only a capitalist economy can generate the resources necessary for the development of a technologically sophisticated, ecologically sustainable global economy.

### Growth Good – Warming

#### Growth ensures a move away from fossil fuel use

William J Baumol, professor of economics at NYU, Robert E. Litan, Senior Fellow of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institute, and Carl J. Schramm, President and chief executive officer of the Kauffman Foundation,” 2007, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, p. np

The same process of technological advance that undermined Malthus’s dire predictions may be able to quiet the concerns of the modern-day Malthusians who worry about disappearing energy, although more active involvement by governments may be necessary to address concerns about global warming. As some sources of energy are depleted—fossil fuels, in particular—their prices will rise, setting in motion several developments that will keep economies from stagnating. For one thing, consumers will cut back on their demand for fossil fuels directly (taking fewer trips, car- pooling, or even moving closer to work) or indirectly by buying things (cars, houses, and appliances) that are more energy-efficient. This occurred after the first postwar “energy crisis” of 1973. Energy use as a percentage of GDP in the United States has been cut in half largely as a result of higher prices, and it will continue to drop if fossil fuel prices (adjusted for inflation) rise in the future. Equally important, if prices of fossil fuels increase, the backers of substitute forms of energy (nuclear power, fusion, geothermal, biomass, solar, and possibly other sources) will have stronger incentives to perfect their technologies so that they can be readily used instead.4

#### Growth solves warming better – US experience with pollution proves

William J Baumol, professor of economics at NYU, Robert E. Litan, Senior Fellow of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institute, and Carl J. Schramm, President and chief executive officer of the Kauffman Foundation,” 2007, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, p. np

As for global warming, there is a consensus among scientists that the problem is real and growing. Indeed, some scientists attribute the intense hurricane activity that devastated the Gulf states and parts of Florida during the 2005 season to warmer waters due to global warming. At the same time, there is an emerging consensus among economists and policy makers around the world that the best way to curb the carbon emissions that are contributing to global warming is to employ a mixture of rules and market- like incentives, perhaps the most promising being the establishment of ceilings on pollution by allocating suitably restricted limits on unavoidable emissions by producers and allowing these rights to be traded in markets. Thus pollution can be capped and growth can nevertheless continue. The “cap and trade” approach, applied globally, was the linchpin of the Kyoto agreement reached in the late 1990s but not yet implemented (due in large part to opposition by the United States). Although political and practical problems may inhibit the adoption of cap and trade on a global scale, it may be feasible on both grounds to implement the idea on a national basis.5 Those who doubt whether economic growth can continue if resources are devoted to reducing pollution need only look to the U.S. experience— where both the air and water are far cleaner today than thirty years ago, even with a substantially higher production of goods.6 If the same political energy that has so far fueled the “no growth” or “limits to growth” movements were channeled instead to persuading governments around the world to accept less socially damaging approaches, including a tradable emissions permit system, there is good reason to believe global warming concerns would be much attenuated

#### Slow growth is worse for warming

Richard High, independent planning consultant and member of the RTPI regeneration network, June 20, 2008, “Striking the right economic balance on consequences of climate change” SECTION: p. 26

Political commitment to climate change spending is being tested by the global slowdown and economists need to fight back with coherent arguments on why the figures add up in the long term, argues Richard High. After becoming headline news a year or so ago, climate change has all but vanished from the national media. The credit crunch and the threat of economic slowdown have distracted attention from a potentially life-threatening issue.

### Growth Good – Space

#### Growth makes space travel possible

Nader Elhefnawy, taught at the University of Miami, published widely on space and international issues, Monday, September 29, 2008, “Economic growth and space development over the long haul” http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1

Nonetheless, even if one should not get carried away by seemingly staggering numbers, the fact of higher output still means an enlarged range of options. Just as China’s economic growth has made its new ambitions in space more than just a dream (even if many of its plans have yet to prove to be realistic), a space project of any given size would seem far more affordable in a world where global wealth had risen by a factor of two, three, or five.

#### Space is key to preventing extinction

James Oberg, space writer and a former space flight engineer based in Houston, 1999, Space Power Theory, http://www.jamesoberg.com/books/spt/new-CHAPTERSw\_figs.pdf

We have the great gift of yet another period when our nation is not threatened; and our world is free from opposing coalitions with great global capabilities. We can use this period to take our nation and our fellow men into the greatest adventure that our species has ever embarked upon. The United States can lead, protect, and help the rest of [hu]mankind to move into space. It is particularly fitting that a country comprised of people from all over the globe assumes that role. This is a manifest destiny worthy of dreamers and poets, warriors and conquerors. In his last book, Pale Blue Dot, Carl Sagan presents an emotional argument that our species must venture into the vast realm of space to establish a spacefaring civilization. While acknowledging the very high costs that are involved in manned spaceflight, Sagan states that our very survival as a species depends on colonizing outer space. Astronomers have already identified dozens of asteroids that might someday smash into Earth. Undoubtedly, many more remain undetected. In Sagan’s opinion, the only way to avert inevitable catastrophe is for mankind to establish a permanent human presence in space. He compares humans to the planets that roam the night sky, as he says that humans will too wander through space. We will wander space because we possess a compulsion to explore, and space provides a truly infinite prospect of new directions to explore. Sagan’s vision is part science and part emotion. He hoped that the exploration of space would unify humankind. We propose that mankind follow the United States and our allies into this new sea, set with jeweled stars. If we lead, we can be both strong and caring. If we step back, it may be to the detriment of more than our country.

#### Growth gets off the rock

Robin Hason, Professor of economics at George Mason University, Oct. 18, 2001, <http://hanson.gmu.edu/wildideas.html>, da 8-31-2012

If our growth does not stop, it must continue. And it cannot continue this long without enabling and encouraging massive space colonization. Spatial/material growth requires it, technical growth enables it, and economic growth induces technical growth.

### Environment Defense

#### Human and environmental resiliency prevents extinction from loss of bio-d

Holly Doremus, Professor of Law, U. Cal Davis, Winter 2000, 57 Was & Lee L. Rev. 11, “The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse,” p. 11

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. n214 Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people.

#### Evolutionary history remains post mass-extinction.

Buffalo News, 12-14-1997, p 6H

Even though populations are disappearing quickly, Hughes said that the second "Science" paper is "a bright spot in all this," describing how the tree of life could survive serious pruning. Even if 95 percent of all species are lost, 80 percent of the underlying evolutionary history remains intact, write Nee and Sir Robert May, also a biologist at Oxford. The scientists came up with equations to describe how much evolutionary history would remain after some species went extinct. And they found that it didn't really matter whether they killed off species at random or in a particular pattern. Choosing particular species to save didn't preserve much more evolutionary history than saving species at random, the research shows.

#### Collapse is worse for the environment

Rhett Butler, founder of Mongabay, 1-26-2009, “What does slowing economy mean for rainforest conservation?” <http://news.mongabay.com/2009/0127-economy_deforestation.html>, da 8-31-2012

Still the downturn is not entirely good news for environmentalists. New funds for conservation and research are drying up as donations dwindle and endowments swoon with stock market turmoil (the Wildlife Conservation Society for example saw its endowment fall 27% in 2008 and faces the prospect of 100% cut in state funding for its New York facilities in 2010). Law enforcement, including park protection and monitoring, may suffer from lack of funding, while "green" initiatives by governments and private entities that are "nice to have" in times of plenty) become an afterthought as the economy sours. The same goes for premium "green" products like certified timber and fair trade coffee — demand is expected to decline as consumers rein in their spending. In places where work is scarce there may be increased pressure on natural resources for subsistence use including fuelwood harvesting and slash-and-burn cultivation. Low prices in the carbon market don't bode well for nascent "avoided deforestation" projects that would compensate tropical countries for reducing their deforestation rates, nor do low oil prices support development of low-carbon energy technologies. Finally the current economic climate offers opportunities for still-healthy firms to buy up forest land and assets at a discount from distressed companies and cash-strapped communities, enlarging their resource pools to exploit once recovery — no matter how green environmentalists try to make it — is on the horizon.

### Warming Defense

#### Dedev can’t solve – it’s impossible to stop warming

Mayer Hillman, Senior Fellow Emeritus at the Policy Studies Institute and Tina Fawcett, UKERC Researcher, Personal Carbon Trading and Equity, 2007, “The Suicidal Planet: How To Prevent Global Climate Catastrophe,” pg. 25-26

The effects of climate change cannot quickly be reversed by reducing or even eliminating future emissions of greenhouse gases. There are two reasons for this. First, greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere linger for decades (in the case of relatively short-lived gases like methane), or hundreds of years (for carbon dioxide), or even thousands of years (for the long-lived gases like per-fluorocarbons). Carbon dioxide and methane concentrations in the atmosphere are respectively one-third and more than twice as high as those at any time over the last 650,000 years. Even if no additional carbon dioxide were emitted from now on, atmospheric concentrations would take centuries to decline to pre-Industrial Revolution levels. While elevated levels of greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, additional warming will occur.

#### Species can adapt to climate change

S. Fred Singer, Atmospheric Physicist at George Mason University and Founder of the Environmental Policy Project, and Dennis T. Avery, Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University and University of Wisconsin and former agricultural analyst for the US Department of State, 2007 “Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 years,” p. 16

We know that species can adapt to abrupt global warming because the climate shifts in the 1,500-year cycle have often been abrupt. Moreover, the world's species have already survived at least six hundred such warmings and cooling’s in the past million years. The major effect of global warming will be more biodiversity in our forests, as most trees, plants, birds, and animals extend their ranges. This is already happening. Some biologists claim that a further warming of 0.8 degrees Celsius will destroy thousands of species. However, the Earth warmed much more than that during the Holocene Climate Optimum, which occurred 8,000 to 5,000 years ago, and no known species were driven extinct by the temperature increase.

#### Species won’t die off – they’ve adapted before

S. Fred Singer, Atmospheric Physicist at George Mason University and Founder of the Environmental Policy Project, and Dennis T. Avery, Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University and University of Wisconsin and former agricultural analyst for the US Department of State, 2007 “Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 years,” p. 76-77

Most of the world's animal species "body types" were laid down during the Cambrian period, 600 million years ago, according to Jeffrey Levinton, chairman of the Department of Evolution and Ecology at the State University of New York-Stony Brook in a widely noted 1992 article in Scientific American.6 Thus, we know that the major species have dealt successfully through the ages with new pest enemies, new diseases, ice ages, and global warmings higher than today's. Virtually every wild species is at least one million years old, which means that they've all been through at least six hundred of the 1,500-year climate cycles. Not the least of the warmings was the Holocene Climate Optimum, which was warmer than even the predictions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change for 2100.

### Growth Good – War

#### Economic decline causes extinction

Phil Kerpen, National Review Online, October 29, 2008, Don't Turn Panic Into Depression, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/29/opinion/main4555821.shtml>, da 8-31-2012

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors - not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale.

#### Global economic decline causes extinction

Lt. Col, Tom Bearden, PhD Nuclear Engineering, April 25, 2000, <http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/042500%20-%20modified.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Just prior to the terrible collapse of the World economy, with the crumbling well underway and rising, it is inevitable that some of the [wmd] weapons of mass destruction will be used by one or more nations on others. An interesting result then---as all the old strategic studies used to show---is that everyone will fire everything as fast as possible against their perceived enemies. The reason is simple: When the mass destruction weapons are unleashed at all, the only chance a nation has to survive is to desperately try to destroy its perceived enemies before they destroy it. So there will erupt a spasmodic unleashing of the long range missiles, nuclear arsenals, and biological warfare arsenals of the nations as they feel the economic collapse, poverty, death, misery, etc. a bit earlier. The ensuing holocaust is certain to immediately draw in the major nations also, and literally a hell on earth will result. In short, we will get the great Armageddon we have been fearing since the advent of the nuclear genie. Right now, my personal estimate is that we have about a 99% chance of that scenario or some modified version of it, resulting.

Economic collapse would cause famine and wars all over the globe

Bernardo V. Lopez,BusinessWorld, September 10, 1998, p. np

What would it be like if global recession becomes full bloom? The results will be catastrophic. Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Unemployment in the US will be the hardest to cope with since it may have very little capability for subsistence economy and its agrarian base is automated and controlled by a few. The riots and looting of stores in New York City in the late '70s because of a state-wide brownout hint of the type of anarchy in the cities. Such looting in this most affluent nation is not impossible. The weapons industry may also grow rapidly because of the ensuing wars. Arms escalation will have primacy over food production if wars escalate. The US will depend increasingly on weapons exports to nurse its economy back to health. This will further induce wars and conflicts which will aggravate US recession rather than solve it. The US may depend more and more on the use of force and its superiority to get its ways internationally. The public will rebel against local monopolies. Anarchy and boycotts will be their primary weapons against cartels especially on agricultural products such as rice and vegetables, which are presently in the hands of a few in most Third World nations. Global recession will test the limits of human cooperation and sharing in the name of survival. Grants and aids will decrease. Rescues and international funding for advocacy NGOs will disappear rapidly. Coupled with disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, climatic aberrations like the El Nino, global recession will degrade a step further.

### AT: K-Waves Theory

#### The worst crisis will be in a downward wave not a rising wave

Heikki Patomäki, professor of World Politics and Economy at the University of Helsinki, 5-2005, “The Long Downward Wave of the World Economy and the Future of Global Conflict,” Globalizations, Vol. 2 No. 1 p. 61-78

Now, Kondratieff discussed also the occurrence of political violence in the nineteenth and early twentieth century Europe, Russia and North America. Although the most severe crises and depressions take place during a downward trend, ‘as a rule, the periods of the rising waves of long cycles are considerably richer in big social upheavals and radical changes in the life of society (revolutions, wars) than are the periods of downward waves’ (ibid., p. 70). Kondratieff acknowledged, however, that this is a loose empirical association. What is nonetheless noteworthy is that two out of three turning points in the twentieth century coincided with the world wars (also the first cycle turned at the time of the Napoleonic wars). The turning point of 1973–76 was relatively smooth and peaceful, however. Korpinen has pointed out that although this was a turning point in the fourth Kondratieff cycle, it did not resonate with shorter cycles as in the most severe economic crises. In 1981, he argued that the ‘worst crisis is probably ahead of us, occurring at some point in the long downward wave, when the world economy is in recession’ (Korpinen, 1981, p. 96).

#### War is more likely during economy contraction, not growth

Terry Boswell, professor of sociology at Emory University, and Mike Sweat, Professor, of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the Medical University of South Carolina, 6-1991, “Hegemony, Long Waves, and Major Wars: A Time Series Analysis of Systemic Dynamics, 1496-1967,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp 123-149

Of Goldstein’s three arguments, the first seems the weakest. It is derived from the logic of lateral pressure theory (North and Lagerstrom, 1971; see Choucri and North, 1975, for a more developed version, and Ashley’s 1980 revision), which states that intensification of market competition tends to increase pressure on the state to use its military resources to gain privileged access to economic resources. While we agree that market competition increases political pressure, there is no reason to believe that competition is greater when markets are expanding than when they are contracting. On the contrary, a Marxist approach would suggest that states initiate war in attempting a political solution to the crisis of an extended stagnation (Lenin, 1916/1939; Frank, 1982; Lotta, 1984; Bergesen, 1985).

#### K wave conflict theory is wrong – assumes individual psyches translate to state policy

Terry Boswell, professor of sociology at Emory University, and Mike Sweat, Professor, of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the Medical University of South Carolina, 6-1991, “Hegemony, Long Waves, and Major Wars: A Time Series Analysis of Systemic Dynamics, 1496-1967,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp 123-149

While not entirely implausible, the psychological rationale is also problematic. Goldstein (1988:264) refers to Lasswell’s (1935/1965) (neo-) Freudian discussion of prosperity inducing indulgent individual demands, and of depressions causing introversion or the scapegoating of less powerful nations rather than of other core powers. The Klingberg (1952) and Holmes (1985) mood/interest theory of introversion and extroversion cycles makes a similar point, although it does not explicitly link extroversion to prosperity despite the high correlation between periods. Two major problems are apparent. First, the theories assume a connection from individual psyches to public opinion to state policy (even to the particular policy of war-making as opposed to numerous other outcomes). But even in democratic states, not to mention monarchies, the connection between public opinion and state policy is notoriously weak and mercurical. Also, the problems of turning individual attitudes into public behavior are manifest. Second, even if we accept the connection, as with crises or pressure a rational state is likely to indulge itself at the expense of the periphery before engaging in a major war.

### No Mindset Shift

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause de-dev – change is impossible without transforming human nature

James Halteman, economics prof @ Wheaton, 12-16-2008, “A sustainable world,” Christian Century, p. 1

In the final section of the book Speth proposes a new, transformed social order as the only permanent solution to the environmental crisis we face. These chapters read like a religious treatise on the transformed life. "When all is said and done," Speth claims, "the only change that will make a difference is the transformation of the human heart." In these chapters, he contrasts a society that is built on individual self-interest with one that is built on social solidarity and designed to face the environmental crisis. The transformations he recommends include moving from getting to giving, from individualism to community, from economy to ecology, from having to being, from satisfying wants to satisfying needs, and from being richer to being better. These changes will come as a response not to carefully designed incentives but to a changed heart. We are at a fork in the road. The path we are on now leads to an abyss. The alternative route will be a bridge to a sustaining, meaningful life. There is much in this book to commend. However, two omissions are worth noting. Speth says nothing about the way in which animal-based eating habits in the U.S. contribute to global warming, and he presents no plan for resolving the energy dilemma. Furthermore, he only lightly addresses the global and cross-cultural complications of environmental degradation.

#### Growth is part of human nature – can’t solve

James Halteman, economics prof @ Wheaton, 12-16-2008, “A sustainable world,” Christian Century, p. 1

A better treatment of the causes of environmental decay would not just discuss the progrowth culture of the U.S. and the rest of the developed world; it would focus on the self-interested nature of all humans regardless of the sort of regime they live under. This diagnosis would fit better with the solution of a transformed human heart. Many will doubt the feasibility of transforming hearts as Speth recommends. Speth believes that religious, humanitarian and all other socially concerned people can join forces to alter the way people look at their own welfare and the way they treat others. He believes that a spirit of cooperation will arise when people see the potential for devastation similar to what might happen in a neighborhood when a tornado strikes. This is Speth's hope for the human race. But Christians know all too well that even a sincere salvation experience hardly eliminates the temptations of selfishness, so it is hard to imagine how Speth's vision of a sustainable world will come about.

#### We’ll just regrow – can’t solve the mindset

Martin Lewis, professor in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke University, 1992, Green Delusions, p 15

The radical environmentalist view sketched above is unabashedly Arcadian, calling for a return to a simpler, rural mode of life. Although this pastoral archetype has long inspired romantic visions of an alternative society, few today are aware of the fate of the historical Arcadia. While poets praised the region’s rusticity, the unsophisticated Arcadians were easily bullied by Spartan aggressors. Finally, in 370 B.C.E. the Theban general Epaminondas united the southern Arcadian villagers into a new polis in order to form a bulwark against further Spartan expansion. Ironically, it was this Arcadian city that first bore the name of Mega­lopolis. Despite Arcadia’s sorrows, the dream associated with its name has never died. Especially since Rousseau, disaffected intellectuals have looked longingly to Arcadia as a symbol of the countryside left behind. Unfortunately, not only is Arcadia impossible to reclaim, but it never really existed as imagined in the first place. The Arcadian myth is based on a sanitized picture of nature, one from which labor and suffering have been conveniently removed (Pepper 1989:8 5 (. If we are to establish a realistic environmental movement we must begin to think in terms of a different classical archetype.

## Warming Good DA

### Ice Age DA 1NC 1/2

#### Ice Age is coming

Peter Ferrara, 5-31-2012, “Sorry Global Warming Alarmists, The Earth Is Cooling,” Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2012/05/31/sorry-global-warming-alarmists-the-earth-is-cooling/2/>, da 8-31-2012

We are also currently experiencing a surprisingly long period with very low sunspot activity. That is associated in the earth’s history with even lower, colder temperatures. The pattern was seen during a period known as the Dalton Minimum from 1790 to 1830, which saw temperature readings decline by 2 degrees in a 20 year period, and the noted Year Without A Summer in 1816 (which may have had other contributing short term causes). Even worse was the period known as the Maunder Minimum from 1645 to 1715, which saw only about 50 sunspots during one 30 year period within the cycle, compared to a typical 40,000 to 50,000 sunspots during such periods in modern times.  The Maunder Minimum coincided with the coldest part of the Little Ice Age, which the earth suffered from about 1350 to 1850.  The Maunder Minimum saw sharply reduced agricultural output, and widespread human suffering, disease and premature death.

#### CO2 emissions are key to stop the next five ice ages

ScienceDaily, 8-30-2007, “Next Ice Age Delayed By Rising Carbon Dioxide Levels,” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/08/070829193436.htm>, da 8-31-2012

The work, which is part-funded by the Natural Environment Research Council, confirms earlier ideas of David Archer of the University of Chicago, who first estimated the impact rising CO2 levels would have on the timing of the next ice age. Dr Tyrrell said: 'Our research shows why atmospheric CO2 will not return to pre-industrial levels after we stop burning fossil fuels. It shows that it if we use up all known fossil fuels it doesn't matter at what rate we burn them. The result would be the same if we burned them at present rates or at more moderate rates; we would still get the same eventual ice-age-prevention result.' Ice ages occur around every 100,000 years as the pattern of Earth's orbit alters over time. Changes in the way the sun strikes the Earth allows for the growth of ice caps, plunging the Earth into an ice age. But it is not only variations in received sunlight that determine the descent into an ice age; levels of atmospheric CO2 are also important. Humanity has to date burnt about 300 Gt C of fossil fuels. This work suggests that even if only 1000 Gt C (gigatonnes of carbon) are eventually burnt (out of total reserves of about 4000 Gt C) then it is likely that the next ice age will be skipped. Burning all recoverable fossil fuels could lead to avoidance of the next five ice ages.

### Ice Age DA 1NC 2/2

#### Ice age outweighs all other impacts

William H. Calvin, is a theoretical neurophysiologist at the University of Washington in Seattle, the author of such books as How Brains Think and The Cerebral Code. Some background is in the Atlantic Monthly Editor's Column. June 14, 2005. “The Great Climate Flip-Flop” <http://standeyo.com/Reports/Ice_age/050614.ice.age.html>, da 8-31-2012

FUTURISTS have learned to bracket the future with alternative scenarios, each of which captures important features that cluster together, each of which is compact enough to be seen as a narrative on a human scale. Three scenarios for the next climatic phase might be called population crash, cheap fix, and muddling through. The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields will cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands ˜ if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, will go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries will attempt to use their armies, before they fall apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This will be a worldwide problem ˜ and could easily lead to a Third World War ˜ but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic. There is another part of the world with the same good soil, within the same latitudinal band, which we can use for a quick comparison. Canada lacks Europe's winter warmth and rainfall, because it has no equivalent of the North Atlantic Current to preheat its eastbound weather systems. Canada's agriculture supports about 28 million people. If Europe had weather like Canada's, it could feed only one out of twenty-three present-day Europeans. Any abrupt switch in climate would also disrupt food-supply routes. The only reason that two percent of our population can feed the other 98 percent is that we have a well-developed system of transportation and middlemen ˜ but it is not very robust. The system allows for large urban populations in the best of times, but not in the case of widespread disruptions. Natural disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes are less troubling than abrupt coolings for two reasons: they're short (the recovery period starts the next day) and they're local or regional (unaffected citizens can help the overwhelmed). There is, increasingly, international cooperation in response to catastrophe ˜ but no country is going to be able to rely on a stored agricultural surplus for even a year, and any country will be reluctant to give away part of its surplus. In an abrupt cooling the problem would get worse for decades, and much of the earth would be affected. A meteor strike that killed most of the population in a month would not be as serious as an abrupt cooling that eventually killed just as many. With the population crash spread out over a decade, there would be ample opportunity for civilization's institutions to be torn apart and for hatreds to build, as armies tried to grab remaining resources simply to feed the people in their own countries. The effects of an abrupt cold last for centuries. They might not be the end of Homo sapiens ˜ written knowledge and elementary education might well endure ˜ but the world after such a population crash would certainly be full of despotic governments that hated their neighbors because of recent atrocities. Recovery would be very slow.

### Yes Ice Age

#### Ice Age coming now

George Kukla, 6-15-2007, PhD micropalentologist and Special Research Scientist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, “Forget Warming Beware the Next Ice Age,” <http://www.iceagenow.com/Beware_The_Next_Ice_Age.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Although the magazine article indicated that the cooling trend would be continuous, scientists knew otherwise. "None of us expected uninterrupted continuation of the trend," he states. Moreover, thanks to new evidence that Dr. Kukla only recently published, he now knows that global warming always precedes an ice age. That makes the current period of global warming a mere blip that constitutes additional indication of the ice age to come. To Dr. Kukla, the fundamental issue here could not be more clear. For millions of years, the geologic record shows, Earth has experienced an ongoing cycle of ice ages, each typically lasting about 100,000 years, and each punctuated by briefer, warmer periods called interglacials, such as the one we are now in. This ongoing cycle closely matches cyclic variations in Earth's orbit around the sun.

#### Ice age coming – glaciers prove

Laurence Hecht, editor of 21st century Science & Technology, 2005 “Is a new ice age underway?,” 21st century science and technology magazine, [http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/articles/Ice\_Age.html](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/articles/Ice_Age.html%20/), da 8-31-2012

“Watch out, Al Gore. The glaciers will get you!” With that appended note, my friend, retired field geologist Jack Sauers, forwarded to me a report that should have been a lead item in every newspaper in the world. It was the news that the best-measured glacier in North America, the Nisqually on Mount Rainier, has been growing since 1931. The significance of the fact, immediately grasped by any competent climatologist, is that glacial advance is an early warning sign of Northern Hemisphere chilling of the sort that can bring on an Ice Age. The last Little Ice Age continued from about 1400 to 1850. It was followed by a period of slight warming. There are a growing number of signs that we may be descending into another Little Ice Age—all the mountains of “global warming” propaganda aside. Our current understanding of the long-term climate cycles shows that for the past 800,000 years, periods of approximately 100,000 years’ duration, called Ice Ages, have been interrupted by periods of approximately 10,000 years, known as Interglacials. (We are now about 10,500 years into the present Interglacial.)

