### 1

#### Obama’s political capital is effectively holding off passage of the Iran sanctions bill now – but it’s still a fight

Delmore 2/5/14 (Erin, Political Analyst @ MSNBC, "Democrats split over Syria, Iran," http://www.msnbc.com/all/democrats-split-over-syria-iran)

Over strong objections from the president, 16 Senate Democrats support a bill that would impose new sanctions on Iran should the country fail to reach a permanent agreement with international negotiators to roll back its nuclear program. Those senators, along with 43 Republicans, argue that tough sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place and further pressure would flex American muscle in the 6-month talks toward crafting a permanent solution. The bill drew support from Sens. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y, and Harry Reid, D-Nev., both close allies of Obama’s but also leading supporters of policies favoring Israel. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee, America’s most powerful pro-Israel advocacy group, has lobbied members of Congress from both parties to support the sanctions.¶ Other Democrats are siding with the Obama administration, which argues that imposing new sanctions damaged “good-faith” negotiations while empowering Iran’s hard-liners rooting for the talks to fail. (A National Security Council spokeswoman charged last month that the sanctions bill could end negotiations and bring the U.S. closer to war.) ¶ The Senate bill has been losing steam ever since the White House ratcheted up pressure on Senate Democrats to abandon the it. Introduced in December by Democrat Robert Menendez, D-N.J. and Sen. Mark Kirk. R-Ill., the legislation was backed by 59 members – but now Senate leaders say they will hold off bringing the legislation to a vote until the six-month negotiation process ends.¶ Adam Sharon, a spokesman for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which Menendez chairs, said the New Jersey Senator stands behind the bill that bears his name. ¶ Menendez and 58 other senators support the bill, Sharon said. “It’s his bill, three or four senators say they wouldn’t call for a vote now. His position has been, having a bill, having this in place is an extremely effective and necessary tool when negotiating with the Iranians that we need to have to avoid Iran crossing the nuclear threshold. He stands behind this bill and the whole essence of the bill is to have sanctions in waiting, but you have to move on them now to make it happen.”¶ The movement is still alive in the House with enough votes to pass, despite a letter signed by at least 70 Democrats opposing the measure, and a letter of criticism by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Obama reiterated in last week’s State of the Union address a promise to veto any attempt to impose new sanctions on Iran.

#### New nuclear initiatives sap tons of PC---the link independently turns the case---reject ev from before 2011

Trembath 11 Alex Trembath is a policy associate in the Energy and Climate Program at Breakthrough. “Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy,” 2/4, Americans for Energy Leadership, <http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/>

If there is one field of the energy sector for which certainty of political will and government policy is essential, **it is nuclear** power. High up front costs for the private industry, extreme regulatory oversight and public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology. In a new report on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the **difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy.** The report, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,” makes the case for political certainty:¶ “It is difficult for energy producers and users to estimate the relative price for nuclear-generated energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives (e.g. natural gas)–an essential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for decades.”¶ Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to supply-side “push” policies, or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power.¶ One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill included provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship.¶ Butthat was last year**. The** **changing of the guard in Congress makes this a** whole different game, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times piece in the aftermath of the elections forecast **a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy**, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees.¶ Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably Lindsey Graham and Richard Lugar, would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS.¶ Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined “innovation hawks,” among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been particularly outspoken in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.”¶ The **extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats** over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post reports that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct Section 48C of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing.¶ Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what **nuclear energy** needs moving forward. It **will require an aggressive push from the White House**, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one.

#### Causes Israel strikes

Perr 12/24 (Jon Perr 12/24/13, B.A. in Political Science from Rutgers University; technology marketing consultant based in Portland, Oregon, has long been active in Democratic politics and public policy as an organizer and advisor in California and Massachusetts. His past roles include field staffer for Gary Hart for President (1984), organizer of Silicon Valley tech executives backing President Clinton's call for national education standards (1997), recruiter of tech executives for Al Gore's and John Kerry's presidential campaigns, and co-coordinator of MassTech for Robert Reich (2002). (Jon, “Senate sanctions bill could let Israel take U.S. to war against Iran” Daily Kos, [http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran#](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran))

