### Erosion

#### Soil erosion controls the internal link to magnitude – BP spill means there on the brink, another spill means they degrade faster, destroying our ability to grow food – that’s Ikerd

#### [ ] That turns any war impact – resource scarcity increases the likelihood of conflict

Gendron & Hoffman, 09 - The Peace and Conflict Review (“Resource Scarcity and the Prevention of Violent Conflicts”, Fall 2009, Volume 4, Issue 1, http://www.review.upeace.org/index.cfm?opcion=0&ejemplar=18&entrada=90)

Resource scarcity can be defined according to three principals. The first is basic human security. A resource is deemed scarce within a specific location if the human population cannot meet its basic dietary requirements. This is known as the minimalist approach, the absolute minimum of resources required to sustain human life. A second interpretation can be defined as current resource availability to meet rising or projected increased demand. A resource in this scenario is considered scarce if there are insufficient resources to meet projected demands. The maximalist approach considers both human and non-human demands on a particular resource (Matthew, 2008). Resource scarcity can further be conceptualized as one of three structural issues: 1) supply induced scarcity, in which environmental degradation occurs; 2) demand induced scarcity in which there is increased consumption of a commodity; or 3) a structural scarcity in which infrastructure and distribution mechanisms unevenly redistribute the resource in question (Kameri-Mbote, 2004, slide 4). Resource scarcity, it should be noted, is not the same as environmental degradation. That is, “resource scarcity can occur without environmental degradation, simply because a nonrenewable source runs dry or demand exceeds what a renewable source can supply. In the event of environmental degradation-usually conceived as a man-made disturbance of the ecosystem-the supply of the resource will become insufficient more quickly” (Crooker et al, 2007, p. 179). Defined in this way, what role might resource scarcity have on the two distinct types of conflict prevention situations described earlier? Resource scarcity during the pre-violent conflict stage Resource scarcity can play a role in both types of conflict prevention situations which were discussed earlier. In the first case, resource scarcity can exacerbate a conflict thus increasing the likelihood that it might become violent. For example, it has been found that natural resources play role in at 40 percent of all [violent] intrastate conflicts (United Nations Environment Program [UNEP], 2009). This fact creates important implications for both conflict prevention warning and response. Resource scarcity is an important factor to consider in both conflict prevention warning and response. In terms of warning, resource scarcity can be used as an indicator, that when combined with other indicators, might help to predict the occurrence of violent conflict. In terms of response, for those conflicts where resource scarcity is a potential cause of violence, responses which address this cause of the conflict may help to avert the outbreak of violent conflict. Both of these situations are more fully described below. Resource scarcity may serve as an important warning indicator that violent conflict may erupt from a nonviolent conflict. There are limitations, however, with using this as an indicator. Le Billon, for example, notes that, “the term of resource war often implies an exclusive analytical focus on resources, and asserts a direct link between conflicts and resources. Such narrow engagement overlooks the multidimensionality of conflicts and resources” (Bercovitch et al., 2009, Part II, Chapter 2). In other words, this factor alone may not be predictive of whether violent conflict will erupt or not. Furthermore, Le Billon states that, “the mere presence of resources should also not be simply understood for the current or future stakes that they represent. Rather, the influence of a resource in conflicts needs to be understood in historical terms” (Bercovitch et al, 2009, Part II, Chapter 2). Hence, we can conclude that any conflict prevention warning system that uses resources as an indicator should place a strong emphasis on the analysis of what this indicator means in the context of this particular conflict at this particular time as well as provide longitudinal data to track historical changes of resource use. Addressing resource scarcity may also play an important role in the response aspect of preventing violence in conflicts. For example, Lund lists several conflict prevention tools and one of the “hands on” targeted structural actions (which are those that address basic societal, institutional and policy factors affecting conflict and peace) that he lists is natural resource management (Bercovitch et al., 2009, Part III, Chapter 1).

### Inherency

#### Plan passed the House – not the Senate

#### House version of the bill will fail due to the Dodd-Frank Act – a change in the bill is necessary to solve.

Alic 7/2 (Jen, geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel, 7/2/13, “Transparency Squabble Stalls US-Mexico Oil & Gas Deal,” http://oilprice.com/Geopolitics/North-America/Transparency-Squabble-Stalls-US-Mexico-Oil-Gas-Deal.html)//DR. H

The US House has ratified an agreement governing oil and gas development along the US-Mexico border, possibly breaking the moratorium on production here and adding in a controversial clause that exempts companies from divulging payments made to foreign governments. The US-Mexico Hydrocarbon Transboundary Agreement (TBA) sets up a framework for joint development of oil and gas assets on the shared border in the Gulf of Mexico by US companies and Mexico’s state-run Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex). About 1.5 million acres and an estimated 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas are covered by the agreement. This area could ostensibly be freed up for leasing, as the legislation effectively ends a treatise moratorium on production here. There is one glitch, however: While the Republican-led House bill passed by a vote of 256 to 171 (with only 28 Democrats voting in favor), there is an alternative bill in the Senate, which does not include the disclosure exemption, and which the Obama administration favors. Before anything is implemented, these two versions will have to come together somehow. The controversy has to do with the Dodd-Frank Act. The Dodd Frank Act Section 1504 requires US companies to disclose payments to foreign governments, subnational governments and the federal government. Opponents of the act, which is pretty much everyone making money on government contracts, say it harms the competitiveness of US companies in the face of foreign companies who are not made to stand up to the same scrutiny. The other argument in favor of the exemption is that Pemex is 100% state-owned and the Mexican government may prohibit the very disclosure required by the Dodd-Frank Act, thus rendering US companies less competitive. Companies who are not required to disclosure payments may have the advantage in winning contracts. Democrats are worried that it will reverse any progress made towards greater transparency and preventing government corruption, which was the intention of the Dodd-Frank Act in the first place. From the White House’s perspective, the House version of the bill “negatively impacts US efforts to increase transparency and accountability,” and while Obama has not said he would veto the bill, the administration is hoping to amend it before it’s implemented. What they are really concerned about is what this might mean beyond Mexico. It could set a precedent for repealing Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act for other countries, which could harm national interests, as well as shareholder interests. Democrats believe the Senate will not pass the House bill without amending this exemption. The US-Mexico TAP was brokered by the two countries in February 2012, and it’s gotten pretty far, pretty fast. If we can get past this last hurdle, it could be a boon for Pemex. The state-run company is eyeing the deep-water Perdido fold belt, which could have the potential to expand Mexico’s stagnating domestic production. Last summer, Pemex announced a major discovery of crude oil in the Perdido fold belt, with preliminary estimates that the company’s Trion-1 well contained 350 million barrels of oil equivalent (proved). The well is about 39 kilometers south of US waters. At the time, Pemex noted that the discovery “increased certainty towards the recovery of prospective resources in the Perdido area project which have been estimated at up to 10 billion bbl of oil equivalent, and could potentially allow Mexico to increase its oil production platform in the medium and long-term.”