#### Ice age is coming now – 92% chance

Tailor, 1-30-2012, “Scientists predict coming Ice Age”, WWN, <http://weeklyworldnews.com/headlines/43321/scientists-predict-coming-ice-age/>, da 8-31-2012

According to the world’s top scientists the world hasn’t warmed in 15 years and we are headed for a new ice age! Statistics and data suggest we are headed for a new ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists said that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830. In this period, named after the meteorologist John Dalton, average temperatures in parts of Europe fell by 2C. However, it is also possible that the new solar energy slump could be as deep as the ‘Maunder minimum’ (after astronomer Edward Maunder), between 1645 and 1715 in the coldest part of the ‘Little Ice Age’ when, as well as the Thames frost fairs, the canals of Holland froze solid.

### Yes Ice Age – Consensus

#### Ice Age now – tons of evidence

Gregory F. Fegel, 11-1-2009, “Earth on the Brink of an Ice Age,” Pravda, <http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/11-01-2009/106922-earth_ice_age-1/>, da 8-31-2012

The earth is now on the brink of entering another Ice Age, according to a large and compelling body of evidence from within the field of climate science. Many sources of data which provide our knowledge base of long-term climate change indicate that the warm, twelve thousand year-long Holocene period will rather soon be coming to an end, and then the earth will return to Ice Age conditions for the next 100,000 years. Ice cores, ocean sediment cores, the geologic record, and studies of ancient plant and animal populations all demonstrate a regular cyclic pattern of Ice Age glacial maximums which each last about 100,000 years, separated by intervening warm interglacials, each lasting about 12,000 years.

#### Ice Age coming now – based on better science than global warming

Gregory F. Fegel, 11-1-2009, “Earth on the Brink of an Ice Age,” Pravda, <http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/11-01-2009/106922-earth_ice_age-1/>, da 8-31-2012

Today we are again at the peak, and near to the end, of a warm interglacial, and the earth is now due to enter the next Ice Age. If we are lucky, we may have a few years to prepare for it. The Ice Age will return, as it always has, in its regular and natural cycle, with or without any influence from the effects of AGW. The AGW theory is based on data that is drawn from a ridiculously narrow span of time and it demonstrates a wanton disregard for the ‘big picture’ of long-term climate change. The data from paleoclimatology, including ice cores, sea sediments, geology, paleobotany and zoology, indicate that we are on the verge of entering another Ice Age, and the data also shows that severe and lasting climate change can occur within only a few years. While concern over the dubious threat of Anthropogenic Global Warming continues to distract the attention of people throughout the world, the very real threat of the approaching and inevitable Ice Age, which will render large parts of the Northern Hemisphere uninhabitable, is being foolishly ignored.

#### Top scientists agree Ice Age is coming

Jack Dini, science writer, 10-24-2011, “Is An Ice Age Coming?” Canada Free Press, <http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/41636>, da 8-31-2012

US solar physicists announced in June 2011 that the Sun appears to be headed into a lengthy spell of low activity, which could mean that the Earth—far from facing a global warming problem—is actually headed into a mini Ice Age. The announcement came from scientists at the US National Solar Observatory (NSO) and the US Air Force Research Laboratory. Three different analyses of the Sun’s recent behavior all indicated that a period of unusually low solar activity may be about to begin. (1) “This is highly unusual and unexpected,” said Dr. Frank Hill of the NSO. “But the fact that three completely different views of the Sun point in the same direction is a powerful indicator that the sunspot cycle may be going into hibernation.” (1) Fred Dardick reports, “We are in the midst of the convergence of three major solar, ocean, and atmospheric cycles all heading in the direction of global cooling. Last year the Southern Hemisphere experienced its coldest winter in 50 years and Europe just went through two particularly cold winters in a row, and the cooling trend has just begun. The likelihood of a repeat of the great frost of 1709 is growing every day. (2) This was the time of the Maunder Minimum (1645-1715) and for periods either side of it, many European rivers which are ice-free today—including the Thames—routinely froze over, allowing ice skating and even for armies to march across them in some cases. (1) More recently other papers confirm that solar effects could bring on little ice ages. Sarah Ineson and her colleagues report that changes in the Sun’s emissions of ultraviolet radiation coincided with observed cold winters over southern Europe and Canada between 2008 and this year. (3) And Katja Matthes and colleagues report that simulations with a climate model using new observations of solar variability suggest a substantial influence of the Sun on the winter climate in the Northern Hemisphere. (4) Couple this with scientists saying an anticipated cold blast will be due to the return of a disruptive weather pattern called La Nina. Latest evidence shows La Nina, linked to extreme weather in America and with a knock-on effect on Britain, is in force and will gradually strengthen as the year ends. This climate phenomenon, characterized by unusually cold ocean temperatures in the Pacific, was linked to Britain’s icy winter last year—one of the coldest on record. (5)

### Yes Ice Age – Brink

#### Ice Age is on the brink – weakest sun cycle in 300 years

David Rose, writer for dailymail.co.uk , 1-29-2012, “Forget global warming,” Science <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2093264/Forget-global-warming--Cycle-25-need-worry-NASA-scientists-right-Thames-freezing-again.html>, da 8-31-2012

The supposed ‘consensus’ on man-made global warming is facing an inconvenient challenge after the release of new temperature data showing the planet has not warmed for the past 15 years. The figures suggest that we could even be heading for a mini ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists yesterday told The Mail on Sunday that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830. In this period, named after the meteorologist John Dalton, average temperatures in parts of Europe fell by 2C. However, it is also possible that the new solar energy slump could be as deep as the ‘Maunder minimum’ (after astronomer Edward Maunder), between 1645 and 1715 in the coldest part of the ‘Little Ice Age’ when, as well as the Thames frost fairs, the canals of Holland froze solid.

#### Ice Age is coming – on the brink now

Gregory F. Fegel, 11-1-2009, “Earth on the Brink of an Ice Age,” Pravda, <http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/11-01-2009/106922-earth_ice_age-1/>, da 8-31-2012

Today we are again at the peak, and near to the end, of a warm interglacial, and the earth is now due to enter the next Ice Age. If we are lucky, we may have a few years to prepare for it. The Ice Age will return, as it always has, in its regular and natural cycle, with or without any influence from the effects of AGW. The AGW theory is based on data that is drawn from a ridiculously narrow span of time and it demonstrates a wanton disregard for the ‘big picture’ of long-term climate change. The data from paleoclimatology, including ice cores, sea sediments, geology, paleobotany and zoology, indicate that we are on the verge of entering another Ice Age, and the data also shows that severe and lasting climate change can occur within only a few years. While concern over the dubious threat of Anthropogenic Global Warming continues to distract the attention of people throughout the world, the very real threat of the approaching and inevitable Ice Age, which will render large parts of the Northern Hemisphere uninhabitable, is being foolishly ignored.

#### Ice Age coming – we’re overdue

Gerald Marsh, retired physicist, 2-24-2008, “The coming of the New Ice Age,” Winning Green, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age. What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt. Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization.

### Warming Good – Ice Age

#### GHG emissions key to preventing another Ice Age - replaces natural loss of CO2

Matt Ridley, DPhil Oxford, 1-14-2012, “Are We Holding a New Ice Age at Bay?”, Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204257504577150812451167538.html>, da 8-31-2012

Since then, of course, warmth has returned, probably driven at least partly by man-made carbon-dioxide emissions. A new paper, from universities in Cambridge, London and Florida, drew headlines last week for arguing that these emissions may avert the return of the ice age. Less noticed was the fact that the authors, by analogy with a previous warm spell 780,000 years ago that's a "dead ringer" for our own, expect the next ice age to start "within about 1,500 years." Hardly the day after tomorrow. Still, it's striking that most interglacials begin with an abrupt warming, peak sharply, then begin a gradual descent into cooler conditions before plunging rather more rapidly toward the freezer. The last interglacial—which occurred 135,000 to 115,000 years ago (named the Eemian period after a Dutch river near which the fossils of warmth-loving shell creatures of that age were found)—saw temperatures slide erratically downward by about two degrees Celsius between 127,000 and 120,000 years ago, before a sharper fall began.

#### Warming holds off Ice Age

Mason Inman, 11-12 2008, “New ice Age Predicted – But Averted By Global Warming?” National Geographic News, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/pf/29078080.html>, da 8-31-2012

Deep ice sheets would cover much of the Northern Hemisphere thousands of years from now—if it weren't for us pesky humans, a new study says. Emissions of greenhouse gases—such as the carbon dioxide, or CO2, that comes from power plants and cars—are heating the atmosphere to such an extent that the next ice age, predicted to be the deepest in millions of years, may be postponed indefinitely (quick guide to the greenhouse effect). "Climate skeptics could look at this and say, CO2 is good for us," said study leader Thomas Crowley of the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. But the idea that global warming may be staving off an ice age is "not cause for relaxing, because we're actually moving into a highly unusual climate state," Crowley added. In about 10,000 to 100,000 years, the study suggests, Antarctic-like "permanent" ice sheets would shroud much of Canada, Europe, and Asia. "I think the present [carbon dioxide] levels are probably sufficient to prevent that from ever happening," said Crowley, whose study will appear tomorrow in the journal Nature.

#### Warming stops the next ice age

Curt Stager, Biology PhD from Duke, 2012, “What Happens AFTER Global Warming?” Nature Education Knowledge 3(3):7 <http://www.nature.com/scitable/knowledge/library/what-happens-after-global-warming-25887608>, da 8-31-2012

Another potentially confusing situation arises when we consider that atmospheric CO2 concentrations will still be high enough in 50,000 AD to prevent the next ice age, which natural cyclic processes would normally be expected to trigger then (Figure 5; Berger & Loutre 2002, Archer & Ganopolski 2005). The next major cyclic cool period is due in 130,000 AD, by which time a moderate carbon emission will have dissipated. This suggests that preventing an extreme 5000 Gton hothouse scenario now could leave Canada and northern Europe vulnerable to being bulldozed by gigantic ice sheets in the deep future. How do we weigh the winners and losers in such a far-sighted view?

Fortunately, long-term perspectives may also suggest possible win-win situations, as well. For instance, leaving most remaining coal untouched rather than using it all up now would reduce the severity of climate change in the near-term, and would also leave large stores of burnable carbon in the ground that later generations could use as a source of greenhouse gases for the prevention of future ice ages, should they so desire.Whichever emissions scenario we choose-be it moderate or extreme-one thing is now clear. Our influence on the climatic future of the world is geological in scope. Little wonder, then, that many scientists are now referring to our chapter of Earth history with a term coined by ecologist Eugene Stoermer-the "Anthropocene Epoch" or the "Age of Humans" (Crutzen & Stoermer 2000, Stager 2011).

### Warming Good – Ice Age

#### CO2 staves off an ice age

Andrea Thompson, writer for Livescience, 8-7-2007, “Global Warming Good News: No more Ice Ages,” <http://www.livescience.com/environment/070907_co2_iceage.html>, da 8-31-2012

Ice ages naturally occur about every 100,000 years or so as the pattern of Earth's orbit changes with time and alters the way the sun strikes the planet's surface. When less solar energy hits a given area of the surface, temperatures become cooler (this is what causes the difference in temperatures between summer and winter). Long-term changes in Earth's orbit that cause less solar energy to hit the surface can cool down summer temperatures so that less ice melts at the poles. If ice sheets and glaciers don't melt a bit in the summer, the ice accumulates and starts to advance—in [past ice ages](http://www.livescience.com/environment/050330_earth_tilt.html), sheets of ice covered all of Canada and most of the Northern United States. The level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is also an important factor in triggering an ice age. In the past, lower carbon dioxide levels (caused by natural processes) helped cool the Earth and again allowed ice to advance. Rising carbon dioxide levels, as is the case with global warming, can have the opposite effect. No more ice ages

#### Global warming key to stop the next 5 ice ages

Andrea Thompson, writer for Livescience, 8-7-2007, “Global Warming Good News: No more Ice Ages,” <http://www.livescience.com/environment/070907_co2_iceage.html>, da 8-31-2012

Tyrrell and his team's model shows that carbon dioxide levels will be higher far into the future than previously predicted, because the acidifying ocean will dissolve more calcium carbonate from the shells of marine organisms, which acts as a buffer against acidification. But this buffer can only help to a certain point, and eventually the ocean won't be able to take up any more carbon dioxide. "It can't just keep taking it up," said Joan Kleypas of the U.S. National Center for Atmospheric Research, who was not involved in the study. The model results, detailed in a recent issue of the journal Tellus, project that 8 to 10 percent of the carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere will remain there for thousands of years, causing levels of the greenhouse gas to equilibrate in the atmosphere at twice their pre-industrial levels. "It won't go back to original levels," Kleypas told LiveScience. Even if we burn only a quarter of the Earth's total reserves of fossil fuels (currently we have burned less than one tenth of reserves), the carbon dioxide remaining in the atmosphere could cause the next ice age to be skipped because ice sheets and glaciers [will have melted](http://www.livescience.com/php/multimedia/imagegallery/igviewer.php?imgid=626&gid=42&index=0) and won't be able to reform substantially, Tyrrell found. In fact, burning up all of Earth's reserves would prevent the next five ice ages, the model shows, he said. "Our research shows why atmospheric CO2 will not return to pre-industrial levels after we stop burning fossil fuels," Tyrrell said. "It shows that if we use up all known fossil fuels it doesn't matter at what rate we burn them. The result would be the same if we burned them at present rates or at more moderate rates; we would still get the same eventual ice-age-prevention result."

#### Warming is good – checks an ice age

Terrance Aym, 3-28-2011, “Prepare for Ice Age Now, says top paleoclimatologist,” <http://www.iceagenow.com/Prepare_for_Ice_Age_Now_says_top_paleoclimatologist.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Geologic records show that Ice Ages are the norm, punctuated by brief periods of warming. Now one of the most highly respected paleoclimatologists - George Kukla, 77, retired professor of paleoclimatology at Columbia University and researcher at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory - has weighed in and is warning everyone to prepare for a new Ice Age. The "Earth has experienced an ongoing cycle of ice ages dating back millions of years. Cold, glacial periods affecting the polar to mid-latitudes persist for about 100,000 years, punctuated by briefer, warmer periods called interglacials," says Kukla. Kukla asserts all Ice Ages start with a period of global warming. They are the the harbingers of new Ice Ages. Actually, he explains, warming is good. Ice Ages are deadly and may even kill millions. Can Mankind stop it? No. Just as humanity cannot affect the long term climate of the planet, neither can it stop an Ice Age from happening. The climate is primarily driven by the sun. "I feel we're on pretty solid ground in interpreting orbit around the sun as the primary driving force behind Ice Age glaciation," he says. "The relationship is just too clear and consistent to allow reasonable doubt. It's either that, or climate drives orbit, and that just doesn't make sense." During a lengthy interview with Gelf Magazine, Kukla explained: "What is happening is very similar to the time 115,000 years ago, when the last glaciation started.... Believe it or not, the last glacial started with 'global warming!'" He knows that global warming always precedes an Ice Age. The history of that is in the ice core records repeating itself every 100,000 years or so over millions of years. Generations ago, scientists believed Ice Ages advanced slowly taking tens of thousands of years. Now some researchers have revealed startling evidence that an Ice Age can be triggered in under 10 years. Warming is much more preferable than cooling. Warming would actually help Mankind; cooling will do just the opposite.

### AT: Thermohaline Circuit Link Turn

#### THC shutdown won’t happen – Bering Strait checks

Michael D. Lemonick, prominent science journalist, 4-10-2012, “How a Patch of Ocean Helps Keep Europe from Freezing,” Climate Central, <http://www.climatecentral.org/news/how-a-patch-of-ocean-off-alaska-helps-keep-europe-from-freezing/>, da 8-31-2012

Climate scientists have been explaining for years that the problem with global warming isn’t just warming. It’s also about the other changes warming can bring, including heat waves, droughts, rising seas, intense storms and much more. One of the scariest possibilities is that major ocean currents could abruptly stop entirely, plunging areas like Western Europe into an abrupt deep-freeze. It’s happened before, tens of thousands of years ago, and while climate experts doubt that it will happen again anytime soon, they haven’t had especially powerful evidence to back their optimism. But now they do, thanks to a new paper just published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. What will save Europe from disaster, say the authors, is the Bering Strait, the 50-mile-wide gap that separates Siberia from Alaska. “As long as the Bering Strait remains open,” said lead author Aixue Hu, a climate modeler at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), in a telephone interview, “we will not see an abrupt climate event.”

#### THC shutdown very unlikely

Michael D. Lemonick, prominent science journalist, 4-10-2012, “How a Patch of Ocean Helps Keep Europe from Freezing,” Climate Central, <http://www.climatecentral.org/news/how-a-patch-of-ocean-off-alaska-helps-keep-europe-from-freezing/>, da 8-31-2012

So the scientists looked for evidence of what else might have been happening at times when the current shut off. They noticed that it tended to happen when sea level was especially low — specifically when it dropped low enough to expose the sea floor at the Bering Strait, creating a “land bridge” that connected the two continents. (Anthropologists think prehistoric Asians crossed this bridge when they first populated the Americas.) “So we thought maybe,” Hu said, “this played a role.” And so it did, they discovered, when they used a powerful climate model to test their hypothesis. “When the strait is open,” Hu said, “water flows into the Arctic Ocean and eventually out into the North Atlantic.” Pacific Ocean water, it turns out, is somewhat less salty than the Atlantic, so the current is already in a constant state of mild dilution. If more freshwater gets dumped in during these times — by, say, melting a significant amount of ice on Greenland — it only adds to the dilution, slowing the conveyor belt gradually. When the Bering Strait is closed, however, the conveyor belt is undiluted. Dump a lot of freshwater in and it’s such shock to the system that it can cause a total shutdown. The good news is that the Bering Strait is currently open for business, and as sea level continues to rise with global warming, it’s not closing shop any time soon. So an abrupt shutdown of the conveyor belt, leading to sudden cooling in the north along more heat staying bottled in the south — the series of events that may have brought us out of the last Ice Age, a new study in Nature argued last week — is unlikely. Considering all of the disruptions we’re already seeing from climate change, and those that are likely to come over the next century, it’s slightly reassuring to realize that things could be far worse.

#### Thermohaline won’t collapse

Scott K. Johnson, MA Hydrogeology from UWisc, 4-11-2012, “An Open Bering Strait blocks off sudden swings in climate” <http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/04/bering-strait-influences-abrupt-changes-in-ocean-circulation/>, da 8-31-2012

The simulation with an open Bering Strait couldn’t replicate this behavior. The overturning circulation would slow down, but as soon as the freshwater addition started to drop, the circulation would smoothly recover right along with it. With the Bering Strait closed, however, the circulation would collapse more quickly, hold steady there for a while, and then abruptly kick back into gear. Much like the real thing is thought to have done. The Bering Strait exerts its influence by controlling flow between the Arctic and the North Pacific. Normally, fresher water flows into the Arctic, but when freshwater is being added to the North Atlantic some of it leaks into the Arctic and out to the Pacific. That helps keep the overturning circulation in the North Atlantic from clogging up so easily. In contrast, when the Bering Strait is closed, the freshwater in the North Atlantic piles up and lingers. Beyond offering an explanation of why the Dansgaard-Oeschger oscillations happened when they did (during the period when sea level was low enough that the Bering Strait was closed off), this work also has something to say about the future. Since the Bering Strait is open today, an abrupt collapse of overturning circulation in the North Atlantic due to melting Greenland ice could be much less likely. And that’s just one more reason why the day after tomorrow probably won’t resemble The Day After Tomorrow.

### AT: Thermohaline Circuit Link Turn

#### THC won’t shut off – ice sheets already melted

Edward Ulrich, 2012, <http://www.newsofinterest.tv/global_warming/effects/sea_level/ugw_sea_level.php>, da 8-31-2012

In his unfortunately popular movie, "An Inconvenient Truth," former U.S. Vice President Al Gore predicts a rise in sea level, not of the 4 to 6 inches endorsed by most experts, but of 20 feet! Where could he have come up with such an absurd number? Gore predicts another climatic event, similar to the Younger Dryas episode of 12,500 years ago, when the sudden release of of trillions of tons of melt-water from melting glaciers in North America **shut down the Atlantic Conveyor, plunging the world into a 1,000-year ice age. We can think of four reasons not to take this prediction seriously. First, consider the trillions of tons of Ice Age ice sheets we don’t have because they melted more than 10,000 years ago.** Twelve thousand years ago, the Gulf Stream did get overwhelmed--by melt-water from the huge ice sheets and glaciers of the ice age as the planet warmed into the Climate Optimum. **But the ice age had created an ice sheet up to 9,000 feet thick over the northern part of Europe and North America.** The Laurentian Ice Sheet in the center of North America extended over all the Great Lakes, west into Iowa and south into Indiana and Ohio. **We calculate there were some 40,000 trillion tons of ice in the world’s various ice sheets and glaciers at that time. Much of that ice is gone now, and the melt-water is already in the oceans. Gore’s scenario cannot happen because there’s not enough ice to trigger it.**

#### No THC shutoff – their authors are doomsaying for research money

Edward Ulrich, 2012, <http://www.newsofinterest.tv/global_warming/effects/sea_level/ugw_sea_level.php>, da 8-31-2012

THC scenario is backwards – meltwater is strengthening the current, not shutting it downs

**Second, the recent warming years, far from triggering a shutdown of the Atlantic Conveyor, have produced a rapid and systematic increase in the flow rate of deep Atlantic currents**. (314) Third, Dr. Gagosian of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, one of the few scientists Gore is able to cite in support of his incredible thesis, is clearly engaged in the now-widespread scientific practice of "scaring up research funds." He noted in his statements that the seas are responsible for about half of the global climate factors, while virtually all of the global warming research money has gone to the atmospheric scientists. (315) His notorious alarming prediction was little more than a thinly veiled demand for more funding.

#### GCM’s prove no THC collapse

Edward Ulrich, 2012, <http://www.newsofinterest.tv/global_warming/effects/sea_level/ugw_sea_level.php>, da 8-31-2012

**Fourth, computerized global circulation models say it won't happen. Computer modeling can be useful when the factors involved are known and the instructions to the computer can be based on real-world data**. After the publication of a report by the National Research Council's Committee on Abrupt Climate Change, (316) researchers at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory ran several versions of the Gulf Stream Collapse theory on the global climate model at the Goddard Institute for Space Studies. **The team found no evidence for a "tripping point" that would push the planet from the projected warming of the 21st century to an abrupt global cooling**. Instead, they found a linear response to glacial meltwater. They say the expected increase in global melt water with the Modern Warming "is not rapid with realistic freshwater inputs." (317) In other words, without an extra 40,000 trillion tons of ice to melt, warming won't shut down the Atlantic Conveyor--as **it didn't during the warming surges of 1850-1870 or 1920-1940.**

### Ice Age Impact – Extinction

#### Ice Age wrecks civilization

Gerald Marsh, retired physicist, 2012, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” Winningreen, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age. What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt. Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization.

#### Ice Ages empirically wipe out civilizations

Gerald Marsh, retired physicist, 2012, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” Winningreen, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>, da 8-31-2012

One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder. The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was followed by the extinction of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland. Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come. By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze. Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization.

#### Ice Age causes extinction

Al Fin, journalist, 2-8-2012, “How to Trigger an Ice Age the Easy Way, Killing Billions of People.” <http://alfin2100.blogspot.com/2012/02/how-to-trigger-ice-age-easy-way-killing.html>, da 8-31-2012

The secret to killing billions and billions of people without being too obvious about it, is to make it difficult or impossible to grow enough food to feed them. Geological history demonstrates that the best way of doing this -- short of a global thermonuclear war -- is by triggering a global ice age. If winters are too long and summers are too short and cold, crops cannot be grown, and livestock will starve. Without enough food, billions of people will die, until there are only enough people to match the dwindling food supplies. Who would want to do such a thing? Well, no one will actually come out and admit to planning a great global human dieoff. But there are some people who are playing with the idea of significantly cutting back on Earth's solar allotment, in the name of mitigating "climate change." But since Earth's climate is always changing no matter what humans do, why would a cooler planet -- with shorter growing seasons and less food -- be better than a warming planet, with more food and longer growing seasons?

### Ice Age Impact – Extinction

#### Ice age causes extinction

L. David Roper, Physics prof @ Virg. Polytech., 1-23-2005, <http://www.roperld.com/science/tempsolinsatc.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Surely, prior to the Next Glacial Maximum about 100 kiloyears in the future surviving Humans will migrate to European, Asian and also American refugia. (See Figure 12.) Surviving North Americans will probably migrate to Central America. A glance at Figure 12 should convince that an exodus to refugia could happen as early as 50, or even 20, kiloyears in the future. With the Human development of weapons of mass and indiscriminant destruction and demonstrated willingness to use them when challenged by other Humans, it is likely that Humans will contribute to their own die offs as they struggle for survival as the Next Major Ice Age begins to take its Human toll. It is not clear that Humans will survive all of the three predicted coldest periods of the Next Major Ice Age. (See Figure 12.) The first and mildest, at about 20 kiloyears in the future, is probably the most dangerous, as there may be still enough of the destructive technology around then.

#### Ice Age causes extinction

Sterling, LLB and like 3 other degrees, 7-25-2012, <http://europebusines.blogspot.com/2010/08/special-post-life-on-this-earth-just.html>, da 8-31-2012

So what does this mean? **Violent mixing of the seasons, crop failures, and increased drought and floods in diverse places is now daily news** since the April 20th 2010 BP Oil Volcano. They have killed the pacemaker of world climate in the worlds of Dr Zangari PhD. Dr Mike Coffman PhD geologist resource climatologist, and Dr Tim Ball PhD climatologist have confirmed that if this data is correct, that **an ice age and massive climate shift with famine is now imminent**. We are now seeing Russia stop all delivery of wheat crops on prior contracts, and most sources of staple food crops moving worldwide in a crisis of famine. **The Gulf Stream and related currents are effectively DEAD. This should enrage the public and bring forth scientists to challenge and support the data and analysis, for the consequences to the civilization of mankind and ecological collapse have global consequence producing famine, death and massive population migration away from zones of advancing ice age and regions unfit for human habitation**. Let us get the facts and call the corporate and government to task on these issues now or face worldwide catechisms of biblical proportions. We shall continue to report with new scientific experts on this most important disaster.

