**National Speech & Debate Association**

*Policy Debate – 2014-2015 – Update – 10/12/14*

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its non-military exploration and/or development of the Earth’s oceans.
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**1AC – Science Leadership Adv (1/16)**

#### The plan is key to reverse and the decline in the credibility of US polar science leadership --- the Arctic is the critical location for overall science leadership initiatives

**Conley, 12** - director and senior fellow of the Europe Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Heather Conley, “A New Security Architecture for the Arctic: an American perspective” January, csis.org)

Although the United States lacks an overarching Arctic economic development strategy and suffers from insufficient security assets, it does maintain a competitive edge in the field of research and science. Northern Alaska has always been a region of particular interest to scientists with its unique climate, flora, and fauna. The Greenland Ice Sheet Project Two, initiated in 1998 by the Office of Polar Programs of the NSF, provided the world with what was then the deepest ice core ever recovered as well as the clearest outline of climate history.47 The discoveries of this project piqued the interest of the scientific community and made clear that the Arctic is one of the most important places to study climatic changes, global temperatures, sea ice extent, and short-lived climate forcers, such as black carbon and levels of methane. The United States has been at the vanguard of international climate research with established institutions like the National Science Foundation, U.S. Arctic Research Commission (USARC, part of the NSF),48 the U.S. Geological Survey,49 and the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee,50 the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,51 and the National Snow and Ice Data Center.52 The National Science Foundation had an annual budget of $6.8 billion for FY 2011, with the Office of Polar Programs receiving $493.4 million and USARC research receiving $1.58 million.53 The USARC has laid out its research goals in its Report on Goals and Objectives for Arctic Research, stressing five main themes: environmental change of the Arctic, Arctic Ocean, and Bering Sea; Arctic human health; civil infrastructure; natural resource assessment; and indigenous languages, cultures, and identities.54 These goals are broad based, and while they may not directly address security concerns, they do have an impact on U.S. Arctic policy because all future decisionmaking related to the Arctic—be it economic development or aligning security assets—is completely dependent on a strong scientific understanding of this fragile milieu. There can never be too much scientific data or understanding about this largely unknown region, and the current level of U.S. science and research in the Arctic is a critical and foundational element of a proactive U.S. leadership model.

Unfortunately, strong capabilities as an Arctic science power do not make up for the deficiency in the rest of U.S. coastal and security capabilities. As stated in the Coast Guard’s own report to Congress in 2008, “Although the NSF is a global leader in scientific research, the Coast Guard believes that the NSF would lack the staff and expertise to direct the multi-mission deployment of icebreakers employed for other USCG missions.”55 In addition, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is unable to collect and provide all the information on weather forecasting, oceanography, and navigational charting requested by the Coast Guard, the industries, and the local communities.56 In fact, the NSF has repeatedly made use of Canadian, Russian, and Swedish icebreakers to transport U.S. scientists in the U.S. Arctic, where U.S. capabilities were nonexistent.57 This kind of arrangement has proven both risky and inefficient. In July 2011, Sweden decided to recall its icebreaker Oden, leased to the NSF every winter since 2006–07, due to worsening ice conditions in the Baltic Sea. This recall left the United States without the technical ability to reach and resupply McMurdo station in Antarctica.58 Further examples illustrate U.S. dependence on other nations as a result of its own lack of capabilities. In December 2011, officials from Nome, Alaska, requested a Russian fuel tanker to deliver an emergency shipment when the city was blocked by sea ice. Originally, the Healy was unavailable to assist with this operation as it was returning from a previously scheduled scientific mission.59 However, the Healy is now scheduled to break an ice channel for the tanker once the Russian vessel is cleared to enter the Alaskan port and will facilitate the tanker’s return to open water.60 As U.S. capabilities are stretched between critical missions and its ongoing yet equally critical scientific work, the need to address these shortfalls in capabilities is urgent, as Alaskan Lieutenant Governor Mead Treadwell stated in his December 2011 congressional testimony: “Without action, America is putting its national security on the line, and we are going to miss the opportunities of the Arctic while watching other nations advance.”61

**1AC – Science Leadership Adv (2/16)**

#### Icebreakers are key to reclaiming US polar science leeadership --- specifically key to climate science

**NRC 7** – working arm of the United States National Academies, which produces reports that shape policies, inform public opinion, and advance the pursuit of science, engineering, and medicine (National Research Council, “Polar Icebreakers in a Changing World: An Assessment of US Needs,” <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11753&page=R1>)

Fundamental advances resulting from polar research have directly benefited society. Polar research led to the identification of the presence and cause of the “ozone hole” and has resulted in coordinated worldwide actions to discontinue the use of chlorofluorocarbons. Understanding how the polar regions affect ocean circulation is leading to a better understanding of global climate. The study of Weddell seals, which dive to great depths and cease breathing for long periods, led to better understanding of how such mammals handle gas dissolved in blood during and after deep diving events. This has contributed to advances in understanding sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS). The study of mammals, insects, and plants that endure freezing temperatures, yet prevent the formation of ice crystals in their internal fluids, is aiding in the design of freeze-resistant crops and improved biomedical cryopreservation techniques.

The Arctic and Antarctic are natural laboratories whose extreme, relatively pristine environments and geographically unique settings enable research on fundamental phenomena and processes that are feasible nowhere else. Today, researchers seek a better understanding of how new ocean crusts form, how organisms adapt to the extremes of temperature and seasonality (light conditions), how ice sheets behave, and how the solar wind and the earth interact. Unexplored, subglacial lakes in the Antarctic that have been sealed from the atmosphere for millions of years are soon to be explored and entered. Beneath the South Pole Station a cubic kilometer of clear ice is being instrumented with 5,000 detectors to observe high-energy neutrinos that may tell us about phenomena such as supernovae. Pristine ice cores that span centuries give direct data about temperature changes and atmospheric gas concentrations in the past. As global climate has garnered worldwide attention, the polar regions have been found to react acutely to fluctuations in climate and temperatures. The 40 percent reduction in Arctic sea-ice thickness over the past four decades is one of the most dramatic examples of recent changes. Because ice tends to reflect solar radiation and water absorbs it, melting in the polar regions can exert a strong influence on both atmospheric climate and ocean circulation. Huge reservoirs of water are held in massive ice sheets and glaciers; substantive release may create major climate and social dislocations. Thus, research in these regions plays a pivotal role in the global Earth system exerting influences of critical importance. Scientists have declared 2007-2008 the International Polar Year. Multinational collaboration and new polar research activities are planned. The health and continued vitality of polar research are intimately linked to the availability of the appropriate infrastructure and logistical support to allow scientists to work in these harsh environments. Access to the polar regions is essential if the United States is to continue to be a leader in polar science. To operate reliably and safely in these regions necessitates a national icebreaking capability. Icebreakers enable resupply of land-based stations and field camps in the south. The availability of polar icebreakers with greater icebreaking capability would enable important new research in the Southern Ocean in locations where ice is thick. While other assets and platforms such as airplanes and spaceborne sensors are useful tools, surface ground-truth and in situ sampling
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will not be replaced in the near future. Because there are no land sites in the central Arctic, an icebreaker is an essential platform to support sustained scientific measurements in the Arctic Ocean. The availability of adequate icebreaking capabilities will be essential to advancing research in both polar regions.

#### That’s key to successfully adapting to climate change --- Arctic science is the lynchpin for climate research answers that affect the entire globe

**Ross 14** – Victoria Ross, San Diego Technology Examiner, “The Arctic holds the key to climate change” http://www.examiner.com/article/the-arctic-holds-the-key-to-climate-change)

In a place at the very top of the Northern Hemisphere scientists are collecting the most important samples. Arctic News yesterday reports how devastating the changes have been in the Arctic due to warming waters and ash blown from fires in Alaska and Canada. There is an urgent need to collect data on the changes in the Arctic. Phytoplankton is the key element in the change of the planet as the specks of algae are emitted to the clouds from the basic phytoplankton. This is the key to affect climate swings and it is the key to feeding arctic inhabitants. A few years ago Kevin Arrigo was in the Chukchi Sea for a research project funded by NASA. He states, “The deeper we went into the ice, the more phytoplankton there were. They reached amazing concentrations, to the point where it was the largest bloom anybody had ever seen anywhere in the world’s oceans. And it was less than three feet of ice.” Why is this research so important? What is its connection to Climate Change on the planet? Bob Pickart, the lead physical oceanographer, for a project funded by the National Science Foundation in the Chukchi Sea this spring had the goal to gather hundreds of water samples. The samples contain the nutrients which spur the growth of the phytoplankton. Once it begins it goes up the food chain to all inhabitants in the Chukchi Sea and Arctic- both ocean and land. This is the basis for the ecosystem. When phytoplankton has light, it can bloom and blooms were found three feet deep in the ice. Arrigo says that, “Productivity has been shifting earlier and earlier, because the ice is melting earlier and earlier. But now the bloom — the productivity — is not even waiting for the ice to melt.” This presents a new set of circumstances. Arrigo is concerned that if it’s coming earlier for animals who have set their biological clock : “What’s going to happen? Are they going to produce their offspring at a point when the bloom’s already happened, it’s too late, there’s no food in the water?” The imbalance of ice melting more quickly and earlier each year changes the actions of polar bears and other inhabitants to hunt on the disappearing solid ice for the fish. The phytoplankton will transmit the algae upward to the atmosphere earlier and cause an imbalance in a chain of effects set from the past decades of ten thousand years. The Arctic is particularly vulnerable to warming due to seas in the Arctic Ocean which are often shallow and covered by sea ice that is disappearing rapidly. The Arctic Ocean acts like a trap capturing heat carried in by the Gulf Stream, which brings in ever warmer water and the land around it is affected with melting ice. Of all the heat trapped on Earth by greenhouse gases, 90 percent goes into oceans, while the remaining 10 percent goes to the Arctic ice sheets. In the US President Obama has created a task force of 26 officials from across the country to address the issue. He announced a nearly $1 billion National Disaster Resilience Competition in June. Obama told members of the task force at a meeting this past Wednesday that, "We are here because we know that climate change is an undeniable scientific fact." For the hard hit Alaska tribes facing ice melts and rising sea levels, the Interior Department is setting aside $10 million dollars. The question of how the Arctic region will change and with it the planet finds its answer in the Chukchi Sea where the Arctic life from plant blooms lead to its inhabitants. The need for study and answers with technology based equipment will unravel the secrets of the phytoplankton in the Arctic for mankind of the planet.
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**Polar research is also key to successful climate adaptation --- the Arctic is the lynchpin of accurate prediction**

**IJIS 12** (IARC-JAXA Information System, geoinformatics facility for satellite image analysis and computational modeling/visualization in support of international collaboration in Arctic and global change research at the International Arctic Research Center in corporation with the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, “Arctic Research Overview,” 2012, http://www.ijis.iarc.uaf.edu/en/welcome/overview.htm#top)

The Arctic is the high-latitude region around the North Pole including parts of the North America and Eurasia continents, Greenland and other islands as well as the Arctic Ocean. It is generally considered to be the north of the Arctic Circle (66°33´N), which is the limit of the midnight sun in summer. It is also defined as the area where the average monthly temperature of the warmest month is lower than 10°C. We have many more definitions of the Arctic for various disciplines and perspectives. The Arctic is a vast, inhospitable area but the frontier for scientific researches. There are unique subjects around the Arctic Sea with adjacent seas, tundra and permafrost areas, and magnetic phenomena such as aurora borealis or magnetic storm. It is also important for prediction of mid-latitude climate to study the Arctic phenomena, because the condition of arctic sea ice significantly affects the climate in Japan and neighboring nations. Previous researches suggest that a future temperature rise over the Arctic would lead cold wave and aridity to the mid-latitude region and threaten human life. **Development of Arctic research is an urgent global requirement to prevent global warming.** Besides, many countries have a close relation to the Arctic region. Enhancing mutual cooperation in international arctic research is desirable.

**Informed climate research prevents extinction --- adaptation is critical**

**Romero 08** (Purple S. Romero, ABS-CBN News, “Climate Change and Human Extinction—Are You Ready to be Fossilized?” May 17, 2008, http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/nation/05/16/08/climate-change-and-human-extinction-are-you-ready-be-fossilized)

Climate change killed the dinosaurs. Will it kill us as well? Will we let it destroy the human race? This was the grim, depressing message that hung in the background of the Climate Change Forum hosted on Friday by the Philippine National Red Cross at the Manila Hotel. "Not one dinosaur is alive today. Maybe someday it will be our fossils that another race will dig up in the future, " said Roger Bracke of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, underscoring his point that no less than **extinction is faced by the human race, unless we are able to address** global warming and **climate change** in this generation. Bracke, however, countered the pessimistic mood of the day by saying that the human race still has an opportunity to save itself. This more hopeful view was also presented by the four other speakers in the forum. Bracke pointed out that all peoples of the world must be involved in two types of response to the threat of climate change: mitigation and adaptation. "Prevention" is no longer possible, according to Bracke and the other experts at the forum, since climate change is already happening. Last chance The forum's speakers all noted the increasing number and intensity of devastating typhoons--most recently cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, which killed more than 100,000 people--as evidence that the world's climatic and weather conditions are turning deadly because of climate change. They also reminded the audience that deadly typhoons have also hit the Philippines recently, particularly Milenyo and Reming, which left hundreds of thousands of Filipino families homeless. World Wildlife Fund Climate and Energy Program head Naderev Saño said that "this generation the last chance for the human race" to do something and ensure that humanity stays alive in this planet. According to Saño, while most members of our generation will be dead by the time the worst effects of climate change are felt, our children will be the ones to suffer. How will Filipinos survive climate change? Well, first of all, they have to be made aware that
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climate change is a problem that threatens their lives. The easiest way to do this – as former Consultant for the Secretariats of the UN Convention on Climate Change Dr. Pak Sum Low told abs-cbnews.com/Newsbreak – is to particularize the disasters that it could cause. Talking in the language of destruction, Pak and other experts paint this portrait of a Philippines hit by climate change: increased typhoons in Visayas, drought in Mindanao, destroyed agricultural areas in Pampanga, and higher incidence rates of dengue and malaria. Sañom said that as polar ice caps melt due to global warming, sea levels will rise, endangering coastal and low-lying areas like Manila. He said Manila Bay would experience a sea level increase of 72 meters over 20 years. This means that from Pampanga to Nueva Ecija, farms and fishponds would be in danger of being would be inundated in saltwater. Sañom added that Albay, which has been marked as a vulnerable area to typhoons, would be the top province at risk. Sañom also pointed out that extreme weather conditions arising from climate change, including typhoons and severe droughts, would have social, economic and political consequences: Ruined farmlands and fishponds would hamper crop growth and reduce food sources, typhoons would displace people, cause diseases, and limit actions in education and employment. Thus, Saño said, while environmental protection should remain at the top of the agenda in fighting climate change, solutions to the phenomenon "must also be economic, social, moral and political." Mitigation Joyceline Goco, Climate Change Coordinator of the Environment Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, focused her lecture on the programs Philippine government is implementing in order to mitigate the effects of climate change. Goco said that the Philippines is already a signatory to global agreements calling for a reduction in the "greenhouse gasses"--mostly carbon dioxide, chloroflourocarbons and methane--that are responsible for trapping heat inside the planet and raising global temperatures. Goco said the DENR, which is tasked to oversee and activate the Clean Development Mechanism, has registered projects which would reduce methane and carbon dioxide. These projects include landfill and electricity generation initiatives. She also said that the government is also looking at alternative fuel sources in order do reduce the country's dependence on the burning of fossil fuels--oil--which are known culprits behind global warming. Bracke however said that mitigation is not enough. "The ongoing debate about mitigation of climate change effects is highly technical. It involves making fundamental changes in the policies of governments, making costly changes in how industry operates. All of this takes time and, frankly, we're not even sure if such mitigation efforts will be successful. In the meantime, while the debate goes on, the effects of climate change are already happening to us." Adaptation A few nations and communities have already begun adapting their lifestyles to cope with the effects of climate change. In Bangladesh, farmers have switched to raising ducks instead of chickens because the latter easily succumb to weather disturbances and immediate effects, such as floods. In Norway, houses with elevated foundations have been constructed to decrease displacement due to typhoons. In the Philippines main body for fighting climate change, the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change, (PTFCC) headed by Department on Energy Sec. Angelo Reyes, has identified emission reduction measures and has looked into what fuel mix could be both environment and economic friendly. The Department of Health has started work with the World Health Organization in strengthening its surveillance mechanisms for health services. However, **bringing information** hatched from PTFCC’s studies down **to** and **craft**ing **an action plan for adaptation** with the communities in the barangay level **remains a challenge.**

#### Conesnsus of experts agree --- it’s try or die

**Costello et al. 11** – Anthony Costella, Institute for Global Health, University College London, Mark Maslin, Department of Geography, University College London, Hugh Montgomery, Institute for Human Health and Performance, University College London, Anne M. Johnson, Institute for Global Health, University College London, Paul Ekins, Energy Institute, University College London (“Global health and climate change: moving from denial and catastrophic fatalism to positive action” May 2011 vol. 369 no. 1942 1866-1882 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society)