### Thorium CP

**Thorium doesn’t solve in the short term and only replaces nuclear power**

**Ibrahim 7/15** (Dr. Ahmad, Fellow at the Academy of Science Malaysia and Science Analyst for Strait Times, “More interest in nuke fuel thorium,” http://www.nst.com.my/opinion/columnist/more-interest-in-nuke-fuel-thorium-1.319433)

DESPITE the safety issues related to nuclear power, many feel it is not wise to ignore it as an energy source. We should instead look for ways to mitigate the safety challenges. One of the most powerful arguments in support of nuclear energy is its low greenhouse gas emissions. As climate change continues to pose threats to global wellbeing, going nuclear is a viable energy option. Scientists are looking at how to improve the safety features of nuclear energy. They do this in a number of ways. One is to develop new reactor designs that make the operation of nuclear plants safer. Another, which is more long term, is to look at alternative nuclear fuels. Thorium is one such fuel that appears to show promise. Thorium is a naturally occurring radioactive material. It was discovered in 1828 by a Norwegian mineralogist and named after Thor, the Norse god of thunder. Thorium is estimated to be three to four times more abundant than uranium in the Earth's crust. Thorium was once commonly used as the light source in gas mantles. Many countries have experimented using thorium as a nuclear fuel. These include Canada, China, Germany, India, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. When compared with uranium, there is growing interest in developing thorium as a new primary energy source. Extracting its latent energy value in a cost-effective manner remains a challenge and will require considerable research and development (R&D) investment. Research into the use of thorium as a nuclear fuel has been taking place for more than 40 years, though with much less intensity than that for uranium. Basic development work has been conducted in Germany, India, Canada, Japan, China, Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Russia, Brazil, the United Kingdom and the United States. Tests have been conducted on a number of different thorium-based fuel forms. The China Academy of Sciences in January 2011 launched a big R&D programme on reactor technology for thorium. The Research Centre apparently has a 5MW prototype under construction at Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics. This should come into operation in 2015. India has huge resources of easily accessible thorium, but relatively little uranium. This explains why India has made use of thorium for large-scale energy production a major goal in its nuclear power programme. Using thorium as fuel offers attractive features, including lower levels of waste generation, less radioactive elements in that waste, and providing a diversification option for nuclear fuel supply. Also, the use of thorium in most reactor types leads to significant extra safety margins. Thorium fuel is now being tested in the Halden research reactor in Norway. It was loaded in the last week of April. Led by Norwegian company Thor Energy, the test will provide information necessary for qualifying this new fuel material for commercial use in current reactors. Such fuel, in pellet form, promises higher operating safety margins due to higher thermal conductivity and melting point, and produces no new plutonium as it operates. Thor Energy said thorium-plutonium fuels provided a new option for reducing civil and military plutonium stocks. It is clear many countries are investing in developing thorium as a viable nuclear fuel. A recent report has suggested that China has recently approved more than 1,000 PhD students on thorium studies. Malaysia does have decent deposits of thorium. Apart from the tailings from tin mining, studies show there are other deposits. Another potential source is the residue coming from the Lynas rare earths processing plant in Kuantan. This is the reason why many feel it is unwise to allow such residue to be exported out. In France, a similar rare earths processing company, Rhodia, has kept all its thorium-rich residue for future use as fuel. In Malaysia, unfortunately, we have squandered on the opportunity to capitalise on the thorium contained in the residues of the Asian Rare Earths Company, which operated a while back in Perak. They have all been cementised for disposal. The recently established National Committee on Thorium may provide a plan on how to use the country's thorium deposits.

#### \_\_\_ conditional options are a voting issue-

#### A) 2AC strategy skew- cross applications prevents and deters reading 2AC offense, kills affirmative strategy

#### B) Advocacy skills and education - we never defend positions in the debate- kills portable skills - bolsters ideological polarization

**[ ] You get dispo**

**[ ] You get one condo**

### Debt Ceiling

#### Laundry list of reasons why it won’t pass

Marcus, 9/20 – Writer for Real Clear Politics (Ruth, “On Debt Ceiling, a Different Feel,” Real Clear Politics, 20 September 2013, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/20/on\_debt\_ceiling\_a\_different\_feel\_120005.html//HO

Let's hope so. But steady Washington hands worry that this time really could be different -- and, remember, even edging close to default is costly.¶ There are four (at least) reasons to worry:¶ 1) House Speaker John Boehner has chosen to play with fire, arguing to his colleagues that the ultimate showdown should be over raising the debt ceiling rather than extending government funding.¶ Boehner's calculation appears to be twofold: that Republicans have more to lose from a shut-down fight (you may recall that didn't go so well for Newt Gingrich in 1995) and that Republicans will therefore have more leverage with Democrats and President Obama if they make their stand on the debt ceiling.¶ This strategy hinges on the assumption that Obama will blink. This has some basis in reality: He's blinked before, and blinking in the face of imminent disaster might be the prudent thing to do.¶ Yet the president has been asserting for months that he will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. This attitude is a trifle ahistoric: Presidents, including Obama, always make deals and offer concessions to secure an increase. But previous Congresses, however, have not been willing to take the debt-ceiling extortion racket to the brink.¶ What Obama really means by "not negotiating" is that he won't accept a cuts-only approach, which is, of course, the only approach that Republicans will accept. As I said, playing with fire.¶ 2) Mitch McConnell is AWOL. The Senate minority leader played a crucial role, along with Vice President Joe Biden, in defusing the last crisis, over the fiscal cliff. Never mind that the Kentucky Republican got a pretty good deal -- Democrats ended up with way less new tax revenue than Boehner had offered, and lost leverage to obtain more. He's taken grief for raising any taxes at all, and is desperate to fend off a tea party-fueled primary challenge.¶ 3) The insistence on defunding Obamacare introduces an unfulfillable new demand into an already complicated equation. That's not going to happen, but enough House members have gotten themselves so worked up over the issue that Boehner's ploy to give them a symbolic vote and move on with funding the government blew up last week.¶ You know things are bad when The Wall Street Journal editorial page starts sounding rational. As the Journal described the lunatic strategy, "Republicans must threaten to crash their Zeros into the aircraft carrier of Obamacare. ... Kamikaze missions rarely turn out well, least of all for the pilots."¶ Yes, but in the House, the crazies are in the cockpit and, in the form of outside groups, supplying the fuel in the form of campaign spending. Boehner doesn't have control of his caucus.¶ 4) The low-hanging fruit has been plucked. Taxes have been raised on the wealthiest Americans.¶ Discretionary spending has been cut to the bone (with the sequester, beyond). The contours of a deal are as ever: blending entitlement changes and new revenue through tax reform. But the obstacles to a deal also remain firmly in place. Serious talks are close to non-existent. The ability to quickly concoct a mini-bargain is limited.