#### Ice age seriously messes up the human race

Sterling, LLB and like 3 other degrees, 7-25-2012, <http://europebusines.blogspot.com/2010/08/special-post-life-on-this-earth-just.html>, da 8-31-2012

The 'process' of entering a new Ice Age could begin coming upon us in full force (rather like in the movie "The Day After Tomorrow") at any time, or it could take three to five year to fully play out with early glaciation beginning in North America and Europe and Asia this winter (both models have existed in the beginnings of different Ice Ages in Earth's past).  **A new Ice Age, could kill 2/3 of the human race in the first year in a rapid** onset; a slower onset would likely kill close to this number but simply take a handful of years.! Thank you BP; thank you President Obama, the lies and the dispersants were just great. Now if you could just direct all that hot air to the right places maybe we can avoid a icy hell in our near future.

### Ice Age Prodicts

#### Ice Age theorists aren’t crackpots – mainstream acceptance

Lawrence Solomon, exec. Dir. Energy Probe, 6-17-2011, “NASA Scientist Reverses Sunspot Prediction, Bolstering Global Cooling Theory,” Global Warming Policy Foundation, <http://thegwpf.org/the-climate-record/3232-nasa-scientist-reverses-sunspot-prediction-bolstering-global-cooling-theory.html>, da 8-31-2012

All this comes amid a flurry of other reports, including from scientists at the U.S. National Solar Observatory (NSO) and U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory, indicating that global cooling, and perhaps even a new Little Ice Age, is on its way. “We expected to see the start of the zonal flow for Cycle 25 by now, but we see no sign of it,” states Frank Hill of the U.S. National Solar Observatory, who recently co-authored another paper in the field. “This indicates that the start of Cycle 25 may be delayed to 2021 or 2022, or may not happen at all.” The upshot is chilling: “If we are right, this could be the last solar maximum we’ll see for a few decades,” Hill states. “That would affect everything from space exploration to Earth’s climate.” The notion of another Little Ice Age, as happened in the last half of the 1600s, is no longer dismissed. Asks the National Solar Observatory: “An immediate question is whether this slowdown presages a second Maunder Minimum, a 70-year period with virtually no sunspots [which occurred] during 1645-1715.”

#### Top scientists agree

Fred Pearce, science writer, 9-4-2009, “World's climate could cool first, warm later,” New Scientist, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn17742-worlds-climate-could-cool-first-warm-later.html?DCMP=OTC-rss&nsref=online-news>, da 8-31-2012

Forecasts of climate change are about to go seriously out of kilter. One of the world's top climate modellers said Thursday we could be about to enter one or even two decades during which temperatures cool. "People will say this is global warming disappearing," he told more than 1500 of the world's top climate scientists gathering in Geneva at the UN's World Climate Conference. "I am not one of the sceptics," insisted Mojib Latif of the Leibniz Institute of Marine Sciences at Kiel University, Germany. "However, we have to ask the nasty questions ourselves or other people will do it." Few climate scientists go as far as Latif, an author for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. But more and more agree that the short-term prognosis for climate change is much less certain than once thought. Nature vs humans This is bad timing. The UN's World Meteorological Organization called the conference in order to draft a global plan for providing "climate services" to the world: that is, to deliver climate predictions useful to everyone from farmers worried about the next rainy season to doctors trying to predict malaria epidemics and builders of dams, roads and other infrastructure who need to assess the risk of floods and droughts 30 years hence. But some of the climate scientists gathered in Geneva to discuss how this might be done admitted that, on such timescales, natural variability is at least as important as the long-term climate changes from global warming. "In many ways we know more about what will happen in the 2050s than next year," said Vicky Pope from the UK Met Office. Cold Atlantic Latif predicted that in the next few years a natural cooling trend would dominate over warming caused by humans. The cooling would be down to cyclical changes to ocean currents and temperatures in the North Atlantic, a feature known as the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO). Breaking with climate-change orthodoxy, he said NAO cycles were probably responsible for some of the strong global warming seen in the past three decades. "But how much? The jury is still out," he told the conference. The NAO is now moving into a colder phase.

#### Our scientists are experts

Cher Thornhill, 11-13-2008, “ “Global warning: We are actually heading towards a new Ice Age, claim scientists,” Mail Online, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1085359/Global-warning-We-actually-heading-new-Ice-Age-claim-scientists.html>, da 8-31-2012

It has plagued scientists and politicians for decades, but scientists now say global warming is not the problem. We are actually heading for the next Ice Age, they claim. British and Canadian experts warned the big freeze could bury the east of Britain in 6,000ft of ice. Most of Scotland, Northern Ireland and England could be covered in 3,000ft-thick ice fields. The expanses could reach 6,000ft from Aberdeen to Kent – towering above Ben Nevis, Britain’s tallest mountain. And what's more, the experts blame the global change on falling - rather than climbing - levels of greenhouse gases. Lead author Thomas Crowley from the University of Edinburgh and Canadian colleague William Hyde say that currently vilified greenhouse gases – such as carbon dioxide – could actually be the key to averting the chill. The warning, published in the authoritative journal Nature, is based on records of tiny marine fossils and the earth’s shifting orbit. The Earth has seen dramatic climate fluctuations – veering between cold and warm extremes - over the past three million years, the researchers say. And changes in the Earth’s orbit and slowly falling levels of carbon dioxide are the cause. The team says we are approaching a turning point, in the next 10,000 to 100,000 years, which will lead to the new ice sheets smothering much of Europe, Asia and South America.

### CO2 Ag DA 1NC 1/2

#### CO2 is key to boosting agricultural yields

Wall Street Journal, 6-22-2012, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html>, da 8-31-2012

The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere.

#### Without expanded agricultural output, massive wars result

Julian Cribb, fellow at Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, 2010, The Coming Famine: The Global Food Crisis and What We Can Do to Avoid It, p. gbooks

The character of human conflict has also changed: since the early 1990S, more wars have been triggered by disputes over food, land, and water than over mere political or ethnic differences. This should not surprise US: people have fought over the means of survival for most of history. But in the abbreviated reports on the nightly media, and even in the rarefied realms of government policy, the focus is almost invariably on the players—the warring national, ethnic, or religious factions—rather than on the play, the deeper subplots building the tensions that ignite conflict. Caught up in these are groups of ordinary, desperate people fearful that there is no longer sufficient food, land, and water to feed their children—and believing that they must fight ‘the others” to secure them. At the same time, the number of refugees in the world doubled, many of them escaping from conflicts and famines precipitated by food and resource shortages. Governments in troubled regions tottered and fell. The coming famine is planetary because it involves both the immediate effects of hunger on directly affected populations in heavily populated regions of the world in the next forty years—and also the impacts of war, government failure, refugee crises, shortages, and food price spikes that will affect all human beings, no matter who they are or where they live. It is an emergency because unless it is solved, billions will experience great hardship, and not only in the poorer regions. Mike Murphy, one of the world’s most progressive dairy farmers, with operations in Ireland, New Zealand, and North and South America, succinctly summed it all up: “Global warming gets all the publicity but the real imminent threat to the human race is starvation on a massive scale. Taking a 10—30 year view, I believe that food shortages, famine and huge social unrest are probably the greatest threat the human race has ever faced. I believe future food shortages are a far bigger world threat than global warming.”2° The coming famine is also complex, because it is driven not by one or two, or even a half dozen, factors but rather by the confluence of many large and profoundly intractable causes that tend to amplify one another. This means that it cannot easily be remedied by “silver bullets” in the form of technology, subsidies, or single-country policy changes, because of the synergetic character of the things that power it.

### CO2 Ag DA 1NC 2/2

#### Food shortages kill billions – expanded CO2 is the only way to solve

Sherwood Idso, research physicist, 7-6-2011, “Meeting the Food Needs of a Growing World Population,” CO2 Science, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V14/N27/EDIT.php>, da 8-31-2012

Parry and Hawkesford (2010) introduce their study of the global problem by noting that "food production needs to increase 50% by 2030 and double by 2050 to meet projected demands," and they note that at the same time the demand for food is increasing, production is progressively being limited by "non-food uses of crops and cropland," such as the production of biofuels, stating that in their homeland of the UK, "by 2015 more than a quarter of wheat grain may be destined for bioenergy production," which surely must strike one as both sad and strange, when they also note that "currently, at least one billion people are chronically malnourished and the situation is deteriorating," with more people "hungrier now than at the start of the millennium." So what to do about it: that is the question the two researchers broach in their review of the sad situation. They begin by describing the all-important process of photosynthesis, by which the earth's plants "convert light energy into chemical energy, which is used in the assimilation of atmospheric CO2 and the formation of sugars that fuel growth and yield," which phenomena make this natural and life-sustaining process, in their words, "a major target for improving crop productivity both via conventional breeding and biotechnology." Next to a plant's need for carbon dioxide comes its need for water, the availability of which, in the words of Parry and Hawkesford, "is the major constraint on world crop productivity." And they state that "since more than 80% of the [world's] available water is used for agricultural production, there is little opportunity to use additional water for crop production, especially because as populations increase, the demand to use water for other activities also increases." Hence, they rightly conclude that "a real and immediate challenge for agriculture is to increase crop production with less available water." Enlarging upon this challenge, they give an example of a success story: the Australian wheat variety 'Drysdale', which gained its fame "because it uses water more efficiently." This valued characteristic is achieved "by slightly restricting stomatal aperture and thereby the loss of water from the leaves." They note, however, that this ability "reduces photosynthetic performance slightly under ideal conditions," but they say it enables plants to "have access to water later in the growing season thereby increasing total photosynthesis over the life of the crop." Of course, Drysdale is but one variety of one crop; and the ideal goal would be to get nearly all varieties of all crops to use water more efficiently. And that goal can actually be reached by doing nothing, by merely halting the efforts of radical environmentalists to deny earth's carbon-based life forms -- that's all of us and the rest of the earth's plants and animals -- the extra carbon we and they need to live our lives to the fullest. This is because allowing the air's CO2content to rise in response to the burning of fossil fuels naturally causes the vast majority of earth's plants to progressively reduce the apertures of their stomata and thereby lower the rate at which water escapes through them to the air. And the result is even better than that produced by the breeding of Drysdale, because the extra CO2 in the airmore than overcomes the photosynthetic reduction that results from the partial closure of plant stomatal apertures, allowing even more yield to be produced per unit of water transpired in the process. Yet man can make the situation better still, by breeding and selecting crop varieties that perform better under higher atmospheric CO2 concentrations than the varieties we currently rely upon, or he can employ various technological means of altering them to do so. Truly, we can succeed, even where "the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of substantially reducing the world's hungry by 2015 will not be met," as Parry and Hawkesford accurately inform us. And this truly seems to us the moral thing to do, when "at least one billion people are chronically malnourished and the situation is deteriorating," with more people "hungrier now than at the start of the millennium.”

### CO2 Good – Yields

#### All evidence proves CO2 is good for agriculture

Robert Zubrin, MS in Aaeronautics from Rochester, 4-3-2012, “Carbon Emissions are Good,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/295098/carbon-emissions-are-good-robert-zubrin>, da 8-31-2012

This has left the EPA’s second premise — that global warming would be a harmful development — largely unchallenged. This is unfortunate, because while it is entirely possible that the earth may be warming — as it has done so many times in the past — there is no rational basis whatsoever to support the contention that carbon-dioxide-driven global warming would be on the whole harmful to life and civilization. Quite the contrary: All available evidence supports the contention that human CO2 emissions offer great benefits to the earth’s community of life. Putting aside for the moment the question of whether human industrial CO2 emissions are having an effect on climate, it is quite clear that they are raising atmospheric CO2 levels. As a result, they are having a strong and markedly positive effect on plant growth worldwide. There is no doubt about this.

#### Satellite data proves CO2 is good for ag

Robert Zubrin, MS in Aaeronautics from Rochester, 4-3-2012, “Carbon Emissions are Good,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/295098/carbon-emissions-are-good-robert-zubrin>, da 8-31-2012

NASA satellite observations taken from orbit since 1958 show that, concurrent with the 19 percent increase in atmospheric CO2 over the past half century, the rate of plant growth in the continental United States has increased by 14 percent. Studies done at Oak Ridge National Lab on forest trees have shown that increasing the carbon dioxide level 50 percent, to the 550 parts per million level projected to prevail at the end of the 21 century, will likely increase photosynthetic productivity by a further 24 percent. This is readily reproducible laboratory science. If CO2 levels are increased, the rate of plant growth will accelerate. Now let us consider the question of warming: If it is occurring — and I believe it is, based not on disputable temperature measurements but on sea levels, which have risen two inches in two decades — is it a good thing or a bad thing? Answer: It is a very good thing. Global warming would increase the rate of evaporation from the oceans. This would increase rainfall worldwide. In addition, global warming would lengthen the growing season, thereby increasing still further the bounty of both agriculture and nature.

#### CO2 concentrations boost ag yields

Thomas Gale **Moore**, senior fellow at the Hoover institution, 1995, “Global Warming: A boon to man and animals”, The Public Interest, <http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/Boon_To_Man.html>, da 8-31-2012

Moreover, the enrichment of the atmosphere with CO2 will fertilize plants and make for more vigorous growth. Agricultural economists studying the relationship of higher temperatures and additional CO2 to crop yields in Canada, Australia, Japan, northern Russia, Finland, and Iceland found not only that a warmer climate would push up yields, but also that the added boost from enriched CO2 would enhance output by 17 percent.[11] Researchers have attributed a burgeoning of forests in Europe to the increased CO2 and the fertilizing effect of nitrogen oxides.[12] Professor of Climatology Robert Pease writes that we may now be living in an "icehouse" world and that a warming of about two degrees Celsius, which is what his model indicates, may actually make the earth more habitable. The higher temperatures combined with more carbon dioxide will favor plant and crop growth and could well provide more food for our burgeoning global populations. Geologic history reveals that warmer global temperatures produce more, not less, precipitation, a fact reflected by a recent scientific investigation that shows the Greenland ice-cap to be thickening, not melting. So much for the catastrophic prediction that our coastlines will be flooded by a rise in sea level from polar meltwaters.[13]

### CO2 Good – Agriculture

#### CO2 increases agricultural yields – eliminates pests

Craig Idso, PhD Geography from Arizona State University, 1-2-2008, “Effects of Elevated CO2 on Plant-Herbivore Interactions” <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V11/N1/B2.php>, da 8-31-2012

What was learned With respect to the first subject of their review, Stiling and Cornelissen report that "the densities of all leaf miner species (6) on all host species (3) were lower in every year in elevated CO2 than they were in ambient CO2." With respect to the second subject, they say that "elevated CO2 significantly decreased herbivore abundance (-21.6%), increased relative consumption rates (+16.5%), development time (+3.87%) and total consumption (+9.2%), and significantly decreased relative growth rate (-8.3%), conversion efficiency (-19.9%) and pupal weight (-5.03%)," while noting that "host plants growing under enriched CO2 environments exhibited significantly larger biomass (+38.4%), increased C/N ratio (+26.57%), and decreased nitrogen concentration (-16.4%), as well as increased concentrations of tannins (+29.9%)." What it means With plant biomass increasing and herbivorous pest abundance decreasing (by +38.4% and -21.6%, respectively, in response to an approximate doubling of the atmosphere's CO2 concentration), it would appear that in the eternal struggle to produce the food that sustains all of humanity, either directly or indirectly, man's crops will fare ever better as the air's CO2 content continues its upward climb. Likewise, it would appear there will be a concomitant expansion of the vegetative food base that sustains all of the biosphere.

#### CO2 boosts food production

Patrick J. Michaels, PhD, Apple Daily, November 3, 2004, “Is Global Warming Always Bad?” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/is-global-warming-always-bad>, da 8-31-2012

Have you ever read anything good about global warming? Why is all the news always bad? Objectively speaking, any environmental change should have both positive benefits and negative effects. For example, theory predicts and observations confirm that human-induced warming takes place primarily in winter, lengthening the growing season. Satellite measurements now show that the planet is greener than it was before it warmed. There are literally thousands of experiments reported in the scientific literature demonstrating that higher atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations -- cause by human activity -- dramatically increase food production.

#### Warming is good for plants

Graham Smith, MS Environmental Science, 6-12-2012, Daily Mail,

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2158226/The-Arctics-getting-greener-Global-warming-causing-vegetation-grow-taller.html#ixzz1yGTw6XR7>, da 8-31-2012

Plants in the Arctic region are growing greener and taller as a result of global warming, scientists claim. Higher temperatures have also seen the proportion of bare ground decrease, according to a study. Lead researcher Dr Robert Björk, from the University of Gothenburg in Sweden, said: 'We've managed to link the vegetation changes observed at the different sites to the degree of local warming.' Greener: Plants in the Arctic region are growing greener and taller as a result of global warming, scientists claim The scientists' comparisons show that the prevalence of vascular species, such as shrubs and plants, is increasing as temperatures rise. The degree of change depends on climate zone, soil moisture and the presence of permafrost, they claim. Researchers working on the International Tundra Experiment (ITEX) have been gathering data for almost 30 years. By analysing changes in vegetation in 158 plant communities at 46 locations across the Arctic between 1980 and 2010, they have been able to identify a number of general trends.

### CO2 Good – Soil Erosion

#### Warming solves soil erosion

M. A. Nearing, Scientist at National Soil Erosion Research Laboratory, 2004, “Expected Climate Change Impacts on Soil Erosion Rates: A Review,” Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, <http://www.tucson.ars.ag.gov/unit/publications/PDFfiles/1542.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Soil erosion rates may be expected to change in response to changes in climate for a variety of reasons, the most direct of which in the change in the erosive power of rainfall. A second predominant pathway of influence by climate change on erosion rates is through plant biomass. The mechanisms by which climate change affects biomass, and by which biomass changes impact runoff and erosion and erosion, are complex. For example, anthropogenic increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration causes increases in plant production rates and changes in plant transpiration rates, which translate to an increase in soil surface canopy cover and, more importantly, biological ground cover.

#### Soil Erosion causes extinction – prerequisite to all life

Stephen Leahy, 3-22-2008, “Peak soil: the silent global crisis,” Earth Island Journal, <http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/peak_soil/>, da 8-31-2012

A handful of this dirty snow melts quickly, leaving a thin, fine-grained wet mess. It doesn’t look like much, but the mucky sludge in my hand is the prerequisite for life on the planet. “We are overlooking soil as the foundation of all life on Earth,” says Andres Arnalds, assistant director of the Icelandic Soil Conservation Service. Arnalds is an eloquent spokesperson for the unheralded emergency of soil erosion, a problem that is reducing global food production and water availability, and is responsible for an estimated 30 percent of the greenhouse gases emissions. “Land degradation and desertification may be regarded as the silent crisis of the world, a genuine threat to the future of humankind.”

#### Our impact is irreversible – soil can’t be renewed

Stephen Leahy, 3-22-2008, “Peak soil: the silent global crisis,” Earth Island Journal, <http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/peak_soil/>, da 8-31-2012

No one knows how much food-producing land will be left by 2050, when another three billion people are expected to join the current global population of 6.5 billion. What we do know is that right now, 99 percent of human food calories come from the land. Global food production has kept pace with population growth thus far thanks chiefly to the extensive use of chemical fertilizers. But food production per acre of land is starting to decline, primarily due to loss of productive land and water shortages. The latter is often the result of soil erosion because soil and vegetation act as a sponge that holds and gradually releases water. And that soil erosion, in turn, is exacerbated by chemical farming practices that over time break down soil structure. Add to these challenges climate change’s impact on soil erosion and the competition between growing food and producing biofuels, and it’s frightening to consider the challenge of feeding nine billion people when nearly one billion go hungry right now. Arnalds summarizes the challenge: More food will have to be produced within the next 50 years than during the last 10,000 years combined. “Securing food in many places will become a crisis of rapidly growing proportions.” Erosion largely goes unnoticed by farmers as it “nickels and dimes you to death,” says David Pimentel, an ecologist at Cornell University who has conducted extensive research on the subject. Even if there were no humans on the planet, soils would still erode. The soil formation from the weathering of rock and the breakdown of plants, however, would be faster than the erosion rate; it takes roughly 500 years to create one inch of soil.

### CO2 Good – AT: C3/C4

#### Warming helps both C3 and C4 plants

Stack Exchange, 1-31-2012, “How will rising carbon dioxide levels in the troposphere affect photosynthetic producers,” <http://biology.stackexchange.com/questions/681/how-will-rising-carbon-dioxide-levels-in-the-troposphere-affect-photosynthetic-p>, da 8-31-2012

In general, C4 plants are much (about 50%) more efficient than their C3 counterparts, and they are particularly well adapted to high temperatures and moist environments. So, as atmospheric CO2 levels continue to rise, C3 plants will gradually be able to photosynthesize more efficiently. Interestingly though, C4 plants are predicted to also benefit from increased atmospheric CO2. If global temperatures rise as predicted, both C3 and C4 plants will be able to operate more efficiently than they currently do, up to a maximum temperature beyond which enzymes will begin to denature faster and efficiency will drop. One consideration is that the difference in efficiency between C3 and C4 systems will decrease, which may significantly alter the makeup of plant communities around the world.

#### CO2 increases C3 yields

Craig D. Idso, PhD, fellow in Earth Science @ James Cook, et al, 2011, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” <http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/2011report.html>, da 8-31-2012

We begin our review of atmospheric CO2 enrichment effects on Earth‘s vegetation with a consideration of C3 plants—those in which the enzyme RuBisCO is involved in the uptake of CO2 and the subsequent photosynthetic process, which results in its incorporation into a 3-carbon compound—starting with the study of Norikane et al. (2010). They focused on the genus Cymbidium, which comprises about 50 species distributed throughout tropical and subtropical Asia and Oceania. The four researchers worked with shoots of Music Hour ‗Maria,‘ a type of orchid, possessing two to three leaves, which they obtained from a mass of protocorm-like bodies they derived from shoot-tip culture. They grew them in vitro on a modified Vacin and Went medium in air augmented with either 0, 3,000, or 10,000 ppm CO2 under two photosynthetic photon flux densities (either 45 or 75 µmol m -1 s -1 ) provided by cold cathode fluorescent lamps for a period of 90 days. They then transferred the plants to ex vitro culture for 30 more days. Relative to plants grown in vitro in ambient air, the percent increases in shoot and root dry weight due to enriching the air in which the plants grew by 3,000 ppm CO2 were, respectively, 216 percent and 1,956 percent under the low-light regime and 249 percent and 1,591 percent under the high-light regime, while corresponding increases for the plants grown in air enriched with an extra 10,000 ppm CO2 were 244 percent and 2,578 percent under the low-light regime and 310 percent and 1,879 percent under the high-light regime.

#### CO2 increases C4 output

Craig D. Idso, PhD, fellow in Earth Science @ James Cook, et al, 2011, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” <http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/2011report.html>, da 8-31-2012

Historically, C4 crops have been thought to be relatively unresponsive to atmospheric CO2 enrichment, as they possess a CO2-concentrating mechanism that allows them to achieve a greater photosynthetic capacity than C3 plants at the current atmospheric CO2 concentration, particularly at high growth temperatures (Matsuoka et al., 2001). Thus, simple reasoning might suggest C4 plants may be little benefited, if at all, in a CO2-enriched and warmer world of the future. However, in the case of sugarcane, as the research of Vu and Allen demonstrates, simple reasoning would be incorrect, especially with respect to the most important measure of sugarcane‘s economic value: stem juice production. The two researchers with the USDA‘s Agricultural Research Service, who hold joint appointments in the Agronomy Department of the University of Florida (USA), grew two cultivars of sugarcane (Saccharum officinarum) for a period of three months in paired-companion, temperaturegradient, sunlit greenhouses under daytime CO2 concentrations of 360 and 720 ppm and air temperatures of 1.5°C (near ambient) and 6.0°C higher than outside ambient temperature, after which they measured several different plant properties. ―On a main stem basis, Vu and Allen write, ―leaf area, leaf dry weight, stem dry weight and stem juice volume were increased by growth at doubled CO2 [as well as at] high temperature, and they state these increases were even greater under the combination of doubled CO2 and high temperature, with plants grown under these conditions averaging ―50%, 26%, 84% and 124% greater leaf area, leaf dry weight, stem dry weight and stem juice volume, respectively, compared with plants grown at [the] ambient CO2/near-ambient temperature combination.

### CO2 Ag Impacts

#### Billions will die without expanded agricultural output

Mahendra Shah, Executive Secretary of CGIAR and Maurice Strong, Senior Adviser to UN and World Bank 2000, “Food in the 21st century: from science to sustainable agriculture,” p. 9-10

As the new millennium begins, the world faces another food crisis that is just as dangerous — but much more complex — than the one it confronted thirty years ago. Each year the global population climbs by an estimated 90 million people. This means, at the very least, the world's farmers will have to increase food production by more than 50 percent to feed some two billion more people by 2020. But the numbers don't tell the full story. The challenge confronting the world is far more intricate than simply producing more food, because global conditions are very different than they were on the eve of the Green Revolution. To prevent a crisis, the world community must confront the issues of poverty, food insecurity, environmental degradation, and erosion of genetic resources. Feeding the world in the 21st century will require not only food availability, but food security — access to the food required for a healthy and productive life. It means the ability to grow and to purchase food as needed. It also means that people do not have to rely only on staples such as wheat, rice, potatoes and cassava. Food security focuses attention on areas such as income, markets, and natural resources. The basic statistics on food security are grim. In addition to the expected population growth, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates as many as 840 million people — a number that exceeds the combined populations of Europe, the United States, Canada, and Japan — currently do not have enough to eat. The companion problem of "hidden hunger" — deficiencies of vital micronutrients — affects even more people in the developing world. The shift away from the traditional food staples will make this challenge even more difficult. Simply increasing productivity of wheat and rice alone may not have the impact it did 30 years ago

#### Food shortages jack the economy

Andrew McKillop, 8-4-2011, “The Food Crisis War Endgame,” Market Oracle, <http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article29666.html>, da 8-31-2012

Food shortage is driven by population growth: anybody who wants to deny that by calling it fascistminded can take a look at how agribusiness operates, from Monsanto, Dow, Bayer and McDonalds to the Bill Gates Foundation. Their game is trashing the environment for decades or centuries ahead and making profits right now - - while just about being able to feed 6.1 billion persons on Earth. The other 900 million suffer permanent food shortage. That is one-in-seven of world population. The number of underfed is growing by around 4% to 6% per year - far ahead of the population growth rate, and the average rate of global economic growth. And one thing is sure: in global economic recession the underfed will grow even faster, unless food prices behave like "other commodities" and tank in recession - which is no longer certain. This is the danger: recession will come. Oil prices will drop, even gold edges down a little - maybe - but food prices stay high and dangerous. They can, could or might even continue rising in global economic recession, drastically multiplying the social stress and damage from recession.