Advocacy about the health consequences will ensure that climate change is a high priority. The United Nations Convention on Climate Change was set up in 1992 to ensure that nations worked together to minimize the adverse effects, but McMichael and Neira noted that, in preparation for the Copenhagen conference in December 2009, only four of 47 nations mentioned human health as a consideration [1]. With business as usual, global warming caused by rising greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will threaten mass populations through increased transmission of some infections, heat stress, food and water insecurity, increased deaths from more frequent and extreme climate events, threats to shelter and security, and through population migration [2]. On the one hand it is necessary in the media to counter climate change sceptics and denialists, but on the other it is also important **not to allow climate catastrophists**, who tell us it is all too late, **to deflect us from pragmatic** **and positive action.** Catastrophic scenarios are possible in the longer term, and effective action will be formidably difficult, but evidence suggests that we do have the tools, the time and the
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resources to bring about the changes needed for climate stability. 2. Climate change evidence and denial Given the current body of evidence, it is surprising that global warming and its causal relationship with atmospheric GHG pollution is disputed any more than the relationship between acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, or lung cancer and cigarette smoking. The basic principles that determine the Earth’s temperature are, of course, relatively simple. Some of the short-wave solar radiation that strikes the Earth is reflected back into space and some is absorbed by the land and emitted as long-wave radiation (heat). Some of the long-wave radiation is trapped in the atmosphere by ‘greenhouse gases’, which include water vapour, carbon dioxide and methane. Without GHGs the Earth would be on average 33◦C colder. Over the last 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution, humans have been adding more carbon dioxide and methane into the atmosphere. The result is that the Earth’s atmosphere, ocean and land are indeed warming—due to increased atmospheric ‘greenhouse gas’ concentrations [3]. Gleick et al. [4], from the US National Academy of Sciences, wrote a letter to Science stating ‘There is compelling, comprehensive, and consistent objective evidence that humans are changing the climate in ways that threaten our societies and the ecosystems on which we depend’. The most recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [5], amounting to nearly 3000 pages of detailed review and analysis of published research, also declares that the scientific uncertainties of global warming are essentially resolved. This report states that there is clear evidence for a 0.75◦C rise in global temperatures and 22 cm rise in sea level during the twentieth century. The IPCC synthesis also predicts that global temperatures could rise further by between 1.1◦C and 6.4◦C by 2100, and sea level could rise by between 28 and 79 cm, or more if the melting of Greenland and Antarctica accelerates. In addition, weather patterns will become less predictable and the occurrence of extreme climate events, such as storms, floods, heat waves and droughts, will increase. There is also strong evidence for ocean acidification driven by more carbon dioxide dissolving in the oceans [6]. Given the current failure of international negotiations to address carbon emission reductions, and that atmospheric warming lags behind rises in CO2 concentration, there is concern that global surface temperature will rise above the supposedly ‘safe limit’ of 2◦C within this century. Each doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration alone is expected to produce 1.9–4.5◦C of warming at equilibrium [7]. Of course, climate modelling is an extremely complex process, and uncertainty with projections relating to future emissions trajectories means that the time scale and magnitude of future climate change cannot be predicted with certainty [8]. These uncertainties are magnified when future climate predictions are used to estimate potential impacts. For example, the environmental impacts of climate change are also uncertain, but could underestimate such impacts because they detrimentally interact with habitat loss, pollution and loss of biodiversity due to other causes. There is also the additional problem that switching from biome to biome may not be directly reversible. For example, rainforest recycles a huge amount of water so it can survive a significant amount of aridification before it burns and is replaced by savannah. But the region then has to get much wetter before rainforest can return, as there is greatly reduced water cycling in savannah [9]. In the policy arena, further uncertainty surrounds the desire for international agreements on emission cuts, and the possible routes to such agreement and implementation. The feasible speed of technological innovation in carbon capture and provision of renewable/low-carbon energy resources is also uncertain. Denying the causes or the current weight of evidence for anthropogenic climate change is irrational, just as the existence of ‘uncertainties’ should not be used to deny the need for proportionate action, when such uncertainties could underestimate the risks and impact of climate change. There is no reason for inaction and there are many ways we can use our current knowledge of climate change to improve health provision for current and future generations. 3. Catastrophism At the other end of the scale are doom-mongers who predict catastrophic population collapse and the end of civilization. In the early nineteenth century, the French palaeontologist Georges Cuvier first addressed catastrophism and explained patterns of extinction observed in the fossil record through catastrophic natural events [10]. We know now of five major extinctions: the Ordovician–Silurian extinction (439 million years ago), the Late Devonian extinction (about 364 million years ago), the Permian–Triassic extinction (about 251 million years ago), the End Triassic extinction (roughly 199 million to 214 million years ago) and the Cretaceous– Tertiary extinction (about 65 million years ago). These mass extinctions were caused by a combination of plate tectonics, supervolcanism and asteroid impacts. The understanding of the mass extinctions led Gould & Eldredge [11] to update Darwin’s theory of evolution with their own theory of punctuated equilibrium. Many scientists have suggested that the current human-induced extinction rates could be as fast as those during these mass extinctions [12,13]. For example, one study predicted that 58 per cent of species may be committed to extinction by 2050 due to climate change alone [14], though this paper has been criticized [15,16]. Some people have even suggested that **human extinction may not be a remote risk** [17–19]. Sherwood & Huber [7] point to continued heating effects that could make the world largely uninhabitable by humans and mammals within 300 years. Peak heat stress, quantified by the wet-bulb temperature (used because it reflects both the ambient temperature and relative humidity of the site), is surprisingly similar across diverse climates and never exceeds 31◦C. They suggest that if it rose to 35◦C, which never happens now but would at a warming of 7◦C, hyperthermia in humans and other mammals would occur as dissipation of metabolic heat becomes impossible, therefore making many environments uninhabitable.
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#### Research-driven adaptation strategies build in resilience to prevent total ecosystem collapse

**Doney 08** - Senior Scientist Marine Chemistry & Geochemistry Department Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (Scott Doney, “The Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act: H.R. 4174” Written testimony presented to the Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, United States House of Representatives 6/5, <http://www.whoi.edu/page.do?pid=8916&tid=282&cid=43766>)

Major gaps exist in our current scientific understanding, limiting our ability to forecast the consequences of ocean acidification and hindering the development of adaptation approaches for marine resource managers. Thus far, most of the elevated CO2 response studies on marine biota, whether for calcification, photosynthesis or some other physiological measure, have been short-term laboratory or mesocosm experiments ranging in length from hours to weeks. Chronic exposure to increased CO2 may have complex effects on the growth and reproductive success of calcareous and non-calcareous plants and animals and could induce possible adaptations that are not observed in short term experiments. Our present understanding also stems largely from experiments on individual organisms or a species in isolation; consequently, the response of populations and communities to more realistic gradual changes is largely unknown. Other aspects of ocean biogeochemistry may be strongly influenced by rising CO2 levels. Recent experiments with one of the most abundant types of phytoplankton, Synechococcus, showed significantly elevated photosynthesis rates under warmer, high CO2 conditions. Elevated CO2 also enhanced nitrogen fixation rates (production of biologically useful nutrients from dissolved nitrogen gas) for a key tropical marine cyanobacteria, which would in effect fertilize the surface ocean and offset predicted reductions in tropical biological production due to climate warming and stratification. Further, a major but underappreciated consequence of ocean acidification will be broad alterations of inorganic and organic seawater chemistry beyond the carbonate system. Acidification will affect the biogeochemical dynamics of calcium carbonate, organic carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus in the ocean as well as the seawater chemical speciation of trace metals, trace elements and dissolved organic matter. A fully-integrated research program with in-water and remote sensing observing systems on multiple-scales, laboratory, mesocosm (large volumes of seawater either in tanks or plastic bags), and field process studies, and modeling approaches is required to provide policymakers with informed management strategies that address how humans might best mitigate or adapt to these long-term changes. This program should emphasize how changes in the metabolic processes at the cellular level will be manifested within the ecosystem or community structure, and how they will influence future climate feedbacks. A program should include the following components: Systematic monitoring system with high resolution measurements in time and space of atmospheric and surface water carbon dioxide partial pressure (pCO2), total dissolved inorganic carbon, alkalinity, and pH to validate model predictions and provide the foundations for interpreting the impacts of acidification on ecosystems;In regions projected to undergo substantial changes in carbonate chemistry, tracking of abundances and depth distributions of key calcifying and non-calcifying species at appropriate temporal and spatial scales to be able to detect possible shifts and distinguish between natural variability and anthropogenic forced changes; Standardized protocols and data reporting guidelines for carbonate system perturbation and calcification experiments; Manipulative laboratory experiments to quantify physiological responses including calcification and dissolution, photosynthesis, respiration, and other sensitive indices useful in predicting CO2 tolerance of ecologically and economically important species;

New approaches to investigate address long-term subtle changes that more realistically simulate natural conditions; Manipulative mesocosm and field experiments to investigate community and ecosystem responses (i.e., shifts in species composition, food web structure, biogeochemical cycling and feedback mechanisms) to elevated CO2 and potential interactions with nutrients, light and other environmental variables; Integrated modeling approach to determine the likely implications of ocean acidification processes on marine ecosystems and fisheries including nested models of biogeochemical processes and higher trophic-level responses to address ecosystem-wide dynamics such as competition, predation, reproduction, migration, and spatial population structure;

Robust and cost effective methods for measuring pH, pCO2, and dissolved total alkalinity on moored buoys, ships of opportunity, and research vessels, floats and gliders; Studies on the human dimensions of ocean acidification including the socio-economic impacts due to damaged fisheries and coral reefs; Assessment of potential adaptation strategies needed by resource managers including reducing other human stresses (over-fishing, habitat destruction, pollution) to increase ecosystem resiliency as well as local-scale mitigation efforts.
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#### Status quo reliance on non-US icebreakers unravels the US polar science leadership --- specfically the Antarctic

**Augustine, 12** - Report of the U.S. Antarctic Program Blue Ribbon Panel; Augustine was the chair of the Panel (Norman Augustine, “More and Better Science in Antarctica Through Increased Logistical Effectiveness” July, [http://www.nsf.gov/od/opp/usap\_special\_review/usap\_brp/rpt/antarctica\_07232012.pdf)](http://www.nsf.gov/od/opp/usap_special_review/usap_brp/rpt/antarctica_07232012.pdf)//DH)

The U.S. inventory of icebreakers relevant to McMurdo resupply operations is effectively limited to three USCG ships—the medium icebreaker Healy and two polar class icebreakers, Polar Sea and the Polar Star17.

Healy, commissioned in 2000, participated in the McMurdo break-in mission in 2002/03. Healy is more ice-capable, albeit less maneuverable, than the Russian Vladimir Ignatyuk that successfully conducted the 2011/12 breakin under the very light ice conditions that prevailed prior to the arrival of Iceberg B15 in the McMurdo Sound area and again over the past two years. The Healy does not possess either the power or the maneuverability required for unassisted break-in operations in heavy, multiyear ice. In addition, Healy is typically fully engaged in Arctic science operations for its entire annual operating schedule (approximately 185 days per year) and is expected to be committed to such duties indefinitely into the future. Healy could, at least in principle, be made available as a backup vessel to assist another vessel with the break-in under exigency situations, or, if deemed in the national interest and other options are unavailable, to conduct the break-in at McMurdo under light ice conditions (much as it did for a fuel delivery to Nome, Alaska, in early 2012). The relevant studies assume that the Healy will eventually undergo a service life extension that would permit it to remain in operation for the foreseeable future.

Polar Sea, commissioned in 1978, is in “commissioned, inactive” status and has been incapable of operating since May 2010, when it experienced an unexpected catastrophic failure of five of its recently refurbished engines. It is not decided whether the Polar Sea will return to active status.

Polar Star, commissioned in 1976, is undergoing a $60 million service life extension that should provide an additional seven to ten years of operating life. Polar Star would not be available for operational icebreaking services until 2013/14 at the earliest, and is unlikely to be operational much past the 2020/21 season.

At present, and perhaps again in the future, the USAP is in the position of being principally or totally reliant upon foreign sources for icebreaking support for the annual resupply. Additionally, it is not clear that the Swedish and Russian icebreakers used in recent years will be available in the future. This approach to resupply of U.S. operations in Antarctica is unsatisfactory in the long term. The lack of a U.S. capability to conduct the McMurdo break-in severely jeopardizes the U.S. commitment to its stated policies regarding the Antarctic Continent. As soon as possible, the break-in should again be supported by icebreaking services reliably controlled by the U.S. government, preferably an icebreaker owned and operated by the USCG.
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#### A strong US science presence in the Antarctica is key to stability of the Antarctic Treaty

**Augustine, 12** - Report of the U.S. Antarctic Program Blue Ribbon Panel; Augustine was the chair of the Panel (Norman, “More and Better Science in Antarctica Through Increased Logistical Effectiveness” July, <http://www.nsf.gov/od/opp/usap_special_review/usap_brp/rpt/antarctica_07232012.pdf>)

Setting aside the ambiguities associated with the federal budgeting process, logistics planning in Antarctica is complicated by the shortness of the season during which the continent can be reliably accessed for logistical purposes, nominally 21 weeks by air at McMurdo Station and 15 weeks at South Pole Station. Using U.S.-owned heavy icebreakers, McMurdo Station could be accessed by ship during about ten weeks each year. As these ships have become unavailable and less-powerful icebreakers are used, the time in which to accomplish resupply by sea has been reduced to the four-week annual sea ice minimum—a challenging and unreliable practice. In Antarctica, weather changes frequently and abruptly, necessitating contingency plans for most activities, particularly those in remote areas. The cost of energy is high and uncertain, and the behavior of the ice pack can hinder the delivery of energy and other critical supplies. During late 2011, a series of storms affecting harbor conditions left too little time for the McMurdo ice pier to thicken to sufficient strength, thus requiring deployment of a portable modular causeway system loaned by the Department of Defense (DoD). The Panel itself made the final landing of the season at the Sea Ice Runway, the airfield closest to McMurdo Station, before sea ice conditions deteriorated to the point that air operations had to be moved to a more solid but more remote location. At the Pegasus Runway, constructed on glacial ice, temperatures now rise more frequently to within a few degrees of the point where air operations are precluded.

Long-term uncertainties abound. Some Antarctic research activity will continue to shift from relatively simple to more highly integrated research that requires more complex support. Further, the impact on the Antarctic region of greatly expanded tourism remains to be determined. Many nations do not participate in the Antarctic Treaty. Seven countries have made claims to parts of Antarctica that remain in abeyance while the Treaty is in force—pointing to the importance of maintaining an influential U.S. science presence as a stabilizing influence. Finally, climate change in Antarctica could significantly complicate future runway and ice pier construction and thereby impact both air and sea operations.
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#### That leads to armed conflict --- the treaty is key

**Roura 11** (Ricardo, graduate in geology from University of Buenos Aires, M.Phil from Massey University - Advisor to the Antarctic Ocean Alliances Marine Protected Areas campaign - SOC representative to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings - “Antarctica’s Wilderness Values”, 2011, <http://www.oneworldmagazine.org/focus/southpole/contmain.htm>)

As we continue to move towards more "advanced" forms of exploitation of the natural environment, it is somewhat ironic that the wilderness values of Antarctica, and what they mean to the planet and the human spirit, are protected by the bureaucracy of the Antarctic Treaty. In a changing world where the population is burgeoning, consumption is increasing, and technology allows for more exploitation of resources, these values would otherwise disappear. There is a kind of symbiotic relationship between the Antarctic Treaty and Antarctica as a protected wilderness; i.e., the peace ensured by the Treaty would more likely disappear if Antarctica were not a protected wilderness: There would be a scramble for the exploitation of its resources and the assertion of territorial claims; sooner or later, this would lead to the collapse of the Antarctic Treaty and armed conflict. Likewise, if there were no Antarctic Treaty system set in place to endure that Antarctica remains an area devoted to peace and science, there would be little environmental protection and the Antarctic wilderness would be destroyed. Maybe the future of Antarctica will rely on this duel protection.

#### Most likely scenario for conflcit scenario --- instability is modeled worldwide

**Yin 12** (Wenquin Yin, Chinese Journal of International Law, Moratorium in International Law, June 29th, 2012, <http://chinesejil.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/04/18/chinesejil.jms032.full>)

The intent and purpose of the moratorium on performance or furtherance of conflicting claims are not to make any judgment on the claims, or to settle dispute resulting from the conflicting claims, but to freeze, shelve or set aside dispute and postpone the final settlement of dispute. The Antarctic Treaty is a case in point. According to Article IV(1) of the Antarctic Treaty, the Treaty will have neither positive nor negative effects on the asserted rights of or claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica as well as on positions of any contracting party as regards its recognition or non-recognition of such asserted rights or claims. Under Article IV(2), the status quo relating to claims is frozen, “acts or activities taking place” while the Treaty is in force have nothing to do with claims, and no new claims and enlargement of existing claims are permissible. In negotiating the Antarctic Treaty, “claimants do not generally favour any solutions that involve a renunciation of their claims”,33 and at the same time, they had no idea of settling their respective claims. In achieving the fundamental objectives of the peaceful uses of the continent and the promotion of scientific research and co-operation, negotiating parties tended to “sidestep particularly contentious issues relating to territorial jurisdiction.”34 As it stands today, the Antarctic Treaty successfully suspends disputes of claims and counterclaims on Antarctica. The Antarctic Treaty has been generally considered a precedent for co-existence, and provided the framework for international activities and a basis for stability
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in Antarctica.35 “The key to reaching this desirable result was Article IV in the Antarctic Treaty.”36 However, the territory claims are far from dead. The seven claimants have maintained their positions.37 For example, the United Kingdom, as a claimant, claimed that “appurtenant to Antarctica there exist areas of continental shelf the extent of which has yet to be defined”, and reserved the right to submit information to the Commission on the Limits of Continental Shelf thereof, when it submitted information relating to the continental shelf of Ascension Island on 9 May 2008.38 Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty “just postpones the question of settlement of territorial sovereignty but does not exclude in principle the application of the concept of territorial sovereignty in Antarctica.”39 In case the Antarctic Treaty system collapses, the issue of territorial claim disputes will definitely arise again.