As 2013 draws to close, the negotiations over the Iranian nuclear program have entered a delicate stage. But in 2014, the tensions will escalate dramatically as a bipartisan group of Senators brings a new Iran sanctions bill to the floor for a vote. As many others have warned, that promise of new measures against Tehran will almost certainly blow up the interim deal reached by the Obama administration and its UN/EU partners in Geneva. But Congress' highly unusual intervention into the President's domain of foreign policy doesn't just make the prospect of an American conflict with Iran more likely. As it turns out, the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act essentially empowers Israel to decide whether the United States will go to war against Tehran.¶ On their own, the tough new sanctions imposed automatically if a final deal isn't completed in six months pose a daunting enough challenge for President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry. But it is the legislation's commitment to support an Israeli preventive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities that almost ensures the U.S. and Iran will come to blows. As Section 2b, part 5 of the draft mandates:¶ If the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran's nuclear weapon program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.¶ Now, the legislation being pushed by Senators Mark Kirk (R-IL), Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Robert Menendez (D-NJ) does not automatically give the President an authorization to use force should Israel attack the Iranians. (The draft language above explicitly states that the U.S. government must act "in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force.") But there should be little doubt that an AUMF would be forthcoming from Congressmen on both sides of the aisle. As Lindsey Graham, who with Menendez co-sponsored a similar, non-binding "stand with Israel" resolution in March told a Christians United for Israel (CUFI) conference in July:¶ "If nothing changes in Iran, come September, October, I will present a resolution that will authorize the use of military force to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear bomb."¶ Graham would have plenty of company from the hardest of hard liners in his party. In August 2012, Romney national security adviser and pardoned Iran-Contra architect Elliott Abrams called for a war authorization in the pages of the Weekly Standard. And just two weeks ago, Norman Podhoretz used his Wall Street Journal op-ed to urge the Obama administration to "strike Iran now" to avoid "the nuclear war sure to come."¶ But at the end of the day, the lack of an explicit AUMF in the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act doesn't mean its supporters aren't giving Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu de facto carte blanche to hit Iranian nuclear facilities. The ensuing Iranian retaliation against to Israeli and American interests would almost certainly trigger the commitment of U.S. forces anyway.¶ Even if the Israelis alone launched a strike against Iran's atomic sites, Tehran will almost certainly hit back against U.S. targets in the Straits of Hormuz, in the region, possibly in Europe and even potentially in the American homeland. Israel would face certain retaliation from Hezbollah rockets launched from Lebanon and Hamas missiles raining down from Gaza.¶ That's why former Bush Defense Secretary Bob Gates and CIA head Michael Hayden raising the alarms about the "disastrous" impact of the supposedly surgical strikes against the Ayatollah's nuclear infrastructure. As the New York Times reported in March 2012, "A classified war simulation held this month to assess the repercussions of an Israeli attack on Iran forecasts that the strike would lead to a wider regional war, which could draw in the United States and leave hundreds of Americans dead, according to American officials." And that September, a bipartisan group of U.S. foreign policy leaders including Brent Scowcroft, retired Admiral William Fallon, former Republican Senator (now Obama Pentagon chief) Chuck Hagel, retired General Anthony Zinni and former Ambassador Thomas Pickering concluded that American attacks with the objective of "ensuring that Iran never acquires a nuclear bomb" would "need to conduct a significantly expanded air and sea war over a prolonged period of time, likely several years." (Accomplishing regime change, the authors noted, would mean an occupation of Iran requiring a "commitment of resources and personnel greater than what the U.S. has expended over the past 10 years in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined.") The anticipated blowback?¶ Serious costs to U.S. interests would also be felt over the longer term, we believe, with problematic consequences for global and regional stability, including economic stability. A dynamic of escalation, action, and counteraction could produce serious unintended consequences that would significantly increase all of these costs and lead, potentially, to all-out regional war.

#### Impact is nuclear war

**Reuveny** **10** (Rafael – professor in the School of Public and Environmental affairs at Indiana University, Unilateral strike on Iran could trigger world depression, p. http://www.indiana.edu/~spea/news/speaking\_out/reuveny\_on\_unilateral\_strike\_Iran.shtml)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash. For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force. Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground. All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians, but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early-warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces. Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike — or even numerous strikes — could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond. A regional war Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey — all of which essentially support Iran — could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony. Replaying Nixon’s nightmare Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force. While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

### 2

#### Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats

Buell 3 (Frederick Buell, cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books; “From Apocalypse To Way of Life,” pg. 185-186)

Looked at critically, then, **crisis discourse** thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “**total solution**” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “**final solution**.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into **inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “**total solution**.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode; eco-authoritarianism** was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

#### That securitization militarizes environmental politics and causes war

Brzoska 8 —Director of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg [Michael Brzoska, 2008, “The Securitization Of Climate Change And The Power Of Conceptions Of Security,” Paper Prepared for the International Studies Association Convention in San Francisco, March 26-29, Available Online via All Academic at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p253887\_index.html]

In the literature on securitization it is implied that when a problem is securitized it is difficult to limit this to an increase in attention and resources devoted to mitigating the problem (Brock 1997, Waever 1995). Securitization regularly leads to all-round ‘exceptionalism’ in dealing with the issue as well as to a shift in institutional localization towards ‘security experts’ (Bigot 2006), such as the military and police. Methods and instruments associated with these security organizations – such as more use of arms, force and violence – will gain in importance in the discourse on ‘what to do’. A good example of securitization was the period leading to the Cold War (Guzzini 2004). Originally a political conflict over the organization of societies, in the late 1940s, the East-West confrontation became an existential conflict that was overwhelmingly addressed with military means, including the potential annihilation of humankind. Efforts to alleviate the political conflict were, throughout most of the Cold War, secondary to improving military capabilities. Climate change could meet a similar fate. An essentially political problem concerning the distribution of the costs of prevention and adaptation and the losses and gains in income arising from change in the human environment might be perceived as intractable, thus necessitating the build-up of military and police forces to prevent it from becoming a major security problem. The portrayal of climate change as a security problem could, in particular, cause the richer countries in the global North, which are less affected by it, to strengthen measures aimed at protecting them from the spillover of violent conflict from the poorer countries in the global South that will be most affected by climate change. It could also be used by major powers as a justification for improving their military preparedness against the other major powers, thus leading to arms races.

#### The alternative is to analyze the framing of the 1AC – small momentum and change in language is the basis for large-scales social change.