#### Reducing CO2 emissions prevents economic growth

Xiaobing Zhao, 7-24-2011, “The Impact of CO2 Emission Cuts on Income”, <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/103412/2/Zhao-1-the%20impact%20of%20The%20cost%20of%20CO2%20emission%20cuts%20on%20income.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

That is, holding constant other relevant variables, a one percent cut in CO2 emissions will on average reduce income per capita by 0.31%. There are several popular proposals regarding CO2 emission cuts. However, a deep linear cut of 50% below 1990 emissions by 2050 may be more relevant to policy discussions. This proposal means at least a 1% cut in CO2 emissions per year. If a 1% cut in CO2 emissions will on average reduce income per capita by 0.31% as we show in Table 2, the cost of emission cuts is not only statistically but also economically significant. Since the average economic growth rate for the 23 OECD countries from 1980 to 2004 is only about 2% per year based on our data, a 0.31% reduction in GDP per capita per year represents a 15% slowdown in economic growth.

### CO2 Ag Impacts – Poverty

#### Increase food production key to solve poverty

Nina Chestney, 1-30-2012, “World lacks enough food, fuel as population soars: U.N.” Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/30/us-un-development-idUSTRE80T10520120130>, da 8-31-2012

The world is running out of time to make sure there is enough food, water and energy to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population and to avoid sending up to 3 billion people into poverty, a U.N. report warned on Monday. As the world's population looks set to grow to nearly 9 billion by 2040 from 7 billion now, and the number of middle-class consumers increases by 3 billion over the next 20 years, the demand for resources will rise exponentially. Even by 2030, the world will need at least 50 percent more food, 45 percent more energy and 30 percent more water, according to U.N. estimates, at a time when a changing environment is creating new limits to supply. And if the world fails to tackle these problems, it risks condemning up to 3 billion people into poverty, the report said. Efforts towards sustainable development are neither fast enough nor deep enough, as well as suffering from a lack of political will, the United Nations' high-level panel on global sustainability said.

#### Poverty is on-par with an ongoing nuclear war – it kills millions a year

Mumia Abu-Jamal, 9-19-1998, “A Quiet and Deadly Violence,” www1.minn.net/~meis/quietdv.htm, da 8-31-2012

This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it -- really? Gilligan notes: "[E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world." [Gilligan, p. 196]

#### Moral obligation to expand food production

Caroline Henshaw, 5-31-2011, “Feeding the World’s Hungry is a Moral Necessity-Oxfam,” WSJ,http://blogs.wsj.com/source/2011/05/31/feeding-the-worlds-hungry-is-a-moral-necessity-oxfam/?mod=google\_news\_blog, da 8-31-2012

. None of these recommendations is new. Since the last food-price spike of 2007-08, policymakers and farmers alike have been wrestling with how to improve production and G20 leaders have made food security a priority this year. But the apocalyptic tone struck by Oxfam’s report shows an increasing urgency in the pleas of the international aid community for change, as the cost of feeding an ever-growing number of hungry mouths rises despite ever-growing world agricultural production. Addressing the needs of the world’s hungry is not only necessary; it will be the deciding factor in our own moral trajectory. As the UN’s special rapporteur, Olivier de Schutter, says: “The question of global hunger [is] not one of production only, but also one of marginalization, deepening inequalities and social justice.”

## Warming Good DA Answers

### No Ice Age

#### Ice Age is a long way off – status quo CO2 is enough

Reuters, 3-9-2012, “Next ice age not likely before 1,500 years, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/09/us-ice-age-emissions-idUSTRE80814T20120109>, da 8-31-2012

High levels of carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere mean the next ice age is unlikely to begin for at least 1,500 years, an article in the journal Nature Geoscience said on Monday. Concentrations of the main gases blamed for global warming reached record levels in 2010 and will linger in the atmosphere for decades even if the world stopped pumping out emissions today, according to the U.N.'s weather agency. An ice age is a period when there is a long-term reduction in the earth's surface and atmospheric temperature, which leads to the growth of ice sheets and glaciers. There have been at least five ice ages on earth. During ice ages there are cycles of glaciation with ice sheets both advancing and retreating. Officially, the earth has been in an interglacial, or warmer period, for the last 10,000 to 15,000 years, and estimates vary on how long such periods last. "(Analysis) suggests that the end of the current interglacial (period) would occur within the next 1,500 years, if atmospheric CO2 concentrations do not exceed (around) 240 parts per million by volume (ppmv)," the study said. However, the current carbon dioxide concentration is of 390 ppmv, and at that level an increase in the volume of ice sheets would not be possible, it added. The study based on variations in the earth's orbit and rock samples was conducted by academics at Cambridge University, University College London, the University of Florida and Norway's University of Bergen. The causes of ice ages are not fully understood but concentrations of methane and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, changes in the earth's orbit around the sun, and the movement of tectonic plates are all thought to contribute. The world is forecast to grow hotter as greenhouse gases continue to rise, increasing threats such as extreme weather events and sea level rise. Scientists have warned that global temperature rise should be limited to within 2 degrees Celsius to avoid the worst effects of climate change but delays in curbing emissions growth are putting the planet at risk.

#### No ice age – Sunspots aren’t proof

Reuters, 6-16-2011, “Scientists see sunspots, but no Ice Age,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/16/us-climate-sunspots-idUSTRE75E5L620110616>, da 8-31-2012

Sunspot cycles -- those 11-year patterns when dark dots appear on the solar surface -- may be delayed or even go into "hibernation" for a while, a U.S. scientist said on Wednesday. But contrary to some media reports, this does not mean a new Ice Age is coming, Frank Hill of the National Solar Observatory said in a telephone interview. "We have not predicted a Little Ice Age," Hill said, speaking from an astronomical meeting in New Mexico. "We have predicted something going on with the Sun." The appearance of sunspots helps predict solar storms that can interfere with satellite communications and power grids. Hill and other scientists cited a missing jet stream, fading spots and slower activity near the Sun's poles as signs that our nearest star is heading into a rest period. "This is highly unusual and unexpected," he said in a statement released on Tuesday. "But the fact that three completely different views of the Sun point in the same direction is a powerful indicator that the sunspot cycle may be going into hibernation." That hibernation would not begin now, as the current sunspot cycle, the 24th, has recently passed its minimum. Hill and his colleagues pondered a slowdown in sunspot activity in the 25th cycle, expected sometime around 2019.

#### Solar variation doesn’t affect climate

Met Office, 1-23-2012, “Decline in solar output unlikely to offset global warming,” <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/news/releases/archive/2012/solar-output-research>, da 8-31-2012

23 January 2012 - New research has found that solar output is likely to reduce over the next 90 years but that will not substantially delay expected increases in global temperatures caused by greenhouse gases. Carried out by the Met Office and the University of Reading, the study establishes the most likely changes in the Sun's activity and looks at how this could affect near-surface temperatures on Earth. It found that the most likely outcome was that the Sun's output would decrease up to 2100, but this would only cause a reduction in global temperatures of 0.08 °C. This compares to an expected warming of about 2.5 °C over the same period due to greenhouse gases (according to the IPCC's B2 scenario for greenhouse gas emissions that does not involve efforts to mitigate emissions).

### No Ice Age – No Timeframe

#### Ice age won’t happen any time soon

International Business Times, 1-9-2012, “Next Ice Age in 1,500 years prevented by carbon dioxide emissions.” <http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/279016/20120109/next-ice-age-years-carbon-emissions.htm>, da 8-31-2012

The next ice age, due in the next 1,500 years, won't arrive because of high levels of carbon dioxide greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, scientists reported Monday. Researchers already discovered evidence of at least five Ice Ages on Earth and around 3,500, the world will be due for another round of chilling and frozen wastelands. However, because of greenhouse gases that already exist in the atmosphere, another Ice Age likely won't happen. The research appeared in the Monday edition of the journal Nature Geoscience. "At current levels of CO2, even if emissions stopped now we'd probably have a long interglacial duration determined by whatever long-term processes could kick in and bring [atmospheric] CO2 down," Luke Skinner, lead author and professor at Cambridge University told BBC News. The study also included researchers from University College London, Bergen University in Norway and the University of Florida. The study concluded that for an Ice Age to occur, concentrations of carbon dioxide would have to fall to 240 parts per million - a 40 percent reduction of the 390 ppm in the current atmosphere.

#### Not on the brink of an ice age – newest studies

Andrew Revkin, senior editor of Discover, 3-2-2008, “Skeptics on human climate impact seize on cold spell,” New York Times, p. np

Despite the recent trend toward global warming, scientists have long wondered whether the Earth is nearing a new ice age, an end to the 12,000-year temperate spell in which civilizations arose. Some have said such a transition is overdue, given that each of the three temperate intervals that immediately preceded this current one lasted only about 10,000 years. But now, in an eagerly awaited study, a group of climate and ice experts say they have new evidence that Earth is not even halfway through the current warm era. The evidence comes from the oldest layers of Antarctic ice ever sampled.

#### Not on the brink of an ice age

Andrew Revkin, senior editor of Discover, 3-2-2008, “Skeptics on human climate impact seize on cold spell,” New York Times, p. np

Some scientists earlier proposed similar hypotheses, basing them on the configuration of Earth's orbit, which seems to set the metronome that ice ages dance to. Temperature patterns deciphered in sea sediments in recent years backed the theory. But experts say the new ice data are by far the strongest corroborating evidence, revealing many similarities between today's atmospheric and temperature patterns and those of a warm interval, with a duration of 28,000 years, that reached its peak 430,000 years ago. The findings are described Thursday in the journal Nature in a report by the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica. The evidence comes from a shaft of ice extracted over five grueling years from Antarctica's deep-frozen innards, composed of thousands of ice layers formed as each year's snowfall was compressed over time. The deepest ice retrieved so far comes from 10,000 feet deep and dates back 740,000 years. The relative abundance of certain forms of hydrogen in the ice reflects past air temperatures. Many ice cores have been cut from various glaciers and ice sheets around the world, but until now none have gone back beyond 420,000 years. "It's very exciting to see ice that fell as snow three-quarters of a million years ago," said Dr. Eric Wolff, an author of the paper and ice core expert with the British Antarctic Survey.

### SQ Warming Solves Ice Age

#### Current emissions are enough to prevent Ice Age

Nina Chestney, 1-9-2012, “Next Ice Age Delayed By Global Warming Gases, Study Finds,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/09/next-ice-age-global-warming_n_1193900.html>, da 8-31-2012

High levels of carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere mean the next ice age is unlikely to begin for at least 1,500 years, an article in the journal Nature Geoscience said on Monday. Concentrations of the main gases blamed for global warming reached record levels in 2010 and will linger in the atmosphere for decades even if the world stopped pumping out emissions today, according to the U.N.'s weather agency.

#### Current CO2 levels are already high enough to stop the ice age

Nina Chestney, 1-9-2012, “Next Ice Age Delayed By Global Warming Gases, Study Finds,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/09/next-ice-age-global-warming_n_1193900.html>, da 8-31-2012

"(Analysis) suggests that the end of the current interglacial (period) would occur within the next 1,500 years, if atmospheric CO2 concentrations do not exceed (around) 240 parts per million by volume (ppmv)," the study said. However, the current carbon dioxide concentration is of 390 ppmv, and at that level an increase in the volume of ice sheets would not be possible, it added. The study based on variations in the earth's orbit and rock samples was conducted by academics at Cambridge University, University College London, the University of Florida and Norway's University of Bergen. The causes of ice ages are not fully understood but concentrations of methane and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, changes in the earth's orbit around the sun, and the movement of tectonic plates are all thought to contribute. The world is forecast to grow hotter as greenhouse gases continue to rise, increasing threats such as extreme weather events and sea level rise. Scientists have warned that global temperature rise should be limited to within 2 degrees Celsius to avoid the worst effects of climate change but delays in curbing emissions growth are putting the planet at risk.

#### We have enough C02 in the atmosphere already

The Week, 1-11-2012, “Has climate change 'blocked' the next ice age?,” <http://theweek.com/article/index/223144/has-climate-change-blocked-the-next-ice-agenbsp>, da 8-31-2012

And this next one might not hit? Probably not — at least not with current concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. For the next ice age to hit, CO2 levels would have to fall to 250 parts per million by volume. Right now? The current carbon dioxide concentration is 390 ppmv — and at that level, the ice sheets just can't expand. So that's a good thing, right? Not exactly. Man-made climate change could have "huge consequences" for the planet, says study leader Dr. Luke Skinner. And the argument that CO2 emissions might be helping the planet is "missing the point."

### Warming Bad – Thermohaline Link Turn

#### Warming shuts down the Thermohaline Circuit, triggering an ice age

Miranda Huey, Greeniac, 6-15-2010, “Thermohaline Circulation – Why it matters for all of us,” <http://www.greeniacs.com/GreeniacsArticles/Global-Warming/Thermohaline-Circulation.html>, da 8-31-2012

Many scientists theorize that the rapid introduction of freshwater into ocean surfaces immediately stopped thermohaline circulation, inducing the massive global cooling of an average of 15 degrees.11 Some scientists predict that global warming will cause enough glacial melting to trigger another abrupt cold spell. Other scientists counter that the melting glaciers, cold spell, and halting thermohaline circulation were caused by separate factors or a broader natural cycle. Nevertheless, if an abrupt shut-down occurred, the consequences would be catastrophic. Thermohaline circulation is responsible for Europe’s warm temperatures relative to other countries at the same latitude. Warm surface waters from the south drift north towards Europe from equatorial regions, providing a moderate climate.12 Shutting it off could mean a regional ice age for northern latitudes. To a smaller degree, the same could go for the East Coast of the United States, since the warmer tropical current also flows northward along the coast.13 It could disrupt ecosystems, reducing agriculture, and increasing storms. A global warming trend could minimize or reverse some of these effects. Equatorial regions, on the other hand, could heat up and experience massive drought and famine.

#### THC shutdown independently causes extinction

Miranda Huey, Greeniac, 6-15-2010, “Thermohaline Circulation – Why it matters for all of us,” <http://www.greeniacs.com/GreeniacsArticles/Global-Warming/Thermohaline-Circulation.html>, da 8-31-2012

Thermohaline circulation isn’t a phrase you hear everyday. That is, not unless you’re an oceanographer. This fundamental ocean process supports three-fourths of marine life and shapes regional climates around the world.1 Climate change, often referred to as Global Warming, however, could slow or shut down entirely the essential ocean process, creating potentially disastrous consequences for life on earth. Most climatologists warn that global warming will most likely slow down the thermohaline circulation cycle by 10-50%% within the next 100 years.2 A warming climate could speed up the melting of Arctic glaciers, diluting the salty surface water with a large amount of freshwater.

#### Global warming will cause an ice age

Jeffrey Masters, Meteorology PhD Michigan, April 2012, “The Science of Abrupt Climate Change: Should we be worried?” <http://www.wunderground.com/climate/abruptclimate.asp>, da 8-31-2012

Global warming will increase precipitation, river run-off, melting of the Greenland ice sheet, and melting of polar sea ice, all of which will increase the amount of fresh water flowing into the critical deep-water formation areas by Greenland. In the 2007 IPCC Fourth Assessment Report Summary for Policymakers (PDF File) it states that, based on current model simulations, it is very likely (90-99% confidence) that the meridional overturning circulation (MOC) of the Atlantic Ocean will slow down during the 21st century. It also confirms the scientific consensus that is very unlikely the MOC will undergo a large abrupt transition during this century. Today's science is such that any long-term assessments of the MOC cannot be made with confidence. A 2012 paper in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences used computer modeling to show that abrupt climate events in the past occurred as a result of a change in ocean currents due to the Bering Strait closing off because of low sea levels. The Bering Strait is the 50-mile-wide gap that separates Siberia from Alaska. "As long as the Bering Strait remains open," said lead author Aixue Hu, a climate modeler at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), in a telephone interview posted at Climate Central, "we will not see an abrupt climate event." With global sea levels rising due to melting icecaps, closure of the Bering Strait is not likely in the forseeable future.

### Ice Age Doesn’t Cause Extinction

#### Ice Age doesn’t cause extinction

Zbigniew Jaworowski, M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc., Winter 2004, “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate,” 21st Century Science and Technology, <http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global_warming.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

However let’s assume thatBudyko has been right and that everything, to the very ocean bottom, will be frozen. Will [hu]mankind survive this? I think yes, it would. The present technology of nuclear power, based on the nuclear fission of uranium and thorium, would secure heat and electricity supplies for 5 billion people for about 10,000 years. At the same time, the stock of hydrogen in the ocean for future fusion-based reactors would suffice for 6 billion years. Our cities, industrial plants, food-producing greenhouses, our livestock, and also zoos and botanical gardens turned into greenhouses, could be heated virtually forever, and we could survive, together with many other organisms, on a planet that had turned into a gigantic glacier. I think, however, that such a “passive” solu- tion would not fit the genius of our future descendants, and they would learn how to restore a warm climate for ourselves and for everything that lives on Earth.

#### We’d adapt to the ice age

ASU News, 11-17-2011, Popular Archaeology, <http://www.stonepages.com/news/archives/004608.html>, da 8-31-2012

A team at Arizona State University and the University of Colorado (USA) used complex computer modelling to analyse evidence of how human hunter-gatherers responded to dramatic changes during the last Ice Age. The researchers used the archaeological record to track human behavioural changes in Late Pleistocene (126,000 - 10,000 BP) Western Eurasia over a period of 100,000 years, and across the equivalent of 1,500 generations of human hunter-gatherers. They applied computer modelling to determine the evolutionary consequences of cultural and biological changes, which included how changes in the movements of modern humans and Neanderthals caused them to interact and interbreed with each other. The results showed that human mobility during the environmental changes associated with the Ice Age increased over time, likely in response to those environmental changes. The modelling suggests the last Ice Age caused the ancestors of modern humans - and Neanderthals - to widen their ranges across Western Eurasia in search of new resources as the climate shifted. According to study co-author Julien Riel-Salvatore of the University of Colorado, Denver, this provides new evidence that Neanderthals were more adaptable and resourceful than previously thought, and suggests Neanderthals were gradually absorbed within the expanding modern human populations.

#### We’d adapt

Hillary Mayell, author, 11-12-2001, “Climate Change Caused Extinction of Big Ice Age Mammals, Scientist Says,” National Geographic News, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2001/11/1112_overkill.html>, da 8-31-2012

Martin, who in 1967 wrote the seminal book proposing the overkill hypothesis, disagrees that climate change could have caused the extensive extinctions. "The climate had been changing over a million-year period, with swings from cold to warm, and back again—some much more severe than the one that occurred at the end of the Pleistocene," he said. "It doesn't make sense that just one more [climate shift swing] would make all the difference in the world." Martin holds that the "dreadful syncopation"—humans arrive, animals disappear—seen in the islands of Oceania, Australia, New Zealand, Madagascar, and other islands fits with what happened in North America.

### Warming Bad – Agriculture

#### Climate change devastates agriculture and overwhelms any possible benefits

William Cline, Senior Fellow at Peterson Institute for International Economics, March 2008, “Global warming and agriculture” Finance and Development, <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2008/03/cline.htm>, da 8-31-2012

In the long list of potential problems from global warming, the risks to world agriculture stand out as among the most important. Yet there has been a tendency in the climate economics literature in recent years to downplay this risk, and even to argue that a couple of degrees Celsius warming might benefit world agriculture. But such studies typically have too short a time horizon (generally out to about 2050). They also focus on overall temperature change (which includes oceans), rather than on the changes that will occur over land (which warms more easily and quickly than water)—and specifically agricultural land. It has been widely recognized that developing countries in general stand to lose more from the effects of global warming on agriculture than do industrial countries.

#### Warming hurts ag more than it helps

Cheryl L Pellerin, 6-25-2010, Adaptation Critical to Agriculture in Already Changing Climate, <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2010/06/20100625122522lcnirellep0.8219416.html#axzz21vjOHv6G>, da 8-31-2012

Meanwhile, according to the International Food and Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the changing climate will have dramatic consequences for agriculture. Water sources will become more variable, droughts and floods will stress crops, some coastal food-producing areas will be inundated by salty seas and food-production rates will fall in some inland areas. “These changes have already begun to have documented effects on agriculture production,” Rosenzweig said, “in yields, growth stages of crops, management practices, pests and diseases, and livestock production and productivity.” APPLIED EVOLUTION CO2 is essential for photosynthesis — the process green plants use to turn water and sunlight into food and oxygen. Rising concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere will increase rates of photosynthesis, speeding up growth and development for many plants. Yields for most crops have risen dramatically over the past 40 years thanks to improvements in cultivation (planting, fertilization) and genetics. But as CO2 rises so does temperature, César Izaurralde of the Joint Global Change Research Institute at the University of Maryland, said June 16, and temperature increases over the next 50 to 100 years are likely to reduce yields of corn, wheat, sorghum, cotton and peanuts.

#### CO2 is worse for ag – gains have been reversed

Dallas News, 8-20-2010, “Global Warming Linked to decline in plant growth.” <http://www.dallasnews.com/news/20100820-Global-warming-linked-to-decline-in-525.ece>, da 8-31-2012

WASHINGTON - Plant growth that had been spurred by global warming has reversed, despite temperatures that continue to rise. Researchers say the change could affect food security and development of biofuels. The amount of carbon taken up by growing plants increased from 1982 through 1999 as temperatures rose and the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere increased. But a new study in today's edition of the journal Science found a drought-related decline in such plant growth from 2000 to 2009, even though temperatures continued to climb. As drought caused by warming reduces the land's ability to take up carbon, the result could be more carbon dioxide left in the atmosphere, and thus more warming, Maosheng Zhao of the University of Montana explained in a telephone interview. "This is a pretty serious warning that warmer temperatures are not going to endlessly improve plant growth," co-author Steven W. Running, also of the University of Montana, said in a statement. "We see this as a bit of a surprise, and potentially significant on a policy level because previous interpretations suggested global warming might actually help plant growth around the world," he said.

### Warming Bad – Pests

#### Increased CO2 just helps pests and weeds

Global Change Research Program, 2009, <http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts/climate-change-impacts-by-sector/agriculture#key1>, da 8-31-2012

Weeds, diseases, and insect pests benefit from warming, and weeds also benefit from a higher carbon dioxide concentration, increasing stress on crop plants and requiring more attention to pest and weed control. Weeds benefit more than cash crops from higher temperatures and carbon dioxide levels.193 One concern with continued warming is the northward expansion of invasive weeds. Southern farmers currently lose more of their crops to weeds than do northern farmers. For example, southern farmers lose 64 percent of the soybean crop to weeds, while northern farmers lose 22 percent.239 Some extremely aggressive weeds plaguing the South (such as kudzu) have historically been confined to areas where winter temperatures do not drop below specific thresholds. As temperatures continue to rise, these weeds will expand their ranges northward into important agricultural areas.

#### Herbicides won’t work with higher CO2 – ensures pests and weeds

Global Change Research Program, 2009, <http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts/climate-change-impacts-by-sector/agriculture#key1>, da 8-31-2012

Kudzu currently has invaded 2.5 million acres of the Southeast and is a carrier of the fungal disease soybean rust, which represents a major and expanding threat to U.S. soybean production.234 Controlling weeds currently costs the United States more than $11 billion a year, with the majority spent on herbicides;241 so both herbicide use and costs are likely to increase as temperatures and carbon dioxide levels rise. At the same time, the most widely used herbicide in the United States, glyphosate (RoundUp®), loses its efficacy on weeds grown at carbon dioxide levels that are projected to occur in the coming decades (see photos below). Higher concentrations of the chemical and more frequent spraying thus will be needed, increasing economic and environmental costs associated with chemical use.233 Many insect pests and crop diseases thrive due to warming, increasing losses and necessitating greater pesticide use. Warming aids insects and diseases in several ways.

#### Warming will increase pests and diseases – messes up agriculture

Global Change Research Program, 2009, <http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts/climate-change-impacts-by-sector/agriculture#key1>, da 8-31-2012

Rising temperatures allow both insects and pathogens to expand their ranges northward. In addition, rapidly rising winter temperatures allow more insects to survive over the winter, whereas cold winters once controlled their populations. Some of these insects, in addition to directly damaging crops, also carry diseases that harm crops. Crop diseases in general are likely to increase as earlier springs and warmer winters allow proliferation and higher survival rates of disease pathogens and parasites.193,234 The longer growing season will allow some insects to produce more generations in a single season, greatly increasing their populations. Finally, plants grown in higher carbon dioxide conditions tend to be less nutritious, so insects must eat more to meet their protein requirements, causing greater destruction to crops.