#### **There’s no link – their Bowman evidence says Obama can’t handle a bill – that’s our AFF**

#### **Obama won’t compromise – campaign like speeches against the house means momentum flows AFF**

KNOLLER, 9/20 – Columnist for CBS News (“Republicans "trying to mess with me" on budget, Obama says”, 9/20/13, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57603954/republicans-trying-to-mess-with-me-on-budget-obama-says/)

President Obama slammed House Republicans for "trying to mess with me" by passing a bill today to fund the government but also defund Obamacare. At a Ford plant that stamps out components for trucks and vans, Mr. Obama said the budget battles in Washington are "always a contentious process." But in a campaign-style speech to autoworkers, the president revved his engine against those he called "a faction on the far right." He says they convinced their leadership to pursue policies that could result in a government shutdown or default, if funding for his signature health care program is not cut off. The president's remarks came just a few hours after the House passed a bill to keep the government funded through the end of the year, but at the same time, block further funding for the Affordable Care Act, which even the president refers to as Obamacare. He called on Congress to quickly pass a funding bill that would avert a government shutdown beginning the start of the new fiscal year October 1st, and to also enact an increase in the debt ceiling, so the U.S. Treasury can resume borrowing to pay its obligations. "They're willing to plunge America into default, if we can't defund Obamacare," said the president. "They're not focused on you," the president told about 2,000 Ford autoworkers gathered on the floor of the stamping plant. "They're focused on politics. They're focused on trying to mess with me." "This is not a banana republic," the president said of the possibility the U.S. might have to default. "We don't run out on our tab. We just can't not pay our bills." Mr. Obama reaffirmed his determination not to bargain with Congress over raising the debt ceiling. "I will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States," he declared to cheers from his crowd. He demanded that Congress fund the government and raise the debt ceiling with "no obstruction, no games, no holding the economy hostage if you don't get 100 percent of what you want."

#### No chance of war from economic decline---best and most recent data

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

PC low – Summers nomination

Koffler, 9/17 – White House Reporter (“Chuck Todd: White House Screwed Up Summers Nomination”, 9/17/13, http://www.whitehousedossier.com/2013/09/17/chuck-todd-white-house-screwed-summers-nomination)

MSNBC’s Chuck Todd this morning laid blame directly at the North Portico doorstep for President Obama’s failure to install his favored candidate, Larry Summers, as Fed Chairman, saying the effort was aborted after a “somewhat inept” performance by the White House. The withdrawal by Summers from contention from the post – done after it became clear he could not rally Senate support for his nomination – is the second major legislative defeat for the president just this month. Obama, by most accounts, was headed for failure on a resolution supporting the bombing of Syria before he abandoned that effort and struck a deal with Russia to supposedly have Syria willingly hand its chemical weapons over. Appearing on the Morning Joe program, Todd said the White House Summers into the arena without proper political backup, resulting in him becoming a “piñata” for his opponents on the Left. Todd said: There is a little bit of internal finger-pointing on how they handled the Summers issue. You know, why did they let it get so public? He was put out there, arguably by his advocates in the White House, sort of put in the public purview, but didn’t have a support network of folks – a sort of a War Room, if you will – to defend him from shots. They had to know this was coming, this was not a surprise. When you look in hindsight, if they really wanted Larry, then how they went about it was wrong and it was a bit inept. There should have been a more concerted effort. They knew who some of the potential roadblocks could be in the Democratic side. They should have been working that a little bit harder behind the scenes before they went so public and allowed him to become a piñata on the Left. Obama’s influence on Capitol Hill has declined to the point that he has so little “political capital” he can’t punish Democrats for opposing Summers, Todd said.

#### **Obama is pushing EPA regs – congressional backlash means fights are inevitable**

Shear, 9/20 – Columnist for NYT (“Administration to Press Ahead With Carbon Limits”, 9/20/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/21/us/politics/obama-administration-carbon-limits.html)

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration on Friday announced that it was not backing down from a confrontation with the coal industry and that it would press ahead with enacting the first federal carbon limits on the nation’s power companies. The proposed regulations, announced at the National Press Club by Gina McCarthy, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, are an aggressive move by Mr. Obama to bypass Congress on climate change with executive actions he promised in his inaugural address this year. The regulations are certain to be denounced by House Republicans and the industry as part of what they call the president’s “war on coal.” In her speech, Ms. McCarthy unveiled the agency’s proposal to limit new gas-fired power plants to 1,000 pounds of carbon dioxide emissions per megawatt-hour and new coal plants to 1,100 pounds of carbon dioxide. Industry officials say the average advanced coal plant currently emits about 1,800 pounds of carbon dioxide per megawatt-hour. “The president’s Climate Action Plan calls on federal agencies to take steady, sensible, and pragmatic steps to cut the harmful carbon pollution that fuels our changing climate, to prepare our communities for its unavoidable impacts, while continuing to provide affordable and reliable energy for all,” Ms. McCarthy said. Opponents of the new E.P.A. rule quickly vowed to take measures to stop it. Senator Mitch McConnell, the Republican leader who is from coal-dependent Kentucky, promised to use his legislative skills to prevent the measure. “The president’s decision today is an escalation of the war on coal and what that really means for Kentucky families is an escalation of his war on jobs and the Kentucky economy,” Mr. McConnell said. “I will file a resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act to ensure a vote to stop this devastating E.P.A. rule.”