Princen 10—Thomas Princen School of Natural Resources and Environment @ Michigan [*Treading Softly* p. 50-53]

A Crisis People won't change until there's a crisis. They're stuck in their ways. They're comfortable. They won't do anything, even with daily reports of melting ice and starving children. That's just human nature-selfish, greedy, short-sighted. It is true that when there is a crisis people come together. When the town floods, everyone pitches in to stack sandbags and evacuate the elderly. But to conclude that people will only act when there's a crisis defies logic-and a whole lot of history. I will give an example of such history, but first let's put the general point right up front: Fundamental social change starts with (1) a few committed people, (2) new understandings, and (3) small acts that eventually confront the structures of power. And for motive, fundamental change draws on people's basic need for meaning, engagement, and fairness. Take slavery. For the great bulk of human history, across cultures, from India and China to Europe and the Americas and Africa, slavery was a perfectly normal practice. Indeed, it was an institution-a set of widely shared norms and principles, rules and procedures. And what people back then shared-rulers and commoners alike-was the idea that some people, by virtue of birth or race or nationality, would be slaves. That's just the way it was, and everyone knew it; it was beyond questioning. Always has been, always will be. Then a dozen shopkeepers and clergy got together in a print shop in London in 1787 and said, in effect, no more; this is wrong; it must stop. So they set about gathering information on what was really happening on slave ships and on the plantations. They distributed brochures and pamphlets and lectured across England and abroad. And they introduced legislation in Parliament and lobbied parliamentarians. Maybe most significantly, they systematically undercut arguments defending the normalcy and necessity of slavery-the economic arguments (the British Empire and all who depend on it around the world will collapse), the political arguments (this is just an attempt by the opposition party to take control of the government), the moral arguments (the slaves rejoice when they leave the Dark Continent).1 Today we take the abolition of slavery to be perfectly reasonable, moral, inevitable. But notice that for the early abolitionists, there was no crisis: They were quite comfortable. Their country was riding high. Life was good. Those shopkeepers and clergy and a few noblemen simply concluded that slavery was wrong. Others might have foreseen slavery's demise due to economic trends or movements for democracy and individual rights. But for much of this early history of abolition, there was no crisis. Instead, a few people acquired new understandings, took a strong moral stance, and confronted power. They took on one of the most pervasive, most accepted, most "necessary" structures in human history-slavery. And they did not back down when defenders ridiculed them, when some claimed that the economy would collapse and people would be thrown out of work, that the empire required it. The abolitionists spoke truth to power. And the truth was that Britain and the world as a whole would do quite well without slavery. In fact, if one accepts the maxim that slavery degrades slave and slaveholder alike, Britain and the world did better without slavery. But notice: there was nothing normal or inevitable, and certainly nothing moral, about slavery. Today there is nothing normal or inevitable about unending growth on a finite planet. There is nothing normal or inevitable about 10 percent of the world's population holding 85 percent of global household wealth 2 while a billion or two struggle day to day just to survive. There is nothing normal or inevitable about knowingly degrading ecosystems, permanently extinguishing entire species, causing irreversible changes in climate, or dislocating millions of people by failing to stop the resultant rise in sea levels. And there is nothing normal or inevitable about justifying all this in the name of "economic growth" or "progress" or "consumer demand" or "efficiency" or "jobs" or "return on investment" or "global competitiveness." So yes, many people in advanced industrial countries are comfortable. They appear unlikely to change until a crisis affects them personally. They have done well by the current structures, economic and political. But just a bit of reflection, a glimmer of foresight, a glance at the biophysical trends, not to mention at financial trends where mounting debt threatens the entire confidence game, and the path's end point is clear: collapse. All the market forces and technological wizardry will not change some basic facts: we have one planet, one set of ecosystems, and one hydrologic cycle; and each of us has just one brain, one body, and one lifetime. Limits are real. If the current system cannot continue on one planet, just as slavery could not continue with trends in democracy and free markets and religious rights and human rights, then the action is with those with a bit of foresight, those with a vision of a different way of living on the planet, of living with nature, not against nature. The action is with those who can accept limits indeed, embrace them. So readers of this book, I assume, may be comfortable, but they are not content. They are looking ahead, they are concerned, they are looking for change. And they know that a fundamental shift is inevitable. They know that all systems, from organisms to ecosystems, from household economies to global economies, have limits. They are the ones preparing the way, laying the groundwork, devising the principles and, yes, the technologies and markets that will allow everyone to live within immutable ecological constraints. They are the ones making sure the sand and the sandbags are on hand so that others can pitch in when the time comes. They are the ones building the compost piles, collecting the information, experimenting with new forms of community, speaking truth to power. The others, the people who need a crisis to act, are not the leaders. They will eventually act, to be sure; they will act when personally threatened. But they will need guidance. They will need role models, concrete examples, opportunities to engage and do good as they protect themselves. And they will need enabling language. That's where the real leaders come in. And now is the time to prepare-not when the crisis hits home and hits hard. So make no mistake, some people will act when there's a crisis. But many others will be getting ready now. These are the concerned and committed, the "moral entrepreneurs" who are already discovering that acting now is very satisfying, very engaging. It's hard, yet at times quite simple.

### 3

#### The United States federal government should condition <plan> on the federal government of Mexico meeting the four human rights requirements of the Mérida Initiative. The United States federal government should decide if the federal government of Mexico meets these requirements based off the findings of Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos.