### Warming Bad – Superweeds

#### CO2 causes superweeds

The Grower, 3-28-2008, <http://www.thegrower.com/news/global_warming_may_create_superweeds_117890664.html>, da 8-31-2012

**One of the major characteristics of a warming planet is an increase in the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere**. Rising carbon dioxide has been shown to help vegetable and grain crops grow more quickly, become more drought resistant and produce potentially higher yields. **Unfortunately, though, the impact of rising carbon dioxide seems to be far more pronounced in the weeds that compete with crops than in the crops themselves**, says Lee Van Wychen, director of science policy for the Lenexa, Kan.-based society. "Weeds are survivors," he says. "They can fill various niches and thrive under a wide range of conditions**. While we have about 45 major crops in the U.S., there are more than 400 species of different weeds associated with those crops**. "**There is always another weed species ready to become a major competitor with a crop if growing conditions change, such as an increase in carbon dioxide levels."**

#### CO2 results in superweeds

The Grower, 3-28-2008, <http://www.thegrower.com/news/global_warming_may_create_superweeds_117890664.html>, da 8-31-2012

The effects of rising carbon dioxide levels on weeds can be striking. In a study conducted by Lewis Ziska, a plant physiologist with U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service in Beltsville, Md., **weeds grown under urban conditions of warmer temperatures and more carbon dioxide—conditions anticipated for the rest of the world in 50 years—grew to the height of those in a country plot 40 miles outside the city, where carbon dioxide and temperature reflected background conditions.**  **His research shows that common ragweed plants exposed to higher levels of carbon dioxide dramatically increased the amount of pollen they produced. A doubling in carbon dioxide led to a quadrupling of pollen.**   **Some people are allergic to ragweed pollen, resulting in the hay fever response, including sneezing and watery eyes. Additional work by Ziska also suggests that even recent increases in carbon dioxide during the past 50 years may have led to bigger poison ivy plants with a more virulent form of the oil that causes people to break out in a rash.** "As the climate and carbon dioxide levels change, we can no longer assume the weed control strategies we used in the past will continue to work," Ziska says. "Not only are some of the nation?s most invasive weeds spreading, but they are becoming more difficult and costly to control. Understanding the impact of increasing carbon dioxide on weed control is still in its infancy. While researchers explore new approaches, we will need to mix and match the strategies currently available."

#### Superweeds kill ag – outweighs any gains

Saikat, 5-17-2011, Indian Environmentalist Writer, <http://www.aboutmyplanet.com/environment/superweeds-winning-ground-over-crops-in-the-u-s/>, da 8-31-2012

**Just like human immunity might lose the battle one day against antibiotic resistant germs, so will the same fate befall agricultural crops**. In an alarming development**, the superweeds have risen from the ground and are suffocating crops all around them.** Weeds versus crops have been a battle since the beginning of agriculture. But the modern day fight has moved on to a different battleground where weeds are increasingly resistant to modern day herbicides. In the crosshairs is the widely used herbicide called glyphosate, commonly known as Roundup. An approximated 10 million of the 178 million acres of U.S. farmland growing corn, cotton, and soybeans are now overrun with weeds that are unassailable to the chemical. Herbicide use could cost the industry $1 Billion a year and may force farmers to review older practices that modern chemicals were supposed to replace. In the 1990s, agrotech giant Monsanto introduced genetically modified crops that could withstand glyphosate, so many farmers turned to Roundup as their sole herbicide. **Here started the problem as accidental propagation of a single species introduces genetic invariability – naturally bred resistances as the few weeds that survive pass their robustness to the next generation. 12 U.S. weed species no longer react to glyphosate, and since some seeds are windborne, resistance carries easily from one farm to another.**

### Warming Outweighs CO2 Ag

#### Even if warming theoretically helps crops, warmer temps kill them

Nicola Jones, editor for Nature, 5-5-2011, “Climate change curbs crops,” <http://www.nature.com/news/2011/110505/full/news.2011.268.html>, da 8-31-2012

Although warm temperatures can extend growing seasons, excessive heat generally restricts crop growth, and promotes pests and water loss. Additional rainfall, meanwhile, is beneficial up to a point. The authors used their modelling results to estimate the effect that temperature and rainfall trends had on each nation's food production from 1980 to 2008. They estimate that, despite the fertilizing effect of increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, the negative effect of climate change on plant growth has cut wheat production by 2.5%, but boosted that of rice by 2.9% and soya beans by 1.3%. It has also, they calculate, bumped up food commodity prices worldwide by about 6.4% over 30 years. The authors admit that their results are packed full of assumptions. They could be overestimating climate's effects, because the model doesn't account for the fact that farmers might switch to different crop varieties or change their planting dates as conditions change. Conversely, the results could be an underestimate, given that the model doesn't look specifically at extreme weather events such as droughts, floods and heatwaves. "It's the best we can do with the data available," says Lobell. Sooner than expected The general result of about a 5% yield loss per degree Celsius of warming is consistent with previous studies, says Lobell. But the authors' conclusions differ from previous work in a few important ways.

#### Increase CO2 is a net loss for global food production

Research News, 10-2-2002, “Increased CO2 Levels Are Mixed Blessing for Agirculture,” <http://researchnews.osu.edu/archive/co2plant.htm>, da 8-31-2012

But that boon comes with a price, said Peter Curtis, a professor of evolution, ecology and organismal biology at Ohio State University. Greater growth and reproduction may hurt the nutritional value of crops. “If you’re looking for a positive spin on rising CO2 levels, it’s that agricultural production in some areas is bound to increase,” Curtis said. “Crops have higher yields when more CO2 is available, even if growing conditions aren’t perfect. “But there’s a tradeoff between quantity and quality. While crops may be more productive, the resulting produce will be of lower nutritional quality.” Nutritional quality declines because while the plants produce more seeds under higher CO2 levels, the seeds contain less nitrogen. “The quality of the food produced by the plant decreases, so you’ve got to eat more of it to get the same benefits,” Curtis said. “Nitrogen is a critical component for building protein in animals, and much of the grain grown in the United States is fed to livestock.

#### Increase CO2 decreases nutritional value

Research News, 10-2-2002, “Increased CO2 Levels Are Mixed Blessing for Agirculture,” <http://researchnews.osu.edu/archive/co2plant.htm>, da 8-31-2012

“Wild plants are constrained by what they can do with increased CO2,” he said. “They may use it for survival and defense rather than to boost reproduction. Agricultural crops, on the other hand, are protected from pests and diseases, so they have the luxury of using extra CO2 to enhance reproduction.” Even though seed size increased, the amount of nitrogen in the seeds didn’t. Nitrogen levels decreased by an average of 14 percent across all plants except cultivated legumes, such as peas and soybeans. For example, the total number of seeds in wheat and barley plants increased by 15 percent, but the amount of nitrogen in the seeds declined by 20 percent. “That’s bad news,” Curtis said. “Nitrogen is important for building protein in humans and animals. If anything, plant biologists want to boost the levels of nitrogen in crops. “A growing global population demands more food, but humans would have to eat more of the food to get the same nutritional benefits.”

### AT: Warming Good – Soil Erosion

#### Warming increases soil erosion

Rattan Lal, Environment Prof @ Ohio State, 2005, “Climate Change, Soil Carbon Dynamics, and Global Food Security,” <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1201/9781420028614.ch5>, da 8-31-2012

Projected change in climate may influence several soil processes with a consequent adverse impact on soil quality (Brinkman and Sombroek, 1996). Important among these processes with an attendant adverse impact on soil quality are: • Hydrolysis: the leaching of silica and basic cations • Cheluviation: removal of Al and Fe by chelating organic acids • Ferrolysis: transformation of clay by alternating oxidation and reduction processes, and reduction in cation exchange capacity • Dissolution: of clay minerals by strong acids producing acid aluminum salts and amorphous silica • Clay formation: reverse weathering leading to clay formation and transformation Hydrolysis and cheluviation may accelerate with temperature increases, and ferrolysis may occur in soils subject to reduction and oxidation in high latitudes and monsoonal climates.

#### Warming will make soil erosion worse

Rattan Lal, Environment Prof @ Ohio State, 2005, “Climate Change, Soil Carbon Dynamics, and Global Food Security,” <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1201/9781420028614.ch5>, da 8-31-2012

Soil degradation is likel y to be accelerated by projected climate change, especially in ecologically sensitive regions. Global hot spots of soil erosion include the Himalayan– Tibetan ecosystem, the unterraced slopes of China and Southeast Asia, tropical areas of Southeast Nigeria, the semiarid Sahelian region of West Africa, sloping lands of Central America, and the Andean valleys and cerrado region of South America (Scherr and Yadav, 1996). Soil erosion rates are likely to change due to the erosive power of rainfall produced by more extreme precipitation events (IPCC, 1995).

#### Warming exacerbates soil erosion

Rattan Lal, Environment Prof @ Ohio State, 2005, “Climate Change, Soil Carbon Dynamics, and Global Food Security,” <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1201/9781420028614.ch5>, da 8-31-2012

Higher temperatures due to projected climate change, especially in arid and semi-arid regions, may produce higher evaporative demand for water and exacerbate the drought that often follows the plow (Glantz, 1994). If the soil and water are adequate, as with irrigation, it turns out that an increase in evaporative demand may heighten the risks of salinization (Brinkman and Sombroek, 1996). However, under high atmospheric CO2 conditions, there may be increased salt tolerance of crops (Bowman and Strain, 1987). Revegetation by overgrazing and other factors could exacerbate the problem of desertification (U.N. Environmental Programme, 1997), especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. Risks of overextraction of groundwater for irrigation in South Asia and also in the Near East/North Africa region are already recognized as serious (FAO, 1990). Soil degradation is thus a major threat to global food security (Oldeman, 1998), and this threat may be increased with anticipated climate change. Soil degradation, especially that caused by accelerated erosion, characteristically involves depletion of soil organic matter.

## Oil DA

### 1NC Oil DA 1/2

#### Oil prices are up and will stay high

Emily Pickrell, 8-30-2012, “Barclays predicts $180 oil by end of decade,” Fuel Fix, <http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/08/30/barclays-predicts-180-oil-by-end-of-the-decade/>, da 8-31-2012

Growing global demand for oil will push prices to $125 a barrel sometime next year and possibly to $180 by the end of the decade, according to a Barclays research report Thursday. While domestic oil production has increased with the discovery of new ways to extract oil from shale and other tight formations, the decline in new production from existing fields internationally will continue to drive up prices, according to Barclays. “Other factors are…destroying the simple case that sluggish economic performance plus shale oil must equal a rapidly loosening market,” Barclays wrote. “The solution to this apparent mystery is that while oil output is strong in the U.S., it has slumped elsewhere.”

**Transportation infrastructure investment lowers oil consumption and prices**

Energy Policy Information Center, 2011, “DOT: Friend or Foe to a Better Transportation System," <http://energypolicyinfo.com/2011/08/dot-friend-or-foe-to-a-better-transportation-system>, da 8-31-2012

Last week, a GOP lawmaker spoke on the radio about the discrepancy regarding the appointment of a federal agency to handle state-dependent transportation issues. Representative Cory Gardner (R-CO) suggested that the Department of Transportation (DoT) was serving as a somewhat ineffective middle man, and that states should be left to handle their own functions. While his concerns are mainly focused on Colorado being a net loser with regards to the federal gasoline tax**, there is value in maintaining a centralized, federal agency to coordinate efforts to improve the national transportation system. The current U.S. transportation system is outdated and requires massive infrastructure improvemen**ts. According to the “Urban Mobility Report” released by Texas Transportation Institute, in 2009, **Americans wasted 4.8 billion hours in traffic, equating to $115 billion and 3.9 billion wasted gallons of fuel. With high energy sources and oil dependence being at the forefront of many political discussions, not less, but more, focus needs to be placed on the DoT as an agency that has the potential to improve transportation infrastructure. The United States is currently ranked 15th in infrastructure competitiveness globally. A national infrastructure strategy is necessary to improve our current system. Effective reforms can help facilitate substantial reductions in U.S. oil consumption. Reducing unnecessary spending on fuel can help protect Americans from the volatility of oil prices**, as well as to reduce the trade deficit.

#### Low oil prices wreck Russia’s economy

International Economic Bulletin, 7-21-2011, “Russia: Stable but Critical”, <http://carnegie.ru/publications/?fa=45130>

Russia’s dependence on the oil price poses another significant medium-term risk. Already, two-thirds of Russia’s exports and almost half of its federal revenues are tied to the oil price. In fact, given current spending and investment trends, Russia’s budget and balance of payments will only stay balanced if the oil price continues to rise. And, even if it rises by 2 percent annually in real terms, the Economic Expert Group and the Gaidar Institute estimate that the deficit could rise to 10 percent of GDP by 2020 (from 0–2 percent currently) if today’s tax burden and economic growth rate hold and the government enacts all programs planned for the next five to seven years.3 Meanwhile, if the oil price were to stabilize—not even fall—the country’s fiscal position could easily deteriorate further and the implications for the current account balance could be even more dramatic. The current account strengthened in the first quarter of 2011 and led the Bank of Russia to allow significant ruble appreciation (15–20 percent) against the currencies of Russia’s biggest importers. But this was due entirely to the rising oil price, which increased from $70 per barrel at the beginning of 2010 to $107–$108 per barrel in the first half of 2011.

### 1NC Oil DA 2/2

#### Russian economic collapse causes nuclear conflict

Steven David, Prof. of political science at Johns Hopkins, 1999, Foreign Affairs, p. np

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

### Yes Oil Prices

#### High prices now

Emily Pickrell, 8-30-2012, “Barclays predicts $180 oil by end of decade,” Fuel Fix, <http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/08/30/barclays-predicts-180-oil-by-end-of-the-decade/>, da 8-31-2012

Production is declining each year by close to four million barrels per day, while annual global demand is rising by more than one million barrels per day, even in the weak economic environment. Political tensions in the Middle East could disrupt supplies further, worsening the shortfall in the coming years. This production gap will become more apparent in the third quarter of this year, according to Barclays. That will lead to higher oil prices and upward price pressure on exploration equipment, such as drilling rigs, and other services, as exploration companies chase production.

#### Oil prices up now – no release of SPR

Nasdaq, 8-30-2012, “Oil Prices Rise While Gasoline Gives Up Some Gains,” <http://www.nasdaq.com/article/oil-prices-rise-while-gasoline-gives-up-some-gains-20120828-00774>, da 8-31-2012

Gasoline futures Tuesday gave back some of their prior-day gains as the oil market weighed the impending arrival of Hurricane Isaac. Front-month oil futures for delivery on the New York Mercantile Exchange settled at $96.33 a barrel, up 86 cents or 0.9% after a report dismissed the chance of an emergency oil stockpile release. Gasoline futures, which jumped 2.5% Monday, closed at $3.126 per gallon, down 2.87 cents, or 0.9%. Brent futures settled at $112.58, up 32 cents. The combination of the rise in oil prices and drop in gasoline prices was a reversal of Monday's trading, when gasoline futures surged on news of U.S. refinery closures due to the threat posed by Isaac. On Monday, oil sank because of lower demand for crude resulting from the refinery closures and speculation that there could be a release of emergency oil stockpiles. But Tuesday, Maria Van der Hoeven, the executive director of the International Energy Agency, was quoted by Bloomberg News as saying there was no need for a strategic stock release because the oil market is "sufficiently well supplied."

#### Crude oil prices are up

WGME, 8-30-2012, “Heating oil prices going up this summer,” <http://www.wgme.com/template/inews_wire/wires.regional.me/20492dd6-www.wgme.com.shtml>, da 8-31-2012

The survey released Thursday says the average heating oil cost is currently $3.59 per gallon, a 32-cent increase from the last survey on June 25. The survey found a high of $3.80 in northern and eastern Maine and a low of $3.40 in southwestern Maine. State officials say heating oil is tracking with crude oil prices, which have grown from $79 a barrel in June to a current high of more than $90.

### Oil Prices Link – Generic

**Alternative transportation lowers oil prices**

Daniel J. Weiss, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, 3-7-2012, "How to Slash Oil Dependence," <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/07/439477/how-to-slash-oil-dependence>, da 8-31-2012

This progress, however, cannot mask the fundamental fact that **we rely too much on a single fuel and are thus extremely vulnerable to volatile prices or international events beyond our control. To end the oil price rollercoaster** that inflicts real damage to our economy and middle class, **we must dramatically curtail our reliance on oil as our primary transportation fuel.** As you know, high oil and gasoline prices slow economic growth and take a real toll on families’ already-strained budgets. Unlike many other commodities, demand for gasoline does not significantly decrease even as prices increase because most people cannot quickly and significantly reduce the amount they drive by changing jobs or buying a new home. Our last two presidents recognized that there are no quick fixes to reduce high oil or gasoline prices. In 2008 President George W. Bush said that “if there was a magic wand to wave, I’d be waving it” to lower prices. Last month President Obama said that “there are no silver bullets short term when it comes to gas prices—and anybody who says otherwise isn’t telling the truth.” He also noted that the United States uses 20 percent of the world’s annual oil consumption but has only 2 percent of the reserves. In lieu of wands, bullets, or slogans, this long-term problem requires long-term solutions. **We need a long-term “all of the above” strategy that generates long-term investments in modern fuel economy standards, alternative fuels, and public transportation that can reduce our vulnerability to future oil and gasoline price spikes.**

#### Alternate modes of transportation lower oil dependence

Center for American Progress, 3-24-2010, “It's Easy Being Green: Rail Transport Picks Up Speed,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/ebg_032310.html>, da 8-31-2012

The United States uses 25 percent of the entire world’s oil supply despite having only 5 percent of the world’s population, and sprawling communities force people to drive even short distances. We need alternate modes of transportation to kick this oil dependence, and one alternative is high-speed rail, which offers tantalizing environmental and economic benefits. President Barack Obama, Vice President Joseph Biden, and Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced a strategic plan for high-speed rail last year that includes $8 billion in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and $1 billion a year for five years in the federal budget. Their goal is to jumpstart a potential world-class rail system in the United States. These economic incentives for a mass U.S. network of high-speed rail trains, or HSR, along existing transportation corridors could create much-needed jobs, decrease our dependence on foreign oil and fossil fuels, and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Reducing gasoline use lowers oil prices

Lisa Margonelli, New America Foundation, 3-27-2012, “A New Green Agenda for Commuters”, [http://www.thenation.com/article/167078/new-green-agenda-commuters#](http://www.thenation.com/article/167078/new-green-agenda-commuters), da 8-31-2012

As gasoline prices passed $3.50 a gallon nationally, the politicking predictably kicked into overdrive. “There’s no reason we can’t get gasoline down to $2 and $2.50 a gallon,” said Newt Gingrich, who in February promised he would accomplish this via an agenda he called “Drill here, drill now, pay less.” Two days later three prominent Democrats, including Representative Ed Markey, called for President Obama to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower gas prices. The huge difference between the thinking of Republicans and Democrats disappears when it comes to gas prices. Both subscribe to the same dubious premise: we can lower prices by increasing supply. But over the past decade, such policies have had little effect on the global oil market. It’s time to change our approach: rather than trying to increase supply in a vain attempt to cut prices, progressives should be embracing policies that will reduce the amount of gasoline we use, thus reducing the impact of prices on household budgets and the national economy.

### Oil Prices Link – Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure investments reduce oil consumption

Peter Lehner, Exec. Dir. Natural Resources Defense Council, 6-20-2010, “Battling Our Oil Dependence Once and For All: A Blueprint” Bello Velo, <http://bellovelo.blogspot.com/2010/06/battling-our-oil-dependence-once-and.html>, da 8-31-2012

Our blueprint, the Route to Reform, prioritizes energy efficiency and security. It includes programs to complete the transportation system by building networks of intercity rail and buses, green freight and ports projects, transit projects in cities and towns, and nationally significant projects. And it makes a strong case for boosting national investments in transit to $500 billion over six years using a variety of financing tools such as a National Infrastructure Bank as proposed by President Obama. There’s real potential to save oil by adopting such policies. Analyses have found that by following our recommendations we could cut oil consumption by more than a million barrels a day by 2030. To sum up, we must use every tool at our disposal given the massive scale of the challenge. This means focusing on reforming our outdated, wasteful transportation law. I look forward to working with Congress and the President on this goal, for the sake of the Gulf, the planet, and future generations.

#### Infrastructure investment lowers oil prices

Treasury Department, 3-23-2012, “A New Economic Analysis Of Infrastructure Investment,” <http://www.treasury.gov/press-center/news/Pages/03232012-infrastructure.aspx>, da 8-31-2012

A more efficient transportation infrastructure system will reduce our dependence on oil, saving families time and money. Traffic congestion on our roads results in 1.9 billion gallons of gas wasted per year, and costs drivers over $100 billion in wasted fuel and lost time. More efficient air traffic control systems would save three billion gallons of jet fuel a year, translating into lower costs for consumers. Finally, new research indicates that Americans who were able to live in “location efficient” housing were able to save $200 per month in lower costs, including paying less at the pump, over the past decade.

#### Additional transportation investments move away from oil

Elgie Holstein, DOE co-chair, 4-11-2011, “Thinking Long Term On America's Energy Future,” <http://blogs.edf.org/energyexchange/2011/04/01/thinking-long-term-about-americas-energy-future/>, da 8-31-2012

On Wednesday, President Obama, speaking at Georgetown University, set out a multi-pronged approach to boosting America’s energy security. We agree that America “cannot keep going from shock to trance on the issue of energy security, rushing to propose action when gas prices rise, then hitting the snooze button when they fall again." President Obama’s goals to leverage alternative fuels, increase efficiency, and invest in smart grid technology, advanced vehicles, high speed rail, and public transit are critical steps toward a truly clean energy economy. The core objectives of our Energy Program are to help accelerate the deployment of large-scale, clean technologies into the nation’s energy system and remake the market for efficiency and innovation. Our goal is to reduce the environmental impact of energy production, delivery, and use. Why? Because investments in clean technology will bring about the clean energy revolution we need by greatly reducing our use of dirty fuels and improving air quality and, thus, the health of millions of Americans – especially children and the elderly.

### Oil Prices Link – Alternative Transportation

#### Public transportation lowers oil consumption and prices

Daniel J. Weiss, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, 3-7-2012, "How to Slash Oil Dependence," <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/07/439477/how-to-slash-oil-dependence>, da 8-31-2012

In addition, the administration and many in **Congress have supported investments in alternative-fuel vehicles, particularly electric passenger vehicles and natural-gas-powered trucks.** Congress must act on these proposals. Unfortunately, **the pending House transportation bill would disinvest in public transportation—something that’s essential to us using less oil** and protecting families from high gasoline prices. While withholding investments for alternatives to oil, we continue tax breaks for Big Oil companies even though the price of oil is nearly double compared to when President Bush said that such support was unnecessary. This includes tax breaks for the big five oil companies—BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, and Shell—which made a record $137 billion in profits in 2011 while they produced 4 percent less oil. It makes little sense to continue $4 billion in annual oil and gas tax breaks for oil and gas companies. Instead, we should invest these revenues in helping Americans reduce their oil and gasoline use and save money. There is a proven tool to provide some temporary relief now from high prices. Selling a small amount of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in coordination with sales from International Energy Agency reserves would boost world oil supplies. Such a sale has occurred under the last four presidents and has lowered oil and gasoline prices every time. This can cut prices and burst the “bubble” caused by Wall Street speculators driving up oil prices for a quick profit. Finally, the Commodities Future Trading Commission must finalize the position limits on large Wall Street speculators to reduce their impact on volatile, high oil prices. Today’s hearing on high gasoline prices is like the rerun of a bad movie. It’s up to you to change the finale**. Congress must slash oil dependence by supporting the doubling of vehicle fuel economy standards, investing in alternative fuels, rejuvenating our public transportation infrastructure**, and paying for it by ending Big Oil tax breaks. The American people would give this ending a standing ovation.

#### Alternate fuels lower oil use

Christine Parthemore, fellow @ NAS, September 2010, “Fueling the Future Force Preparing the Department of Defense for a Post-Petroleum Era,” <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_Fueling%20the%20Future%20Force_NaglParthemore.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

To date, **DOD** has focused heavily on generating renewable electricity at domestic installations, but it **should expand this focus to include reducing petroleum use in vehicle** fleets. **Moving to alternative fuels in ground vehicles will be easier than displacing aviation fuels, which require an array of additional specifications.** At its installations, DOD also has more alternative fueling options that those designed for use in aviation (e.g., **DOD** cannot fly its aircraft with electricity today, but it **can adopt electric ground vehicles** if they meet the guiding principles outlined above). **This added flexibility allows individual bases to invest in energy sources that make sense given regional renewable energy production capabilities and infrastructure.**

#### Non-fossil fuel transportation would reduce oil prices

Union of Concerned Scientists, 2005, “Public Benefits of Renewable Energy,” [www.ucsusa.org/clean\_energy/our-energy-choices/renewable-energy/public-benefits-of-renewable.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/our-energy-choices/renewable-energy/public-benefits-of-renewable.html), da 8-31-2012

An additional benefit of increased competition from renewables-and thus reduced demand for fossil fuels-could be lower prices for electricity generated from fossil fuels. Several analyses reviewed in Chapter 2 show that competition from increasing renewables could reduce natural gas prices. A comprehensive modeling project of the New England Governors' Conference found that an aggressive renewables scenario, in which renewables made up half of all new generation, would depress natural gas prices enough to lead to a slight overall reduction in regional electricity prices compared with what prices would be if new generation came primarily from fossil fuels.[31] The nation's fossil fuel dependence also has serious implications for national security, since the United States could again be forced to protect foreign sources of oil to meet our energy needs. During the Persian Gulf War in 1991, US troops were sent in partly to guard against a possible cutoff of the US oil supply. The public continues to pay taxes to support the protection of overseas oil supplies by US armed forces. Reliance on foreign oil also makes the United States vulnerable to fuel price shocks or shortages if supply is disrupted. In 1997, about a third of US oil came from the Middle East. By 2030, if energy policy does not change, the country may be relying on Middle Eastern, and possibly Central Asian, oil for two-thirds of its supply. Some analysts believe that oil discovery peaked in the early 1960s and that a decline in global oil production, and the beginning of increasingly high prices, will occur within 10 to 12 years.[32] Some regions, especially New England, still use significant amounts of oil for electricity generation even though nationwide most oil is used for transportation. Electric vehicles, especially if powered from renewable sources, could also play an increasingly important role in reducing oil use and emissions from the transportation sector. And higher oil prices, absent sufficient fuel competition, could lead to higher prices for other fossil fuels.