#### That spills over --- ATS is the key framework for a solution to the South China Sea conflict

Shicun and Hong 14 – Shicun Wu is President of the China National Institute for the South China Sea Studies, a sole national-level think-tank in China specializing in South China Sea studies. His research focuses on history and geography on the South China Sea, ocean boundary delimitation, international relations and regional security issues. Nong Hong is Assistant President at the National Institute for South China Sea Studies (NISCSS), with responsibility for the NISCSS Beijing Office.Her research takes an interdisciplinary approach to examining international relations and international law, with focus on International Relations and Comparative Politics in general; ocean governance in East Asia; law of the sea; international security, particularly non-traditional security; and international dispute settlement and conflict resolution. – “Recent Developments in the South China Sea Dispute: The Prospect of a Joint Development Regime”)

The Antarctic Treaty is an excellent model from which marine scientists in the South China Sea may learn many lessons4" and can serve as a practical model for resolving disputes in the South China Sea. The Antarctic Treaty, which was signed in 1939, calls for the eventual demilitarization of the area. The 12 claim¬ant states are strongly urged to prohibit ‘any measures of military rule, such as the establishment of military bases and fortifications, the carrying out military maneuvers, and the testing of any types of weapon’ in the demilitarized Antarctic Ocean.13 The Antarctic Treaty also upholds the collective utilization of the resources in Antarctica. For any disputes that may arise, it mandates the use of‘negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, or other peaceful means of their own choice’ to manage conflicts in the area.44 What is notable in the Antarctic Treaty model is the vital role played by experts and scientists in convincing political leaders to eschew political issues in the area and to start cooperating in functional areas. Through their reliable scientific findings, experts and scientists push for the collective protection of the Antarctic Ocean for the benefit of all claimant states. Instead of competing for the resources of the Antarctic, experts and scientists propose a model that upholds the collective utilization of Antarctica and its resources through ‘joint management.’ Experts and scientists also uphold the idea of making the Antarctic a pristine world park and ‘a center for peaceful scientific inquiry.’ Thus, the Antarctic Treaty guarantees the collective governance of the Antarctic Ocean.
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#### Miscalc risk is high --- tensions absent treaty resolution lead to full military escalation

**Glaser, 12** - senior fellow with the Freeman Chair in China Studies and a senior associate with the Pacific Forum, Center for Strategic and International Studies (Bonnie S., “Armed Clash in the South China Sea Contingency Planning Memorandum No. 14” April 2012 http://www.cfr.org/world/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883)

Introduction The risk of conflict in the South China Sea is significant. China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Brunei, and the Philippines have competing territorial and jurisdictional claims, particularly over rights to exploit the region's possibly extensive reserves of oil and gas. Freedom of navigation in the region is also a contentious issue, especially between the United States and China over the right of U.S. military vessels to operate in China's two-hundred-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). These tensions are shaping—and being shaped by—rising apprehensions about the growth of China's military power and its regional intentions. China has embarked on a substantial modernization of its maritime paramilitary forces as well as naval capabilities to enforce its sovereignty and jurisdiction claims by force if necessary. At the same time, it is developing capabilities that would put U.S. forces in the region at risk in a conflict, thus potentially denying access to the U.S. Navy in the western Pacific. Given the growing importance of the U.S.-China relationship, and the Asia-Pacific region more generally, to the global economy, the United States has a major interest in preventing any one of the various disputes in the South China Sea from escalating militarily. The Contingencies Of the many conceivable contingencies involving an armed clash in the South China Sea, three especially threaten U.S. interests and could potentially prompt the United States to use force. The most likely and dangerous contingency is a clash stemming from U.S. military operations within China's EEZ that provokes an armed Chinese response. The United States holds that nothing in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or state practice negates the right of military forces of all nations to conduct military activities in EEZs without coastal state notice or consent. China insists that reconnaissance activities undertaken without prior notification and without permission of the coastal state violate Chinese domestic law and international law. China routinely intercepts U.S. reconnaissance flights conducted in its EEZ and periodically does so in aggressive ways that increase the risk of an accident similar to the April 2001 collision of a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane and a Chinese F-8 fighter jet near Hainan Island. A comparable maritime incident could be triggered by Chinese vessels harassing a U.S. Navy surveillance ship operating in its EEZ, such as occurred in the 2009 incidents involving the USNS Impeccable and the USNS Victorious. The large growth of Chinese submarines has also increased the danger of an incident, such as when a Chinese submarine collided with a U.S. destroyer's towed sonar array in June 2009. Since neither U.S. reconnaissance aircraft nor ocean surveillance vessels are armed, the United States might respond to dangerous behavior by Chinese planes or ships by dispatching armed escorts. A miscalculation or misunderstanding could then result in a deadly exchange of fire, leading to further military escalation and precipitating a major political crisis. Rising U.S.-China mistrust and intensifying bilateral strategic competition would likely make managing such a crisis more difficult.
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#### Extinction

**Wittner 11** - Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany (Lawrence S. Wittner, 11/28, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", [www.huntingtonnews.net/14446](http://www.huntingtonnews.net/14446))

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.
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#### Antarctic science is the vital internal link to global science diplomacy

**Collins 11** – Center for Global Sustainability Studies and major sponsor of the 22nd Pacific Science Congress (June 2011, “Founded on science, world cooperation in Antarctica a model for meeting climate, other challenges,” <http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2011-06/cfgs-fos061011.php>)

The success of world co-operation based on science and practiced since the Cold War by nations operating in Antarctica offers a model to humanity as it confronts challenges to common interests like climate change, biodiversity loss and overfishing, says the editor of a new book on science diplomacy. Since the end of the Second World War science has become an important tool of diplomacy, not only for issues involving environmental management, but for peace in the world we live in, says Paul Berkman, former Head of the Arctic Ocean Geopolitics Programme, Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, UK, and Research Professor at the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management at the University of California Santa Barbara.

Says Dr. Berkman, keynote speaker at an international conference on Antarctica being held in Malaysia: "For half a century, it has become increasingly obvious that we face planetary-scale phenomena that cannot be solved by any one nation or region, nor solved quickly. Today and forever after, national and international interests need to find the type of balance practiced today under the Antarctic Treaty." In a new book published by the Smithsonian Institution, Science Diplomacy: Antarctica, Science and the Governance of International Spaces, Dr. Berkman writes: "The two world wars of the 20th Century underscored animosity on a global scale. In contrast, reflecting unparalleled international cooperation, institutions have evolved since 1945 to prevent or resolve disputes transcending national boundaries. Most of these institutions relate to issues that cross national boundaries. However, there is a suite of institutions that has emerged to manage regions beyond the reach of national jurisdiction in the high seas (1958), Antarctica (1959), outer space (1967), and the deep sea (1971)." The origin, development and success of the Antarctic Treaty offers hope and inspiration applicable to the challenges of climate change, biodiversity loss, overfishing and a host of similarly vexing environmental problems, he writes. "Any lessons we are able to glean from the Antarctic experience will be relevant not only to those interested in traditional international spaces but also to those in search of effective approaches to governing an expanding range of issues (e.g., climate change)…that are destined to become even more important in the future."

"Perhaps the broadest legacy of the first 50 years of the (Antarctic Treaty) is the development of a suite of practices that are useful in any effort to ensure that interactions between science and policy produce positive results for both communities in addressing a wide range of large-scale issues for the benefit of humankind and the world we inhabit." "The parts of the planet that fall under national jurisdiction constitute just 30% of the world," says Dr. Berkman. "We're still in infancy in terms of how to work as a civilization. The extent of humanity's common interests and inter-connectedness has only become truly apparent in the second part of the 20th Century." The fundamental role of science in international governance as exemplified in the Antarctic Treaty includes such responsibilities as monitoring and assessing change over time and space, the discovery of new beneficial health and other products derived from biological resources, and prioritizing and framing issues for consideration. "Science is free of such time-bound blinders and therefore is fundamental to environment-related diplomacy at a global scale," says Dr. Zakri, who co-chairs as well the Malaysian Industry-Government Group for High Technology (MIGHT). "The world is changing always. Science provides the common language, culture and foundation for nations and people to work together in decision-making on shared global interests."
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**Science diplomacy solves all impacts**

**Federoff 08** – professor of biology at Penn State University known for her research on biology and life sciences, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) (April 2008, “International Science and Technology Cooperation: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education,” Committee on Science and Technology, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-110hhrg41470/html/CHRG-110hhrg41470.htm>)

Chairman Baird, Ranking Member Ehlers, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss science diplomacy at the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. is recognized globally for its leadership in science and technology. Our scientific strength is both a tool of ``soft power''--part of our strategic diplomatic arsenal--and a basis for creating partnerships with countries as they move beyond basic economic and social development. Science diplomacy is a central element of the Secretary's transformational diplomacy initiative, because science and technology are essential to achieving stability and strengthening failed and fragile states.

S&T advances have immediate and enormous influence on national and global economies, and thus on the international relations between societies. Nation states, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations are largely **shaped by their expertise in and access to intellectual and physical capital in science, technology, and engineering**. Even as S&T advances of our modern era provide opportunities for economic prosperity, some also challenge the relative position of countries in the world order, and influence our social institutions and principles. America must remain at the forefront of this new world by maintaining its technological edge, and leading the way internationally through science diplomacy and engagement.

The Public Diplomacy Role of Science Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. The global scientific community embraces principles Americans cherish: transparency, meritocracy, accountability, the objective evaluation of evidence, and broad and frequently democratic participation. Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all.

Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides. Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, members of ideologically divergent societies can use the common language of science to cooperatively address both domestic and the increasingly trans-national and global problems confronting humanity in the 21st century. There is a growing recognition that science and technology will increasingly drive the successful economies of the 21st century. Using Science Diplomacy to Achieve National Security Objectives The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the developed world to address the causal factors that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, the world faces common threats, among them climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, food insecurity, and religious extremism. These threats can undermine the national security of the United States, both directly and indirectly. Many are
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blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous. Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy.

There are also important challenges to the ability of states to supply their populations with sufficient food. The still-growing human population, rising affluence in emerging economies, and other factors have combined to create unprecedented pressures on global prices of staples such as edible oils and grains. Encouraging and promoting the use of contemporary molecular techniques in crop improvement is an essential goal for U.S. science diplomacy.

An essential part of the war on terrorism is a war of ideas. The creation of economic opportunity can do much more to combat the rise of fanaticism than can any weapon. The war of ideas is a war about rationalism as opposed to irrationalism. Science and technology put us firmly on the side of rationalism by providing ideas and opportunities that improve people's lives. We may use the recognition and the goodwill that science still generates for the United States to achieve our diplomatic and developmental goals. Additionally, the Department continues to use science as a means to reduce the proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction and prevent what has been dubbed `brain drain.' Through cooperative threat reduction activities, former weapons scientists redirect their skills to participate in peaceful, collaborative international research in a large variety of scientific fields. In addition, new global efforts focus on improving biological, chemical, and nuclear security by promoting and implementing best scientific practices as a means to enhance security, increase global partnerships, and create sustainability.

2AC – Science Extension – Icebreakers Key (1/3)

#### US international science leadership is being eroded in the status quo --- the plan reverses that trend

**NRC 7 –** working arm of the United States National Academies, which produces reports that shape policies, inform public opinion, and advance the pursuit of science, engineering, and medicine (National Research Council, “Polar Icebreakers in a Changing World: An Assessment of US Needs,” <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11753&page=R1>)

FINAL THOUGHTS This chapter has highlighted some of the most exciting polar research being conducted today. Polar research is contributing to a wide range of disciplines, providing fundamental information about Earth’s systems and how they operate. The continued vitality of polar research is intimately linked to the availability of the appropriate infrastructure and logistical support to allow scientists to work in these challenging environments. Conducting research in the polar regions is as complex and challenging as space science. Like research in outer space, U.S. leadership in international polar science is being challenged as countries increasingly exercise their national prerogatives at the poles. As polar science advances, more and more difficult scientific questions are being asked that will require sustained and continuous observations and measurements in these regions. In the north, access to the central Arctic Basin will provide an understanding of the evolution of northern climates. Prediction of future change can be based only on a full understanding of the Arctic and Antarctic systems. In the south, year-round scientific access will be vital, with current research limited by the ability of researchers and teams to access on a regular basis all of the ice-covered seas of Antarctica and the Arctic. While assets and platforms such as airplanes and spaceborne sensors are important technological tools for future investigations, surface ground-truth and in situ sampling cannot and will not be replaced in the foreseeable future. The availability of adequate icebreaking capabilities is fundamental and essential to research in the polar regions of our planet, from which we gain an understanding of human life on Earth, both historically and climatically. The committee noted the successful relationship between U.S. Coast Guard HEALY operations and the U.S. Arctic marine science community, fostered in part by the UNOLS (University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System) Arctic Icebreaker Coordinating Committee (AICC) and supports the continuation of this successful relationship.
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**Heavy icebreakers are critical for any research to happen in the Antarctic --- the plan is key**

**White et al 11** – institute of Arctic and Alpine Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder (James W.C., “Future Science Opportunities in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean,” National Research Council, <http://agdw.uh.edu/sites/agdw/files/docs/future_directions_2011.pdf>)

Heavy icebreakers are a special class of surface ships that are essential to the conduct of science in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, providing access for ocean and coastal research in heavy ice covered seas, and allowing fuel and supplies to reach research stations. They are complex, sturdy vessels that are inherently expensive. Icebreakers are discussed in more depth in Appendix D, with a brief summary provided here. Anticipated scientific research needs in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean will require the services of heavy icebreakers, not only to break ice and clear out harbors, but also to support research missions for less-capable polar research vessel ice breakers and act as helicopter platforms. In addition, scientific operations at McMurdo now totally rely on the annual resupply in late Austral summer of fuel and materials; this is done by transport ship and tanker and requires heavy ice-breaking capacity. There is a critical shortage of U.S. heavy icebreaking capacity in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean at this time. The two U.S. Coast Guard heavy icebreakers, Polar Sea and Polar Star, are more than 30 years old and have exceeded their service lives. The Polar Sea is to be decommissioned in 2011. The Polar Star is undergoing engine repairs and refitting needed to extend this ship’s service for a limited period; repairs are expected to be complete in 2013. As concluded by the 2007 NRC report Polar Icebreakers in a Changing World, the “operations and maintenance of the polar icebreaker fleet have been underfunded for many years” (National Research Council, 2007b).

Other reports have discussed the need for the United States to have its own icebreaking capacity, including three previous NRC reports, a congressional analysis, and a Homeland Security audit (National Research Council, 2007b, 2011c, 2011e; O’Rourke, 2011; Richards, 2011). These documents conclude that there are strong national security and operational reasons for the nation to develop its own icebreaking capability. As stated in the Critical Infrastructure for Ocean Research and Societal Needs in 2030 (National Research Council, 2011c) report, “the nation should recover U.S. capability to access fully and partially ice-covered seas.” Based on the scientific research needs outlined in this report, the committee strongly supports the conclusion that the United States should develop sufficient icebreaking capacity, either on a national or international basis. Any arrangement should ensure that the U.S. needs in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, for both research vessel support, and in particular the annual break-in supplying McMurdo, can be met by secure, reliable, and heavy icebreaking capacity.
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#### McMurdo resupply can only happen with increased icebreakers --- alternative options fail

**Klotz, 12** – senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (Frank, “Trouble at the Ends of the Earth” National Interest, 10/8, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/trouble-the-ends-the-earth-7561>)

McMurdo is the largest American outpost in Antarctica. As many as 1,100 scientists and support personnel live and work at the sprawling facility during the austral summer season. The station also serves as the hub for onward travel to the South Pole and other remote research sites. Supplying food, fuel and equipment to McMurdo is essential to maintaining America’s presence and protecting its interests in the region. As every logistician knows, “getting there” is a prerequisite to “being there.” And getting to Antarctica requires the carefully coordinated use of aircraft, ships and icebreakers. Last season, C-17s staging out of Christchurch, New Zealand, flew more than five thousand passengers and six million pounds of cargo to and from McMurdo. This season’s effort will be comparable in size and scale. Yet, aerial resupply by itself is not sufficient to meet American logistical needs in Antarctica. Aircraft are not particularly well suited for carrying the kind of outsized cargo used in major construction projects, nor are they the most cost-effective means for hauling massive quantities of fuel. These tasks are best handled by ships. Each year, a freighter and a tanker chartered by the U.S. Navy’s Military Sealift Command also participate in Operation Deep Freeze. Last season, nearly seven million pounds of cargo and more than six million gallons of fuel were delivered to McMurdo by sea. For the logistics ships to get there, however, an icebreaker must first open a channel through the ice blocking the approaches to the station. For years, the United States relied primarily upon its only two U.S. Coast Guard heavy icebreakers—the Polar Sea and the Polar Star—to pe rform this “break-in” operation.Unfortunately, America’s comparatively small icebreaker fleet has fallen on very hard times. Both heavy icebreakers have surpassed their original thirty-year design life and are currently in lamentable states of disrepair. The Polar Sea’s diesel engines broke down in 2010, and the vessel was subsequently scheduled to be scrapped starting this past summer. After Senator Cantwell of Washington and Senators Begich and Murkowski of Alaska personally intervened, the Polar Sea won a last-minute reprieve—ostensibly to allow more time to assess the feasibility of returning it to service. Even so, the Polar Sea’s long-term future remains doubtful. The other heavy icebreaker, the Polar Star, entered caretaker status in 2006 and is now undergoing overhaul in Seattle. It reportedly will not return to service until late next year at the earliest. Even then, it may have only seven to ten years of life left. The only other U.S. Coast Guard icebreaker, the Healy, is a “medium” icebreaker. Though routinely used as a polar research vessel, mainly in the Arctic, it is not considered suitable for dealing with the heavy ice conditions often encountered in the vicinity of McMurdo. With the two American heavy icebreakers out of action, the National Science Foundation—which has principal responsibility for managing the U.S. Antarctic Program—has turned to foreign-owned icebreakers to assist the McMurdo resupply effort. Starting in the 2006–2007 season, the NSF chartered the Swedish icebreaker Oden for five consecutive years. During the 2011–2012 season, it contracted with Russia’s Murmansk Shipping Company for the Vladimir Ignatyuk. The practice of relying upon foreign-owned icebreakers to support the principal U.S. station in Antarctica is fraught with risks. Because of competing demands for their services, the vessels simply might not be available when needed. In 2011, the Swedish government abruptly halted the NSF’s long-standing arrangement for leasing the Oden, citing the need to support commercial shipping closer to home in the Baltic. According to published accounts, the Russian Ignatyuk’s availability for the upcoming 2012–2013 season was initially in doubt, though the contract ultimately was renewed.
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**Specifically, Antarctic research is necessary to understand climate change and adopt best mitigation and survival strategies**

**NRC 11** (Committee on Future Science Opportunities in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean; National Research Council, Future Science Opportunities in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, The National Academies Press, 2011. Pg online at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\_id=13169)