#### Oil and gas lobbies love the plan

Kollipara ’12

(Puneet, “U.S., Mexico, reach accord on drilling below maritime border”, Fuel Fix, 2-20-2012, http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/02/20/449517/)

The agreement announced today also would lift a moratorium on waters in a buffer area known as the Western Gap that both nations put off limits for 10 years in a 2000 treaty. That moratorium was extended through 2014 after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. It stems from a May 2010 commitment between U.S. President Barack Obama and Mexican President Felipe Calderón. They said it would include safety insight from the 2010 spill, which started a month earlier. It wouldn’t take force until both nations’ legislatures, the Senate in the case of the U.S., sign off. “We ought to be able to gather necessary political forces to get the ratification that is needed,” Salazar said Mexico still faces the problem of how to get at the deepwater oil on its side of the Gulf border. Pemex lacks much of the technology needed for ultra-deep exploration and production. Also Mexico’s constitution prohibits foreign companies from actually owning any of the oil they produce in the nation’s waters and on its lands, making many less eager to get involved. “With this we all win, and we guarantee that our oil will be used to the benefit of Mexicans,” Calderón said Monday. Tommy Beaudreau, director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, said the accord would “respect” Mexico’s constitution. If Pemex and U.S. countries can’t agree on how to jointly develop a boundary-straddling resource, another process would determine how each side could develop its share, Salazar said. Sean Shafer, analyst with Sugar Land-based Quest Offshore Resources, said companies will need a few years to get permits and more leases and start drilling. But he said the area holds vast promise and some infrastructure is already in the vicinity, as evidenced by Shell’s already-producing Perdido hub project nearby. The waters, concentrated in the western Gulf, are more oil-heavy than eastern Gulf waters, Shafer said. “Right now natural gas prices are very low, so operators are more interested in the oilier stuff,” Shafer said. The oil-and-gas industry hailed the announcement, in a rare moment of praise for the Obama administration, while using the occasion to urge the Interior Department to open new waters off the East Coast. Although Obama has touted that U.S. oil production is at an eight-year high, industry groups such as the American Petroleum Institute argue his policies have hurt development offshore and on federal lands, instead crediting new technologies and rising production on state and private lands. “The administration’s announcement with Mexico is a positive step that demonstrates the value of opening new areas to responsible and safe domestic offshore development,” Reid Porter, API spokesman, said in an email. “This shared announcement also shows the need for U.S. energy policy that emphasizes more domestic development — such as areas offshore Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina — to maximize U.S. jobs and investment to energy development here at home.” The waters belonging to the U.S. make up an area “larger than the state of Delaware,” Salazar said, and contain up to 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

#### Turns the DA

Froomkin ’11

(Dan, “How the Oil Lobby Greases Washington’s Wheels”, Huffington Post, 4-6-2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/06/how-the-oil-lobby-greases\_n\_845720.html)

Clout in Washington isn't about winning legislative battles -- it's about making sure that they never happen at all. The oil and gas industry has that kind of clout. Despite astronomical profits during what have been lean years for most everyone else, the oil and gas industry continues to benefit from massive, multi-billion dollar taxpayer subsidies. Opinion polling shows the American public overwhelmingly wants those subsidies eliminated. Meanwhile, both parties are hunting feverishly for ways to reduce the deficit. But when President Obama called on Congress to eliminate about $4 billion a year in tax breaks for Big Oil earlier this year, the response on the Hill was little more than a knowing chuckle. Even Obama's closest congressional allies don't think the president’s proposal has a shot. "I would be surprised if it got a great deal of traction," Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.), chairman of the Senate energy committee, told reporters at the National Press Club a few days after Obama first announced his plan. Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.), co-author of a House bill that closely resembles Obama's proposal, nevertheless acknowledges that it has slim chances of passing. "It will be a challenge to get anything through the House that includes any tax increase for anyone under any circumstance," he told The Huffington Post. The list goes on: "It's not on my radar," said Frank Maisano, a spokesman for Bracewell Giuliani, a lobbying firm with several oil and gas industry clients. "It's old news and it's never going to happen in this Congress. It couldn't even happen in the last Congress." Indeed, the oil and gas industry's stranglehold on Congres is so firm that even when the Democrats controlled both houses, repeal of the subsidies didn't stand a chance. Obama proposed cutting them in his previous two budgets as well, but the Senate -- where Republicans and consistently pro-oil Louisiana Democrat Mary Landrieu had more than enough votes to block any legislation -- never even took a stab at it.

#### DA’s not intrinsic

#### Fiat solves link

#### Shutdown is inevitable, but there’s no impact – this card assumes all your warrants

Ungar, 9/19 – Writer for Forbes and a Democratic strategist with Mercury Public Affairs (Rick, “Government Shut Down Likely To Actually Happen This Time,” Forbes, 19 September 2013, http://www.forbes.com/sites/rickungar/2013/09/19/government-shut-down-likely-to-actually-happen-this-time/)//HO