#### Solves the AFF and boosts our human rights cred

**WOLA 10** - (Washington Office of Latin America- contains multiple experts on human rights abuse in latin america and quotes the state department's report "Congress: Withhold Funds for Mexico Tied to Human Rights Performance" 9/14/10, <http://www.wola.org/publications/congress_withhold_funds_for_mexico_tied_to_human_rights_performance>)

The US government significantly strengthened its partnership with Mexico in combating organized crime in 2007 when it announced the Merida Initiative, a multi-year US security assistance package for Mexico. To date, the US government has allocated roughly $1.5 billion in Merida funding to Mexico. From the outset, the US Congress recognized the importance of ensuring that the Mexican government respect human rights in its public security efforts, mandating by law that 15 percent of select Merida funds be withheld until the State Department issued a report to the US Congress which showed that Mexico had demonstrated it was meeting four human rights requirements. ¶ ¶ On September 2, 2010, the State Department issued its second report to Congress concluding that Mexico is meeting the Merida Initiative’s human rights requirements, and it stated its intention to obligate roughly $36 million in security assistance that had been withheld from the 2009 supplemental and the 2010 omnibus budgets. ¶ However, research conducted by our respective organizations, Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission, and even the State Department’s own reports, demonstrates conclusively that Mexico has failed to meet the four human rights requirements set out by law. As a result, Congress should not release these select Merida funds. Releasing these funds would send the message that the United States condones the grave human rights violations committed in Mexico, including torture, rape, killings, and enforced disappearances.¶ We recognize that Mexico is facing a severe public security crisis, and that the United States can play a constructive role in strengthening Mexico’s ability to confront organized crime in an effective manner. However, human rights violations committed by Mexican security forces are not only deplorable in their own right, but also significantly undermine the effectiveness of Mexico’s public security efforts. Building trust between the Mexican people and the government is essential to gathering information to dismantle organized crime. When security forces commit grave human rights violations and they are not held accountable for their actions, they lose that trust, alienating key allies and leaving civilians in a state of terror and defenselessness. It is thus in the interest of both of our countries to help Mexico curb systematic human rights violations, ensure that violations are effectively investigated and those responsible held accountable, and assess candidly the progress Mexico is making towards improving accountability and transparency. ¶ Evidence demonstrates that Mexico is not fulfilling effectively any of the requirements established by Congress, particularly those dealing with prosecuting military abuses and torture:

#### HR cred solves conflict

Burke-White 4 (William W., Lecturer in Public and International Affairs and Senior Special Assistant to the Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University The Harvard Environmental Law Review Spring, 2004 LN,[https://www.law.upenn.edu/cf/faculty/wburkewh/workingpapers/17HarvHumRtsJ249(2004).pdf](https://www.law.upenn.edu/cf/faculty/wburkewh/workingpapers/17HarvHumRtsJ249%282004%29.pdf))

#### This Article presents a strategic--as opposed to ideological or normative--argument that the promotion of human rights should be given a more prominent place in U.S. foreign policy. It does so by suggesting a correlation between the domestic human rights practices of states and their propensity to engage in aggressive international conduct. Among the chief threats to U.S. national security are acts of aggression by other states. Aggressive acts of war may directly endanger the United States, as did the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, or they may require U.S. military action overseas, as in Kuwait fifty years later. Evidence from the post-Cold War period [\*250] indicates that states that systematically abuse their own citizens' human rights are also those most likely to engage in aggression. To the degree that improvements in various states' human rights records decrease the likelihood of aggressive war, a foreign policy informed by human rights can significantly enhance U.S. and global security.¶ Since 1990, a state's domestic human rights policy appears to be a telling indicator of that state's propensity to engage in international aggression. A central element of U.S. foreign policy has long been the preservation of peace and the prevention of such acts of aggression. n2 If the correlation discussed herein is accurate, it provides U.S. policymakers with a powerful new tool to enhance national security through the promotion of human rights. A strategic linkage between national security and human rights would result in a number of important policy modifications. First, it changes the prioritization of those countries U.S. policymakers have identified as presenting the greatest concern. Second, it alters some of the policy prescriptions for such states. Third, it offers states a means of signaling benign international intent through the improvement of their domestic human rights records. Fourth, it provides a way for a current government to prevent future governments from aggressive international behavior through the institutionalization of human rights protections. Fifth, it addresses the particular threat of human rights abusing states obtaining weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Finally, it offers a mechanism for U.S.-U.N. cooperation on human rights issues.

### 4

#### Economic engagement is a conditional QPQ

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

* The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.
* The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.
* The tactics of economic engagementshouldpromote China’s economic integration through negotiationsontrade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.
* The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in FareedZakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

Vote negative

a) Limits – policies the embargo means there’s a near-infinite range of “one exception” affs

b) Ground – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of the engagement debate

### 5

#### The AFF lowers the expected future demand for oil—that causes an immediate decline in price and increase in consumption

**Feldstein, 08** – George F. Baker Professor of Economics at Harvard University and Economic Advisor to Mitt Romney (Martin, 7/1/08, “We Can Lower Oil Prices Now”, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121486800837317581.html?mod=opinion_main_commentaries>, KONTOPOULOS)

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. Similarly, credible reports about the future decline of oil production in Russia and in Mexico implied a higher future global price of oil – and that also required an increase in the current oil price to maintain the initial expected rate of increase in the price of oil. Once this relation is understood, **it is easy to see how news stories, rumors and industry reports can cause substantial fluctuations in current prices – all without anything happening to current demand or supply**. Of course, a rise in the spot price of oil triggered by a change in expectations about future prices will cause a decline in the current quantity of oil that consumers demand. If current supply and demand were initially in balance, the OPEC countries and other oil producers would respond by reducing sales to bring supply into line with the temporary reduction in demand. A rise in the expected future demand for oil thus causes a current decline in the amount of oil being supplied. This is what happened as the Saudis and others cut supply in 2007. 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**.