Antarctica and the surrounding Southern Ocean remains one of the world’s last frontiers. Covering nearly 14 million km2 (an area approximately 1.4 times the size of the United States), Antarctica is the coldest, driest, highest, and windiest continent on Earth. While it is challenging to live and work in this extreme environment, this region offers many opportunities for scientific research. The icy landscape of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean may seem distant, but the natural processes that occur there are intimately linked to those on the rest of the planet. For example, the Southern Ocean is an extremely important region of the globe for air-sea exchange of carbon dioxide, second only to the northern North Atlantic. To understand the effects of increasing emissions of carbon dioxide on the climate, it is vitally important to understand the processes that occur in the Antarctic region. Ever since the first humans set foot on Antarctica a little more than a century ago, the discoveries made there have advanced our scientific knowledge of the region, the world, and the universe—but there is still much more to learn. Recent findings in the region have included enormous lakes and mountain ranges buried beneath ice and entire ecosystems of never-seen-before life forms. The rocks, sediments, and ice of Antarctica hold a trove of information about the past history of Earth’s climate, continents, and life forms. The remarkable clarity and stability of the atmosphere above Antarctica allows scientists to look out to the upper reaches of the atmosphere and into the universe beyond—observations that could contribute to understanding of the origins of the universe and the nature of the solar system. However, conducting scientific research in the harsh environmental conditions of Antarctica is profoundly challenging. Substantial resources are needed to establish and maintain the infrastructure needed to provide heat, light, transportation, and drinking water, while at the same time minimizing pollution of the environment and ensuring the safety of researchers. The U.S. Antarctic Program (USAP) within the National Science Foundation (NSF) is the primary U.S. agency responsible for supporting science in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean. In 2010, the NSF Office of Polar Programs, in coordination with the Office of Science Technology Policy, initiated two activities to provide guidance to the USAP program. This report, authored by the National Research Council’s Committee on Future Science Opportunities in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, represents the first activity; the committee’s task was to identify and summarize the changes to important science conducted on Antarctica and the surrounding Southern Ocean that will demand attention over the next two decades. The second activity is an NSF-organized Blue Ribbon Panel intended to assist in making strategic decisions to improve the logistical support of the U.S. science program in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean over the next two decades. In response to its charge, the committee has highlighted important areas of research by encapsulating each into a single, overarching question (see Table S.1). The questions fall into two broad themes: (1) those related to global change and (2) those related to fundamental discoveries. In addition, the committee also identified several opportunities to be leveraged to sustain and improve the science program in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean in the coming two decades. GLOBAL CHANGE Over the past century, temperatures on land and in the ocean have been increasing. Sea level is rising, global weather patterns are shifting, and the chemical and biological processes of the planet are changing. The poles are particularly susceptible to climate change, with the Arctic already displaying large temperature changes. The situation in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean is complicated by the influence of the Antarctic ozone hole, another human-induced change that has uniquely affected this region. Thus, the Antarctic region provides an unparalleled natural laboratory in which to study these changing conditions. Antarctica’s ice sheets exist in a state of dynamic equilibrium: snow and ice accumulate over the continent and flow to the coasts with the movement of glaciers. When the ice comes into contact with the relatively warm ocean, it melts, or chunks of it break off and are lost to the sea in a process called calving. Rising global temperatures now threaten to push the equilibrium out of balance. As more of the Antarctic ice sheets melt, the volume of the world’s oceans will increase—and so too will global sea level.
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The Antarctic ice sheets hold about 90 percent of the world’s ice; if all of this ice were to melt, it would raise global sea levels by more than 60 meters. Therefore, it is critical that scientists understand how rapidly the world will warm, if ice loss will accelerate, and how quickly sea level will rise. Key to improving this understanding in the next 20 years is increased observations and model development to learn more about the interactions of ice sheets at the ice-ocean and ice-bedrock boundaries. What Is the Role of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean in the Global Climate System? The climate system of the Antarctic region is inextricably linked to that of the rest of the planet. The strong westerly winds that circle the Antarctic continent influence global atmospheric circulation. To improve projections of future changes in atmospheric circulation, enhanced observations and modeling capacity are needed to understand the role of the Antarctic ozone hole and the influence of global climate change. Similarly, the Southern Ocean circulation is central to the global ocean circulation, affecting not only the Southern Hemisphere but also the circulation of the North Atlantic Ocean, with impacts on the climate of Europe and North America. In addition, understanding the carbon dioxide exchange between the Southern Ocean and the atmosphere is a fundamental part of understanding the global carbon cycle and climate change. Again, improved observational and modeling capabilities are needed to improve the understanding of the role of the Southern Ocean in the global ocean system. Changes in the patterns of sea ice in the Southern Ocean strongly affect atmospheric and oceanic circulations as well as carbon dioxide uptake; therefore, improved monitoring and modeling of sea ice will be important in the next two decades. There is also an urgent need to better understand the dynamics of the ocean-glacial ice interaction beneath floating ice shelves, which will contribute to better projections of future sea level rise caused by melting of glacial ice in Antarctica. More information on Antarctica’s influence over globally interacting systems will allow scientists to better understand the global climate system and predict how it will change in the future. A systems approach, with increased observations and improved modeling, is critical to further the understanding of all aspects of the climate system over the next 20 years. What Is the Response of Antarctic Biota and Ecosystems to Change? Although recent research has revealed a surprising diversity of life forms in Antarctica, even in habitats once considered lifeless, Antarctic ecosystems are relatively simple compared to those in other areas of the globe. This makes it easier to detect the impacts of global climate change and other environmental changes in Antarctic ecosystems than elsewhere on the planet. Furthermore, Antarctic ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to change. The marine and land-based ecosystems of this region evolved in isolation from the rest of the planet, but now factors such as the global transport of pollutants, the introduction of invasive species, and increases in ultraviolet radiation are altering these communities. Increasing human presence, due to tourism and research, has brought concerns about habitat destruction, overfishing, pollution, and other toxic effects on the environment. Of all the human influences, the impact of human-induced climate change may prove to be the largest. On land and sea, warming and ice melt will increase the area of surfaces exposed to the elements, providing new habitats for colonization by organisms—with the potential to change the functioning and structure of ecosystems. As warming continues, biotic factors such as predation, competition, and pathogens will likely have a greater influence on ecosystem functioning than the physical processes that have, until now, dominated the region’s ecosystems. Changes in the ecosystems of the Antarctic region may be a harbinger of larger changes to come, and therefore monitoring Antarctic change could allow scientists to predict future ecosystem change elsewhere. What Role Has Antarctica Played in Changing the Planet in the Past? The movement, fragmentation, and collision of tectonic plates can have dramatic consequences on the planet, including causing earthquakes and volcanoes, constructing new mountain ranges, opening gateways between vast oceans, and triggering global climate shifts. About 180 million years ago, the movement of tectonic plates caused Gondwana, a massive supercontinent consisting of Antarctica, India, Australia, South America, and Africa, to begin to break apart. Antarctica—which at that time was covered with dense forests inhabited by dinosaurs and mammals—started to move toward its present polar position, opening up new ocean passages and causing great shifts in the circulation of the ocean and atmosphere. These shifts reduced the amount of heat brought to the region and caused glaciation to begin, turning the lush, green continent into a white continent encased in ice. Understanding the opening of the Southern Ocean as Gondwana fragmented is critical to understanding how Antarctica became glaciated, and how global climate came to be in its present state. DISCOVERY Antarctica and the Southern Ocean provide a natural laboratory for scientific discovery. The tiny air bubbles trapped within the ice hold a record of the planet’s atmosphere through time; the living things in the ocean and on land can teach scientists about survival strategies in extreme environments; and Antarctica provides an excellent platform for looking out to the solar system and the universe beyond. The committee highlighted several areas of science that will be important in discovery-driven scientific research in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean over the next two decades. What Can Records Preserved in Antarctica and the Southern Ocean Reveal About Past and Future Climates? Records of the Antarctic region’s past conditions come from drilling into rocks, sediments, and ice, and from examining geological features. This information has allowed scientists to reconstruct past climatic conditions, an important step toward understanding present climate and predicting future climate change.
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**Arctic Science is key to climate change adaptation**

**Ford and Furgal 09** – James Ford, Department of Geography, McGill University - Chris Furgal, Indigenous Environmental Studies Program, Trent University, - Norsk Polar Institute “Foreword to the special issue: climate change impacts, adaptation and vulnerability in the Arctic”)

International and national efforts to respond to the problem of climate change are guided by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC). The main focus of the FCCC has been to stabilize or reduce emissions responsible for climate change (known as mitigation), as embodied in the Kyoto Protocol to the FCCC. Adaptation, which seeks to develop measures to reduce or moderate the negative effects of climate change, and to take advantage of the opportunities, is also becoming important in climate policy (Smit & Wandel 2006; Ford et al. 2007; Pielke et al. 2007). This is driven in part by the realization that some degree of climate change is inevitable, and by the current impacts of climate change in vulnerable regions, particularly the Arctic (Pielke et al. 2007; Ford 2008a, b). In the Arctic, adaptation is increasingly prominent in policy discussions, with national and regional governments, non-governmental organizations, communities, and national and international research bodies stressing the need to strengthen the ability of communities, regions, and economic sectors to adapt to current and future climate change (Budreau & McBean 2007; Ford et al. 2007; Ford 2008a, b). The Arctic Council, for example, identified “taking action to develop and implement local adaptation strategies for Arctic areas” as a key priority and objective for the council for the period 2006–2012 (Arctic Council 2007), and one of the main conclusions of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment project (see Symon et al. 2005) was the need for research to support adaptation policy development. Moreover, adaptation research is increasingly important in major national and international research programmes with an Arctic focus, and is a guiding principle in the Arctic Council’s Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Arctic initiative (Kelman & van Dam 2008). To identify adaptation needs and inform the development of policies to reduce the negative impacts of climate change, it is crucial to identify and characterize *vulnerability* (Ford & Smit 2004; Furgal & Seguin 2006; Smit & Wandel 2006). Vulnerability can be thought of as the capacity to be wounded: it is a measure of the susceptibility to harm in a system in response to a stimulus or stimuli (Smit & Pilifosova 2003; Adger 2006). In the case of climate change—the focus of this special edition—the stimuli are climate-related risks, and the “system” can range from an individual or household unit to the nation state. It is widely accepted in the climate and environmental change literature that vulnerability is related to both exposure and sensitivity to climatic risks, and the adaptive capacity to deal with those risks (Kelly & Adger 2000; Turner et al. 2003; Reid & Vogel 2006; Smit & Wandel 2006; Ford in press).

**2AC – Science Extension – Science Key To Cooperation**

**Antarctic science is critical to international cooperation**

**Song and Zou 14** (Song, Research fellow at the Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica, Nankang, Taipei, Taiwan. Keyuan Zou is Harris Professor of International Law at the Lancashire Law School of the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan), United Kingdom. He specializes in international law, in particular law of the sea and international environmental law. “ Major Law and Policy Issues in the South China Sea European and American Perspectives)

Scientific activities began in Antarctica much earlier than the emergence of the legal regime and they helped its establishment. According to the Antarctic Treaty, the freedom of scientific investigation and cooperation is reaffirmed, which confers upon any country in the world the right to conduct its scientific research in its capability at any spot in Antarctica. In order to promote international cooperation in this regard, Treaty Parties agree to exchange scientific information and personnel and to encourage the establishment of cooperative working relations with other international organizations which have a scientific and technical interest in Antarctica. With the legal guarantee of the Antarctic Treaty, the international cooperation of scientific research has worked very well in the Antarctic. The freedom of scientific research greatly promotes scientific investigations in Antarctica. The main resource today exported from Antarctica is just scientific knowledge. In particular, progress in our knowledge of world climate change is largely due to the research carried out in Antarctica.10 So the Antarctic continent is truly a land of science and international cooperation. As to individual countries, a typical example can be drawn from Chinese practice. China, as a leading developing country in the world, has benefited a lot from other countries, especially at its first stage of Antarctic activities under the provision of international cooperation in the Antarctic Treaty: Japan offered training to Chinese explorers before the first expedition; the former Soviet Union extended a warm welcome and gave assistance; Chile and Argentina helped China choose a suitable site for its first Antarctic station; and the United States and New Zealand shared their Antarctic experiences with Chinese scientists." Such scientific cooperation, more or less, softened tensions and promoted friendly relations among the countries concerned. On the international plane, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) is a coordinating organization which is subordinated to the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). SCAR is to initiate, promote and coordinate scientific activity in the Antarctic, with a view to framing and reviewing scientific programmes of circumpolar scope and significance.12
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**Polar research is key to colonization --- it overcomes potential barriers**

**Shields 12** – Michelle Fuchs and Sky Shields are writers for the executive intelligence report Sky Shields is the leader of the LPAC Basement Research Team, January 6, 2012, (“Self-Developing Systems and Artic Development,” http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2012/3901econ\_future\_arctic.html)

Along with mining this mineral wealth, the **scientific researchers** living in the city of Umka will be engaged in plumbing the even richer depths of undiscovered knowledge in the **biological and physical sciences** there in the Arctic region. The real beauty of such an endeavor is best seen from the **extraterrestrial standpoint** we mentioned earlier. At this extreme latitude, strong winds dominate, and temperatures sink below -30°C—the same temperature as within the lunar lava tubes—and even in Summer, rarely climb over the freezing point. These hostile conditions provide an excellent opportunity to develop and apply the technologies which will be needed to **conquer** the next frontiers for mankind: **the Moon and Mars**. The giant dome enclosing such a city is just the beginning of how these explorers will be protected from the hostile environment. With few comforts provided by the local terrain, this sort of design shares with space exploration the quality of having to bring everything from home, **including all life-support systems.**

**This solves inevitable extinction and global warfare**

**Collins and Autino, 10** (Patrick, Professor of Life and Environmental Science @ Azabu University, and Adriano, Systems Engineer @ Andromeda Incorporated, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture, and world peace,” Acta Astronautica, Science Direct)

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People ﬁght to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of ‘‘Resource Wars’’. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of ‘‘resource wars’’ is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of ‘‘war on terror’’ to the language of the novel ‘‘1984’’ which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves. 7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless ‘‘resource wars’’ As an alternative to the ‘‘resource wars’’ already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Ofﬁce, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: ‘‘Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conﬂict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security’’ [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: ‘‘Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for ‘‘drilling up’’ vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately’’ [38]. Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to
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those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22,37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the beneﬁts of civilisation which are being eroded today by ‘‘resource war-mongers’’, most notably the governments of the ‘‘Anglo-Saxon’’ countries and their ‘‘neo-con’’ advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufﬁciently to start the commercial use of space resources. Industrial and ﬁnancial groups which proﬁt from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which proﬁt from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their proﬁtable situation. However, these groups’ continuing proﬁts are justiﬁed neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, ‘‘resource wars’’ are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using longrange rockets to ﬁght each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need! 7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man-made space structures. In the ﬁrst phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage ﬁnancing and insurance, trafﬁc management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live. Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional beneﬁt of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horriﬁc, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11,16].

**2AC – Science Add-On – Arctic Biodiversity**

**Polar research is pivotal to safeguard Arctic ecosystems**

**Borg 08** (Dr. Joe Borg, Member of the European Commission, Fisheries and Foreign Affairs, “The Arctic: A Matter of Concern to Us All,” Common Concern for the Arctic, October 9, 2008, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\_SPEECH-08-415\_en.htm?locale=en)

Firstly, we must aim at safeguarding the Arctic. **Scientific research** and monitoring **have a pivotal role to play in this respect.** The EU has a strong track record here. Our Research Framework Programmes have contributed strongly to the International Polar Year and the current understanding of the Arctic ecosystem. We believe that boosting cooperation among partners will serve as a catalyst for enhancing research infrastructure and creating much-needed synergies in this field. Protecting the environment is of course crucial. The vulnerability of ice-covered areas to marine pollution from shipping activities is so apparent that it had even merited a specific Article in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is clear that a global response is needed if we are to create high standards of environmental protection. Within this context, the European Union will remain at the forefront of such initiatives concerning the fight against climate change and sustainable development.

**Extinction**

**WWF 10** (World Wildlife Fund, “Drilling for Oil in the Arctic: Too Soon, Too Risky,” Nuka Research and Planning Group, LLC, December 1, 2010, http://assets.worldwildlife.org/publications/393/files/original/Drilling\_for\_Oil\_in\_the\_Arctic\_Too\_Soon\_Too\_Risky.pdf?1345753131)

Planetary Keystone The Arctic and the subarctic regions surrounding it are important for many reasons. One is their enormous biological diversity: a kaleidoscopic array of land and seascapes supporting millions of migrating birds and charismatic species such as polar bears, walruses, narwhals and sea otters. Economics is another: Alaskan fisheries are among the richest in the world. Their $2.2 billion in annual catch fills the frozen food sections and seafood counters of supermarkets across the nation. However, there is another reason why the Arctic is not just important, but among the most important places on the face of the Earth. A keystone species is generally defined as one whose removal from an ecosystem triggers a cascade of changes affecting other species in that ecosystem. The same can be said of the Arctic in relation to the rest of the world. With feedback mechanisms that affect ocean currents and influence climate patterns, the Arctic functions like a global thermostat. Heat balance, ocean circulation patterns and the carbon cycle are all related to its regulatory and carbon storage functions. Disrupt these functions and we effect far-reaching changes in the conditions **under which life has existed** on Earth for thousands of years. In the context of climate change, **the Arctic is a keystone ecosystem for the entire planet.**
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**No consensus on catastrophic climate change --- risk of extinction is unlikely**

**Boslough 13** -- PhD, Caltech-trained experimental and computational physicist, Fellow of the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (Mark, 1/6/2013, "Global Warming: Scholarship vs. Pseudoscholarship," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mark-boslough/global-warming-scholarshi\_b\_2422438.html)

What is not settled is **the degree** of climate change. In the peer-reviewed scientific literature there is a healthy, open, honest, and vigorous scientific debate. The best scientific estimate of the amount of warming (when CO2 levels double, which is likely to happen this century) is about 6 ºF. There are those who disagree, and have published the basis for their disagreement. The most useful assessments are not limited to the best estimate, but include quantification of the uncertainty, which is one of the hallmarks of honesty in science. There is a broad range of possibility, from below 4 ºF to greater than 11 ºF. One recent paper estimates a **likelihood of about 2.5%** that average temperature increases could exceed 14 ºF; a change that would probably lead to the collapse of global ecosystems, loss of civilization, and possible human extinction. There is no way to prove or disprove these quantitative estimates, other than to wait and see what happens. That said, it is hard to ignore a scholarly paper (emphasis on the word "scholarly") that gives longer odds for civilization than for a shuttle launch.