So it goes with modern government in the United States and its own version of extreme actors who now seem to arrive with each passing generation. They come to Washington possessing a powerful drive to shut down the government—whether it makes any logical sense or not—and end up seeing their political lives go up in smoke (see Newt Gingrich) as they are vanquished in a war they could never actually win.¶ While this behavior, and the resulting damage that comes from self-inflicted crisis, might be described as a failure of leadership while a victory for mediocrity of the highest order, as Clemenza would say….these things gotta happen.¶ Why?¶ Because it helps to get rid of the bad blood.¶ Since the arrival of the Obama presidency, the United States has lived in a perpetual state of threatened government closures, credit defaults and any number of unproductive and distorted acts promising to wreak havoc on an already struggling economy while causing the greatest harm to those who can least bear it. Indeed, this annual ritual has become so commonplace that most Americans now simply roll their eyes when budget and debt-ceiling season rolls around, knowing full well that—after all the drama we seem to love so much plays out—the two sides will stumble towards some sort of an agreement and life will return to normal for most of us until the show begins anew next year.¶ But this time may very well be different …this time, a government shutdown is actually likely to happen.¶ As Congressional Republicans continue to insist on the one thing that the White House cannot possibly agree to as the condition for allowing the government to keep its doors open—the defunding of Obamacare—the only way a government shut down would appear avoidable would be for the Congressional Republicans to back down in a rather dramatic fashion.¶ However, as the GOP has painted itself into a corner from which there is no viable way out, this is not likely to happen.¶ After all the speeches, bellowing and other efforts offered up to convince voters that , somehow, a government shut down would be the fault of the President, one must look far and wide to find a Republican in office who doesn’t completely understand that backing down on defunding Obamacare—after going so far out on a limb—is not going to produce a happy political ending except for the wingnuts who will benefit in their home districts for behaving ridiculously.¶ Meanwhile, while many may choose to view the Obama presidency as a tragic adventure, asking the President to pronounce his own presidency to be a failure—which would be precisely what he would be doing if he were to agree to the defunding or delay of his signature legislation—is just not going to happen. What’s more, the White House knows very well that even those Americans who may dislike Obamacare understand that a president cannot be expected to cave when a gun is put to his head, nor would the overwhelming majority of Americans want him to do so.¶ The likely result?¶ A government shutdown that can only bring on bad days for the GOP—and the Republican leadership knows it.¶ Speaking earlier this year, Speaker John Boehner said,¶ ““If we were to put Obamacare into the C.R. [continuing resolution funding government] and send it over to the Senate, we were risking shutting down the government. That is not our goal. Do you want to risk the full faith and credit of the United states government over Obamacare? That’s a very tough argument to make.”¶ And yet, on Wednesday, the Republican leadership in the House capitulated to the right wing of their party by agreeing to attach a provision to the very Continuing Resolution Boehner referenced in his remarks earlier this year. It is a provision requiring the defunding of Obamacare as a condition to keeping the government operating beyond September 30th when funding officially runs out.¶ According to a source attending the closed-door meeting of the House GOP Caucus, Speaker Boehner’s capitulation was confirmed as he said, “Every member in this room is for defunding Obamacare. We’re going to send it over to the Senate, so our conservative allies over there can continue the fight.”¶ Translation—Boehner had no choice but to drop back ten and punt, knowing that the bill will very likely pass in the House of Representatives while also knowing that the bill is destined to die a quick death when it reaches the Senate as Senate Democrats will never go for defunding Obamacare.¶ Boehner also knows that there are a handful of Senate Republicans who see the effort to tie the operations of the United States government to the effort to use the repeal of Obamacare as blackmail is as foolish as it is doomed.¶ With the Speaker unable to function in a way that even approaches actual leadership, his only recourse was to attempt to shift the political blame for what he knows must follow over to his Republican counterparts in the other branch of Congress—the United States Senate.¶ However, on the very day that Boehner threw this political grenade into the Senate chamber in an effort to keep it from exploding in his own face, Mr. Tea Party himself, Senator Ted Cruz, picked up that grenade and threw it right back at Boehner’s head.¶ Despite Cruz’s constant proclamations that he would lead his party to the promised land of Obamacare destruction, the Senator from Texas had now decided that the time had come for him to run for cover and do whatever he can to deflect from his own abject failure.¶ Take a look at what Senator Cruz had to say—¶ “ Harry Reid will no doubt try to strip the defund language from the continuing resolution, and right now he likely has the votes to do so,” Cruz said in a statement. “At that point, House Republicans must stand firm, hold their ground, and continue to listen to the American people.”¶ Yes, after these many months of Cruz telling anyone who would listen—and there are quite a few willing to do so— that he, the “Super-Cruz”, would never cave when it comes to putting Obamacare to death, even if it meant single-handedly taking down the monster by heroically placing the Senate upon his manly shoulders and forcing them to kill Obamacare or shut down the government, Cruz was going out with a whimper.¶ And where did Senator Cruz seek to put the blame for what is likely to be a disastrous political result for his party?¶ Squarely on the backs of John Boehner and the House Republicans…and the House Republicans are not the least bit happy about it.¶ Said a senior GOP aide in the House—¶ “We haven’t even taken up the bill and Ted Cruz is admitting defeat. Some people came here to govern and make things better for their constituents. Ted Cruz came here to throw bombs and fundraise off of attacks on fellow Republicans. He’s a joke, plain and simple.”¶ This aide’s remarks were among the kindest aimed at Cruz as Republican legislators took to social media to denounce their Senate GOP counterparts—reserving their best shots for Senator Cruz—for doing just great when it comes to scoring big in town halls and Facebook FB +3.28% “likes” but failing completely when it comes to actually standing their ground.¶ If that isn’t bad blood, I don’t know what is.¶ The bottom line to all the drama is that the Republicans have set up a scenario where a government shutdown is highly likely because the Senate will not support the House bill and the House will not support a Senate bill that comes without a defunding of Obamacare.¶ Meanwhile, while such a shut down will produce the same political disaster for today’s generation of Republicans as it did when Newt Gingrich miscalculated during his adventures into the darkness in 1995-96, the White House will continue to stand at the ready to negotiate a deal that is actually negotiable and will, eventually, be credited for being the grown-ups that will get the government functioning once again.¶ You see, while the government ‘families’ may soon be “going to the mats”, it is inevitable that the Democrats must emerge from the war far stronger and will do so without having to expend much in the way of fire power.¶ The Republicans will defeat themselves as they descend into darkness, despair and destruction at the hands of their own civil war. After all, a family can hardly be expected to defeat the mob across town when they are busily occupied with putting out hits on their own Dons.¶ It turns out that Clemenza was a pretty smart fellow.¶ And while we despair of the innocent bystanders who will be harmed in this war—veterans, senior citizens, federal employees, and the most needy in our society—every now and then, as Clemenza said, we have to clear out the bad blood.¶ Can’t happen soon enough for me.

#### Winners win – empirically proven, it’s true for energy, and compromises don’t work

Gergen 1/19 – CNN Senior Political Analyst

(David, “Obama 2.0: Smarter – but wiser?”, CNN, 1-19-2013, http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/18/opinion/gergen-obama-two/index.html)

On the eve of his second inaugural, President Obama appears smarter, tougher and bolder than ever before. But whether he is also wiser remains a key question for his new term. It is clear that he is consciously changing his leadership style heading into the next four years. Weeks before the November elections, his top advisers were signaling that he intended to be a different kind of president in his second term. "Just watch," they said to me, in effect, "he will win re-election decisively and then he will throw down the gauntlet to the Republicans, insisting they raise taxes on the wealthy. Right on the edge of the fiscal cliff, he thinks Republicans will cave." What's your Plan B, I asked. "We don't need a Plan B," they answered. "After the president hangs tough -- no more Mr. Nice Guy -- the other side will buckle." Sure enough, Republicans caved on taxes. Encouraged, Obama has since made clear he won't compromise with Republicans on the debt ceiling, either. Obama 2.0 stepped up this past week on yet another issue: gun control. No president in two decades has been as forceful or sweeping in challenging the nation's gun culture. Once again, he portrayed the right as the enemy of progress and showed no interest in negotiating a package up front. In his coming State of the Union address, and perhaps in his inaugural, the president will begin a hard push for a comprehensive reform of our tattered immigration system. Leading GOP leaders on the issue -- Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Florida, for example -- would prefer a piecemeal approach that is bipartisan. Obama wants to go for broke in a single package, and on a central issue -- providing a clear path to citizenship for undocumented residents -- he is uncompromising. After losing out on getting Susan Rice as his next secretary of state, Obama has also shown a tougher side on personnel appointments. Rice went down after Democratic as well as Republican senators indicated a preference for Sen. John Kerry. But when Republicans also tried to kill the nomination of Chuck Hagel for secretary of defense, Obama was unyielding -- an "in-your-face appointment," Sen. Lindsay Graham, R-South Carolina, called it, echoing sentiments held by some of his colleagues. Republicans would have preferred someone other than Jack Lew at Treasury, but Obama brushed them off. Hagel and Lew -- both substantial men -- will be confirmed, absent an unexpected bombshell, and Obama will rack up two more victories over Republicans. Strikingly, Obama has also been deft in the ways he has drawn upon Vice President Joe Biden. During much of the campaign, Biden appeared to be kept under wraps. But in the transition, he has been invaluable to Obama in negotiating a deal with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell on the fiscal cliff and in pulling together the gun package. Biden was also at his most eloquent at the ceremony announcing the gun measures. All of this has added up for Obama to one of the most effective transitions in modern times. And it is paying rich dividends: A CNN poll this past week pegged his approval rating at 55%, far above the doldrums he was in for much of the past two years. Many of his long-time supporters are rallying behind him. As the first Democrat since Franklin D. Roosevelt to score back-to-back election victories with more than 50% of the vote, Obama is in the strongest position since early in his first year. Smarter, tougher, bolder -- his new style is paying off politically. But in the long run, will it also pay off in better governance? Perhaps -- and for the country's sake, let's hope so. Yet, there are ample reasons to wonder, and worry. Ultimately, to resolve major issues like deficits, immigration, guns and energy, the president and Congress need to find ways to work together much better than they did in the first term. Over the past two years, Republicans were clearly more recalcitrant than Democrats, practically declaring war on Obama, and the White House has been right to adopt a tougher approach after the elections. But a growing number of Republicans concluded after they had their heads handed to them in November that they had to move away from extremism toward a more center-right position, more open to working out compromises with Obama. It's not that they suddenly wanted Obama to succeed; they didn't want their party to fail. House Speaker John Boehner led the way, offering the day after the election to raise taxes on the wealthy and giving up two decades of GOP orthodoxy. In a similar spirit, Rubio has been developing a mainstream plan on immigration, moving away from a ruinous GOP stance. One senses that the hope, small as it was, to take a brief timeout on hyperpartisanship in order to tackle the big issues is now slipping away. While a majority of Americans now approve of Obama's job performance, conservatives increasingly believe that in his new toughness, he is going overboard, trying to run over them. They don't see a president who wants to roll up his sleeves and negotiate; they see a president who wants to barnstorm the country to beat them up. News that Obama is converting his campaign apparatus into a nonprofit to support his second term will only deepen that sense. And it frustrates them that he is winning: At their retreat, House Republicans learned that their disapproval has risen to 64%. Conceivably, Obama's tactics could pressure Republicans into capitulation on several fronts. More likely, they will be spoiling for more fights. Chances for a "grand bargain" appear to be hanging by a thread.