#### Low oil prices wreck the Russian economy—high prices create a window for sustained growth

**IMF, 11** - International Monetary Fund (9/27/11, "Russia Should Leverage Commodity Boom to Boost Growth", http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2011/int092711a.htm, KONTOPOULOS)

**Russia’s economy grew** by 4 percent in 2010, **aided by the boom in** commodity **prices, in** particular **oil.** For 2011, the IMF is projecting growth of 4.3 percent. But Russia could do much better. Before the global financial crisis, the economy was growing at more than 7 percent per year, and it could take off again if economic policies and the supporting policy institutions are strengthened. **Russia** also **remains overly reliant on oil revenues, which makes it vulnerable to a** slowdown in economic growth and a **sudden drop in** commodity **prices**. In an interview, **IMF mission chief for Russia** Juha **Kähkönen and deputy mission chief** Daria **Zakharova discuss the outlook for Russia’s economy, and weigh risks** such as continued crisis in the euro area or a pronounced slowdown in the global economy. IMF Survey online: What is the outlook for Russia’s economy? **Kähkönen: Russia is still benefiting from high oil prices**, but its post-crisis economic performance has been disappointing, with only moderate growth and high inflation. Russia saw a major decline in output of about 8 percent of GDP during the global crisis, and is still catching up. The economy grew by 4 percent in 2010 and is projected to grow by 4.3 percent this year. Growth has suffered as a result of a bad harvest in 2010 brought on by drought. The economy is also slowing down now because of the ongoing turmoil in advanced countries. Going forward, Russia’s outlook will depend not just on the external environment but also on economic policies. If current policies—a high nonoil fiscal deficit and no clear medium-term anchor for fiscal policy, monetary policy that is insufficiently focused on reducing inflation, a financial sector lacking adequate oversight, and stalled structural reforms—are maintained, the result will be muddling through, with growth tapering off to below 4 percent in the medium term. But if there is a major strengthening of the economic policies, Russia’s potential is huge. The country could easily grow by an annual rate of 6 percent or more on a sustained basis if the right policies are put in place. IMF Survey online: How vulnerable is the economy to ongoing turmoil in Europe and the slowdown in global growth? Zakharova: **If the crisis** in the euro area intensifies and **leads to** another global downturn and **a precipitous fall in oil prices, Russia’s economy could be severely affected.** Russia could also be impacted through the financial channel. Although Russia’s direct exposure to European sovereign debt is limited, a severe distress in a large bank in a core euro area country could have serious repercussions for Russia’s banking system. IMF Survey online: What are your main recommendations to the Russian authorities on the macroeconomic policy mix? Kähkönen: **High oil prices give Russia a window of opportunity to put the economy on a higher growth path**. Policies should be strengthened in four main policy areas: monetary policy, fiscal policy, structural reforms to improve the business climate, and banking sector supervision. We think it would be most beneficial to have action simultaneously in all of these areas because the reforms would be mutually reinforcing. Russia’s macroeconomic policies would also benefit from more stable and predictable frameworks. Right now, there are too many ad hoc policy decisions. In terms of monetary policy, we think the central bank should focus squarely on inflation. In the past, the bank has had multiple targets, which has diluted the emphasis on price stability. Russia’s underlying inflation currently is high at about 8 percent. Zakharova: The fiscal policy framework should also be strengthened. Right now, policy focus is on the overall fiscal balance. But because Russia is an oil producer, it is more appropriate to look at the nonoil deficit—the size of the deficit before taking oil revenues into account. This deficit increased by 9 percent of GDP during the crisis, with Russia implementing one of the largest fiscal stimuli in the Group of 20 (G-20) leading industrial and emerging market countries. Our advice is to refocus fiscal policy on the nonoil balance and introduce an ambitious, credible, and growth-friendly fiscal consolidation that aims at reaching a nonoil deficit of 4.7 percent, the current long-term fiscal target of the government. We also recommend that Russia refrain from enacting further supplementary budgets, which in the past have been used to spend excess oil revenues. Supplementary budgets make fiscal policy pro-cyclical, thus undermining macroeconomic stability. IMF Survey online: Russia has been riding high on the commodity boom, but **what will happen if prices start to falter?** Zakharova: **Russia has been rescued** from the recent financial crisis **by a strong recovery in oil prices, but in the process the economy has become much more vulnerable to a sudden drop in** commodity **prices.** **Russia’s nonoil deficit has** almost **tripled** following the crisis. Just to put this in perspective, **if oil prices were to fall to $40 per barrel as they did during the most recent financial crisis, Russia would be running deficits in the order of 8 percent of GDP.** At the same time, **the Oil Reserve Fund, which Russia** successfully **used to cushion the economy** in the most recent downturn, **has been** almost **exhausted. This means that the government would have to borrow from the markets**—and possibly at high rates—**if there is a** precipitous **drop in oil prices. The external current account would also be severely affected by a decline in oil prices.** We would expect that the current high surplus would turn into a deficit fairly quickly, putting pressure on the exchange rate.

#### Causes multiple scenarios for CBW conflictOliker and Charlick-Paley 02 (Olga and Tanya, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, “Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/)