**No impact --- past temperatures disprove human loss**

**Fowler 12** -- adjunct professor of engineering at George Mason University, retired systems engineer, doctorate is in systems and control theory from George Washington University (Thomas B., 9/1/2012, "THE GLOBAL WARMING CONUNDRUM," Modern Age, EBSCO)

Longer-Term Findings Perhaps the best way to put the current global warming controversy into perspective is to look at temperature records over longer historical periods. These records are obtained by proxies, and the main proxy used is ice core samples from central Creenland, made by NOAA. These are shown in Figure 4, beginning with the period from AD 1400 to the present, illustrating the controversial "hockey stick": It appears that things may be getting pretty bad today. But let us move to a slightly longer term, going back to the year 800, illustrated in Figure 5: Now things start to become more interesting. The well-documented Medieval Maximum is clearly visible and shows a **much higher temperature deviation** than the modern record. (This is disputed by some climate researchers and by the IPCC, which claims that its top is below that of the modern instrument record.)\* Nonetheless the ice core data agree with documentation that grapes were grown in England, for example, during that period. It was also a period of great awakening in Europe. But we must look further back, so we turn to the period from about 3000 BC to the present, given in Figure 6. Now more ttends become apparent. In particular, there is a peak corresponding to the Roman Empire, well documented, around the year 50 BC or so, known as the "Roman Maximum," which dwarfs the Medieval Maximum; and an even larger peak at the time of the late Bronze Age, about 1200 BC, which in turn dwarfs even the Roman Maximum. The late Bronze Age was also a **very fertile period for human activity**. There is also a smaller peak during the period now usually called "Late Antiquity," around the years AD 400-500. Note that even the dip between the Roman Maximum and this Late Antiquity peak
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had temperatures that equal or exceed that of the recent past, as did the dip in temperatures from the end of the Late Bronze Age peak to the Roman Maximum. Still, we must persevere and go back even further, this time to about 11,000 BC, shown in Figure 7. Now the last Ice Age clearly comes into view, a cold period that ended about 10,000 BC. There are several other peaks prior to the Late Bronze Age, but now the record makes the peaks and dips from about 8000 BC to the present look like **noise on top of a much larger signal.** We are not yet at the end of our quest. We now go back about fifty thousand years, shown in Figure 8. From this graph it is clear that the latter days, that is, the past twelve thousand years, have been abnormally warm. Much cooler temperatures appear to be the norm, with much greater variability. Note that the last Ice Age, with its great glacial ice sheets, was a maximum about twenty thousand years ago. Still, this is not the best we can do. We shall go back now 450,000 years, shown in Figure 9 (page 54). From this vantage point, it is quite clear that there is a distinct cyclical pattern to the earth's temperature, with a period of about 100,000 years, in which there is a sharp rise in temperatures to roughly current levels, followed quickly by a rapid decline. What is especially interesting is the relatively short time these peaks persist, only to be followed by some type of ice age.

**Status quo solves – emissions are declining**

**Levi 9-25** (Michael, David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment – CFR, “Why Have U.S. Carbon Dioxide Emissions Plummeted?,” Council on Foreign Relations, 2012, http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/09/25/why-have-u-s-carbon-dioxide-emissions-plummeted/)

U.S. carbon dioxide emissions for January-May are **down six percent** from 2011 to 2012. Headlines have highlighted the fact that emissions from January-March hit a twenty year low. What explains the shift? That question has been the subject of intense debate. John Hanger argues that 77 percent of that decline can be attributed to the shift from coal to gas. The folks over at CO2Scorecard, looking at January-March data, put that number at a more modest 21 percent. These are drastically different figures. What number should we believe? Part of the discrepancy comes from looking at different time periods. January-March emissions were affected more by the warm winter than April-May ones were. That makes sense because January-March is part of the winter. April-May emissions were affected more by rock bottom natural gas prices than January-March ones were. That makes sense because it was April-May when rock bottom (i.e. sub-two-dollars wellhead) natural gas prices prevailed. Let’s focus on the full January-May span, since it’s now the longest period for which we have 2011 and 2012 data, and do the analysis for ourselves. First the basics: Carbon dioxide emissions fell from 2,303 metric tons (Mt) in 2011 to 2,158 Mt in 2012, a drop of 145 Mt. (To keep things simple, the January-May time period is implicit in all this.) **The basic story is that emissions from coal consumption plummeted** by 132 Mt. Falling oil emissions chipped in another 18 Mt. Natural gas emissions were nearly flat; they were actually down 5 Mt. This would seem to suggest that natural gas played little role in falling emissions. Instead, it appears to suggest, reduced demand for coal is what did the trick. This’s roughly the intuition behind the conclusion from CO2Scorecard that natural gas has played a modest role in the U.S. emissions decline. Hanger contests this by making three basic points. First, he notes, “about 85% (132 of 144 million tons) of the 2012 U.S. Carbon emission decline is a product of falling emissions from coal.” Second, he argues, the decline in emissions from coal are “almost entirely as a result of more gas displacing coal generation this year. Indeed, coal’s electricity generation market share fell from 42% for all of 2011 to 32% in April and 34% in May.” Third, he observes, “Electricity demand is down 2% in the first 5 months of 2012 compared to 2011 so that is a small reason for declining emissions and probably explains about 10% of the 132 million ton decline of coal emissions.” Hanger puts these together with a few other estimates to come to his conclusion that 77 percent of the emissions decline is due to gas.
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#### No conflict despite tensions --- economics and diplomacy provide a check on escalation

**Stearns 8/14** – Scott Stearns is VOA’s State Department correspondent. He has worked as VOA’s Dakar Bureau Chief, White House correspondent, and Nairobi Bureau Chief since beginning his career as a freelance reporter in the Liberian civil war. He has written for the BBC, UPI, the Associated Press, The Jerusalem Post, and The Economist. Scott has a Bachelors and Masters in Journalism from Northwestern University. (Scott, “Kerry: Law, Not coercion, key to resolving sea disputes,” voanews.com, August 14, 2014, http://www.voanews.com/content/reu-kerry-says-constructive-relations-with-china-needed-for-regional-stability/2412785.html)

Speaking in Hawaii after a week-long trip to Asia, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said resolving competing territorial claims in the South China Sea is about respecting international law, not rival claimants trying to intimidate each other.

Secretary Kerry said disputed mineral and fishing rights in the South China Sea underlie more fundamental legal questions of sovereignty and rights of free passage.

"You know they're really about more than claims to islands and reefs and rocks and the economic interests that flow from them. They're about whether might makes right or whether global rules and norms and rule of law and international law will prevail," said Kerry.

The South China Sea is one of the world's busiest shipping lanes, where China's coast guard already has clashed with vessels from both Vietnam and the Philippines. Indonesia, Brunei, Malaysia and Taiwan also have competing claims in the South China Sea, where Kerry says a constructive US-China relationship will contribute to stability. "President Obama has made it clear that the United States welcomes the rise of a peaceful, prosperous and stable China -- one that plays a responsible role in Asia and the world, and supports rules and norms on economic and security issues,” said Kerry.

Kerry added that Washington wants to avoid "the trap of strategic rivalry" with China. But China over the weekend helped undercut U.S. efforts to freeze provocative actions in the South China Sea, further eroding Washington's so-called pivot of diplomatic and military resources, said American Enterprise Institute analyst Michael Auslin. "Look at the way that the waterscape in Asia has changed. Look at China's increasing coercion bordering on aggression right now. You're not doing anything about that. And yet at every turn, at every occasion you remind us about how important the pivot is to you. I just think people don't know what to make of it," said Auslin.

With the Philippines and Vietnam looking to Washington for help, American University professor Hillary Mann Leverett said China is pushing U.S. allies to the point where Beijing believes Washington will show the weakness of its Asia policy by failing to come to their aid.

"It's a really focused, determined strategy based on assumptions that the United States is not really going to put its military wherewithal into the South China Sea to fight China over issues that it doesn't really care about," said Leverett.

Such a perception, she said, hurts Washington at a time when Beijing and Moscow see a greater common cause.

"The concern about U.S. policy has been pushing Russia and China together now for a few years, particularly since the start of the Arab Awakening, over Libya, over Syria. We've been seeing them coming together more and more, especially on hydrocarbon issues,” continued Leverett.

Kerry said the Obama administration is working to raise trade and investment standards in Asia because national interests are advanced not just by troops or by diplomats, but by entrepreneurs and good corporate citizens as well.
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#### Treaty modeling won’t stop the conflict --- but it will never escalate regardless --- no terminal impact

**Meidan 12** -- analyst at Eurasia Group; research includes China's energy and environmental policies, policymaking, Chinese elite politics, and diplomacy; MA in political sciences and East Asian studies from the French Institute of Oriental Languages and Cultures (Michal, 8/7, "Guest post: Why tensions will persist, but not escalate, in the South China Sea," http://blogs.ft.com/beyond-brics/2012/08/07/guest-post-why-tensions-will-persist-but-not-escalate-in-the-south-china-sea/#axzz2GsDDT62R)

These tensions are likely to persist. And Beijing is not alone in perpetuating them. Vietnam and the Philippines, concerned with the shifting balance of powers in the region, are pushing their maritime claims more aggressively and increasing their efforts to internationalise the question by involving both ASEAN and Washington. Attempts to come up with a common position in ASEAN have failed miserably but as the US re-engages Asia, it is drawn into the troubled waters of the South China Sea. Political dynamics in China – with a once in a decade leadership transition coming up, combined with electoral politics in the US and domestic constraints for both Manila and Hanoi – all augur that the South China Sea will remain turbulent. No government can afford to appear weak in the eyes of domestic hawks or of increasingly nationalistic public opinions. The risk of a miscalculation resulting in prolonged standoffs or skirmishes is therefore higher now than ever before. But there are a number of reasons to believe that even these skirmishes are unlikely to escalate into broader conflict. First, despite the strong current of assertive forces within China, cooler heads are ultimately likely to prevail. While a conciliatory stance toward other claimants is unlikely before the leadership transition, China’s top brass will be equally reluctant to significantly escalate the situation, since this will send southeast Asian governments running to Washington. Hanoi and Manila also recognize that despite their need for assertiveness to appease domestic political constituencies, a direct confrontation with China is overly risky. Second, military pundits in China also realize that the cost of conflict is too high, since it will strengthen Washington’s presence in the region and disrupt trade flows. And even China’s oil company CNOOC, whose portfolio of assets relies heavily on the South China Sea, is diversifying its interests in other deepwater plays elsewhere, as its attempted takeover of Nexen demonstrates.
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**No impact – can’t use science as leverage**

**Marlow 12** (Jeffrey, Graduate Student in Geological and Planetary Sciences – California Institute of Technology, “The Promise and Pitfalls of Science Diplomacy,” Wired, 12-11, http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2012/12/the-promise-and-pitfalls-of-science-diplomacy/)

This notion of science as a diplomatic tool – its use as an entry point to a recalcitrant society that simultaneously breaks down politically steeped preconceptions and offers tangible benefits – is a promising mode of development and a constructive brand of international relations. The Obama Administration understands the value of science diplomacy; last month, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced the expansion of the Science Envoy program, appointing Barbara Schaal of Washington University in St. Louis, Bernard Amadei of the University of Colorado, and Susan Hockfield of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to the position. These prominent scientists represent the third class of envoys – the program began in 2009 and has sponsored visits to nearly 20 countries. The philosophy behind the envoy program is noble, but its current directive is a bit vague. As noted in the State Department’s official release, “the science envoys travel in their capacity as private citizens and advise the White House, the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. scientific community about the insights they gain from their travels and interactions.” A recent assessment of the program by envoy Elias Zerhouni noted the **challenge** of following through on initiatives predicated on the personal credibility and contacts of the individual envoys. **Leveraging the networks of world-renowned scientists within the framework of a coherent policy of international relations is difficult**, particularly when funding for longer-term projects is uncertain. The trust of international partners requires a predictable political and financial environment.

**National security trump science diplomacy – makes international agreements impossible**

**Dickson 10** (David, Director – SciDev.Net, “Science Diplomacy: Easier Said than Done,” SciDev.Net Blog, 6-24, http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/2010/06/24/science-diplomacy-easier-said-than-done/)

Others pointed to the broader issue of an apparent conflict between the supposed goal of science to promote international interests, and the goal of diplomacy, namely to advance the national interests of the country that the diplomat is serving. There has been much talk of the need to find a way of achieving a balance between these two tendencies. **Reaching agreement on where that balance should lie is a major challenge**. Achieving that balance will be even harder. Already it is clear from this meeting that science diplomacy is easier said than done.

**2NC – XT: No Warming Impact**

**Err neg --- no human impact and certainly no extinction --- experts agree**

**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."

**2NC – XT: No SCS Conflict**

#### No SCS conflict

Economist 12 (9/22, "Could Asia really go to war over these?" http://www.economist.com/node/21563316)

Optimists point out that the latest scuffle is mainly a piece of political theatre—the product of elections in Japan and a leadership transition in China. The Senkakus row has boiled over now because the Japanese government is buying some of the islands from a private Japanese owner. The aim was to keep them out of the mischievous hands of Tokyo’s China-bashing governor, who wanted to buy them himself. China, though, was affronted. It strengthened its own claim and repeatedly sent patrol boats to encroach on Japanese waters. That bolstered the leadership’s image, just before Xi Jinping takes over. More generally, argue the optimists, Asia is too busy making money to have time for making war. China is now Japan’s biggest trading partner. Chinese tourists flock to Tokyo to snap up bags and designer dresses on display in the shop windows on Omotesando. China is not interested in territorial expansion. Anyway, the Chinese government has enough problems at home: why would it look for trouble abroad? Asia does indeed have reasons to keep relations good, and this latest squabble will probably die down, just as others have in the past. But each time an island row flares up, attitudes harden and trust erodes. Two years ago, when Japan arrested the skipper of a Chinese fishing boat for ramming a vessel just off the islands, it detected retaliation when China blocked the sale of rare earths essential to Japanese industry.

#### No SCS escalation

Storey 12 -- Senior Fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, specializes in Asian security issues, with a focus on Southeast Asia (Ian, Interviewed by Ann Jung, 7/16/12, "ASEAN and the South China Sea: Deepening Divisions," http://www.nbr.org/research/activity.aspx?id=262)

The worst-case scenario for the United States, and indeed all stakeholders in the South China Sea, is a serious confrontation in which military force is employed. But frankly I think the chances of that happening are not very high. The best-case scenario is for China and ASEAN to agree on a credible and effective CoC that ameliorates tensions, leads to the implementation of confidence-building measures, and thereby creates an environment conducive to a peaceful resolution. I don’t think the chances of that outcome are very high either. So I think what we will see for the foreseeable future is a continuation of the status quo in the South China Sea: tensions will continue to ebb and flow, the claimants will protest each other’s moves, and ASEAN and China will keep the DoC/CoC process going if only to show that they are doing something. How long the status quo can continue is another matter. I think it has a limited shelf life, though what the post–status quo will look like is impossible to say at this point in time. But it could be very messy.
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#### Even if scientific cooperation on a national level ceases, micro-level cooperation will not be affected – that’s where the majority of cooperation occurs anyways

**Leifert and Wagner, 08** (Harvey, American Geophysical Union Public Information Manager) and Caroline S. Wagner (Researcher at the Center for International Science and Technology Policy @ George Washington U), 1/16/2008. Article by Leifert, Cites Wagner, “Author Caroline Wagner Urges More Inclusive Global Science Cooperation”, American Association for the Advancement of Science, http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2008/0116stls\_wagner.shtml)

Wagner told the participants that science has evolved considerably since the era of the original Invisible College. She cited the rise of professionalism in the 18th century, the expansion of distinct scientific disciplines in the 19th century, and the era of big, nationalistic science in the 20th century, when some scholars suggested that 80 to 90% of all scientists in human history (up until that time) lived. National science reached its epitome during the Cold War, she said, when the U.S. and Soviet Union built redundant scientific systems on a competitive basis. This national innovation system, which operated through the 1990s, has become dysfunctional from the point of view of the governance of science, Wagner said, because knowledge creation does not honor national borders. In the 21st century, science mostly self-organizes, she emphasized, including and most influentially on the international level. It functions through networks that are generally informal, she said, but they do have structure, norms, and rules that scientists must understand if they are to participate successfully. Although large, government-funded, international science projects are highly visible, they are just the tip of an iceberg in terms of overall international scientific activities, Wagner said; they are not in fact typical of international collaboration. "The bulk of international collaboration in science and technology happens below the waterline," she told the seminar, as scientists organize themselves into teams and conduct research of mutual interest, without regard to national boundaries or government agencies. Wagner identified four kinds of collaborative scientific activities, based on a combination of how projects are initiated and where they take place. In the first category, she described top-down and bottom-up projects: \* Top-down science includes large, directed programs, usually based in an office that one can visit, such as NASA programs, CERN, and polar research. \* Bottom-up science is based on the interests of individual researchers who contact colleagues all over the world to work ad hoc on a self-generated project; their partnerships are often invisible to outsiders. In the second category, there are centralized and distributed projects: \* Centralized projects depend on specialized laboratories or installations, such as the earthquake shake table in Japan, or the Rain Forest Research Institute in Costa Rica. \* Distributed projects take place all around the world by individuals or small teams, such as happened in the Human Genome Project; they do not depend on large facilities. Each area of scientific research combines one aspect of each of the two categories. Policy-makers must understand each of the resulting four types of international collaboration in their efforts to assure that taxpayers, who fund most of the research, get their money's worth and that the knowledge produced "comes home" and is usable at the local level, Wagner said. Science operates on a reward system, in which researchers are seeking to enhance their reputation and gain recognition from their colleagues in their fields, their own countries and worldwide. As a result, Wagner said, in many developing countries where she has worked, government officials complain that local scientists are better connected with colleagues abroad than with the needs of their own society. For example, she was amazed at how much "great science" is being conducted in ethnobotany in Mozambique—and how little it impacts Mozambique. Mozambican scientists are working with colleagues at Stanford
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University in the U.S., but their research has little impact on local farmers. The scientists are not against improving the lives of their countrymen, Wagner said, but they realize that "the more you gain recognition within science, the more you are able to access the resources of science. And ultimately, scientists the world over are seeking freedom—the freedom to pursue their own interests." Wagner gave the example of the Department of Energy's Center for Nanoscale Materials at its Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois. Argonne had recently hired 15 scientists recruited on a worldwide basis for this cutting edge nanotechnology laboratory. They were seeking the best scientists they could find, regardless of nationality, and 10 of the 15 chosen were from outside the United States, Wagner said. This select group includes Yugang Sun, a 29-year-old Chinese postdoctoral scientist who, in his first year at Argonne, published a seminal paper that has already been cited in the literature over 1,500 times. The Department of Energy offered Sun additional laboratory resources he needed to continue his research, Wagner said, "but these people are free agents; they can go anywhere." Sun is, at 29, "an unbelievable superstar in nanosciences," she said, and is—so far—still at Argonne.