#### Shutdown either inevitable and no impact or there’s no shutdown

Marcus, 9/20 – Writer for Real Clear Politics (Ruth, “On Debt Ceiling, a Different Feel,” Real Clear Politics, 20 September 2013, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/20/on\_debt\_ceiling\_a\_different\_feel\_120005.html//HO

The chilling part is obvious. Having the government shut down, especially briefly, is stupid but survivable. (Economically, that is. The political ramifications are another matter.) We've been down this idiotic path before, and we may well be stumbling there again.¶ But leaving the government unable to borrow enough money to pay the debts it has already incurred is a different matter entirely. Breaching the debt ceiling evokes words like catastrophic and unthinkable, which is why it has never happened.¶ And why the notion that it might is so surprising. Astonishing, actually. Washington is used to government by crisis and deadline. Our creaky system is capable of rousing itself only when the train is bearing down the tracks.¶ So my usual way of analyzing these moments is to reason backward: The debt ceiling must be raised.¶ Therefore it will be. The situation will seem to be at an unbreakable stalemate until, suddenly, a solution appears. Everyone will breathe a sigh of relief -- until the inevitable next act in our political psychodrama. Panic, solve, repeat.¶ And this could well happen in the coming showdown.

### 2ac renewables t/o

#### This is our AFF- we transition to renewables

#### Renewables don’t offset fossil fuels – boomerang effect ensures it just drives up consumption

Zehner 12 – visiting Scholar at UC Berkeley (Ozzie, “Solar Cells and Wind Turbines Don't Offset Fossil Fuel Use, According to New Book, Green Illusions,” Wall Street Journal, June 12 2012, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/solar-cells-and-wind-turbines-dont-offset-fossil-fuel-use-according-to-new-book-green-illusions-2012-06-12 ) //JG

Renewable energy technologies do not offset fossil fuel use in the United States according to a new environmental book, Green Illusions (June 2012, University of Nebraska Press), by University of California - Berkeley visiting scholar Ozzie Zehner. In fact, building more solar cells and wind turbines could actually accelerate fossil fuel use unless nations take other steps to avoid a rebound effect. Many renewable energy researchers assume that building solar cells and wind farms will displace coal use and lower carbon dioxide levels. However, Zehner explains that subsidizing renewable energy merely expands energy supplies, which exerts a downward pressure on prices. Energy demand subsequently increases. "This brings us right back to where we started: high demand and so-called insufficient supply," says Zehner. "Historically, we've filled that added demand by building more coal-fired power plants, not fewer." "We create an energy boomerang," Zehner remarked during a recent PBS interview. "The harder we throw energy into the grid, the harder demand comes back to hit us on the head. More efficient solar cells, taller wind turbines, and advanced biofuels are all just ways of throwing harder."

#### Renewables won’t catch on– low efficiency, high cost, low reliability, land scarcity, lack of storage capacity. It’s a double-bind: either market forces will drive innovation absent the aff, or they can’t cause investment

**Taylor and Van Doren 11** – critic of federal energy and environmental policy, Wall Street Journal Contributor, served on congressional advisory bodies, member of International Association for Energy economics, writer for *The Energy Journal,* testified in Congress / editor of the quarterly journal *Regulation* and expert in the regulation of energy and environment, taught at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, School of Organization and Management at Yale University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, former postdoctoral fellow in political economy at Carnegie Mellon University (Jerry and Peter, “The Green Energy Economy Reconsidered” 4/25/11; < http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/green-energy-economy-reconsidered>)//Beddow