The preceding chapters have illustrated the ways in which Russia’s decline affects that country and may evolve into challenges and dangers that extend well beyond its borders. The political factors of decline may make Russia a less stable international actor and other factors may increase the risk of internal unrest. Together and separately, they increase the risk of conflict and the potential scope of other imaginable disasters. The trends of regionalization, particularly the disparate rates of economic growth among regions, combined with the politicization of regional economic and military interests, will be important to watch. The potential for locale, or possibly ethnicity, to serve as a rallying point for internal conflict is low at present, but these factors have the potential to feed into precisely the cycle of instability that political scientists have identified as making states in transition to democracy more likely to become involved in war. These factors also increase the potential for domestic turmoil, which further increases the risk of international conflict, for instance if Moscow seeks to united a divided nation and/or demonstrate globally that its waning power remains something to be reckoned with. Given Russia’s conventional weakness, an increased risk of conflict carries with it an increased risk of nuclear weapons use, and Russia’s demographic situation increases the potential for a major epidemic with possible implications for Europe and perhaps beyond. The dangers posed by Russia’s civilian and military nuclear weapons complex, aside from the threat of nuclear weapons use, create a real risk of proliferation of weapons or weapons materials to terrorist groups, as well as perpetuating an increasing risk of accident at one of Russia’s nuclear power plants or other facilities. These elements touch upon key security interests, thus raising serious concerns for the United States. A declining Russia increases the likelihood of conflict—internal or otherwise—and the general deterioration that Russia has in common with “failing” states raises serious questions about its capacity to respond to an emerging crisis. A crisis in large, populous, and nuclear-armed Russia can easily affect the interests of the United States and its allies. In response to such a scenario, the United States, whether alone or as part of a larger coalition, could be asked to send military forces to the area in and around Russia. This chapter will explore a handful of scenarios that could call for U.S. involvement. A wide range of crisis scenarios can be reasonably extrapolated from the trends implicit in Russia’s decline. A notional list includes: Authorized or unauthorized belligerent actions by Russia troops in trouble-prone Russian regions or in neighboring states could lead to armed conflict. Border clashes with China in the Russian Far East or between Russia and Ukraine, the Baltic states, Kazakhstan, or another neighbor could escalate into interstate combat. Nuclear-armed terrorists based in Russia or using weapons or materials diverted from Russian facilities could threaten Russia, Europe, Asia, or the United States. Civil war in Russia could involve fighting near storage sites for nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and agents, risking large-scale contamination and humanitarian disaster. A nuclear accident at a power plant or facility could endanger life and health in Russia and neighboring states. A chemical accident at a plant or nuclear or nuclear-related facility could endanger life and health in Rusisa and neighboring states. Ethnic pogrom in south Russia could force refugees into Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and/or Ukraine. Economic and ethnic conflicts in Caucasus could erupt into armed clashes, which would endanger oil and gas pipelines in the region. A massive ecological disaster such as an earthquake, famine, or epidemic could spawn refugees and spread illness and death across borders. An increasingly criminalized Russian economy could create a safe haven for crime or even terrorist-linked groups. From this base, criminals, drug traders, and terrorists could threaten the people and economies of Europe, Asia, and the United States. Accelerated Russian weapons and technology sales or unauthorized diversion could foster the proliferation of weapons and weapon materials to rogue states and nonstate terrorist actors, increasing the risk of nuclear war.

### Warming

#### Empirical trends disprove warming impacts

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)

Discussion and Conclusions **Despite claims that GW will reduce human well-being in poor countries, there is no evidence that this is actually happening**. Empirical trends **show that by any objective climate-sensitive measure, human well-being in such countries has improved remarkably over the last several decades**. Specifically, **agricultural productivity has increased; the proportion of people suffering from chronic hunger has declined; the rate of extreme poverty has been more than halved; rates of death and disease from malaria, other vector-borne diseases and extreme weather events have declined.** Together, these improvements correspond with life expectancy in poor countries more than doubling since 1900. **The fact that these improvements have occurred in spite of GW indicates that economic and technological development has been**, overall, **a very significant benefit to people in poor countries.**

**Nuclear power trades off with other alternative energy and efficiency programs---that increases overall emissions**

Roche 9 - Pete Roche, Energy and Environment consultant working mainly for Greenpeace and the Nuclear-Free Local Authorities, June 2009, “Building New Reactors Damages Attempts to Tackle Climate Change,” NO2Nuclear Power Briefing, online: http://www.no2nuclearpower.org.uk/reports/NewNuclearDamagesClimate.pdf

But, in fact the risk associated with building new reactors is much worse than simply increasing the risks associated with nuclear power. As The Independent highlighted in an editorial after the 2007 Energy White Paper, the danger is that nuclear investment will crowd out investment in renewables and undermine energy efficiency. (4) If we divert attention political effort and resources from the urgent programmes needed to effectively tackle climate change not only will we miss our targets, but as past experience suggests we could end up with carbon emissions still rising in 2025 because the nuclear programme has been hit by the problems and delays we have seen in the past and by then it will be too late to start implementing alternative strategies.

In February 2003 the Government itself had similar concerns. After the 2003 Energy White Paper (5) was published, Patricia Hewitt, the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry at the time, said:

“It would have been foolish to announce …a new generation of nuclear power stations, because that would have guaranteed we would not make the necessary investments in energy efficiency and renewables.” (6)

No offense---their authors assume nuclear solves warming by replacing coal plants---but it’ll actually displace decentralized renewables which are far more likely to solve warming

Squassoni 9 – Sharon Squassoni, senior associate in the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment, former director of Policy Coordination in the Nonproliferation Bureau of the State Department, 2009, “Nuclear Energy: Rebirth or Resuscitation?,” online: http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/nuclear\_energy\_rebirth\_resuscitation.pdf

Many of the estimates of nuclear energy’s future carbon savings assume that nuclear power plants would be built in place of new coal electric plants. It is unlikely that nuclear power plants will displace just new coal plants, however. Nuclear energy that displaces natural gas, wind, solar, or renewables would have less impact on reducing carbon emissions. Ultimately, decisions about investing in large versus small generation facilities and centralized versus distributed generation will affect the extent to which nuclear energy might displace other zerocarbon options.41 This is important because smaller, distributed electricity generation may be a more favorable option for developing countries, where 70 percent of the projected growth in electricity demand is expected by 2050.