**1NC – Arctic War Defense (1/2)**

**Most recent evidence proves they won’t go to war**

**BFP 3/8** -- The German Marshall Fund of the United States, The Federal Authorities of Belgium, Daimler, BP, OCP Foundation, Government of Latvia, Bank of America-Merrill Lynch, Government of Montenegro (Brussels Forum Partners, 2013, "Race to the Arctic," http://www.euintheus.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/BF-Program\_complete\_finaldraft.pdf)

Although the discovery of oil, gas, and precious minerals as well as the wish to control new global shipping lanes has revived territorial disputes among the eight Arctic nations — Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Russia, and the United States — they are unlikely to go to war with each other. But the Arctic does stir fierce nationalist sentiment in each of these nations and some, such as Norway, Russia, or Canada, have carefully begun to militarize their presence in the region. Moreover, non-Arctic actors such as China, Japan, India, and the European Union have become increasingly vocal on Arctic-related issues and are more and more competing for diplomatic clout over the region, for instance by currently applying for observer status in the Arctic Council.

#### Cooperation will control Arctic politics --- existing treaties provide a terminal backstop to escalation

**Young 11** – Professor of Environmental Institutions and Co-Director of the Programme on Governance for Sustainable Development at the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, 11 (Oran R, “The future of the Arctic: cauldron of conflict or zone of peace?” International Affairs 87:1, p. 185-193, ebsco)

Popular accounts of the Arctic’s jurisdictional issues are regularly couched in terms of provocative phrases like the afore-mentioned ‘who owns the Arctic’ or ‘use it or lose it’. But these phrases turn out to be highly misleading in this context. There are virtually no disputes in the Arctic regarding sovereignty over northern lands; no one has expressed a desire to redraw the map of the Arctic with regard to the terrestrial boundaries of the Arctic states. Most of the disagreements are to do with jurisdiction over marine areas where the idea of ownership in the ordinary sense is irrelevant. While some of these disagreements are of long standing and feature relatively entrenched positions, they are not about establishing ownership, and they do not indicate that some level of ‘use’ is required to avoid the erosion of sovereignty. There is little prospect that these disputes will spawn armed clashes. As both Michael Byers and Shelagh Grant make clear in their excellent analyses of Arctic sovereignty, recent efforts to address matters involving sovereignty in the Arctic are marked by a spirit of rule-based problem-solving, rather than an escalating spiral of politically charged claims and counterclaims. The process of delineating jurisdictional boundaries regarding the seabed beyond the limits of Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) is taking place in conformity with the rules and procedures set forth in Article 76 of UNCLOS. Norway and Russia have signed an international treaty resolving their differences regarding jurisdictional boundaries in the Barents Sea. There are signs that Canada and the United States are interested in a similar approach with regard to the Beaufort Sea. The Russians, whose much ballyhooed 2007 initiative to plant the Russian flag on the seabed at the North Pole is widely discussed in the books under review, have acted in conformity with the relevant rules of international law in addressing jurisdictional matters and repeatedly expressed their readiness to move forward in a cooperative manner in this realm. There are, of course, significant
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sensitivities regarding the legal status of the Northern Sea Route and especially the Northwest Passage. But given that commercial traffic on these routes is likely to be limited during the near future, and that the use of these routes will require the active cooperation of the coastal states, regardless of their formal legal status, opportunities arise for devising pragmatic arrangements governing the use of these waterways. The progress now being made regarding the development of a mandatory Polar Code covering Arctic shipping is good news. The fact that ‘hot spots’ in the search for oil and gas in the Arctic are located, for the most part, in areas that are not subject to jurisdictional disputes is also helpful. Overall, it seems fair to conclude that the Arctic states are living up to their promises to deal with jurisdictional issues in the region in a peaceful manner.

#### No escalation --- Arctic conflicts will remain purely diplomatic

Byron 12 (Ruby Byron, John Gardner Fellow at the U.S. Department of State in the Office of Global Change working on adaptation measures to climate change, Conflict or Cooperation? Arctic0 Geopolitics and Climate Change, 2012, Berkeley Undergraduate Journal, Office of Undergraduate Research, UC Berkeley)

Within the existing literature on Arctic geopolitics and climate change, few authors explicitly define what they mean by "conflict." In fact, the term is often thrown around loosely, sometimes referring to a state of armed warfare or at other times to conflict of the political or diplomatic kind. While these uses are certainly legitimate and within the established meaning of the word, it makes for fuzzy boundaries and ambiguous projections: the chance or likelihood of future diplomatic "conflict," whatever that is intended to mean, most certainly differs—and probably differs starkly—from the chances of total war between two Arctic nations. Thus, for the purposes of this research, unless otherwise specified, conflict is defined as a militarized confrontation between at least two countries. No shots need be fired, nor do casualties need to be suffered. A formal declaration of war would also be too high of a standard for "conflict," as that would exclude such prominent wars like those in Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf on the basis of what has become in many respects a dispensable procedural formality. Rather, the mere formal invocation of some form of coercive force is sufficient to qualify an event as a form of conflict (e.g. ordering a ship to fire across the bow of another ship belonging to another nation). A baseline example of what would constitute a conflict, then, is the Turbot War of 1995 between Canada and Spain, where the Canadian Navy boarded a Spanish fishing vessel and arrested its crew for fishing in Canada’s Exclusive Economic Zone off the coast of Newfoundland (Nordås & Gleditsch 2007, 631). In this respect, this definition of conflict differs slightly from the typical notion of "war," which tends to connote much greater military mobilization and the number of causalities being greater than zero (Bremer 1992, 310). The logic for narrowing the scope of conflict in this respect is twofold. First, while there has certainly been a history of diplomatic dispute in the Arctic, there has yet to be any form of armed brinksmanship or militarized conflict to date—at least not since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. This leaves such future-facing projections on armed conflict—such as this research— still a relevant exercise. Second, it creates a clear distinction between what does constitute "conflict" and what does not. Definitions of conflict seeking to make qualitative judgments on the degree, size, or escalation of conflict inevitably invite criticism in terms of the arbitrariness of the line that renders some conflicts authentic and others as something else altogether.

**2NC – XT: No Arctic War**

**Arctic council checks escalation**

**Tassinari 9/7** (Fabrizio Tassinari is a non-resident Senior Fellow at the German Marshall Fund and the Head of Foreign Policy and EU Studies at the Danish Institute for International Studies, September 7, 2012, “Avoiding a Scramble for the High North”, <http://blog.gmfus.org/2012/09/07/avoiding-a-scramble-for-the-high-north/>)

For a peaceful Arctic environment to emerge, the political discourse and ensuing practices need rebalancing. Besides abstract musings about the normative virtues of multilateralism, straightforward considerations of enlightened self-interest should justify the drive for cooperation. As The Economist put it in a recent report, “The five Arctic littoral countries … would sooner develop the resources they have than argue over those they do not have.” Some **recent developments point in this direction**. The Arctic Council, the main regional forum grouping the littoral countries plus Iceland, Sweden, and Finland, has grown into a premier venue of high-level interaction among Arctic powers. The stature of outsiders queuing up for permanent observer status,including China and the EU, testifies to the growing importance of this body. In 2011, the Council’s members strengthened cooperation on search and rescue operations (a crucial matter for such a territorially vast area). In 2008, the five littoral countries joined together in a statement, the Ilulissat Declaration, **by which they committed to settle in an orderly manner disagreements that may arise on issues such as navigation rights and delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf**.

**2NC – XT: No Russian Aggression**

#### The trend is cooperation --- not conflict --- Russia and other Northern countries have ended disputes

**Economist 12** (The Economist Print Edition, June 16, 2012, <http://www.economist.com/node/21556797>)

Far from violent, the development of the Arctic is likely to be uncommonly harmonious, for three related reasons. One is the profit motive. The five Arctic littoral countries, Russia, the United States (US), Canada, Denmark and Norway, would sooner develop the resources they have than argue over those they do not have. A sign of this was an agreement between Russia and Norway last year to fix their maritime border in the Barents Sea, ending a decades-long dispute. The border area is probably rich in oil; both countries are now racing to get exploration started. Another spur to Arctic co-operation is the high cost of operating in the region. This is behind the Arctic Council’s first binding agreement, signed last year, to co-ordinate search-and-rescue efforts. Rival oil companies are also working together, on scientific research and mapping as well as on formal joint ventures. The third reason for peace is equally important: a strong reluctance among Arctic countries to give outsiders any excuse to intervene in the region’s affairs. An illustration is the stated willingness of all concerned to settle their biggest potential dispute, over their maritime frontiers, according to the international Law of the Sea (LOS). Even the United States accepts this, despite its dislike for treaties—though it has still not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, an anomaly many of its leaders are keen to end.

**No impact to Russian aggression in the Arctic**

**Chernitsa 12** (Polina Chernitsa citing Alexander Vasiliev, Moscow Times, Alexander Vasiliev is a senior Ambassador in the Russian Foreign Ministry, “Arctic: Politics against speculations”, http://english.ruvr.ru/2012\_09\_13/Arctic-Politics-against-speculations/, 2012)

Moscow says that the situation in the Arctic Region is positive and stable, Anton Vasilyev, Ambassador at Large (Russian Foreign Ministry) said, adding that there are no reasons for the emergence of conflicts there. This is what he said at the conference that focused on the history and development of the Arctic Region. Among the announced topics are studying the development of the Arctic Region and the discussion of the regional development strategy. More than 350 specialists from Russia and other Arctic states have arrived in Arkhangelsk. One of the main topics is the broadening of international cooperation in the Arctic Region. Anton Vasiliyev says. "The threat of a nuclear conflict has been eliminated, strategic weapons are being reduced, and the development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation is gaining momentum there." Alexander Vasiliev says that the opinion that the Arctic Region has become an arena of fierce struggle for resources is far-fetched. The current arrangement of forces in the region can trigger neither conflicts nor wars, the Russian ambassador said. According to him, all issues are being settled in a civilized way – the more so as the greater part of the resources has already been divided between the Arctic states. Tensions are being fanned by those who are either unable to understand what is happening there or by those who want to intentionally distort the reality. Really, earlier Moscow’s plans to establish a military brigade for work in the Arctic caused sharp criticism in the West. Alexander Vasiliev says that this measure is only Moscow’s answer to the changes in the region: the thawing of the Arctic ice makes Russia’s northern borders more passable – that is why the strengthening of the coast guard is inevitable.

**1NC – Russia War Defense (1/2)**

#### US will never go to war with Russia even with aggression in the Arctic– self-preservation, war-fatigue, empirics

**Peck 14** – Contributing editor for Foreign Policy Magazine, a writer for the War is Boring defense blog and of course a contributor at Forbes. My work has also appeared in the Washingon Post,Slate, Defense News, USA Today, the Philadelphia Inquirer  (Michael, 7 Reasons Why America Will Never Go to War over Ukraine,” Forbes.com, March 5, 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelpeck/2014/03/05/7-reasons-why-america-will-never-go-to-war-over-ukraine/)

America is the mightiest military power in the world. And that fact means absolutely nothing for the Ukraine crisis. Regardless of whether Russia continues to occupy the Crimea region of Ukraine, or decides to occupy all of Ukraine, the U.S. is not going to get into a shooting war with Russia.

This has nothing to do with whether Obama is strong or weak. Jimmy Carter or Ronald Reagan would face the same constraints. The U.S. may threaten to impose economic sanctions, but here is why America will never smack Russia with a big stick:

Russia is a nuclear superpower. Russia has an estimated 4,500 active nuclear warheads, according to the [Federation of American Scientists](http://www.fas.org/programs/ssp/nukes/nuclearweapons/nukestatus.html). Unlike North Korea or perhaps Iran, whose nuclear arsenals couldn’t inflict substantial damage, Russia could totally devastate the U.S. as well as the rest of the planet. U.S. missile defenses, assuming they even work, are not designed to stop a massive Russian strike.

For the 46 years of the Cold War, America and Russia were deadly rivals. **But** they never fought. Their proxies fought: Koreans, Vietnamese, Central Americans, Israelis and Arabs. The one time that U.S. and Soviet forces almost went to war was during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Neither Obama nor Putin is crazy enough to want to repeat that.

Russia has a powerful army. While the Russian military is a shadow of its Soviet glory days, it is still a formidable force. The Russian army has about 300,000 men and 2,500 tanks (with another 18,000 tanks in storage), according to the “[Military Balance 2014″](http://www.iiss.org/en/militarybalanceblog/blogsections/2014-3bea/january-1138/milbal-advertorial-dfa6) from the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Its air force has almost 1,400 aircraft, and its navy 171 ships, including 25 in the Black Sea Fleet off Ukraine’s coast.

U.S. forces are more capable than Russian forces, which **did not perform** impressively during the [2008 Russo-Georgia War](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russo-Georgian_war). American troops would enjoy better training, communications, drones, sensors and possibly better weapons (though the latest Russian fighter jets, such as the T-50, could be trouble for U.S. pilots). However, better is not good enough. The Russian military is not composed of lightly armed insurgents like the Taliban, or a hapless army like the Iraqis in 2003. With advanced weapons like T-80 tanks, supersonic AT-15 Springer anti-tank **missiles,** BM-30 Smerch multiple rocket launchers and S-400 Growler anti-aircraft missiles, Russian forces pack enough firepower to inflict significant American losses.

Ukraine is closer to Russia. The distance between Kiev and Moscow is 500 miles. The distance between Kiev and New York is 5,000 miles. It’s much easier for Russia to send troops and supplies by land than for the U.S. to send them by sea or air.

The U.S. military is tired. After nearly 13 years of war, America’s armed forces need a breather. Equipment is worn out from long service in Iraq and Afghanistan, personnel are worn out from repeated deployments overseas, and there are still about 40,000 troops still fighting in Afghanistan.
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The U.S. doesn’t have many troops to send. The U.S. could easily dispatch air power to Ukraine if its NATO allies allow use of their airbases, and the aircraft carrier George H. W. Bush and its hundred aircraft are patrolling the Mediterranean. But for a ground war to liberate Crimea or defend Ukraine, there is just the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Italy, the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit sailing off Spain, the 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment in Germany and the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

While the paratroopers could drop into the combat zone, the Marines would have sail past Russian defenses in the Black Sea, and the Stryker brigade would probably have to travel overland through Poland into Ukraine. Otherwise, bringing in mechanized combat brigades from the U.S. would be logistically difficult, and more important, could take months to organize.

The American people are tired. Pity the poor politician who tries to sell the American public on yet another war, especially some complex conflict in a distant Eastern Europe nation. Neville Chamberlain’s words during the 1938 Czechoslovakia crisis come to mind: “How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a far away country between people of whom we know nothing.”

America‘s allies are tired. NATO sent troops to support the American campaign in Afghanistan, and has little to show for it. Britain sent troops to Iraq and Afghanistan, and has little to show for it. It is almost inconceivable to imagine the Western European public marching in the streets to demand the liberation of Crimea, especially considering the region’s sputtering economy, which might be snuffed out should Russia stop exporting natural gas. As for military capabilities, the Europeans couldn’t evict Libyan dictator Muammar Gaddafi without American help. And Germans fighting Russians again? Let’s not even go there.

**2NC – AT: Add-On – AT: Space Colonization (1/2)**

**Colonization fails --- medical dangers, high launch costs, and technological barriers**

**Egan and Kreso 11** – (2011, Michael Egan and John Kreso, thesis paper submitted in fulfillment of a BS degree at WPI, advised by Professor Mayer Humi, Mathematical Sciences, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, “Expediting Factors in Developing a Successful Space Colony,” <http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-041911-134845/unrestricted/IQP_Final.pdf>)

Currently, it is still not technologically feasible to colonize space. Although many countries and a few private corporations have the capability to travel to space, the high levels of technology needed to sustain human life in space still do not exist. A more efficient method of propulsion is needed to make space missions more economically feasible. The high cost of launching objects into space, which would be undoubtedly necessary to start a colony, is still a deterrent for large missions. Until more frequent and cheaper ways of sending people and goods into LEO exists, the planning stages of creating the first space colony will not even be possible. Also, protecting the human body from the harsh conditions of space becomes a much greater problem when the time spend in space is years instead of months. Bioengineering is a key factor that can combat the negative effects on humans. This can be done either by adapting humans to be more resistant to these effects, or by creating better protective suits and ways to ensure the prolonged health of humans. Even if the propulsion technology and infrastructure were available in space to start a colony, without better ways to guarantee the safety of humans the first colonies still would not be able to sustain human life.

**Cosmic rays create genetic mutations and damage the body**

**Heppenheimer 07** – a major space advocate and researcher in planetary science, aerospace engineering, and celestial mechanics. His books are on the recommended reading list of the National Space Society, “Colonies in Space – National Space society” http://www.nss.org/settlement/ColoniesInSpace/colonies\_chap12.htm

When the sun is quiet, it emits a solar wind of protons and electrons which stream outward at speeds of 300 miles per second. The particles do not penetrate and pose no threat to the colony. However, every eleven years the sun enters an active phase and can produce solar flares. In these sporadic violent eruptions, the sun emits blasts of high-energy protons which can deliver dangerous doses of radiation. In the flares the particle energies usually are below a billion electron volts, but the worst radiation conditions occur during eruptions similar to the great flare of February 23, 1956. The proton energies then can range up to several billion electron volts, which gives approximately the radiation environment inside a research-type nuclear accelerator. An unprotected human being would need less than an hour to receive many times the fatal dose of radiation. Cosmic-ray flares occur once every several years, and flares as large as the 1956 event occur every few decades. Because many of their protons travel at nearly the speed of light, there are only a few minutes between detection of the flare by telescopes and the arrival of the worst of the cosmic rays. People not in a sheltered place will have very little time to get to one. Once a flare begins, its most dangerous time lasts for somewhat less than a day, as streams of energetic particles course in all directions. Cosmic rays are dangerous because, being electrically charged, they break chemical bonds when they pass through tissue. This can create damage to cells which will lead to cancer or damage chromosomes to produce genetic mutations. The damaging power of a cosmic ray is related to its "ionizing power," which measures how many
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chemical bonds are broken. Ionizing power does not increase with energy as might be expected. The most energetic particles, moving close to the speed of light, pass swiftly through the body and do relatively little damage. It is at lower energies, speeds less than the speed of light, that the particles have more time to break bonds and do much greater damage.