Let’s assume, however, that we could afford that. Have we ever seen such a “green economy”? Yes we have; in the 13th century. Renewable energy is quite literally the energy of yesterday. Few seem to realize that we abandoned “green” energy centuries ago for five very good reasons. First, green energy is diffuse, and **it takes a tremendous amount of land and material to harness even a little bit of energy**. Jesse Ausubel, director of the Program for the Human Environment and senior research associate at Rockefeller University, calculates, for instance, that the entire state of Connecticut (that is, if Connecticut were as windy as the southeastern Colorado plains) would need to be devoted to wind turbines to power the city of New York. Second, **it is extremely costly.** In 2016 President Obama’s own Energy Information Administration estimates that onshore wind (the least expensive of these green energies) will be **80% more expensive than combined cycle, gas-fired electricity.** And that doesn’t account for the costs associated with the **hundreds of billions of dollars worth of new transmission systems that would be necessary to get wind and solar energy — which is generally produced far from where consumers happen to live — to ratepayers. Third, it is unreliable. The wind doesn’t always blow and the sun doesn’t always shine when the energy is needed**. We account for that today by having a lot of coal and natural gas generation on “standby” to fire-up when renewables can’t produce. Incidentally, the cost of maintaining this backup generation is likewise never fully accounted for in the cost estimates associated with green energy. But in a world where fossil fuels are a thing of the past, we would be forced — like the peasants of the Dark Age — to rely upon the vagaries of the weather. Fourth, it is scarce. While wind and sunlight are obviously not scarce, **the real estate where those energies are reliably continuous and in economic proximity to ratepayers is scarce.** Finally, **once the electricity is produced by the sun or wind, it cannot be stored because battery technology is not currently up to the task**. Hence, we must immediately “use it or lose it.” **Fossil fuels are everything that green energy is not.** Approximately 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas (which cost approximately $4.00) can generate the same amount of electricity as running an average rooftop solar system for 131 days. It is comparatively cheap. It is reliable; it will burn and produce energy whenever you want it. It is plentiful (we use only a tiny bit of oil in the electricity sector). And you can store fossil fuels until you need them. Proponents of green energy argue that if the government can put a man on the moon, it can certainly make green energy economically attractive. Well, notice that government was not trying to get a man to the moon profitably, which is more akin to the challenge here. Even before the Obama presidency began, about half the production costs of wind and solar energy were underwritten by the taxpayer to no commercial avail. There’s little reason to think that a more sustained, multi-decade commitment to subsidy would play out any differently. After all, the federal government once promised that nuclear energy was on the cusp of being “too cheap to meter.” That was in the 1950s. Sixty-one billion dollars of subsidies and impossible-to-price regulatory preferences later, it’s still the most expensive source of conventional energy on the grid. The fundamental question that green energy proponents must answer is this: if green energy is so inevitable and such a great investment, why do we need to subsidize it? If and when renewable energy makes economic sense, profit-hungry investors will build all that we need for us without government needing to lift a finger. But **if it doesn’t make economic sense, all of the subsidies in the world won’t change that fact.**

#### Renewables can’t solve warming – they supplement, not replace, dirty energy

Angus 12– ecosocialist advocate, citing an extensive study by Richard York, professor at the University of Oregon with an MS in Environmental Studies from Bemidji State University (Iran, “Green energy won’t save the earth without social change”, 3/21/12; < http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/03/21/green-energy-alone-wont-save-the-earth/>)//Beddow

The most popular techno-fix for global warming is green energy. If energy companies would only deploy wind, hydro, solar, geothermal or nuclear, then emission-intensive fossil fuels will eventually disappear. But will that actually work? A new study by Richard York of the University of Oregon shows that it isn’t that simple. **Rather than displacing fossil fuels, green energy sources have proven to be mostly additive.** “Do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels?” published this month in Nature Climate Change, discusses what happened when alternative energy sources were introduced in countries around the world, over the past fifty years. Contrary to the accepted wisdom that new green energy replaces fossil-fuel use, York found that on average each unit of energy use from non-fossil-fuel sources displaced less than a quarter of a unit of energy use from fossil-fuel sources. The picture is worse with electricity, where **each new unit generated from green sources displaced less than one-tenth of a unit of fossil-fuel-generated electricity.** York writes: “Based on all of the results presented above, the answer to the question presented in the title of this paper – do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels? – is yes, but only very modestly. **The common assumption that the expansion of production of alternative energy will suppress fossil-fuel energy production in equal proportion is clearly wrong**.” Why don’t the new sources replace the old? York identifies two key reasons: the inertia of a huge existing fossil-fuel infrastructure, and the power and influence of the coal and oil corporations. **“The failure of non-fossil energy sources to displace fossil ones is probably in part attributable to the established energy system where there is a lock-in to using fossil fuels as the base energy source because of their long-standing prevalence and existing infrastructure and to the political and economic power of the fossil-fuel industry**.” In other words, eliminating fossil-fuel as an energy source is at least as much a social and political problem as a technical one. “Of course all societies need energy. So, obviously, if societies are to stop using fossil fuels they must have other energy sources. However, the results from the analyses presented here indicate that the shift away from fossil fuel does not happen inevitably with the expansion of non-fossil-fuel sources, or at least in the political and economic contexts that have been dominant over the past fifty years around the world…. “The most effective strategy for curbing carbon emissions is likely to be one that aims to not only develop non-fossil energy sources, but also to find ways to alter political and economic contexts so that fossil-fuel energy is more easily displaced and to curtail the growth in energy consumption as much as possible. “A general implication of these findings is that polices aimed at addressing global climate change should not focus principally on developing technological fixes, but should also take into account human behaviour in the context of political, economic and social systems.” The evidence shows that simply introducing green energy isn’t enough: the introduction must be accompanied by “explicit policies aimed at reducing carbon emissions.” The article is published in a scientific journal, where political and social conclusions can only be expressed in muted form. But Richard York’s research and conclusions reinforce the argument that he and his co-authors (John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark) made more explicitly in their recent book, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Planet. “We are confronting the question of a terminal crisis, threatening most life on the planet, civilization, and the very existence of future generations. … attempts to solve this through technological fixes, market magic, and the idea of a ‘sustainable capitalism’ are mere forms of ecological denial, since they ignore the inherent destructiveness of the current system of unsustainable development – capitalism.”

#### Now is key --- food crises are beginning --- warming ensures strong plants that can provide for the increasing globe

Idso et. al. 11—Former Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology @ Arizona State and PhD from UMinnesota and former research physicist for the Department of Agriculture—AND Keith Idso, PhD in Botany—AND Craig, PhD in Geography (Sherwood, “Is There a Need for a More Sustainable Agriculture?” Vol. 14, Iss. 24, 15 June 2011, <http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N24/EDIT.php>, DA: 6/23/2012//JLENART)