#### Their authors are biased

Ferrara 11 – Heartland Institute senior fellow, senior fellow at the Social Security Institute, graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, general counsel of the American Civil Rights Union, Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under the first President Bush, author of The Obamacare Disaster, President Obama's Tax Piracy, and America's Ticking Bankruptcy Bomb: How the Looming Debt Crisis Threatens the American Dream-and How We Can Turn the Tide Before It's Too Late (Peter, “Packing Heat,” The American Spectator, 9/7/11, [http://spectator.org/archives/2011/09/07/packing-heat)//PC](http://spectator.org/archives/2011/09/07/packing-heat%29//PC)

**The theory that human activity is causing potentially catastrophic global warming is not science. It is politics, driven by special interests with ideological, political and economic stakes in the theory**. **For environmentalists**, **global warming** **corresponds with the authoritarian goal at the core of their movement: repeal of the industrial revolution** (which President Obama's EPA has begun to implement). **For governments, it presents an opportunity to vastly expand their power and control through taxes, regulation and bureaucracy. The theory also presents an opportunity for the United Nations to vastly expand its power and control**. As an organization of world governments who would also gain enormously from acceptance of the theory, the UN is doubly corrupted as an honest broker on the issue. Yet, perversely, **governments across the globe have delegated authoritative inquiry on the issue to the UN through its Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).** Wily **environmentalists** **have also successfully weaved economic stakes in the theory** for some in the business community, starting with tens of billions -- growing into **hundreds of billions -- of government subsidies for businesses that will pose as potential producers of the "green energy of tomorrow**." This enables wily politicians to attempt to snooker voters with promises of "green jobs." Of course, those jobs would only become available if self-supporting producers of abundant low cost energy are replaced with an entire "green" industry that can survive on corporate welfare while producing unreliable high cost energy for the economy (resulting in job loss and a decline in America's standard of living). What is so shocking is the way **formerly objective, reliable Western science has been seduced by all these interests into intellectual corruption in service of the global warming fraud** (**less shocking when you consider the tens of billions in "research" funding provided by the above special interests**). But don't forget that scientists live and breathe in the far left environment of the academic world. Thus, **many** of them **have social and ideological interests in advancing the global warming charade.** The confluence of all these special interests and their money has now corrupted the broader scientific community. **Formerly venerable, objective, respected scientific bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences have been taken over by politicians in scientific drag**. Formerly independent scientific journals and publications have gone the same route rather than suffer the social and financial opprobrium that service to the truth will entail. This **growing intellectual corruption is greatly magnified by** our thoroughly politicized Old **Media, which** **operates today only in service of politically correct causes**. Consequently, so much of the **public discussion on global warming that we see is actually "play acting," with supposed scientists, journalists, media commentators, politicians and others posing as if objective science actually demonstrates the danger of human caused global warming**. One day Al Gore will receive an Oscar for his role in posing as savior of the planet, which actually reflects delusional mental illness in the man who almost became our president. But the politicization of Western science means the decline of Western science as well. That in turn augurs the decline of Western civilization, as objective science was a foundation of the rise of the West for centuries.

### Poverty

#### 1. Poverty down now

**Chen and Ravillion, 07**- \*Senior Statistician in Development Economics Research Group at the World Bank, \*\*Director of World Bank’s Development Research Group (Shaohua and Martin, “The Changing Profile of Poverty in the World”, October 2007, http://www.ifpri.org/2020Chinaconference/pdf/beijingbrief\_ravallion2.pdf)

In absolute terms, the number of people in the developing world living on less than US$1 a day fell from slightly less than 1.5 billion in 1981 to 970 million in 2004, which marks the first time the poverty count has gone below 1 billion (Figure 1a). The choice of poverty line, however, matters. The number living on less than US$2 a day actually rose by about 100 million over this period, to 2.5 billion in 2004. As a share of the population, global US$1-a-day poverty fell from 40 percent in 1981 to 18 percent in 2004, and US$2-a-day poverty fell from 67 percent in 1981 to 48 percent in 2004 (Figure 1b). For both poverty lines, the trend of poverty reduction is about 0.8 percentage points per year over 1981–2004. This rate exceeds the rate of poverty reduction of 0.6 percentage points per year that would be required to halve the 1990 US$1-a-day poverty rate by 2015— the first of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG1). So, in the aggregate, the world is on track to achieve MDG1.

#### The status quo is structurally improving

Dash 13 Co-Founder and Managing Director at Activate, a new kind of strategy consultancy that advises companies about the opportunities at the intersection of technology and media co-founder and CEO of ThinkUp, which shows you how to be better at using your social networks, publisher, editor and owner of Dashes.com, my personal blog where I've been publishing continuously since 1999, entrepreneur, writer and geek living in New York City (Anil Dash, 4 February 2013, “THE WORLD IS GETTING BETTER. QUICKLY.,” http://dashes.com/anil/2013/02/the-world-is-getting-better-quickly.html)