### Oil Prices Link – HSR

#### HSR lowers oil use

Louise M. Slaughter, representative, 2-8-2011, “A Bold Investment in Our Future”, <http://www.louise.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2423:a-bold-investment-in-our-future&catid=69&Itemid=59>, da 8-31-2012

A national high speed rail system would provide a national security defense here at home. It would serve as a modern network to move both civilian and military personnel at a moment’s notice, while freeing our freight rail lines to move goods and supplies. In addition, recent events in the Middle East have again reminded us of how closely tied we are to the oil-rich Middle East to meet our energy needs. This dependency is bad for America’s national security interests, and will only get worse as the world’s oil supply reaches its peak and begins to decline. A national high speed rail system ends our oil dependency quickly and permanently, and prevents our country from being dragged into future struggles to secure oil to meet our energy needs. In addition to our dependence on foreign oil, we face an increasingly urgent climate crisis, with more severe and dangerous storms grinding commerce to a halt, stranding millions, and threatening human life. These storms are just the latest reminder that the benefits of a greener rail system can no longer wait.

#### HSR solves oil dependence – empirics

Steve Yetiv, poly sci prof @ ODU, 2-1-2010, “US high-speed rail to the rescue", <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0201/US-high-speed-rail-to-the-rescue>, da 8-31-2012

**High-speed rail is an important part of the answer to** much of America's travel and environmental woes, not to mention potentially **easing American oil dependence**. The United States, as Obama pointed out recently just needs to take it seriously. Around the world, **high-speed trains have roundly beaten planes on price, overall travel time, and convenience** at ranges of up to 600 miles. **Consider** what happened in **Europe: Commercial flights all but disappeared after high-speed trains were established between Paris and Lyon**. And in the first year of operation, a Madrid-to-Barcelona high-speed link cut the air travel market about 50 percent. Traveling by train from London to Paris generates just 1/10th the amount of carbon dioxide as traveling by plane, according to one study. Consider Asia: While America fumbles, China has seen the light. It plans to build 42 high-speed rail lines across 13,000 kilometers (some 8,000 miles) in the next three years. The Chinese Railway Ministry says that rail can transport 160 million people per year compared with 80 million for a four-lane highway. In addition to the central goal of decreasing oil use and pollution, China seeks to bolster its economy with investment in rail and also to satisfy the demands for mobility of its growing middle class. For America, **as fewer people opt for gas-guzzling air or car travel, a high-speed rail system would hit US oil dependence right where it counts: in the gas tank.**

#### HSR ends US oil dependence

Steve Yetiv, poly sci prof @ ODU, 2-1-2010, “US high-speed rail to the rescue", <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0201/US-high-speed-rail-to-the-rescue>, da 8-31-2012

**We spend a lot of time bemoaning US oil dependence**, the job market, and horrible air travel, **but high-speed rail is the answer right in front of us.** What should be done to make it a reality nation-wide? First, state leaders should encourage citizens to really consider the long-term benefits. **High-speed rail would** not only create jobs for Americans, it would actually increase our national security over time by **help**ing **us get off our oil addiction** – an addiction that strengthens our adversaries and leaves us vulnerable to foreign crises and oil disruptions. Investment in rail is well worth it.

### Link Booster – Backstopping

#### Alternative energy investments cause backstopping – lowers oil prices

Energy Tech Stocks, 1-27-2008, “Petro-politics Expert Marcel,” <http://energytechstocks.com.previewmysite.com/wp/?cat=15&paged=2>, da 8-31-2012

Saudi Arabia still has a lot of oil; nevertheless, the world doesn’t have enough to meet forecasted demand of roughly 115 million barrels a day by 2030, a more than 30% increase over today’s 87 million barrel daily consumption. Shorter term, should OPEC members feel threatened by new alternative energy technologies, they very well may flood the market, temporarily driving crude prices down in order to make the new technologies appear financially unattractive. That’s the analysis of Valerie Marcel, a Dubai-based petro-politics expert and the author of “Oil Titans: National Oil Companies in the Middle East.”

#### Plan causes the Saudis to play hardball, dropping oil prices

Energy Tech Stocks, 1-27-2008, “Petro-politics Expert Marcel,” <http://energytechstocks.com.previewmysite.com/wp/?cat=15&paged=2>, da 8-31-2012

During a lengthy conversation, Marcel, who is an associate fellow at UK-based Chatham House, one of Europe’s leading foreign policy think-tanks, told EnergyTechStocks.com that she wasn’t optimistic that oil shortages can be avoided, despite growing recognition of the problem in major oil-consuming nations. Marcel further said that the Saudi national oil company – Saudi Aramco – appears worried about fuel cell vehicles and other attempts by the world to wean itself off oil, and that should it and other OPEC members feel threatened, they would “play hardball,” flooding the market in an attempt to derail the new technologies. Marcel said that after 36 separate interviews with oil company officials, she believes Saudi Arabia probably has about 75 years of reserves remaining at current production rates, and that the Kingdom is capable of raising daily production from around nine million barrels a day currently to a sustained 12.5 million per day, which is its plan. At the same time, Marcel said she understands why, given the Kingdom’s self-imposed secrecy surrounding its oil industry, the world keeps asking, “Why should we trust them?

#### OPEC will backstop in response to the plan

David Goodstein, PhD, Physics Prof @ Caltech, December 2007, “OPEC Accepts No Substitute,” Nature Physics 3.11, p. np

For decades, it has been the explicit policy of OPEC to keep the price of oil within certain limits: not too low, of course, to preserve revenue; but also not too high, because that would encourage investment in alternative fuels. The implicit threat is this: if you put money into developing an alternative to oil, we will open the spigot, flood the market with cheap oil and wipe out your investment. In other words, the war with Iraq may also have been about preventing investment in alternative fuels.

### Link Booster – Perception

#### US action gets modeled

Steve A. Yetiv, poly sci prof @ ODU, and Lowell Feld, oil markets analyst @ EIA, Fall 2007, “America's Oil Market Power: The Unused Weapon Against Iran,” World Policy Journal, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb6669/is_3_24/ai_n29403801/>, da 8-31-2012

As world oil demand is projected to increase at least through 2025, some might argue that this would diminish the impact of a U.S. 3 MMBD reduction plan. This is not the case. All other things being equal, the 3 MMBD reduction in oil demand would lead to higher spare capacity and lower oil prices. Recall that we are discussing reductions from current baseline projections of future global demand, which include rising demand from China and India. These projections do not include the type reductions envisioned in our plan. Thus, one can reasonably expect the program to impact price, even under the expectation of rising global demand. In addition, the 3 MMBD plan is merely a conservative starting point for an overall, long-term strategy. Over time, the United States could continue to take action towards cutting its oil consumption, and that could spur other countries to follow suit. But even if other nations choose not to pursue similar policies, U.S. action alone would likely decrease oil prices.

#### Perception triggers our link

Martin Feldstein, Harvard Prof, 7-1-2008, “We Can Lower Oil Prices Now,” Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121486800837317581.html?mod=opinion_main_commentaries>, da 8-31-2012

Unlike perishable agricultural products, oil can be stored in the ground. So when will an owner of oil reduce production or increase inventories instead of selling his oil and converting the proceeds into investible cash? A simplified answer is that he will keep the oil in the ground if its price is expected to rise faster than the interest rate that could be earned on the money obtained from selling the oil. The actual price of oil may rise faster or slower than is expected, but the decision to sell (or hold) the oil depends on the expected price rise. There are of course considerations of risk, and of the impact of price changes on long-term consumer behavior, that complicate the oil owner's decision – and therefore the behavior of prices. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (the OPEC cartel), with its strong pricing power, still plays a role. But the fundamental insight is that owners of oil will adjust their production and inventories until the price of oil is expected to rise at the rate of interest, appropriately adjusted for risk. If the price of oil is expected to rise faster, they'll keep the oil in the ground. In contrast, if the price of oil is not expected to rise as fast as the rate of interest, the owners will extract more and invest the proceeds. The relationship between future and current oil prices implies that an expected change in the future price of oil will have an immediate impact on the current price of oil. Thus, when oil producers concluded that the demand for oil in China and some other countries will grow more rapidly in future years than they had previously expected, they inferred that the future price of oil would be higher than they had previously believed. They responded by reducing supply and raising the spot price enough to bring the expected price rise back to its initial rate. Hence, with no change in the current demand for oil, the expectation of a greater future demand and a higher future price caused the current price to rise.

#### Link is perception – plan doesn’t have to affect prices today

Martin Feldstein, Harvard Prof, 7-1-2008, “We Can Lower Oil Prices Now,” Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121486800837317581.html?mod=opinion_main_commentaries>, da 8-31-2012

Now here is the good news. Any policy that causes the expected future oil price to fall can cause the current price to fall, or to rise less than it would otherwise do. In other words, it is possible to bring down today's price of oil with policies that will have their physical impact on oil demand or supply only in the future. For example, increases in government subsidies to develop technology that will make future cars more efficient, or tighter standards that gradually improve the gas mileage of the stock of cars, would lower the future demand for oil and therefore the price of oil today. Similarly, increasing the expected future supply of oil would also reduce today's price. That fall in the current price would induce an immediate rise in oil consumption that would be matched by an increase in supply from the OPEC producers and others with some current excess capacity or available inventories. Any steps that can be taken now to increase the future supply of oil, or reduce the future demand for oil in the U.S. or elsewhere, can therefore lead both to lower prices and increased consumption today

### High Prices Good – Russian Economy

#### Decreased oil prices destroys Russia’s economy

Al Fin, 8-8-2011, “Will Russia and China Collapse Before 2020?”, <http://oilprice.com/Geo-Politics/International/Will-Russia-and-China-Collapse-Before-2020.html>, da 8-31-2012

The key factor that will determine Russia’s collapse will be the price of oil. Five years ago, a balanced budget required only $30 per barrel of oil. This year, it has jumped to $115 because of higher government spending, waste and corruption. Next year, the figure will increase even further to $125 per barrel. If the price of oil drops to $90 a barrel, this will be the beginning of a serious economic crisis for Russia. The stabilization fund might be able to hold the budget over for a couple of years, but inevitably the state will have to cut back on social programs. These cuts in social spending will only exacerbate public discontent. It may also provoke self-sufficient regions to rethink their loyalty to Moscow.

#### Oil prices are key to Russian economy

Al Fin, 8-8-2011, “Will Russia and China Collapse Before 2020?”, <http://oilprice.com/Geo-Politics/International/Will-Russia-and-China-Collapse-Before-2020.html>, da 8-31-2012

The key factor that will determine Russia’s collapse will be the price of oil. Five years ago, a balanced budget required only $30 per barrel of oil. This year, it has jumped to $115 because of higher government spending, waste and corruption. Next year, the figure will increase even further to $125 per barrel. If the price of oil drops to $90 a barrel, this will be the beginning of a serious economic crisis for Russia. The stabilization fund might be able to hold the budget over for a couple of years, but inevitably the state will have to cut back on social programs. These cuts in social spending will only exacerbate public discontent. It may also provoke self-sufficient regions to rethink their loyalty to Moscow. \_MoscowTimes Russia's economy is critically dependent upon the price of natural resources -- specifically gas and oil.

#### Prices are key to the Russian economy and stability

Al Fin, 8-8-2011, “Will Russia and China Collapse Before 2020?”, <http://oilprice.com/Geo-Politics/International/Will-Russia-and-China-Collapse-Before-2020.html>, da 8-31-2012

The growing global boom in shale gas due to North American methods of horizontal drilling and fracking, have cut the legs from under Russia's extortionate pricing for natural gas sales to Europe and elsewhere. Now, if a global economic downturn causes sustained lower oil prices as well, Russia's government will be hard pressed to maintain popular morale -- or more properly, popular indifference to the Moscow government's corruption and mismanagement. Most Russian adults do not vote, largely because they have lost faith in any hope that post-Soviet elections can be pluralistic, free and fair. The one factor that has kept middle-class Russians distracted from politics is their high level of consumption. As long as they have money to spend, they will have much more interest in consumer goods than who is sitting in the State Duma, local legislatures, Kremlin or White House — or their policies. But as soon as this relative prosperity drops, civil protest will surely awaken. Any student of economics can name a dozen factors that carry a risk of economic collapse. Among them are the high dependence on natural resources; low productivity; an ineffective, corrupt, bloated and overly centralized state apparatus; dependent courts; technological backwardness; and an unattractive investment climate. These factors, among others, generate a vicious cycle of poverty and excludes the implementation of a long-term development strategy for the country. It also guarantees a flight of capital, as well as Russia’s most talented and innovative people to freer and more open societies. \_MoscowTimes

### Russian Economy Impacts

#### Russian economic decline causes nuclear war

Sehldon Filger, Staff Huffington, 2009, http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356

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

#### Decrease in oil price wrecks Russia’s sovereignty and economy

Gleb Brynanski and Timothy Heritage, 4-20-2011, “Putin warns Russia against economic complacency” <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2011/04/20/uk-russia-putin-idUKTRE73J1CE20110420>, da 8-31-2012

But he said Russia also faced unspecified external threats to its $1.5 trillion (915 billion pound) economy and the country of 143 million people could not afford to sit back after overcoming the worst of the financial crisis. "Based on GDP, Russia should enter the ranks of the five leading countries (by 2020)," he told deputies, adding that GDP per capita should reach $35,000 by then. "The current beneficial environment in the raw materials and hydrocarbons (markets) should not make us relax. The oil boom we are witnessing only underlines the need to move quickly to a new model of economic development." High oil prices helped fuel Russia's economic resurgence during Putin's 2000-2008 presidency and the price of oil, Russia's main export commodity, is up 28 percent this year. But the economy is over-reliant on energy and raw materials exports, and any fall in the oil price will have a big impact on its overall economic performance unless it diversifies. "Economic weakness and sensitivity to external shocks result in threats to national sovereignty," Putin said, calling for a decade of "strong, calm" economic development and referring to unnamed groups which he said wanted to destabilise Russia. "Let's be frank. In the modern world, if you are weak, there is always someone who will come in and unequivocally recommend which way to go, what policy to conduct, what path to choose."

### AT: Diversification Link Turn

#### High prices spill over to other technologies – leads to economic growth and diversification

Ed Bentley, staff writer @ Moscow News, Moscow News, 6-6-2008, “Russia’s Roaring Economy not out of the Forest”, <http://www.themoscownews.com/business/20080606/55331949.html>, da 8-31-2012

The rising price of energy products appears extremely beneficial for Russia's economy. The revenue from exports is already massive and this has helped fuel growth in the last eight years. Any further increase will certainly be an opportunity but could also present serious challenges. Russia has been accused of being dependent upon its natural resources for growth. The World Bank and IMF claim that the energy sector makes up approximately twenty percent of GDP. The economy is therefore vulnerable to changes in this sector, although an oil price decrease looks unlikely, and the government has recognized the necessity of diversification. "The focus of economic policies..." said the Russian Ambassador to the EU, Vladimir Chizhov, when speaking to EurActiv the day before Medvedev's inauguration, "is to decrease the reliance on oil and gas exports and to use the money accumulated thanks to the high world prices to stimulate the development of other sectors, primarily the innovation sectors, nanotechnologies, high-tech, also improving the infrastructure, including transport infrastructure." Diversification of the technological sector would help to modernize the economy and lead to massive productivity increases. Nano-technologies have been cited as one of Russia's key market opportunities in the next 10 years.

#### Oil is key to the Russian economy – it’s the prerequisite to diversification

Ed Bentley, staff writer @ Moscow News, Moscow News, 6-6-2008, “Russia’s Roaring Economy not out of the Forest”, <http://www.themoscownews.com/business/20080606/55331949.html>, da 8-31-2012

Last year, GDP increased by 8.1 percent, marking an eighth straight year of economic growth. GDP has increased by an average of 7.8 percent a year since 2000, making Russia significantly richer than when Putin assumed office. The IMF predicts that economic growth will remain over 5 percent a year until 2013. However, Russia's GDP per capita of $9,075 is still significantly below that of other G8 nations. Both the U.S. and the U.K. have a GDP per capita of approximately $45,000 and this is set to rise to $55,723 in the U.S. by 2013, according to IMF data. The IMF estimates that GDP per capita in Russia will be $25,090 in 2013. Presently, Russians are less wealthy than their G8 counterparts. Prospects Until 2020 Due to energy prices the Russian economy is in a position with significant potential. Eight years of impressive growth are likely to continue into the future and Russia will begin to catch up with other countries according to IMF predictions. However, for the long term success and stability of the economy, two significant challenges must be overcome. Lowering inflation would create a stable economy which would encourage investment and fuel future growth. Furthermore, diversification is needed to ensure long term growth and protect against shocks in the energy market. As Chizhov suggested, developing high tech industries would allow for substantial growths in GDP and productivity, extending beyond 2020.

#### No link – Oil is not exclusive because it helps the rest of the economy too

Steven Dashevsky , CFA @ Baruch College NYU, Senior economic analyst @ Aton, Managing Director of Dashevsky & Partners, 5-24-2011, “The Russian economy and its oil”, <http://rt.com/business/news/russia-economy-oil-rpice/>, da 8-31-2012

There are elements of Dutch disease, so I think not all the symptoms are here because the oil industry is not, Dutch disease happens when one industry, in this case oil and gas industry, really begins to crowd out investment and jobs and becomes the centre of everything, so the rest of the economy kind of dies.In the Russian case, it’s a little bit different because a lot of the money that flows into the country, via the oil and gas sector, subsequently flows further into the economy. So the impact from the oil and gas sector for example, on the currency is not what it used to be.So, yeah, if the oil prices are high it gets stronger, but it’s not dramatically stronger, and I think the economy is becoming, in relative terms, it is getting better if oil prices are high, instead of getting worse. Dutch disease really happens if there is one sector that is doing well and it drains resources from all the other sectors.In Russia’s case when oil prices are high, all sectors are enjoying it because it trickles down to the entire economy.So I think there are certain elements of it, but I don’t think Russia has Dutch disease, and whatever people say, fortunately if oil prices are high it is good for Russia, and it is good for Russia as a whole, not just for Russian oil companies.”

### **AT: Diversification Link Turn**

#### Russia is different – it can avoid the resource curse

Martin Gilman, senior representative @ IMF Russia, professor at the Hig her School of Economics @ Moscow., 2008, <http://www.times.spb.ru/index.php?action_id=2&story_id=26292>, da 8-31-2012

Russia’s leaders are well aware of the poor track record of oil and other commodity producers in squandering their natural wealth inheritance on wasteful spending, white-elephant projects and corruption. Good examples of this phenomenon include Gabon, Iraq, Libya, Nigeria, Venezuela and Zambia. These countries have all gambled their future on the hope that high commodity prices would continue for the foreseeable future. The problem is that they rarely do.Russia has done well so far in avoiding this infamous “resource curse.” The budget surpluses, the reserve fund, a three-year rolling budget for planning purposes, the analytical use of a non-oil budget and its high external reserves underscore its commitment to maintaining a prudent stance. Moreover, with a booming economy, medium-term prospects are favorable. Relative to most other countries, Russia is in an enviable position. For Russia, oil is not a curse. But it does certainly complicate life.

#### Decreasing oil prices collapse the Russian economy – undermines the government

Luke Harding, lead correspondent @ Guardian, “Russia close to economic collapse as oil price falls, experts predict” 11-20-2008, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/nov/20/oil-russia-economy-putin-medvedev>, da 8-31-2012

The collapse in the value of oil was likely to have several catastrophic consequences for Russia including a possible devaluation of the rouble and a severe drop in living standards next year, they warned. With oil prices tumbling, and his own credibility at stake, Russia's prime minister Vladimir Putin today insisted that the country's economy was still robust. Speaking at a meeting of the pro-Kremlin United Russia party, Putin told delegates in Moscow the country would survive the current global financial turmoil - which he blamed on the US. But the Kremlin is acutely aware that any loss of confidence in the Russian economy could lead to a loss of confidence in Putin and his ally Dmitry Medvedev, who took over from Putin as Russia's president in May. Medvedev's biggest initiative so far has been to float an extension in the presidential term from four to six years - a proposal that entrenches the current Kremlin's grip on power, and which Russia's loyal Duma is likely to approve on Saturday. Putin today said his administration would do everything it could to prevent a recurrence of Russia's last oil-related financial crash in 1998 - which saw the savings of many ordinary Russians wiped out. But the plummeting oil price leaves him little room for manoeuvre.

#### Falling oil prices cause Russian collapse

Luke Harding, lead correspondent @ Guardian, “Russia close to economic collapse as oil price falls, experts predict” 11-20-2008, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/nov/20/oil-russia-economy-putin-medvedev>, da 8-31-2012

Experts suggest that Russia's economy is now facing profound difficulties, despite two massive stabilisation funds accumulated during the booming oil years. The fall in oil prices from $147 this July to below $50 today has blown a gaping hole in the government's budget calculations. It is now facing a $150bn shortfall in its spending plans - and will have to slash expenditure in 2009. Today Putin sought to assure hard-up Russians that their social benefits would not be affected, promising a $20bn assistance package. "We will do everything, everything in our power ... so that the collapses of the past years should never be repeated," he said. The oil slump, however, exacerbates Russia's already severe economic problems. Since May Russian markets have lost 70% of their value. Russia's central bank, meanwhile, has been spent $57.5bn in two months trying to prop up the country's ailing currency. "If the current trend continues with the government supporting the rouble, oil prices falling and a slowing economy we are going to have a major crisis," said Chris Weafer, an analyst with the Moscow brokerage Uralsib.

### High Prices Good – US Economy

#### Low gas prices bad cause deflation and loss of consumer confidence, destroying economic recovery

Annalyn Censky, 8-19-2011, “Falling Gas Prices: A Blessing and a Curse’, <http://www.channel3000.com/news/28916746/detail.html>, da 8-31-2012

But that's not the entire story. Remember the 2008 recession? Gas prices fell then too, and it still wasn't enough to bail out the American consumer. "There's a fine line here. When falling prices cross the line into deflationary prices and economic activity freezes up, that becomes a real problem," said Phil Flynn, senior market analyst with PFG Best. And the reason for the recent drop in oil prices is concerning. Uncertainty is high given all the political divide in Washington, the S&P downgrade and the escalating debt crisis in Europe. Weak data on jobs and housing lately certainly hasn't helped. Amid those factors, oil traders expect demand for oil and gasoline will fall. "The recent sell-off in oil is because of concern that we may be slipping back into a double-dip recession," Flynn said. "We're being driven by fear right now." Of course, that fear is not just contained to oil traders -- it spills over into the general American public. If uncertainty gets to the point where it paralyzes small business owners from hiring, consumers from purchasing big-ticket items or investors from putting their money in stocks, the U.S. economy slows even further.

#### Low oil prices signal economic slowdown in the US and globally

Nouriel Roubini, Econ Prof @ NYU, 10-10-2006, “Confusing Cause and Effect: Why Lower Oil Prices is Bad News for the U.S. Economy” RGE premium content, p. np

One of the arguments repeatedly heard these days among soft-landing optimists is that the recent fall in oil and energy and commodity prices is good news for the US consumer and the US economy as it reduces inflation and provides higher real incomes to consumers allowing them to continue to sustain their high consumption levels. Unfortunately this interpretation confuses cause and effect: whenever the US and the global economy has experienced a recession oil and commodity prices sharply fell at the outset and during such recession as low global demand leads to lower commodities demand; thus, while high and rising oil and commodity prices are a sign of a perky US and global economy (as in 2004-2005) falling oil and commodity prices are actually a sign of a slowing US and global economy. Thus, the recently falling oil prices are a signal of bad news ahead, not good news. Of course once a slowdown or recession leads to sharply lower oil and commodity prices such a fall in prices dampens the depth of an economic recession: but such falling prices are a second order consequence of the fall in demand that has a first order effect on economic growth.

#### Low prices don’t boost growth

Edmund O’Sullivan, staff writer, 8-18-2011, “Dispelling the myth of the oil price shock,” MEED, <http://www.meed.com/sectors/oil-and-gas/oil-upstream/dispelling-the-myth-of-the-oil-price-shock/3107205.article>, da 8-31-2012

US politicians are angry about Opec and gasoline prices, but there is new evidence that oil price increases do not seriously damage the world economy Still toying with the idea of running in the 2012 US presidential race, Donald Trump once more piled into oil producers group Opec about high American gasoline prices in an interview with Fox News in August. Oil should be $30 a barrel and not $100, he said. The only reason why it is not is because Opec conspires against the US and should be broken up. Not only will sharply lower oil prices be bad for oil-exporting nations, it will do little to help the world economy generally and the developing world in particular Economics will be the big issue in next year’s elections and opinion polls this summer suggest it will end President Obama’s presidency with a landslide for any credible Republican Party contender. Opec is an irresistible target for everyone hoping to tap US voters’ anger about joblessness, still accounting for 9 per cent of the US labour force. But it is also conventional wisdom among economists that oil price rises are bad, not only for the US, but for the world. A new report released by the IMF in August falsifies this argument. Using a global dataset covering the years since 1970, IMF economists Tobias Rasmussen and Agustin Roitman indeed demonstrate that oil price rises hurt the US economy, but America is the exception. For the rest of the world, the story is different. “…We find no evidence of a widespread contemporaneous effect (from oil price rises) on economic output across oil-importing countries, but rather value and volume increases in both imports and exports,” say the authors. “These findings suggest that the higher import demand in oil-exporting economies resulting from oil price increases has an important and immediate offsetting effect on economic activity in the rest of the world, and that the adverse consequences are mostly relatively mild and occurring with a lag.”