**In a paper that came to our attention** a couple weeks ago, **Gomiero** et al. (2011) **ask the question "Is there a need for a more sustainable agriculture?"** This they do in the title of a paper recently published in Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences, where **they write** that **"notwithstanding the great achievements of the 'Green Revolution,' the world will need 70 to 100% more food by 2050," concluding that "a new challenge lies ahead: how to feed nine billion with less land, water and energy, while at the same time preserving natural resources and soil fertility."** Coincidentally, this is essentially the same question asked by one of us (Idso, 2011) in a major report published in the current week's issue of CO2 Science: "Estimates of Global Food Production in the Year 2050: Will We Produce Enough to Adequately Feed the World?" **In their analysis of the question, Gomiero et al. state that "technical advances are important in order to meet the future needs," as does Idso**. In addition, **Gomiero et al. state that "addressing key socioeconomic issues, such as the inequality in the access to resources, population growth and access to education are also a priority if we want to properly deal with sustainability." Idso alludes to these** same **factors**, particularly population growth; **but he concentrates most heavily on a subject not touched upon** by **Gomiero** et al. -- **the aerial fertilization effect of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content. Idso** first **identifies the 45 key crops that account for 95% of world food production, after which he calculates the rates at which their productivities rose over the past 15 years in response to all technological innovations of that time period plus the concurrent increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration**. Then, **calculating the percentage increases in the productivities of these crops in response to a 300-ppm increase in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration from experimental data tabulated in the Plant Growth Database of CO2 Science, and knowing how much the atmosphere's CO2 content rose over** the past **15 years, he determines what part of the past 15 years' productivity increases were due to the aerial fertilization effect of CO2** and what part was due to everything else, which remaining part he calls the techno-intel effect. **Extending the linear regression representing this** latter **effect to the year 2050, and using the IPCC's best median estimate of what the atmosphere's CO2 concentration will be in that year, Idso** then **calculates the productivity increases of the 45 key crops due to the aerial fertilization effect of CO2 to that** point in **time**, adding the results to those he obtained for the techno-intel effect. **This he does for the world as a whole**, six world regions, twenty sub-regions and the 25 countries with the greatest populations. And comparing these results with what has been learned from the many different analyses of the subject -- and making adjustments for each geographic entity's projected rate of population growth -- **he determines which entities' projected crop productivity increases fall either below, within or above the 70-100% interval that is deemed necessary to insure food security in 2050, with productivity increases below 70% representing food insecurity, with those above 100% representing food security, and with anything in between** the two percentages **being a "maybe" in terms of food security**. **The results are** rather **chilling. And they should cause all those who are calling for mandatory reductions in anthropogenic CO2 emissions to seriously reconsider their views on the subject, while those who may not have thought at all about the topic should do so now; for the looming global food crisis is everybody's business, and all should have a say in what to do about it.**

#### Food crises cause World War 3

Calvin ’98 [William Calvin, Theoretical Neurophysiologist at the University of Washington, January 1998, Atlantic Monthly, The Great Climate Flip-Flop, Pages 47-64]

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. **Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors** or distant lands -- if only **because their armies,** unpaid and lacking food, **would go marauding**, both at home and across the borders. **The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies,** before they fell 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 would be a worldwide problem -- and** could **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.

#### Consensus of experts agree no impact to climate change

Hsu 10 (Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. <http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>)

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

#### Err neg – aff authors overestimate warming and underestimate adaptation

Goklany 11 - a science and technology policy analyst for the United States Department of the Interior (Indur M., “Misled on Climate Change: How the UN IPCC (and others) Exaggerate the Impacts of Global Warming” December 2011, <http://goklany.org/library/Reason%20CC%20and%20Development%202011.pdf>, PZ)

A third approach would be to fix the root cause of why developing countries are deemed to be most at-risk, namely, poverty. Sustained economic growth would, as is evident from the experience of developed countries, address virtually all problems of poverty, not just that portion exacerbated by global warming. It is far more certain that sustainable economic growth will provide greater benefits than emission reductions: while there is no doubt that poverty leads to disease and death, **there is substantial doubt regarding the reality and magnitude of the negative impact of global warming. This is especially true as assessments often ignore improvements in adaptive capacity.** Of these three approaches, human well-being in poorer countries is likely to be advanced most effectively by sustained economic development and least by emission reductions. In addition, because of the inertia of the climate system, economic development is likely to bear fruit faster than any emission reductions.These figures also indicate that the compound effect of economic development and technological change can result in quite dramatic improvements even over the relatively short period for which these figures were developed. Figure 5, for instance, covered 26 years. By contrast, **climate change impacts analyses frequently look 50 to 100 years into the future**. Over such long periods, the compounded effect could well be spectacular**. Longer term analyses of climate-sensitive indicators of human well-being show that the combination of** economic growth and technological change can, over decades, reduce negative impacts on human beings by an order of magnitude, that is, **a factor of ten, or more**. In some instances, **this combination has virtually eliminated such negative impacts.** But, **since impact assessments generally fail to fully account for increases in economic development and technological change, they substantially** overestimate future net damages from global warming. It may be argued that the high levels of economic development depicted in Figure 6 are unlikely. But if that’s the case, then economic growth used to drive the IPCC’s scenarios are equally unlikely, which necessarily means that the estimates of emissions, temperature increases, and impacts and damages of GW projected by the IPCC are also overestimates.B. Secular Technological Change **The second major reason why future adaptive capacity has been underestimated** (**and the impacts of global warming systematically overestimated) is that few impact studies consider secular technological change.** 25 **Most assume that no new technologies will come on line**, although some do assume greater adoption of existing technologies with higher GDP per capita and, much less frequently, a modest generic improvement in productivity. 26 Such an assumption may have been appropriate during the Medieval Warm Period, when the pace of technological change was slow, but nowadays technological change is fast (as indicated in Figures 1 through 5) and, arguably, accelerating. 27 It is unlikely that we will see a halt to technological change unless so-called precautionary policies are instituted that count the costs of technology but ignore its benefits, as some governments have already done for genetically modified crops and various pesticides. So how much of a difference in impact would consideration of both economic development and technological change have made? If impacts were to be estimated for five or so years into the future, ignoring changes in adaptive capacity between now and then probably would not be fatal because neither economic development nor technological change would likely advance substantially during that period. However, **the time horizon of climate change impact assessments is often on the order of 35–100 years or more.** The Fast Track Assessments use a base year of 1990 to estimate impacts for 2025, 2055 and 2085. **Over such periods one ought to expect substantial advances in adaptive capacity due to increases in economic development, technological change and human capital**. As already noted, retrospective assessments indicate that **over the span of a few decades, changes in economic development and technologies can substantially reduce, if not eliminate, adverse environmental impacts and improve human well-being, as measured by a variety of objective indicators.** 41 **Thus, not fully accounting for changes in the level of economic development and secular technological change would understate future adaptive capacity, which then could overstate impacts by one or more orders of magnitude** if the time horizon is several decades into the future. The assumption that there would be little or no improved or new technologies that would become available between 1990 and 2100 (or 2200), as assumed in most climate change impact assessments, is clearly naïve. In fact, a comparison of today’s world against the world of 1990 (the base year used in most impacts studies to date) shows that even during this brief 20-year span, this assumption is invalid for many, if not most, human enterprises. Since 1990, for example, the portion of the developing world’s population living in absolute poverty declined from 42% to 25%, and in sub-Saharan Africa Internet users increased from 0 to 50 million, while cellular phone users went from 0 per 100 to 33 per 100.