The world is getting better, faster, than we could ever have imagined. For those of us who are fortunate enough to live in wealthy communities or countries, we have a common set of reference points we use to describe the world's most intractable, upsetting, unimaginable injustices. Often, we only mention these horrible realities in minimizing our own woes: "Well, that's annoying, but it's hardly as bad as children starving in Africa." Or "Yeah, this is important, but it's not like it's the cure for AIDS." Or the omnipresent description of any issue as a "First World Problem". But let's, for once, look at the actual data around developing world problems. Not our condescending, world-away displays of emotion, or our slacktivist tendencies to see a retweet as meaningful action, but the actual numbers and metrics about how progress is happening for the world's poorest people. Though metrics and measurements are always fraught and flawed, Gates' single biggest emphasis was the idea that measurable progress and metrics are necessary for any meaningful improvements to happen in the lives of the world's poor. So how are we doing? THE WORLD HAS CHANGED The results are astounding. Even if we caveat that every measurement is imprecise, that billionaire philanthropists are going to favor data that strengthens their points, and that some of the most significant problems are difficult to attach metrics to, it's inarguable that the past two decades have seen the greatest leap forward in the lives of the global poor in the history of humanity. Some highlights: Children are 1/3 less likely to die before age five than they were in 1990. The global childhood mortality rate for kids under 5 has dropped from 88 in 1000 in 1990 to 57 in 1000 in 2010. The global infant mortality rate for kids dying before age one has plunged from 61 in 1000 to 40 in 1000. Now, any child dying is of course one child too many, but this is astounding progress to have made in just twenty years. In the past 30 years, the percentage of children who receive key immunizations such as the DTP vaccine has quadrupled. The percentage of people in the world living on less than $1.25 per day has been cut in half since 1990, ahead of the schedule of the Millennium Development Goals which hoped to reach this target by 2015. The number of deaths to tuberculosis has been cut 40% in the past twenty years. The consumption of ozone-depleting substances has been cut 85% globally in the last thirty years. The percentage of urban dwellers living in slums globally has been cut from 46.2% to 32.7% in the last twenty years. And there's more progress in hunger and contraception, in sustainability and education, against AIDS and illiteracy. After reading the Gates annual letter and following up by reviewing the UN's ugly-but-data-rich Millennium Development Goals statistics site, I was surprised by how much progress has been made in the years since I've been an adult, and just how little I've heard about the big picture despite the fact that I'd like to keep informed about such things. I'm not a pollyanna — there's a lot of work to be done. But I can personally attest to the profound effect that basic improvements like clean drinking water can have in people's lives. Today, we often use the world's biggest problems as metaphors for impossibility. But the evidence shows that, actually, we're really good at solving even the most intimidating challenges in the world. What we're lacking is the ability to communicate effectively about how we make progress, so that we can galvanize even more investment of resources, time and effort to tackling the problems we have left.

### Meltdowns

#### No deaths from nuclear meltdowns

Drum 11 Kevin, political blogger for Mother Jones, "Nukes and the Free Market", March 14, www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/nukes-and-free-market

We’re currently told that the death toll in Japan will be at least 10,000 people of whom approximately zero seem to have perished in nuclear accidents. What happens when a tsunami hits an offshore drilling platform or a natural gas pipeline? What happens to a coal mine in an earthquake? How much environmental damage is playing out in Japan right now because of gasoline from cars pushed around? The main lesson is “try not to put critical infrastructure near a fault line” but Japan is an earthquakey country, so what are they really supposed to do about this?¶ This is a good point: energy sources of all kind cause problems. Sometimes the problems create screaming headlines (nuke meltdowns, offshore oil explosions, mining disasters) and sometimes they don't (increased particulate pollution, global warming, devastation of salmon runs). But the dangers are there for virtually every type of energy production.¶ Still, it's worth pointing out that the problem with nuclear power isn't so much its immediate capacity to kill people. As Matt points out, no one has died in Japan from the partial meltdowns at its damaged nuclear plants, and it's unlikely anyone ever will. The control rods are in place, and even in the worst case the containment vessels will almost certainly restrict the worst damage.

#### Chernobyl proves meltdowns don’t cause lasting damage

Bosselman 7 (Professor of Law Emeritus, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Fred, “THE NEW POWER GENERATION: ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND ELECTRICITY INNOVATION: COLLOQUIUM ARTICLE: THE ECOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER,” 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2007)

C. "But What About Chernobyl?" In 1986, an explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine caused the release of large amounts of radiation into the atmosphere. [247](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n247) Initially, the Soviet government released little information about the explosion and tried to play down its seriousness, but this secrecy caused great nervousness throughout Europe, and fed the public's fears of nuclear power all over the  [\*46]  world. [248](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n248) Now a **comprehensive analysis** of the event and its aftermath has been made: In 2005, a consortium of United Nations agencies called the Chernobyl Forum released its analysis of the long-term effects of the Chernobyl explosion. [249](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n249) The U.N. agencies' study found that the explosion caused fewer deaths than had been expected. [250](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n250) Although the Chernobyl reactor was poorly designed and badly operated [251](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n251) and lacked the basic safety protections found outside the Soviet Union, [252](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n252) fewer than seventy deaths so far have been attributed to the explosion, mostly plant employees and firefighters who suffered acute radiation sickness. [253](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n253) The Chernobyl reactor, like many Soviet reactors, was in the open rather than in an American type of pressurizable containment structure, which would have prevented the release of radiation to the environment if a similar accident had occurred. [254](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n254)  [\*47]  Perhaps the most surprising finding of the U.N. agencies' study was that "**the ecosystems around the Chernobyl site are now flourishing.** The [Chernobyl exclusion zone] has become a wildlife sanctuary, and it looks like the nature park it has become." [255](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n255) Jeffrey McNeely, the chief scientist of the World Conservation Union, has made similar observations: Chernobyl has now become the world's first radioactive nature reserve... . 200 wolves are now living in the nature reserve, which has also begun to support populations of reindeer, lynx and European bison, species that previously were not found in the region. While the impact on humans was strongly negative, the wildlife is adapting and even thriving on the site of one of the 20th century's worst environmental disasters. [256](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n256) Mary Mycio, the Kiev correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, has written a fascinating book based on her many visits to the exclusion zone and interviews with people in the area. [257](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n257) She notes that the fear that radiation would produce permanent deformities in animal species has not been borne out after twenty years; the population and diversity of animals in even some of the most heavily radiated parts of the exclusion zone is similar to comparable places that are less radioactive.