### AT: High Prices Bad – Oil Shocks

#### No impact to oil shocks – they have minimal effects, the economy is resilient

Philip Auerswald, assistant professor and director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy at the School of Public Policy, George Mason University, June 2007, “The Irrelevance of the Middle East,” The American Interest, <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=269>, da 8-31-2012

Macroeconomic evidence to support such dramatic claims is simply non-existent. Even with reference to the oil shocks of the 1970s, the causal link between oil supply disruption and economic downturn is not as clear as is widely believed. Among macroeconomists who have studied that era, policy decisions—in particular, monetary policy and Nixon-initiated price controls from 1971 to 1979—are generally agreed to have been important, if not the dominant, contributing factors to the recessions of that period. Indeed, a study co-authored by current Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke in 1997, based on 1965–95 data, found that interest rate adjustments historically accounted for most of the depressing effects of oil price shocks on the economy. While one can construct a macroeconomic model in which oil shocks do cause recessions of the magnitude observed in the mid 1970s, early 1980s and early 1990s, most models predict substantially smaller effects.

#### Even major oil shocks don’t hurt the economy

Philip Auerswald, assistant professor and director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy at the School of Public Policy, George Mason University, June 2007, “The Irrelevance of the Middle East,” The American Interest, <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=269>, da 8-31-2012

A rough consensus suggests that a 100 percent increase in oil prices today should lead to a 1 percent drop in aggregate output. And, as already noted, recent experience indicates that even this far-from-cataclysmic impact is likely an overestimate. Nearly everyone agrees, moreover, that thanks to policy, organizational and technological innovations, the oil-consuming economies of developed countries are far more resilient in the face of short-term oil supply disruptions today than they were thirty years ago. The strategic oil reserves of the OECD countries have grown to more than a billion barrels, representing a significant short-term response capability. We also use energy inputs far more efficiently than we did thirty years ago. And for all their negative lessons, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita demonstrated that the U.S. economy can adapt quickly to infrastructure disruption. How many terrorist cells would it have taken to damage Gulf Coast production and refining facilities as thoroughly as did those two storms? And even then, with the aggravating impact of the war in Iraq and speculative activity in the oil markets, the observed macroeconomic impact has been negligible.

#### No impact – oil is only a small part of economies

Tobias Rasmussen, Senior Economist, Middle East and Central Asia Department, IMF, and Agustin Roitman, Economist IMF, 8-25-2011, “Oil shocks around the world: are they really that bad?” <http://voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/6905>, da 8-31-2012

Across the world, oil price shock episodes have generally not been associated with a contemporaneous decline in output but, rather, with increases in both imports and exports. There is evidence of lagged negative effects on output, particularly for OECD economies, but the magnitude has typically been small. Controlling for global economic conditions, and thus abstracting from our finding that oil price increases generally appear to be demand-driven, makes the impact of higher oil prices stand out more clearly. For a given level of world GDP, we do find that oil prices have a negative effect on oil-importing countries and also that cross-country differences in the magnitude of the impact depend to a large extent on the relative magnitude of oil imports. The effect is still not particularly large, however, with our estimates suggesting that a 25% increase in oil prices will typically cause a loss of real GDP in oil-importing countries of less than half of 1%, spread over 2 to 3 years. These findings suggest that the higher import demand in oil-exporting countries resulting from oil price increases has an important contemporaneous offsetting effect on economic activity in the rest of the world, and that the adverse consequences are mostly relatively mild and occur with a lag.

### High Prices Good – Chemical Industry

#### Chemical industry doing well now

Joseph Chang, ICIS contributor, 1-3-2011, “Chems to continue outperforming market in 2011—U.S. analyst”, <http://www.icis.com/Articles/2011/01/03/9422702/chems-to-continue-outperforming-market-in-2011-us.html>, da 8-31-2012

The chemical sector is poised to continue outperforming broader financial markets in 2011 after a strong 2010, as fears about earnings and margin deterioration are overblown, a US analyst said on Monday. “We expect this sector outperformance to continue in the near-to-medium term as global utilisation rates tighten in the 2011 through 2014 timeframe,” said Hassan Ahmed, partner and head of research at US-based investment research firm Alembic Global Advisors. “Our analysis suggests commodity chemical share prices could essentially double from current levels to attain prior peak levels,” he added.

#### Low oil prices undermine the chemical industry

Analyst Wire, 8-25-2005, p. np

You know, if you look at history, you can see times where oil prices are very low. And you know what, chemical stocks did horribly. The reason why oil was low is because demand wasn t so good. And if demand is not good then the chemical industry is not going to do so well. In periods where oil prices have been high, demand has been fairly high. And if the chemical companies are able to have high operating rates in that environment, you have high operating rates, you can push through higher pricing. And that is kind of what we are seeing right now. This is a sector that has been fundamentally under-invested in over the past decade such that today we have no new capacity to start up to absorb this new demand that is coming on-line. So if demand is high and supply is constrained, high operating rates, high margins, high profitability despite what energy costs are doing. Now I don t want to suggest that high energy is not a concern, because obviously there is some talk that perhaps high energy and high oil will lead.

Chemical industry is key to solve disease

National Academy of Sciences, 2002, “CHALLENGES FOR THE CHEMICAL SCIENCES IN THE 21ST CENTURY NATIONAL SECURITY & HOMELAND DEFENSE,” Board on Chemical Sciences and Technology, <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309085047/html/R1.html#pagetop>, da 8-31-2012

Many drugs are produced by either chemical synthesis or biosynthetic processes. Recent advances in synthetic organic chemistry, catalysis, biotechnology, and combinatorial chemistry have made it possible to synthesize many chemicals that are not found in nature or have heretofore been difficult to produce. Current chemical drugs, such as antibiotics, used to combat infectious diseases are threatened by bacterial abilities to quickly mutate into a drug-resistant form. Concern also exists for purposefully genetically modified organisms used for terrorist attacks. Consequently, there is a need to constantly develop new chemical drugs for fighting infectious diseases caused by new biological agents. As we know more about human genomics, many new drugs, whether small-molecule chemicals or large proteins, can be developed to better target the diseases. Rapid production of small-molecule drugs will require the development of new organic reactions that maximally increase chemical complexity and that are highly selective. Advances in automation and miniaturization will be required to expedite discovery of synthesis sequences for large-scale drug preparation.

### High Prices Good – Saudi Arabia

#### High prices are key to Saudi stability

Glen Carey, Bloomberg News, 2-23-2012, “The Saudis Need Those High Oil Prices”, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-02-23/the-saudis-need-those-high-oil-prices>, da 8-31-2012

The world last year watched to see if Saudi Arabia would suffer the same instability that swept away other regimes in the Middle East. The question now is whether the world’s largest oil supplier needs to raise prices to sustain ramped-up spending intended to calm its citizens. Higher prices would be bad news for Western governments, which need affordable oil to nurture their economic recoveries. The Saudis rarely spell out exactly what they are thinking on the topic, but there are signs their strategy has changed, and they are increasingly willing to raise prices. Still, they seem not inclined to let prices go sky-high. A year ago Saudi oil minister Ali Al-Naimi said oil at $70 to $80 a barrel was fair. Then on Nov. 21, Al-Naimi said he was “very happy” with current crude prices; on that day oil traded close to $98 a barrel. Prices are now around $106 a barrel.

#### Oil prices are key to Saudi social spending

Glen Carey, Bloomberg News, 2-23-2012, “The Saudis Need Those High Oil Prices”, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-02-23/the-saudis-need-those-high-oil-prices>, da 8-31-2012

The spending has achieved its political purpose: The House of Saud’s eight-decade rule survived unscathed as Hosni Mubarak and Muammar Qaddafi were toppled, despite sporadic protests in the Shiite areas of Saudi Arabia’s Eastern Province. The Saudi economy expanded 6.8 percent in 2011, central bank data show. Government employees were even awarded two months in bonus pay last year—an act of generosity that cost the government an extra 224 billion riyals over budgeted expenses. Oil sales make up 80 percent of Saudi government revenue, says Faisal Hasan, head of research at Kuwait-based Global Investment House. Two years ago the kingdom needed an oil price per barrel of around $70 in order to pay for its budget without tipping into deficit. For 2011, the Saudis’ break-even oil price was estimated by the International Monetary Fund to have risen to $80 a barrel, a figure that will increase to $98 a barrel by 2016.

#### Global war

Gregory Copley, GIS Editor, 5-22-2002, Defense and Foreign Affairs Daily, p. 1

Nonetheless, Saudi Arabia's problems have become the problems of virtually the entire Muslim ummah (nation), and are perhaps the real core of the schism between Western and Muslim societies. The danger exists that the Saudi leadership could still collapse in the near future and the integrity of the Saudi State could come into question. The problems in Saudi Arabia -- decades in the making -- are at the geopolitical heart of Islam, thus affecting most of the Muslim world and the relationship between Islamic societies and the West. The phenomena of Osama bin Laden's worldwide terrorism network, the radical Islamist anti-state activities under Sudan's Dr Hassan al-Turabi, the related and parallel evolution of the Taliban in Afghanistan, the direction of the Chechen rebellion, and so on, all owe much to the evolving problems in Saudi Arabia as well as to the radical clerics in Iran. Not even Saudi Arabia's leadership has acknowledged the extent of the crisis, although privately many leading Saudi princes have admitted the prospect of an imminent collapse of the House of Sa'ud. Saudi Arabia's problems have an immediate bearing on whether major war occurs between Israel and its neighbors, and whether Saudi Arabia survives with its present form of government. They are therefore critical to the global economy and global strategic stability.

### High Prices Good – Saudi Arabia

#### High oil prices key to prevent Saudi collapse

Michael Peel and Javier Blas, writers for the Financial Times, 3-31-2011, “Saudi budget could require high oil price”, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/87d60044-5bbb-11e0-b8e7-00144feab49a.html#axzz1VoV7UyMU>, da 8-31-2012

Saudi Arabia could need the oil price to average more than $100 a barrel by 2015 to sustain the big public spending rises it plans in an effort to forestall the political unrest sweeping the Middle East. The oil market is growing increasingly worried about Riyadh’s fiscal needs as it fears that they could force Saudi Arabia to pursue oil policies similar to those of Venezuela and Iran, traditionally the price hawks at the Opec oil cartel. The break-even oil price the Gulf kingdom requires to balance its budget will jump from $68 last year to $88 this and then $110 in 2015, according to new estimates by the Institute of International Finance, a leading industry group. Only a decade ago Saudi Arabia was able to balance its budget with oil prices averaging $20-$25 a barrel. The forecast shows the scale of the task facing Saudi Arabia, the world’s largest oil producer and a crucial plank of the west’s regional security strategy, as it grapples with a growing population and increasing infrastructure problems.

#### A Saudi collapse spreads in the Mideast and collapses the global economy

Robert Baer, former CIA field officer in the Middle East, *Sleeping With the Devil*, 2003, pg. 206-7

Not all the wishing and hoping in the world will change the basic reality of the situation, which is as follows: The industrial world is dependent on the oil reserves of the Islamic world and will be for decades to come, whether it’s the already developed reserves of the largely Arab states or the soon to be developed reserves of Central Asia. Of the Islamic oil states, none is more critical than Saudi Arabia, because (a) it sits on top of the largest proven reserves; (b) it serves as the market regulator for the entire global petroleum industry; and (c) it has the money, the polit­ical will, and the religious zeal to pursue control of the Arab Peninsula and Central Asia. Of all the oil-consuming states, none consumes more than the United States, none enjoys anything like the most-favored-nation status that the U.S. enjoys with the Saudis, and thus none is more dependent on Saudi oil to fulfill its appetite and to keep doing so at a compliments-of-the-house rate. If Saudi Arabia tanks, and takes along the other four dysfunc­tional families in the region who collectively own 60 percent of the world’s proven oil reserves, the industrial economies are going down with it, including the economy of the United States of America.

#### That leads to economic collapse

Richard **Douthwaite**, advisor for the Green Economics Institute and author of The Growth Illusion, 2003, Construct Ireland, <http://www.constructireland.ie/articles/0210douthwaite.php>, da 8-31-2012

In April, the merchant bank Goldman Sachs warned that a ‘super-spike’ in oil prices might drive the cost of a barrel of crude up to $105, twice what they are at the time I’m writing this in early June. $105 would also be six times the average price between 1987 and 2000. The bank referred to a ‘spike’ because prices could not stay at the $100 level for more than a few months without causing the collapse of the world economy. This would happen because we would all be spending so much more to buy our oil that we would be unable to carry on buying other things at the rate we do at present, particularly as the prices of other fuels would rise in step with that of oil. As a result of the diversion of our spending, factories around the world would find they had spare capacity. They would lay off staff and cancel expansion projects and, as construction work is so energy intensive, its cessation would cause oil demand to fall rapidly. This is exactly what happened the last time its price went significantly above the $20 level in 1972 money. Millions of people would become unemployed and cut their spending to the bare minimum, causing other people to lose their jobs too. A global depression could develop in which the lack of activity in the world economy could cause the price of oil in today’s money to plummet from $100 back to around $15 a barrel again.

### High Prices Good – Iran Strike

#### High oil prices prevent Iran strikes

Robin Pomeroy , 1-22-2011 , “Higher oil price empowers Iran, blunts sanctions”, Edmonton Journal, p. np

Juan Cole, a professor of Middle East history at the University of Michigan, said a higher oil price reduced the risk that Washington or its Middle East ally Israel would attack Iran. Both have said they could do that if nothing else halted Iran's nuclear program, which they say is aimed at getting nuclear weapons. Iran says it is entirely peaceful. "I think the high petroleum prices in the context of a weak U.S. economy make military action less likely. You would not want to risk administering a 'Bush I' to yourself," he told Reuters, referring to the first President George Bush's war on Iraq, which he believes exacerbated a U.S. recession. "Ahmadinejad must enjoy sticking the West with this winter's high prices, as a little revenge for the sanctions." But the sanctions are exacting a long-term cost on Iran's oil sector, already hobbled by years of underinvestment. One day that could mean bigger oil costs for the entire world.

#### Extinction

Jorge Hirsch, Professor of physics at the University of California San Diego, 2-20-2006, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>, da 8-31-2012

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss –The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us.

### High Prices Good – Hegemony

#### High oil prices key to dollar heg

Stratfor, 1/8/2008, “Annual Forecast 2008,” [web.stratfor.com/images/writers/STRATFOR\_Annual\_1\_08.pdf](http://web.stratfor.com/images/writers/STRATFOR_Annual_1_08.pdf), da 8-31-2012

Quietly developing n the background, the global economy is undergoing a no less dramatic transformation. While we expect oil prices to retreat somewhat in 2008 after years of surges, their sustained strength continues to shove a great deal of cash into the hands of the world’s oil exporters — cash that these countries cannot process internally and that therefore will either be stored in dollars or invested in the only country with deep enough capital pools to handle it: the United States. Add in the torrent of exports from the Asian states, which generates nearly identical cash-management problems, and the result is a deep dollarization of the global system even as the U.S. dollar gives ground. The talk on the ﬁnancial pages will be of dollar (implying American) weakness, even as the currency steadily shifts from the one of ﬁrst resort to the true foundation of the entire system.

#### Dollar hegemony key to US hegemony.

Robert Looney, Prof @ Naval Postgrad, November 2003, “From Petrodollars to Petroeuros: Are the Dollar's Days as an International Reserve Currency Drawing to an End?” Strategic Insights, 2.11, <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/nov03/middleEast.asp>, da 8-31-2012

Political power and prestige. The benefits of "power and prestige" are nebulous. Nevertheless, the loss of key currency status and the loss of international creditor status have sometimes been associated, along with such non-economic factors as the loss of colonies and military power, in discussions of the historical decline of great powers. Causality may well flow from key currency status to power and prestige and in the opposite direction as well.[8] On a broader scale, Niall Ferguson[9] notes that one pillar of American dominance can be found in the way successive U.S. government sought to take advantage of the dollar's role as a key currency. Quoting several noted authorities, he notes that   [the role of the dollar] enabled the United States to be "far less restrained…than all other states by normal fiscal and foreign exchange constraints when it came to funding whatever foreign or strategic policies it decided to implement." As Robert Gilpin notes, quoting Charles de Gaulle, such policies led to a 'hegemony of the dollar" that gave the U.S. "extravagant privileges." In David Calleo's words, the U.S. government had access to a "gold mine of paper" and could therefore collect a subsidy form foreigners in the form of seignorage (the profits that flow to those who mint or print a depreciating currency). The web contains many more radical interactions of the dollar's role. Usually something along the following lines:   World trade is now a game in which the U.S. produces dollars and the rest of the world produces things that dollars can buy. The world's interlinked economies no longer trade to capture a comparative advantage; they compete in exports to capture needed dollars to service dollar-denominated foreign debts and to accumulate dollar reserves to sustain the exchange value of their domestic currencies…. This phenomenon is known as dollar hegemony, which is created by the geopolitically constructed peculiarity that critical commodities, most notably oil, are denominated in dollars. Everyone accepts dollars because dollars can buy oil. The recycling of petro-dollars is the price the U.S. has extracted from oil-producing countries for U.S. tolerance of the oil-exporting cartel since 1973.[10]   America's coercive power in the world is based as much on the dollar's status as the global reserve currency as on U.S. military muscle. Everyone needs oil, and to pay for it, they must have dollars. To secure dollars, they must sell their goods to the U.S., under terms acceptable to the people who rule America. The dollar is way overpriced, but it's the only world currency. Under the current dollars-only arrangement, U.S. money is in effect backed by the oil reserves of every other nation.[11] While it is tempting to dismiss passages of this sort as uninformed rants, they do contain some elements of truth. There are tangible benefits that accrue to the country whose currency is a reserve currency. The real question is: if this situation is so intolerable and unfair, why hasn't the world ganged up on the United States and changed the system? Why haven't countries like Libya and Iran required something like euros or gold dinars in payment for oil? After all, with the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1971 the International Monitary Fund's Standard Drawing Rights (unit of account) was certainly an available alternative to the dollar.[12]

## Oil DA Answers

### High Oil Prices Inevitable

#### Long term, high prices inevitable – reserves are tougher to extract and refine – massively increases costs

Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, 3-13-2012, “A Tough-Oil World” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/obama-gas-prices_b_1342042.html?ref=green>, da 8-31-2012

In energy terms, we are now entering a world whose grim nature has yet to be fully grasped. This pivotal shift has been brought about by the disappearance of relatively accessible and inexpensive petroleum -- “easy oil,” in the parlance of industry analysts; in other words, the kind of oil that powered a staggering expansion of global wealth over the past 65 years and the creation of endless car-oriented suburban communities. This oil is now nearly gone. The world still harbors large reserves of petroleum, but these are of the hard-to-reach, hard-to-refine, “tough oil” variety. From now on, every barrel we consume will be more costly to extract, more costly to refine -- and so more expensive at the gas pump.

#### Oil will hit $500 a barrel in 2020

Paul Franke, staff writer, 3-12-2012, “Crude Oil is Going to $500 a Barrel (Part 1),” Motley Fool, <http://beta.fool.com/quantemonics/2012/03/12/crude-oil-going-500-barrel-part-1/2813/?source=eogyholnk0000001>, da 8-31-2012

Now that’s a headline grabber! Quantemonics Investing (QI) is projecting US$500 a barrel for crude oil in 8 years, basically compounding at the same rate as it has since 1999, between 2012 and 2020. During 1999 the price for a barrel of oil was $10. Today it goes for $110-$130. Anybody predicting $100 a barrel for 2011 back in 1999 was considered a crackpot lunatic, and I am sure many reading this will say the same about such a ludicrous “prediction” of $500 in the not too distant future. I can remember telling people in 1999 that $10 a barrel petroleum and $0.75 a gallon gas were insanely cheap, especially when a gallon of water in a plastic bottle at the local grocery store was selling for over $1.00! Imagine cheap oil, cheaper than tap water! All the exploration and production expense, extensive refining and transportation cost, storage expense, marketing and retailing margins at the local gas station, and still it was cheaper than water! Ah, the good old days of a God-given American right to low cost driving. In early 2012, it costs $1.00 to start your car, and at least $0.50 a mile to fully depreciate, maintain, fuel and insure most any automobile at $3.50 gas. The average 10,000 mile a year driver is spending $5,000 annually to own and run a car. The bad news is this critical cost of living and expense to run a business will continue to skyrocket during 2012-13 and beyond. Interestingly, while mainstream prognosticators are confidently predicting oil will decline soon with today’s “Don’t Worry Be Happy” market sentiment backdrop, the truly contrarian stance may be to prepare for starkly higher oil and energy pricing. Three undeniable variables are pushing oil prices higher and higher each year, and will not change much in the immediate future. Record money printing by the U.S. Federal Reserve (FED) bank and central bankers across the globe, the Peak Oil supply phenomena (which basically explains why the world is running out of this important nonrenewable energy resource), and increasing levels of political chaos, revolution, civil disobedience and outright war between nations in the largest oil supply region of the Middle East are all pushing the envelope in supply/demand balance. For most of 2011 and 2012, the world has been running a deficit in crude oil supply vs. demand of at least 500,000 barrels a day (U.S. Energy Dept. estimate), and this is before any increase in demand from economic growth or a supply shock from war with Iran. Plus, the International Energy Agency is worried that necessary long-term investments in oil production and infrastructure are lagging mushrooming demand on the planet.

#### Tons of events will keep oil prices high

Michael Raymond, writer for Bluffton Today, 3-14-2012, “Who controls the price of oil?” <http://www.blufftontoday.com/bluffton-opinion/2012-03-14/who-controls-price-oil>, da 8-31-2012

The commodities market is a strange place where consumers — big oil companies — write futures contracts for crude deliveries to their refineries, and speculators — non-consumers — gamble on whether the price of crude will go up or down. Everyone in this game must keep a sharp eye on numerous factors that can impact oil prices, and, be constantly ready to adjust their position accordingly. Generally speaking, for the past 10 years those impacts have been cumulatively negative. Consider the following factors: The U.S. military — the largest single consumer of oil other than a country — fighting a two-front war halfway around the world. Their fuel bill last year was over $17 billion. The oil production of Iraq, taken off line for years. The Arab Spring, now Arab Summer, with riots hot enough to depose dictators in oil-producing countries. Production problems in Venezuela and Nigeria. The NATO bombing of Libya and rumors of intervention in Syria. Israeli threats of a nuclear strike on Iran. Those are some of the major political events causing destabilization in the market, but there are other forces at work as well. The rising affluence of Asian countries has, and will continue to pressure demand. Ben Bernanke’s weak dollar policy has trashed our currency valuation and driven up prices. Reports from the National Weather Service predicting worsening hurricane activity — meaning negative impacts on transport and logistics — push bids higher. And now comes summer to the northern hemisphere and the ringing of pumps from millions of vacationers.

### Alt-Causes to Oil Prices

#### Cost of oil will stay high for decades without a major energy shift

Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, 3-13-2012, “A Tough-Oil World” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/obama-gas-prices_b_1342042.html?ref=green>, da 8-31-2012

Tough-oil reserves like these will provide most of the world’s new oil in the years ahead. One thing is clear: even if they can replace easy oil in our lives, the cost of everything oil-related -- whether at the gas pump, in oil-based products, in fertilizers, in just about every nook and cranny of our lives -- is going to rise. Get used to it. If things proceed as presently planned, we will be in hock to big oil for decades to come.

#### Multiple factors ensure high oil prices

Steven Mufson, writer for the Washington Post, 3-13-2012, “Voters blame president for gas prices, but experts disagree,” <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2017741395_gasprices14.html>, da 8-31-2012

Today's oil prices are the product of years and decades of exploration, automobile design and ingrained-consumer habits combined with political events in places such as Sudan and Libya, anxiety about possible conflict with Iran, and the energy aftershocks of last year's earthquake in Japan.

#### High prices are here to stay – Asian demand

Lalit Jha, writer for News24, 2-3-2012, “Obama blames India, China for high oil prices” <http://www.news24online.com/Obama-blames-India-China-for-high-oil-prices_News24_40793.aspx>, da 8-31-2012

US President Barack Obama sought to blame burgeoning growth in India, China and Brazil for the raising oil prices in a bid to deflect the criticism of the Republicans in an election year who are attributing the surge to his failed energy policy. Citing rising auto sales in these countries, he said as people in India and China get wealthier they will buy more cars and fill them up like Americans do, driving up oil prices.

### High Prices Bad – Russian Nationalism

#### High oil prices are putting Russia on the brink of a Nationalist resurgence, only a drop in oil prices can check it

Craig Mellow, 8-2-2011, “Russia Markets: Putin Deems US a “parasite”, <http://www.minyanville.com/businessmarkets/articles/debt-ceiling-us-debt-debt-deficit/8/2/2011/id/36083>, da 8-31-2012

Russia is fast becoming a rich and powerful country, backed by huge natural mineral resources, and has been pursuing an independent foreign policy that frequently is at loggerheads with the West. To the western corporate, media and liberal chattering classes, Putin, as a patriot and nationalist, is a pariah. This is why he gets such a bad press in the West. However, Mother Russia is fast emerging onto the world stage, gripped by a fervent nationalism and increasingly prosperous. One particularly encouraging aspect of this burgeoning patriotism is the emergence of a nationalist youth movement in Russia, called “Nashi”. Please watch the video report below for an introduction to Nashi:

#### Russian Nationalism means nuclear war

Conflict Studies, Research Centre Royal Military Academy, July 1999, “How Far can the West afford to Ignore Russia”, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/russia/agency/ob69-cjd.htm>, da 8-31-2012

A real sense of threat, at present absent in the minds of most Russians, would likely give rise to a nationalist and/or pan-Slavic revival. A resurgent Russia that sees the west as an enemy might well feel it has both the need to recoup post-Cold War losses and undermine perceived efforts at containment. This would lead both to a serious effort at rearmament, even at the expense of longer term economic progress and therefore economic and political stability, and a commitment to a de facto recreation of at least part of the USSR. Belarus would quickly fall into line. Ukraine, Kazakhstan and probably other states would be subject to a combination of pressures and inducements to join a confederation that could well be successful. Russophobe minorities could be stirred up for political purposes and struggles over spheres of influence intensified. The prospects of intra- and inter-state conflict in the fSU would be significantly enhanced. At best, such developments would lead to a new Cold War, and at worst to a hot one.