**Reproduction issues make it impossible to solve extinction**

**The Week 11** (news source, [http://theweek.com/article/index/212267/why-humans-will-never-colonize-space](http://theweek.com/article/index/212267/why-humans-will-never-colonize-space" \t "_blank) “Why humans will never colonize space”)

Sorry, Stephen Hawking. The astrophysicist's [grandiose plan for the human race](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1301482/Human-race-colonise-space-face-extinction-warns-Stephen-Hawking.html" \t "_blank) to leave Earth and colonize the far reaches of space may never come to fruition. Why? Because NASA has discovered that space is "[simply not a good place to have sex.](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/why-infertility-will-stop-humans-colonising-space-2213861.html" \t "_blank)" Here, a quick guide to our outer-space fertility problem: Why couldn't humans colonize space? Because any child conceived and born in space is likely to be born sterile. Scientists at NASA say that the high levels of **radiation in space would kill any female fetus' lifetime supply of eggs, while males in the womb would likely become sterile.** The child could also suffer "mental and physical defects" from exposure to harmful radiation. Couldn't spaceships protect against this kind of radiation? No. These are no ordinary protons, but high-energy proton particles from galactic cosmic rays. We on Earth are kept safe from them by our atmosphere and magnetic field, but astronauts in space remain vulnerable. Has anyone had sex in space before? It's not clear, [says Jason Mick at Daily Tech](http://www.dailytech.com/Researchers+Study+Sex+and+Pregnancy+in+Space+Say+it+Will+be+Hard/article20904.htm" \t "_blank). Both NASA and the Russians refuse to reveal if their astronauts had ever attempted "zero-G docking maneuvers" in space. The only couple to have traveled together into space — husband and wife team Jan Davis and Mark Lee — remain tight-lipped about whether or not they "got their stellar groove on."

\*\*\*AFF ECONOMY UPDATES\*\*\*

2AC – US Econ High Now

**US economy is growing – business, consumers and GDP increases**

**Mitchell 9/26** [Josh-covers the U.S. economy from the Journal's Washington, D.C. bureau. He previously covered transportation policy and the bailouts of General Motors and Chrysler. Prior to the Journal, he worked as a reporter for the Baltimore Sun and the Palm Beach Post, “U.S. Economy Grew at 4.6% Rate in Second Quarter”, WSJ, 9/26/14, http://online.wsj.com/articles/u-s-economy-grew-at-4-6-rate-in-second-quarter-1411734858]

The U.S. economy is regaining traction as the year winds down, boosted by an accelerating business sector and a modest pickup among consumers.

Growth appears poised to post a healthy performance of more than 3% in the current quarter, according to several major forecasters, following a choppy first half of the year.

Gross domestic product, the broadest measure of goods and services produced in the U.S., grew at an annual rate of 4.6% in the second quarter, the Commerce Department said Friday in its third estimate of the gauge. That replaced the agency's previous 4.2% reading and equaled the strongest quarter of the five-year-old recovery, matching the final three months of 2011.

The latest reading, along with other recent economic reports, make the first quarter's 2.1% contraction look increasingly like a weather-driven anomaly. Growth has exceeded 3.5% for three of the past four quarters. If expansion greater than 3% materializes for the third quarter, that would mark the strongest stretch of economic growth since 2004 to 2005, the height of the last decade's expansion.

1AR – US Econ High Now (1/2)

**US economy high – 2 year high**

**Crutsinger 9/26** [Martin-staff writer for AP, “Last spring, U.S. economy grew at strongest pace since late 2011”, CTV news, 9/26/14, http://www.ctvnews.ca/business/last-spring-u-s-economy-grew-at-strongest-pace-since-late-2011-1.2025707]

WASHINGTON -- After a dismal winter, the U.S. economy expanded at an annual rate of 4.6 per cent in the spring, the fastest pace in more than two years, the government reported Friday. The solid rebound is expected to provide momentum for strong growth the rest of the year.

The Commerce Department said the April-June figure compared to a decline of 2.1 per cent in the first three months of the year, when a harsh winter caused the biggest drop in activity since the Great Recession.

Friday's result was even better than the 4.2 per cent estimate made a month ago. The latest revision reflects improvements in business investment and exports. Economists believe the economy is growing above 3 per cent in the current July-September quarter.

The 4.6 per cent growth in gross domestic product, the economy's total output of goods and services, was the government's third and final look at GDP in the second quarter. The first estimate pegged growth at 4 per cent and that was revised last month to 4.2 per cent.

The final upward revision reflected new-found strength in business investment, which grew at an annual rate of 9.7 per cent in the second quarter. The result is better than the government's previous estimate of 8.1 per cent, bolstered by both investment in structures and equipment.

The revision showed that export sales grew at an 11.1 per cent rate in the second quarter, stronger than a previous 10.1 per cent estimate, another factor helping to boost growth.

Consumer spending, which accounts for more than two-thirds of economic activity grew at a 2.5 per cent annual rate, unchanged from the previous estimate but double the 1.2 per cent growth in consumer spending in the first quarter.

The surge of activity this spring was in part a turnaround from a terrible winter, which disrupted factory production and kept consumers away from shopping malls.

Economists expect much less volatility in growth going forward. Many say the economy will grow at an annual rate of 3 per cent or better in both the current July-September quarter and in the final quarter this year.

But because of the rough start to the year, growth for all of 2014 is expected to be a lacklustre 2.1 per cent, little changed from last year's 2.2 per cent GDP increase.

Analysts have much a much brighter outlook for 2015. They say that the economy is finally entering a period of above-trend growth as unemployment level falls. Those growing payrolls should translate into stronger consumer spending, which accounts for about two-thirds of economic growth.

Economists at JPMorgan Chase predict growth of 3 per cent next year, a significant improvement over the average annual growth rates of around 2 per cent that the country has experienced since the end of the recession in June 2009.

Federal Reserve policymakers last week decided to keep a key short-term interest rate at record lows, near zero, and indicated that they planned to keep it there for a "considerable time."

Analysts viewed the Fed's comments as support for their view that the Fed will not start to raise interest rates until the middle of next year. The low rates will help support more spending by consumers and businesses to boost growth and drive the unemployment rate lower.

1AR – US Econ High Now (2/2)

**Increased consumer confidence points to US economic improvement**

**AP 9/26** [Associated Press-staff writer, “US consumer sentiment index reaches 14-month high”, 9/26/14, The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/us-consumer-sentiment-index-reaches-14-month-high/2014/09/26/bc739c50-458a-11e4-8042-aaff1640082e\_story.html]

WASHINGTON — A measure of U.S. consumer confidence reached its highest level since July 2013, led by greater optimism that the economy will grow and incomes will rise.

The University of Michigan said Friday that its index of consumer sentiment rose to 84.6 in September from 82.5 in August. That’s the second highest level in the past seven years, although the index has rarely topped 85 since the Great Recession. Before the downturn, it typically stood above 90.

Still, the sunnier outlook could spur consumers to spend more, which would accelerate economic growth. Consumer spending accounts for about 70 percent of economic activity. But spending growth has been subdued since the recession ended in 2009, averaging at an annual rate of 2 percent. It usually rises above 3 percent in a healthy economy.

Other measures also indicate that consumers’ outlook is brightening. The Conference Board’s consumer confidence index increased to a seven-year high last month.

A big reason Americans have been spending less is that their paychecks have barely kept up with inflation over the past five years. Consumers are now starting to anticipate larger raises: More households expect their incomes to rise in the coming year than at any other time in the past six years.

The typical household expects its incomes to increase 1.1 percent, the most since late 2008, the Michigan survey found. More optimism about wage gains could also drive more spending. Before the recession, Americans generally expected pay gains at about 2 percent to 3 percent a year.

Faster growth may be fueling the more bullish outlook. The economy expanded at a 4.6 percent annual rate in the April-June quarter, the government says, the fastest pace in more than two years.

2AC – Chinese Econ High Now

**China economy growing due to consumer confidence**

**WCT 9/12** [Want China times-Staff writer, ”Domestic confidence in China's economy highest in world: survey”,9/12/14, http://www.wantchinatimes.com/news-subclass-cnt.aspx?id=20140912000091&cid=1202]

Chinese people are the most positive people on their country's economy in the world, according to the projections of a survey by American thinktank the Pew Research Center cited by Shanghai's China Business News. The center surveyed nearly 50,000 people in 44 countries between March and June this year. A median of 46% of all respondents were positive about their nation's economies over the next year, suggesting that even though it has been six years since the financial crisis in 2008 the majority of the world's population remains pessimistic about their country's economic outlook. The median percentage of participants who thought that their country's economy was not doing well at the moment was 60%. This figure was 59% among emerging economies. Only participants in developing countries were more satisfied with 51% of them predicting a positive economic outlook. The highest percentage of participants holding negative views on their current economics was Greece at 97%, followed by Italy at 96%, Spain at 93% and Ukraine at 93%. Around 89% of participants in China think that the country's economy is going strong, followed by Vietnam at 87% and Germany at 85%. Around 58% of American participants said the US economy has not done well and only 40% said it is doing fine. The number of them holding positive views on their economy has dropped from 44% to 35% since last year. Brazilians' confidence on their economy tumbled from 59% to 23% over the past year, according the survey's projections. The figure in Venezuela dropped 15% and declined by 13% in both Argentina and Malaysia. The economic confidence of UK citizens and Pakistanis increased during the same period. The percentage of British participants who felt positive about their country's economy increased from 15% to 43% while the percentage rose from 17% to 37% in Pakistan. UK participants' predictions for the country's economic outlook next year are even more positive, with the percentage of positive people increasing from 23% to 45%. Indonesians with positive outlooks rose from 18% to 55% while those in Uganda increased from 15% to 57%. Japanese participants' confidence in their country's economy plunged from 40% last year to 15%. According to the country's parliament, Japan's GDP growth shrunk further from 6.8% to 7.1% during the second quarter this year, which was the sharpest GDP fall over the past five years, raising concerns over the negative influence of the country's high sales tax. Rising commodity prices and high unemployment rates were considered the biggest problems in all participants' countries. A wide poverty gap came the second while high public debts were the third with a 1% disparity. High public debt is the biggest concerns among developed economies while inflation is among emerging markets and high unemployment and inflation are the two biggest worries in developing economies. High unemployment is considered the biggest challenge among six developed countries. Nearly all Greek participants considered unemployment the biggest obstacle while over 90% of Italian and Spanish participants held the same view. The International Monetary Fund predicted that the global economy will grow 3.4% this year and 4% in 2015. Around 59% of Africans were positive over their economic growth next year. The figure was second highest in Latin America at 56%, in Asia at 48% but only 25% in Europe.

2AC – Russian Econ High Now

**Sanctions have set the stage for Russian economic growth, focusing on domestic markets and local consumption—new statistics prove that the market is showing positive economic signs**

**Lossan 9/25**, Writer for Russia Beyond the Headlines, occasional write for the Telegraph(Alexei, “Sanctions can be used in order to speed up Russian economy, says Putin,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, [http://rbth.com/business/2014/09/25/sanctions\_can\_be\_used\_in\_order\_to\_speed\_up\_russian\_economy\_says\_puti\_ 40103.html)](http://rbth.com/business/2014/09/25/sanctions_can_be_used_in_order_to_speed_up_russian_economy_says_puti_%2040103.html))

During a session of the State Council on Sept. 18, Russian President Vladimir Putin suggested that the sanctions could be turned to Russia’s advantage by increasing the competitiveness of the Russian economy, focusing on gross domestic and national product, consumption, savings, and capital formation, or the real sector. "In the next one and a half to two years it is necessary to take a real leap in the improvement of the real sector's competitiveness. Doing something that in the past would have taken years to do," he announced. According to Putin, the efforts of all federal and regional government organs must be oriented towards the development of the real sector. In particular, key instruments must be accessible credits and new competitive conditions for financing business. The principal points In general, the Russian government plans on using the domestic market in order to develop the real sector. "The competitiveness of Russian enterprises will directly depend on whether they will be able to put out a sufficient quantity of production that will not be inferior to foreign production in price and quality," Putin explained. In his words, "we need to use one of the country's most important competitive edges: the capacious domestic market." It needs to be filled with quality goods made by the real sector, while maintaining the economy's stability and equilibrium, according to Putin. Russia to look for new technologies beyond United States and EU Russia to look for new technologies beyond United States and EU Experts reacted to the president's words with caution. "Talk of accessible credit has been around in Russia since the fall of the USSR, but enterprises have still not received it," says Anton Soroko, analyst at the Finam Investment Holding. “Furthermore, the situation in Ukraine has not helped. Therefore, in the near future we must start anew." According to Soroko, the opaqueness of the institutional environment can easily neutralize practically any monetary flows into the country. Chief Economist on Russia and the CIS countries at the Bank of America Merrill Lynch Vladimir Osakovsky is also not counting on the growth of the Russian economy in the near future. "We expect that the macroeconomic situation in Russia will worsen as a result of the accelerating inflation caused by the restrictions on food imports, the fall of consumption and the volume of investment, as well as the reduction of exports," the RBC business daily cites Osakovsky as saying. According to Osakovsky's new forecast, in the second part of 2014 and the first half of 2015 Russia will sink into a recession, which will be followed by a recovery generated, mainly, by the base effect. Alexei Kozlov, chief analyst of UFS IC, has a different opinion. "The proposal to accelerate the development of the Russian economy that we heard during the State Council session is completely realistic," he says. According to him, the objectives have a maximalist character, but without setting such high goals, it is impossible to make a radical change in the way the Russian economy functions. "On the whole, Russia has been voicing its aim to reduce its raw material dependence for a long time," remarks Kozlov. "In light of the recent events, this goal has been expanded and is now attainable." The market's reaction Russian industrial enterprises are continuing to show positive economic signs. According to data collected in September by the Gaidar Institute of Economical Policy (IEP), short-term investment expectations in the industrial sector are still high, on a par with those of 2012. Moreover, the institute's "industrial optimism index" practically reached a three-year maximum in September 2014. The institute believes that it is highly likely that this month a growth in production output will be recorded. Russia needs reforms, not a sanctions war Russia needs reforms, not a sanctions war In the first half of the year the growth of industrial production was 1.5 percent in comparison with the same period in 2013, while GDP grew by almost twice as less: 0.8 percent. According to a study carried out by the Higher School of Economics, the last time this happened was in 2010-2011, during the phase of reserves accumulation. However, in this case growth depends completely on state orders. For the time being, according to experts, only a certain industrial sector is witnessing growth: the production of vessels, aircrafts, spacecraft and other means of transportation. This industrial segment also includes the production of railroad cars, airplanes, helicopters, submarines and so on, that is, a substantial part of transportation bought by the government and by state companies, including military technology. Production in this sector has been growing since the middle of 2013, and in 2014 it drastically increased. While at the end of 2013 this subsector's contribution was only 0.1 percent of the growth of industrial production (out of 0.4 percent of growth), in the period between January and August 2014 it was already 0.7 percent out of 1.3 percent, which is more than half. This means that this year industrial growth was fully conditioned by state demand, according to the Higher School of Economics.

1AR – Russian Econ High Now (1/2)

**Russia will pull through economically, substituting new markets for the loss of Western capital and developing a stronger domestic economy—projections show stable medium term growth**

**Russia Today 9/20** (Russia Today, “Russia has enough resources to weather sanctions - Economy Minister,” 9/20/14, <http://rt.com/business/189136-ulyukaev-russia-economy-sochi-forum/)>

The Russian government plans to look within Russia as well as Asia to help sustain the blow of Western sanctions, Russia’s economy minister said. Internal sources will provide a substitute for Western capital markets. A new scheme of internal funding will include tapping into Russia’s $87.97 billion National Welfare Fund as well as pension funds, Economy Minister Aleksey Ulyuakaev said in an interview with RT at the Sochi Investment Forum on Friday. Access to the global capital market is nearly shut off after the US and EU unleashed sanctions barring Russian state-owned companies from long-term borrowing. For Russian companies, this means that support has to come from the Russian government. “We have our reserves. We have the National Welfare Fund which is used for big infrastructural projects, but it could also be used for additional capitalization of banks,” Ulyukaev said. These sources have enough capital for the needs of the economy in the medium term, meaning a period of about 3 years. On Thursday, President Vladimir Putin announced that Russia will embark on a program of import substitution in order to protect and develop domestic markets, which Ulyuakev believes will help Russia increase GDP in the medium-term. “Our measures should be concentrated on our consumers and our producers,” Ulyukaev said. Besides internal moves, Moscow will also look to its eastern neighbors to make up for the lack of Western participation in Russian business. Increasing economic relations with China and other Asian countries remains a priority, as does continuing cooperation with Europe. “We are not Leaving Europe for Asia - we have to find a new balance. Our trade turnover with Europe is more than $400 billion. Our trade turnover with China, Korea, Japan and the most rapidly developing part of the world is just $170 billion. This is a great imbalance, so the challenge is to have more balanced relationships with Europe and Asia.” Russian trade with Europe will be affected as Russia consolidates its relations with advanced Asian economies. Demise of the WTO Ulyukaev agreed with President Vladimir Putin that sanctions which target Russia are a direct violation of the World Trade Organization’s (WTO) principles, and that Russia needs to continue to defend its economy with protective measures. “This is against the rule of free competition of goods and services on the market. It means that somehow our Western partners are looking to weaken the organization.” Western allies have violated the core principles of the WTO, which undermines its authority and may lead to its demise, Ulyuakev said. READ MORE: Ruble hits record low as West waits for Russia's response to sanctions, oil recedes The ongoing crisis in Ukraine has dealt a big blow to the Russian economy: capital has diminished and foreign investment is down. However, the minister remains optimistic that the ruble will recover by the end of the year, after hitting historic lows in the past week.
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**The Russian government has been able to curb the worst effects of the sanctions—no price volatility, stronger domestic markets and countermeasures**

**ITAR-TASS 9/25**, Information Telegraph Agency of Russia (ITAR-TASS, “Russian government, retailers keep food prices under control — ministry,” 9/25/14, <http://en.itar-tass.com/economy/751202)>

MOSCOW, September 25. /ITAR-TASS/. The Russian authorities and retailers have been able to prevent food price hikes amid a ban on food imports imposed by Russia in retaliation to western sanctions, Deputy Industry and Trade Minister Viktor Yevtukhov said on Thursday. “We have managed jointly with food retailers to restrain food prices and keep the range of products necessary for consumers,” Yevtukhov said at a retail business conference. “We have managed to restrain the emotional outbursts of those suppliers and producers who wanted to take advantage of the situation on the market,” the deputy industry and trade minister said. Russia’s Industry and Trade Ministry is daily monitoring retail prices and the situation on the food market remains quite stable, the deputy minister said. “There are some price fluctuations but far from all of them are related to those decisions that were taken,” the deputy minister said, referring to Russia’s embargo on food imports as a counter-sanction. The main task today is to ensure the priority of Russian producers on the domestic market, the deputy minister said. The Russian agri-business, for example, is currently at the stage when “we have a possibility to make a serious breakthrough in the development and support of domestic agricultural producers.” “No doubt, any country is doomed, if it fails to ensure its production sovereignty,” the deputy minister said. Russia introduced a package of counter-measures on August 7 in retaliation to the sanctions imposed by the United States, Australia, Canada, the European Union and Norway against Moscow over its stance on developments in neighboring Ukraine. Russia’s counter-sanctions involve a one-year ban on food and agricultural imports from the countries that slapped sanctions against Moscow.