#### Oil prices lets Putin crush democracy

Jamie Darembulm, Costa Rica’s former ambassador to the U.S. and director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Hundson Institute, 1-12-2009, “Putin’s Dangerous Games”, <http://www.american.com/archive/2009/putin2019s-dangerous-games>, da 8-31-2012

It is discouraging, though not at all surprising, that Moscow has once again resorted to energy blackmail—having Gazprom, a state-run Russian monopoly, cut off natural gas shipments to neighboring Ukraine—in hopes of bullying a pro-Western democracy and frightening the European Union, which gets roughly one-quarter of its gas supplies from Russia. Vladimir Putin may now be the Russian “prime minister” and not its formal president, but he is still the head honcho. For several years now, Putin has pursued a multipronged strategy aimed at reestablishing his country as a global power. He has sought to bring Russia’s former Soviet-era possessions back within its sphere of influence, intimidate the West, and bolster anti-American regimes around the world, including the governments of Iran and Venezuela. While implementing these policies abroad, Putin has gradually but dramatically rolled back the institutions of democracy at home. Through it all, he has boasted sky-high approval ratings, thanks mainly to Russia’s oil-fueled economic boom, his control of the domestic media, and his skillful manipulation of Russian nationalism. Putin’s game seemed to be working well when commodity prices were shooting through the roof and the Kremlin’s coffers were bulging with cash. But now that energy prices have fallen substantially and the financial crisis has spread, Moscow may soon face a full-blown economic meltdown, which would inevitably have an impact on its foreign policy behavior.

### Oil Not Key Russian Economy

#### Oil not key to Russian economy

World News, 4-6-2011, “Russia's Economy Has Ceased To Grow After The Oil”, <http://mysouth.su/2011/04/russia-39-s-economy-has-ceased-to-grow-after-the-oil/>, da 8-31-2012

Ministry of Economic Development by 30 percent raised the forecast average oil price in 2011 – from 81 to a record $ 105 a barrel. Vedomosti writes that the economy is not going to help: GDP growth forecast on unchanged – 4.2 percent. C beginning of the year the average price of Brent was 106.2 dollars, while the Russian grade Urals – 103,2 dollars. Most economists believe that oil prices linger above $ 100 dollars. In 2000-2008, crude oil rose in price by 25-30 percent a year, Russia's economy grew by an average of 7 percent. Experts interviewed by the publication, noted that the increase in oil prices by 10 per cent faster economic growth in Russia on 0,9 percentage points within 12 months. However, this effect is gradually reduced. The oil sector was the main driver of the economy in 2000-2005 and in 2005-2008 the economy grew at the expense of the consumer boom. Now, this mechanism does not work anymore: all attempts to stimulate consumption leads to faster growth of imports and inflation. Economists view that leads edition, indicate that a new source of growth may be investing, but they needed structural reforms. It is not excluded that this is why the desire top officials to improve the investment climate. Oil prices on the world market have increased significantly in early 2011 due to riots in several countries in the Middle East and North Africa. The new jump in prices occurred in February, when conflicts of opposition and the ruling forces in Libya escalated into civil war.

#### Russian economy not dependent on oil

Voice of Russia, 4-21-2011, “Russian economy won’t depend on oil prices”, 4http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/04/21/49258460.html, da 8-31-2012

Growth in oil prices no longer drives the development of the Russian economy, Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin said at a session of the Russian Union of Industrialists & Entrepreneurs. According to him, the country’s mid-term economic growth scenario that is presently before the government does not depend on oil prices. The minister also believes that their further growth worldwide will “depress the economy even more now.” Kudrin said that the 2011 federal budget stipulates $75 per barrel, whereas significantly less than the current world prices.

#### Oil not key to the Russian econ—diversification and structural changes

The Telegraph, 2-18-2008, “Are Russian funds the crème de la Kremlin?”,

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/personalfinance/2785283/Are-Russian-funds-the-creme-de-la-Kremlin.html>, da 8-31-2012

Russia is also seeing a growing internal market for commodities as it builds infrastructure to support its development. There is also a developing consumer economy. Collings says: "Everyone is willing to spend like there is no tomorrow. And they still haven't got to the point where they are using debt. They have very high savings rates." Geffen adds: "There has been very strong growth in the middle class, which has quadrupled since Putin came to power. Most people have seen a 20 per cent nominal pay rise over each of the last four years. " He claims that a new generation of entrepreneurs is creating exciting new companies, many of which are now on the stock market. This is helping the economy and the stock market to diversify away from oil and gas, which still make up around half of the Russian stock market by value. However, the high oil price is certainly not doing any harm. Geffen calculates that every time the oil price rises by $1, the Russian government gets another $1bn in tax revenue. Yet the government and companies no longer need a high oil price to sustain growth. Collings claims that, even if the oil price drops below $60, GDP growth will be sustained because Russia has banked its windfall carefully. Collings reckons that its foreign exchange reserves may be about $400bn (£200bn). The government also has a $160bn investment fund. So how can investors get access to the Russian story? Rob Burdett, co-head of the multi-manager team at Thames River Capital, says: "We use the Neptune Russia and Greater Russia fund. For our overall emerging markets exposure we use the Nevsky Global Emerging markets fund. "It is too early to say whether Russia can 'de-couple' from the problems in developed markets, but savings ratios are high, which should help sustain the economy. Plus, the country still has the ability to make large amounts from oil even if the prices fall."

### **Russian Diversification Link Turn**

#### Staying reliant on high oil prices kills the Russian economy – causes Dutch Disease

Ambrose Evans Pritchard, International Business Editor, 2008, “Russian economy succumbs to the oil curse,”

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/banksandfinance/2783813/Russian-economy-succumbs-to-the-oil-curse.html>, da 8-31-2012

Moscow is the most expensive city in the world, like Tokyo before the Nikkei bubble burst. A taxi from Domodedovo airport to the Kremlin costs $170 (£86). Property in Ostozhenka trumps Chelsea. Space fetches $30,000 a square metre.Nice Tsarist flats fetch $3m to $4m. Even Bolshevik boxes are booming. Moscow boasts 150,000 home millionaires in dollars, says Sergei Polonsky, the Mirax Group tycoon. In a good year, prices double. This is the curse of commodity wealth, the "Dutch Disease" that eats at the competitive foundations of an economy and incubates a parasite culture. No doubt Russia's scientists, engineers, and cyber talent, will enrich the country, but first it must overcome the toxic effects of oil at $90 a barrel. "We can no longer afford to buy Russian equipment," said Yevgeny Ivanov, head of Polyus Gold. "The prices here are one and a half times higher than abroad so we're having to break our rigid rule and turn to foreign-made machinery. It is bad news for Russian firms. The commodity super-cycle is catching up with us through higher prices. It is a disheartening picture," he said. "There's no infrastructure, no power, no roads. Electricity costs twice what they pay in Alaska and Canada. We face a Soviet bureaucracy passing decrees that make you weep," he said.The government has declared an infrastructure emergency. Russia has hit the limits of durable growth on today's rickety foundations. China has built 25,000 miles of highways since 1988, Russia a few hundred.

#### Reliance on high oil kills the economy – it causes deindustrialization and decreases competitiveness

Thomas Friedman , columnist for the New York Times, June 2006, “The First Law of Petropolitics”, May/June 2006, <http://www.ituassu.com.br/oil_fp2.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

To be sure, professional economists have, for a long time, pointed out in general the negative economic and political impacts that an abundance of natural resources can have on a country. This phenomenon has been variously diagnosed as “Dutch Disease” or the “resource curse.” Dutch Disease refers to the process of deindustrialization that can result from a sudden natural resource windfall. The term was coined in the Netherlands in the 1960s, after it discovered huge deposits of natural gas. What happens in countries with Dutch Disease is that the value of their currency rises, thanks to the sudden influx of cash from oil, gold, gas, diamonds, or some other natural resource discovery. That then makes the country’s manufactured exports uncompetitive and its imports very cheap. The citizens, flush with cash, start importing like crazy, the domestic industrial sector gets wiped out and, presto, you have deindustrialization. The “resource curse” can refer to the same economic phenomenon, as well as, more broadly speaking, the way a dependence on natural resources always skews a country’s politics and investment and educational priorities, so that everything revolves around who controls the oil tap and who gets how much from it—not how to compete, innovate, and produce real products for real markets.

#### High oil prices block any Russian economic reform and causes political tension

Craig Pirrong, PhD., Professor of Finance, and Energy Markets Director for the Global Energy Management Institute at University of Houston, 1-6-2011, “Higher Oil Prices Will Stymie Reform in Russia,” <http://seekingalpha.com/article/245309-higher-oil-prices-will-stymie-reform-in-russia>, da 8-31-2012

Russia’s internal problems relate to the “resource curse.” If oil prices remain high, Russia will probably delay much-needed economic reforms. . . . . But in Russia it is especially problematic [to improve economic and political institutions] as the ruling elite is not interested in building such institutions. The “resource curse” provides and explanation. Guriev and Tsyvinski argue that higher oil prices are antithetical to the political reforms that Russia requires to become a truly modern, innovative, entrepreneurial economy and more humane polity.

### No Russian Economy Impact

#### No impact to Russian economy

Robert Blackwill, former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning, 2009, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, RAND, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2009/RAND_OP275.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it aff ect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary infl uence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy fi rst principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

#### Putin wont be belligerent

Andrew C. Kuchins, Senior Fellow and the Director of the CSIS Russia and Eurasia Program and Igor A. Zevelev, Director of the Moscow Office of The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, 2012, “Russian Foreign Policy: Continuity in Change,” Washington Quarterly, <http://www.twq.com/12winter/docs/12winter_Kuchins_Zevelev.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

The imminent return of Vladimir Putin to the presidency of the Russian Federation in 2012 raises many questions about the future of Russian foreign and security policy as well as U.S.—Russia relations. To what extent will Putin seek to continue and implement the goals of current President Dmitri Medvedev’s modernization program? Will Putin reform the political system in the direction of decentralization of power and pluralism? Will the ‘‘reset’’ in U.S.—Russia relations endure? Even with these issues up in the air, the return of Putin as president will not significantly alter the course of Moscow’s foreign policy. Some argue that Putin never relinquished authority over foreign policy in the first place, and that may well be true. But even if it is, there are deeper structural reasons involving debates among Russian elites about foreign policy and Russia’s place in the world that are more important in explaining why Putin’s return will not usher in a significant policy shift.

#### Lots of alt-causes to Russian stability – can’t lash out

Eugene B. Rumer, senior fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, and Celeste A. Wallander, director of the Russia and Eurasia Program and the Trustee Fellow at CSIS, Winter 2003, The Washington Quarterly

The internal political, economic, societal, and defense challenges with which the Russian leadership continues to struggle will preclude Russia from achieving great-power status in the near future. This reality has profound implications for U.S. policy and expectations that Russia can be a partner that can and will help the United States shoulder the burdens of the international system. Russia's internal trends suggest that it is unlikely to bring to the international table the kind of resources and reliability needed to take a leading role in solving complex global problems and threats.

### Oil Not Key Saudi Economy

#### Oil not key to Saudi Arabia

A.S. Al-Hazmi, no date, “Saudi Arabia”, FAO, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/v9978e/v9978e0k.htm>, da 8-31-2012

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia covers a large area of about 2 000 000 km2, which is about 80 percent of the total area of the Arabian peninsula. The country lies between 15.2° and 32.6° north and 34.1° and 55.5° east and the climate is generally mild in the winter and dry and hot in the summer. Rainfall occurs in the winter but never exceeds 100 mm per year in most regions except for the southwestern mountains of Asir, where it rains more often in the summer. Irrigation is mainly carried out from tube-wells, but in the Hofuf region water is derived from natural springs. Dams have been built in many areas for water conservation and aquifer recharge. To reduce dependence on oil exports as the main source of income and to produce more food for the increasing population with a high standard of living, Saudi Arabia has been making intensive efforts through its five-year development plans to develop the agricultural sector. The country is witnessing an unprecedented exploitation of its agricultural potential. As a result of government encouragement and financial aid, cultivated land has dramatically increased from about 435 000 ha in 1980 to more than 1.5 million ha in 1990. Sophisticated technology and modern machinery were introduced, new crops and varieties were cultivated, the greenhouse industry and large agricultural projects were established, and two more colleges of agriculture were opened. Self-sufficiency and even export of some products such as wheat, dates, watermelon, poultry and fresh eggs and milk have been achieved. Major crops include cereals (wheat, sorghum, barley and millet), vegetables (tomato, watermelon, eggplant, potato, cucumber and onions), fruits (date-palm, citrus and grapes) and forage crops (alfalfa). These crops are cultivated over an area of nearly 1.1 million ha which represents about 81 percent of the total cultivated area. In 1990, wheat was cultivated over an area of about 744 422 ha (i.e. 55 percent of the total cultivated area), and production was about 3.5 million tonnes (Table 18).

#### Saudi economy has moved away from oil

Lucien Zeigler, 9-6-2010, “Yanbu Industrial City: Exemplifying Saudi Economic Diversification”, <http://arabianomics.com/2010/09/06/yanbu-industrial-city-exemplifying-saudi-economic-diversification/>, da 8-31-2012

It is often said in American economic and political discourse that the West, and particularly the United States, is “dependent” on Middle Eastern oil – particularly that from our strongest regional ally, Saudi Arabia. But until recently, it wasn’t just a one way street. While Saudi Arabia’s oil revenues vastly outweigh its national expenditures even with a soaring budget, the finite nature of oil as a source of energy meant that the Kingdom could not rely on petroleum revenues forever. Despite the fact that the global consumption of petroleum continued to climb steadily in the first decade of the 21st century, and may continue that climb, Saudi leaders and technocrats have long known that the key for Saudi’s economic future is in the slow and steady diversification of its economy away from oil revenues. There is no doubt that the wealth from Saudi Arabia’s oil reserves has helped the Kingdom to build the country it is today. But equally as certain is the positive impact that Saudi investment in its downstream and petrochemicals sector will have in building for the nation a healthy economic tomorrow. While the Kingdom is pouring money into new infrastructure and growth programs across the board, investments in the downstream and petrochemical sectors in particular will have the greatest “trickle down” effect on Saudi economic and social life in the 21st century, as well as in its regional and global economic standing. Those governmental reinvestments in the Saudi economy, and particularly in the downstream and petrochemical sectors, are set to begin paying off. Saudi Arabia now boasts the “world’s lowest feedstock costs and a large-scale capacity expansion” according to Arab News, which is set to turn the nation’s downstream and petrochemicals industries into a “formidable force” on the world stage. Press releases regarding major contracts signed between Saudi Aramco or SABIC and international corporations for work on various projects in its growing downstream and petrochemicals industries have emerged steadily in recent years.

### High Prices Bad – US Economy

#### Low oil prices would jumpstart the US economy

Chris Isidore, CNN Money contributor, 6-23-2011, “New economic stimulus: lower oil prices“, <http://money.cnn.com/2011/06/23/news/economy/spr_stimulus_oil_prices/index.htm>, da 8-31-2012

Economists say that if speculators believe there will be additional releases, that in itself could lead to significant declines in oil prices. And falling oil prices could be a major lift for the economy. "It depends on how fast it translates into prices at the pump," said Brett Ryan, U.S. economist at Deutsche Bank. "But it matters to a lot of Americans. If oil were to retreat and gas fell to $3 a gallon, that frees up $100 billion in annualized consumer spending from where we peaked out. That's significant." When asked if stimulating the economy was a motivation for the action, a senior administration official said Thursday that the SPR was tapped only to address supply disruptions. He refused to comment on what the price impact of the move might be. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce blasted the release of oil from the reserves Thursday, saying the move was an ill-advised response to "politically inconvenient high prices." Oil was down about 5% Thursday, breaking below $90 a barrel for the first time since February before recouping some of the losses. There were other factors driving down oil prices though. Gloomy comments about the economic outlook Wednesday afternoon by Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke reinforced growing concerns about a weaker economy, which typically drives down oil prices. Bernanke's comments that the Fed isn't ready to pump more cash into the economy in the near term helped lift the value of the dollar, which can also lower oil prices. "I'm sure there is some short-term impact on oil prices from the release from the SPR, but I don't view it as a way to keep prices down for any extended time," said Mark Zandi, chief economist with Moody's Analytics. "But it could have a longer effect if it scares speculators out and keeps them out."

#### High oil prices increase inflation and tanks economic stability

La Presna, 3-1-2011, “Rising oil prices could hurt U.S. growth, Fed chief says”, <http://www.laprensasa.com/309_america-in-english/1038924_rising-oil-prices-could-hurt-u.s.-growth-fed-chief-says.html>, da 8-31-2012

Washington, Mar 1 (EFE).- The recent hike in oil prices will likely cause a "temporary and relatively modest increase in U.S. consumer price inflation," but sustained increases could pose a more serious threat to the economy, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said Tuesday. He told the Senate Banking Committee that the Fed will "respond as necessary" if signs emerge that global oil prices, which went above $100 a barrel last week, are spurring inflation. "Sustained rises in the prices of oil and other commodities would represent a threat both to economic growth and to overall price stability, particularly if they were to cause inflation expectations to become less well anchored," the chairman said in his prepared remarks. He also said that up to now inflation is under control in the United States, thanks to the rise in commodity prices being balanced by stability in labor costs.

#### Increase oil prices cripples U.S. and other industrialized countries

Andres Cala, editor for the Christian Science Monitor, 8-14-2011, “Will high oil prices trigger global double-dip recession”, <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/will-high-oil-prices-trigger-global-double-dip-recession>, da 8-31-2012

When the global economy slows, one of the few bright spots for consumers is a little relief at the pump, with gas prices falling in response to slowing demand. But this time around, oil prices look set to stay firm, and perhaps rise, through a stagnant growth cycle. Warning bells are sounding from commodities analysts and institutions like the International Energy Agency, which advises industrialized economies. So far, demand for oil products is slowing in tandem with global economic growth, especially in OECD countries, which explains why the average price for a gallon of gasoline in the United States has fallen 30 cents to $3.67 from three months ago. But it's unlikely that they'll drop much more. In fact, oil prices could rise even as industrial production stagnates in major industrialized countries like the US. That's because global oil production is not growing fast enough to offset supply cuts – namely from Libya - and consumption is increasing in emerging economies like China.

### High Prices Bad – China

#### High oil prices threatens China’s economy

Investor Trip, Financial talk for Global Investors, 8-10-2011, “Rising Oil Prices Hurt Chinese Manufacturers”, <http://www.investortrip.com/rising-oil-prices-hurt-chinese-manufacturers/>, da 8-31-2012

With oil nearing $100 per barrel, Chinese manufacturers are feeling the heat. As it becomes more cost-effective to make goods at home, China’s long time monopoly in the manufacturing sector might come to an end. Cheap energy fed Chinese boom During the 1990s, cheap energy made outsourcing manufacturing very profitable. When oil was just $15 a barrel, it was easily justified to send materials halfway around the world for construction, and then send the finished product back to consumers. As oil increases in price, it is hard to justify the transportation of goods to overseas producers. The Chinese economy benefits from producing outsourced goods. Products and materials are moved to China to be put together where they are then shipped all around the world. Oil’s recent move to $100 per barrel makes outsourcing no longer as profitable or profitable at all. Other commodities up as well Higher energy prices also mean higher prices for materials, such as plastics and glass which requires large amounts of energy to produce. Prices for plastics are already up and will probably continue as oil prices rise through the summer. History tells us that oil prices usually peak in June. Last June, prices were in the $50s and $60s, a far cry from the $100 that we are now seeing in the slow part of the year. If oil prices are up to $100 a barrel during the slowest driving season, what is in store for next summer when the driving season is in full effect? History would suggest that 2008 will be a brutal year for the consumer if oil prices follow their historical pattern. The news of higher oil prices certainly will not sit well with China’s manufacturing industry, as most of Chinese production is for goods that will be sold on foreign soil.

#### Chinese economic decline causes war with the world powers

Dr. Thomas M. Kane teaches security studies at the University of Hull, UK and Dr. Lawrence W. Serewicz recently received his Ph.D. in politics from the University of Hull, UK, Fall 2001, Parameters, p. np

Despite China's problems with its food supply, the Chinese do not appear to be in danger of widespread starvation. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the prospect entirely, especially if the earth's climate actually is getting warmer. The consequences of general famine in a country with over a billion people clearly would be catastrophic. The effects of oil shortages and industrial stagnation would be less lurid, but economic collapse would endanger China's political stability whether that collapse came with a bang or a whimper. PRC society has become dangerously fractured. As the coastal cities grow richer and more cosmopolitan while the rural inland provinces grow poorer, the political interests of the two regions become ever less compatible. Increasing the prospects for division yet further, Deng Xiaoping's administrative reforms have strengthened regional potentates at the expense of central authority. As Kent Calder observes, In part, this change [erosion of power at the center] is a conscious devolution, initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1991 to outflank conservative opponents of economic reforms in Beijing nomenclature. But devolution has fed on itself, spurred by the natural desire of local authorities in the affluent and increasingly powerful coastal provinces to appropriate more and more of the fruits of growth to themselves alone. [49] Other social and economic developments deepen the rifts in Chinese society. The one-child policy, for instance, is disrupting traditional family life, with unknowable consequences for Chinese mores and social cohesion. [50] As families resort to abortion or infanticide to ensure that their one child is a son, the population may come to include an unprecedented preponderance of young, single men. If common gender prejudices have any basis in fact, these males are unlikely to be a source of social stability. Under these circumstances, China is vulnerable to unrest of many kinds. Unemployment or severe hardship, not to mention actual starvation, could easily trigger popular uprisings. Provincial leaders might be tempted to secede, perhaps openly or perhaps by quietly ceasing to obey Beijing's directives. China's leaders, in turn, might adopt drastic measures to forestall such developments. If faced with internal strife, supporters of China's existing regime may return to a more overt form of communist dictatorship. The PRC has, after all, oscillated between experimentation and orthodoxy continually throughout its existence. Spectacular examples include Mao's Hundred Flowers campaign and the return to conventional Marxism-Leninism after the leftist experiments of the Cultural Revolution, but the process continued throughout the 1980s, when the Chinese referred to it as the "fang-shou cycle." (Fang means to loosen one's grip; shou means to tighten it.) [51] If order broke down, the Chinese would not be the only people to suffer. Civil unrest in the PRC would disrupt trade relationships, send refugees flowing across borders, and force outside powers to consider intervention. If different countries chose to intervene on different sides, China's struggle could lead to major war. In a less apocalyptic but still grim scenario, China's government might try to ward off its demise by attacking adjacent countries.

### High Prices Bad – South Korea

#### High oil prices wreck South Korea’s economy

Jung Sung-ki, writer for the Korean times, 4-24-2011, “Uncertainties cloud Korean Economy”, <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/bizfocus/2011/05/335_85786.html>, da 8-31-2012

Despite a faster-than-expected recovery, the outlook for the Korea economy still remains unclear due to lingering uncertainties abroad, such as rising oil costs, China’s slowing growth rate, the knock-on effect from the Japanese earthquake and the European sovereign debt crisis, according to government officials and economic analysts. The rise in oil prices, in particular, is a headwind to Korea’s economic growth, as the fourth largest economy in Asia is heavily dependent on imports. Bank of Korea Governor Kim Choong-soo echoed those worries earlier this month. “The run-up in oil prices associated with the political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, the aftermath of the Japanese devastating earthquake and the fiscal problems of certain European countries will act as major downside risk factors,” Kim said April 21 after a rate-setting meeting. Moody’s senior vice president Tom Byrne anticipated should the oil price head above $120 a barrel, the effects will be more severe. HSBC chief economist Frederic Neumann noted, “Korea is quite dependent on export growth and high oil prices could slow demand elsewhere in the world, thus dampening Korea’s surging export performance.

#### South Korean economic downturn lead to global economic collapse

Manzur Ejaz, Philosophy Prof @ Punjab, 1-5-1998, “Pakistan Can Learn From South Korea’s Economic Woes”, <http://users.erols.com/ziqbal/jan_5.htm>, da 8-31-2012

After dragging their feet for weeks, US, Japan and other industrial nations led by the IMF have decided to pump another $10 billion into the South Korean economy. The major economic players in the globalized world were scared by the impact of the imminent possibility of breakdown of the South Korean: it could lead to a worldwide recession/depression and the situation may get out-of-hand quickly. The South Korean example shows that if the economy is of a significant size--South Koreans have the tenth largest economy in the world--and globalized, the economic superpowers and the IMF can go to any extent to rescue it. Otherwise, in cases like Pakistan, the major players don't do much other than issue soothing statements or throwing in meager amounts.

#### South korea super sensitive to oil fluctuation—still recovering from recession

ASEAN Free Trade Area, 5-18-2011, “South Korea’s economy faces growing negative impact of oil prices” report”, <http://www.aftasources.com/news/show-1259.html>, da 8-31-2012

The impact of oil prices on South Korea's economy has been growing over the past decade, a think tank said Wednesday, calling for more efforts to reduce the nation's dependency on fossil energy for economic growth. A 10-percent hike in crude oil prices would lead to a 0.6 percentage point decline in purchasing power from the nation's gross domestic product in 2010, up from a 0.3 percentage point fall estimated in the 1990s, according to the state-run Korea Development Institute. The contraction is much higher than other major economies such as France, Japan and China, which posted corresponding figures of about 0.2 percentage point contractions, the KDI said. "The negative impact of energy price hikes on the national economy seems to be increasing and the extent is also significantly high compared with other countries," said Kim Dong-seok, an economist who authored the report. "That is because our dependence on oil has significantly increased." The report comes as rising crude oil prices are feared to undercut South Korea's economic recovery by dampening consumption and driving up the overall production costs. South Korea is the world's fifth-largest oil importer and depends heavily on imports for almost all of its energy needs. Seoul is currently pushing to reduce its reliance on oil under the so-called green growth campaign by increasing the use of environmentally-friendly and other alternative energy sources. The report lent support for the government's current energy policies aimed at expanding the ratio of renewable energy and nuclear power in the nation's energy consumption. It also stressed that the government needs to use the current sky-high oil prices as an opportunity to boost the nation's overall energy efficiency.