2AC – Manufacturing Low (1/2)

**US manufacturing low – bad supply chain, job losses, China, and loss of domestic industry**

**Killingsworth 9/18** [William- whose Ph.D. is from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is vice president of Manufacturing and Supply Chain Research at DESE Research, an organization which carries out theoretical and analytical research in defense, energy, space, and the environment, “How to Save American Manufacturing”, 9/18/14, Machine Design, http://machinedesign.com/guest-commentary/how-save-american-manufacturing]

“When I went to the office printer to retrieve a printed version of this preface, I had to load paper into the printer. On the wrapper of the ream of paper was a graphic of a kangaroo. Looking more closely, I saw that the paper was made in Australia. Importing paper? From Australia? Really? Is it that bad?” Well, yes, it really is that bad. These are the words of author William Killingsworth in a soon-to-be-published book titled, Saving American Manufacturing: The Fight for Jobs, Opportunity, and National Security. Killingsworth, whose Ph.D. is from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is vice president of Manufacturing and Supply Chain Research at DESE Research, an organization which carries out theoretical and analytical research in defense, energy, space, and the environment. We recently had a chance to ask him about the causes of the decline and what can be done about it. Killingsworth: A few years ago I was doing a project for the U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command on the strength of the U.S. industrial base. As I worked with manufacturers, I realized the supply chain was filled with single-source suppliers. If one company went down the tubes for some reason, the whole supply chain would come to a stop. I began to realize that many of our supply chains have an overreaching fragility. In aviation, for example, there are issues with foundries and forgings. It was an awakening for me to see the number of single sources. In the book, you point out that U.S. manufacturing wasn’t in bad shape up to about the year 2000. That’s when a lot of manufacturing plants started to close and massive job losses began. What happened that year to cause this decline? Before the year 2000, China’s trade status had to be renewed annually by Congress. The renewal was always controversial and uncertain. So companies were reluctant to invest in China or send work there because they were never sure they would be able to bring in Chinese-manufactured products. But in 2000, Congress enacted a law that gave China permanent normal trade relations. That meant the uncertainty was gone. Companies started making investments in China because they knew the trade status was permanent. And in 2001, China became part of the World Trade Organization (WTO). These two events started massive manufacturing-job losses in the U.S. What specifically happened after the year 2000? The number of U.S. manufacturing plants started dropping rapidly. Between the years 2000 and 2007, 50,000 U.S. plants closed. This was a different dynamic than just laying off employees during a slowdown and then bringing them back later. These plants just closed and never reopened. In almost every industry I examined, the majority of job losses came with closings in the two largest categories of plants, those having between 500 and 1,000 employees, and those having 1,000 employees or more. You say that measurements of manufacturing output have masked a deteriorating manufacturing base. What’s so tough about measuring manufacturing output? In general, it’s not tough to measure manufacturing output. What is tough is measuring the manufacturing output of computers and peripheral equipment. The Federal Reserve and the Dept. of Commerce don’t measure this kind of equipment in terms of the number of units shipped. Instead, they adjust sales numbers by their estimated improved productivity because of factors such as more memory or faster computing. That adjustment number is so big it masks other manufacturing numbers. Actually, the number of computers shipped in the U.S. has been declining, as have durable goods. You also say that rising productivity figures for the U.S. are an illusion. The Dept. of Commerce publishes a production index that does not track unit sales. When you look at the dollar value of shipments, rather than the production index, you see significant declines in U.S. computer and telecommunications goods. And there has been a commensurate increase in imports from China. But the production index is still climbing because of the adjustments made for better technology. How much of the U.S. decline in manufacturing is due to
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currency manipulations? Probably a significant portion of it. China is keeping its currency very undervalued. Consequently, its products are inexpensive in the U.S. while our products are expensive when they get to China. The undervalued currency makes it hard for U.S. manufacturers to export to China. And this sort of currency manipulation supposedly violates trade agreements and WTO rules. Why have U.S. legislators ignored this problem? The only thing I can see is that most of these job losses have been associated with larger firms, the multinationals. And these firms are very active lobbyists. Even recent Tea Party members who have been elected to Congress have supported trade pacts when you would think they would be of a mind not to. But the money really flows when trade pacts are under discussion. There has been talk recently of a U.S. manufacturing renaissance. Have you seen any evidence of this? There have been a few positive developments but on the order of 10,000 to 20,000 jobs, nothing near the 6 million that have been lost. I think a more substantial movement has been to leave China and move manufacturing to Mexico. Our trade deficit with Mexico is substantial and growing, particularly in autos and auto parts. Delphi is now one of the largest employers in Mexico with over 50,000 employees there.

2AC – Oil Prices Low (1/2)

**Prices are low now and countries keep pumping**

**Johnson 14** (Keith, The Week, 10/6/14, “Oil prices are falling. Here's why petrostates aren't panicking.,” <http://theweek.com/article/index/269281/oil-prices-are-falling-heres-why-petrostates-arent-panicking>)

Oil prices continued falling last week, dipping to levels last seen almost two years ago, despite a steady drumbeat of perilous developments from Ukraine to Iraq to Hong Kong. But for all the turmoil in oil markets, not all petrostates are panicking. Although big producers, from Saudi Arabia to Russia, rely on high crude prices to balance their budgets, the price hasn't dropped low enough, or long enough, to fiscally squeeze them just yet. Crude oil traded in New York slipped below $90 a barrel in midday trading last Thursday before settling slightly higher; Brent crude traded in London fell to about $93 a barrel, continuing a plunge that began in June. Oil prices had reached $115 a barrel over the summer, at the height of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria's territorial gains in Iraq. In other words, the benchmark oil price has fallen by one-fifth in little more than three months, despite a potent and bottomless cocktail of the kind of scary news that used to send oil prices soaring, from rampaging terrorists to renewed Cold War tensions. The explanation, however, is easy enough to find: Producers, especially those in OPEC, just keep pumping, even as a tottering world economy needs less Black Gold. That supply-demand imbalance is made even worse by production gains in the United States, a surprising and unlikely rebound in Libyan output, and near-record production levels from Russia. (More from Foreign Policy: Notes on a Turkish conspiracy) Oil prices have definitely fallen — but not collapsed. By historical standards, prices are still very high; in real-dollar terms, $90-odd barrels are rare, equating to volatile periods such as the late 19th century, the late 1970s, or the current spike that began in the mid-2000s. More importantly, cheaper oil doesn't hit producers equally: Some, such as Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, are well prepared to weather softer oil prices in the short term, whereas Iraq, Russia, and the like have more to fear, and not just from falling oil. But it would take either a sustained drop or a much sharper price plunge to require big petrostates to start making painful choices. Some observers are sounding the warning bell nonetheless. The International Monetary Fund recently warned that Saudi Arabia could slip into deficit much sooner than expected because its domestic spending has jumped since the start of the Arab Spring and it needs higher oil prices than just a few years ago to balance its budget. Gulf countries overall relied on oil fetching about $62 a barrel in 2009 to stay in the black; last year that baseline rose to $82 and climbing. "The government's ambitious spending program could significantly erode the buffers that have been built up and increase vulnerability to a drop in oil prices," the IMF warned last month. But Saudi Arabia and its neighbors have plenty of cushion. Riyadh ran budget surpluses for years, has huge currency reserves, and has almost no debt. Ninety-dollar barrels are obviously not as profitable as $115 ones, but it won't force any drastic changes in Saudi policy. (More from Foreign Policy: The case against Qatar) "In the short term, the Saudis are the last ones who need to worry. They can sit it out for a couple of years, even with oil below $90," said Laura El-Katiri, a research fellow at the Oxford Institute for Energy Studies. Other Gulf states, such as Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, can also resort to deficits or spending tweaks to weather a price storm, she said. That may partly explain the deaf ears turned by Saudi Arabia and other big OPEC members to Iran's pleas. Of the big producers, Iran by far requires the highest prices to remain fiscally sound, by some estimates as much as $130 a barrel. Further, Iran has been hammered by Western sanctions that have cut its oil exports — and earnings — almost in half. Yet Saudi Arabia, still the world's swing oil producer and a visceral opponent of Shiite Iran, has little interest in slashing output. Quite the contrary: Saudi Arabia on Wednesday suddenly started offering discounts to maintain its market share, even if it undermines overall crude prices. Cheaper oil is a threat to Iraq, too. Given its huge internal spending commitments, Baghdad's green eyeshades pencil in ever-higher prices — by some estimates, at least $93 a barrel — to square the books. And unlike other OPEC members, Iraq doesn't have deep reserves
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to fall back on, making it much more sensitive to short-term price swings. It also has a much more immediate problem in the form of rampaging ISIS terrorists, who on Thursday made further inroads in western Iraq. (More from Foreign Policy: Are Hong Kong's protesters getting bamboozled?) "Iraq is different because it's a corrupt welfare state facing a bloody insurgency. It's living hand to mouth, whereas the Gulf states have saved up huge surpluses in recent years," said Matthew Reed, vice president at energy consultancy Foreign Reports. Russia could feel the pain next. Oil far outweighs gas in Russia's energy-export mix, but Moscow's budget is predicated on Brent crude prices north of $100 a barrel. What's more, Russia's economy has also been battered by Western sanctions in the wake of the Ukrainian crisis, leading to ruble flight, slumping markets, higher interest rates, and slashed growth forecasts. Now, falling oil prices have Russian policymakers worried: One former finance minister said cheaper oil could punch a $30 billion to $40 billion hole in Russian revenues. The Russian Central Bank, meanwhile, is scrambling to prepare for oil prices as low as $60 a barrel, Reuters reported. Russia's current finance minister said Thursday that cheaper oil is a huge risk to its wobbly economy.

\*\*\*NEG ECONOMY UPDATES\*\*\*

1NC – US Econ Low Now

**US economy low-data proves-growing claims are false**

**Snyder 9/24** [Michael-writer for global research, “Economic Recovery” for the U.S. Middle Class: Significantly Less Purchasing Power than Before the 2008 Financial Crisis”, 9/24/14, Global research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/economic-recovery-for-the-u-s-middle-class-significantly-less-purchasing-power-than-before-the-2008-financial-crisis/5403937]

The U.S. economy has had six full years to bounce back since the financial collapse of 2008, and it simply has not happened. Median household income has declined substantially since then, total household wealth for middle class families is way down, the percentage of the population that is employed is still about where it was at the end of the last recession, and the number of Americans that are dependent on the government has absolutely exploded. Even those that claim that the economy is “recovering” admit that we are not even close to where we used to be economically. Many hope that someday we will eventually get back to that level, but the truth is that this is about as good as things are ever going to get for the middle class. And we should enjoy this period of relative stability while we still can, because when the next great financial crisis strikes things are going to fall apart very rapidly. The U.S. Census Bureau has just released some brand new numbers, and they are quite sobering. For example, after accounting for inflation median household income in the United States has declined a total of 8 percent from where it was back in 2007. That means that middle class families have significantly less purchasing power than they did just prior to the last major financial crisis. And one research firm is projecting that it is going to take until 2019 for median household income to return to the level that we witnessed in 2007… For everybody wondering why the economic recovery feels like a recession, here’s the answer: We’re still at least five years away from regaining everything lost during the 2007-2009 downturn. Forecasting firm IHS Global Insight predicts that real median household income — perhaps the best proxy for middle-class living standards — won’t reach the prior peak from 2007 until 2019. Since the numbers are adjusted for inflation, that means the typical family will wait 12 years until their purchasing power is as strong as it was before the recession. That would be the longest period of stagnation, by far, since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Of course that projection assumes that the economy will continue to “recover”, which is a very questionable assumption at best. Meanwhile, total household wealth has been declining for middle class families as well. According to the New York Times, the “typical American household” is now worth 36 percent less than it was worth a decade ago. That is a pretty substantial drop. But you never hear our politicians (especially the Democrats) bring up numbers like that because they want us to feel good about things.

2NC – US Econ Low Now

**US economy decline inevitable-significantly less growing capacity**

**The Economist 9/3** [The Economist-staff writer, “Potentially interesting”, The Economist, 9/3/14, http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2014/09/americas-economy]

THE American economy, we [wrote in July](http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21607810-new-figures-show-speed-which-americas-economy-can-grow-without-stoking-inflation-has), almost certainly has less room to grow than it used to. Estimates of the economy's potential output, or how much it can produce at a given time without serious inflationary pressure building, have been revised down substantially by the Congressional Budget Office and other economists studying the issue. A recent NBER [working paper](http://www.nber.org/chapters/c13407.pdf) by John Fernald, a productivity expert at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, reckoned that America's output gap had shrunk to about 2% of GDP, suggesting that most of the shortfall in output relative to the pre-recession trend represents a loss of structural capacity.

Brand [new work](http://www.nber.org/papers/w20423.pdf) by economist Robert Gordon, of Northwestern University, is more pessimistic still. Mr Gordon has made headlines in recent years for his dour assessments of America's future growth prospects. As we [noted in early 2013](http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21569393-fears-innovation-slowing-are-exaggerated-governments-need-help-it-along-great) he is sceptical of the potential of new technological discoveries to engineer a productivity rebound sufficient to offset the growth-crimping effects of rising inequality, growing public debt, and demographic change. Mr Gordon's latest research casts a doubting eye at most near-term economic growth forecasts, which have the American economy growing between 2% and 3% in coming years. Instead, he reckons America will be lucky to have potential GDP growth around 1.6% per year through the end of the decade, and that anything much faster is well nigh impossible given recent trends in labour markets.

1NC – Chinese Econ Low Now

**Chinese economic decline inevitable-protests and lack of tourism**

**Roberts 9/30** [Dexter-is Bloomberg Businessweek's Asia News Editor and China bureau chief, 9/30/14, “Hong Kong Protests Trigger New Worries for China's Economy”, Bloomberg Businessweek, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2014-09-30/hong-kong-protests-trigger-new-worries-for-chinas-economy]

What is the potential long-term economic and business impact of the massive protests sweeping Hong Kong? That’s being considered by a number of investment analysts, who have issued quick reports over the past two days. Not surprisingly, no one is ready to make any hard, fast predictions just yet. That’s because of continuing uncertainty about how long the demonstrations will last and the huge question mark over what steps Beijing may take to contain the unrest. Instead, the reports set out possible scenarios and then take brave stabs at possible economic outcomes. If the protests keep going—an open question at this point—they would hit the tourism and retail industries of Hong Kong hard, which together make up about 10 percent of the territory’s gross domestic product, according to estimates from London-based Capital Economics. The two sectors would be “badly affected, as tourists stayed away. Business confidence would also take a dive. With its economy having contracted last quarter, Hong Kong could easily be pushed into recession,” wrote Capital Economics’ Gareth Leather. Add in the danger that the demonstrations will further damage the strained relations between Hong Kong’s executive and legislative branches, wrote Citigroup Asia Pacific economist Adrienne Lui. That could make it difficult for Hong Kong to pass key economic boosting policies while the territory’s “risk premium looks set to rise longer-term as businesses and investors are increasingly building in higher operational risks, fearing that future protests could escalate and turn more frequent.” The worst-case scenario would come if Beijing were to decide to intervene in a forceful fashion—most frighteningly by sending in its army or armed police. That would probably have repercussions far beyond Hong Kong’s borders. “If Hong Kong’s status as an international financial center were jeopardized by such a nasty turn of events—as it presumably would be—then China’s own economy would suffer,” wrote Capital Economics’ Leather and his colleague John Higgins in a second note released on Tuesday. “And if China attempted to resolve the problem in a heavy-handed way, the rest of the world might respond—say by imposing trade sanctions on China, or by seeking to limit her influence in global policymaking.” “Any sign of growing tension between the rest of the world and a large economic and military superpower like China,” the analysts added, “would surely dull investors’ appetite for risk.”

1NC – Russian Econ Low Now

**Sanctions have crushed the Russian economy—rising prices, poverty, and an unpredictable economic environment are compounded by broader failures**

**Hill 9/28,** Kathrin Hille is the FT Moscow Bureau Chief. Previously, she was an FT correspondent in Beijing, Taipei correspondent and world news editor at Financial Times Deutschland (Kathrin, “From Bentleys to fish, Russia’s economy feels sanctions’ sting,” Financial Times, 9/28/14, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c20ade1e-4574-11e4-ab86-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3Eezi6O8d)>

More than once, Mikhail Zub was driven to the verge of failure in his attempts over the past 20 years to transform a rotting Soviet fish processing plant in the Arctic city of Murmansk into a viable business. Yet things have never looked so bleak as they do now. The factory lost access to supplies from Norway overnight when Russia banned western food imports last month in retaliation against Ukraine-related sanctions. Mr Zub is trying to save his company by suing the government over the ban. “He is a stubborn man, but we don’t think it will work. The plant is going to die,” says Tatyana, a Murmansk resident whose husband was sent home because the plant is idling. Things look grim not only in Murmansk. In its sixth month under western sanctions, the Russian economy is starting to show the strain. The World Bank has warned in a new report that if sanctions remain in place, the economy could contract 0.9 per cent next year and 0.4 per cent in 2016. Russia chart Fixed-asset investment, which was already stagnant last year, has fallen 2.5 per cent in the first eight months of this year. BCS Prime, the largest independent broker on the Moscow Stock Exchange, forecasts inflation to reach 8 per cent by the end of the year. This toxic mix has slowed consumer demand, which had long supported at least some growth. Due to inflation and slower loan expansion, real income growth has slowed sharply in the first eight months of this year. “I expect to see a drop in real incomes in 2014 and a small growth in 2015,” Vladimir Tikhomirov, BCS Prime’s chief economist, predicts. The automobile market has been one of the most drastic indicators. New car sales dropped 26 per cent in August compared with the same month last year, according to the Association of European Business in Russia. New car sales are down 12 per cent this year compared with the first eight months of 2013. While luxury brands had been somewhat insulated from the drop, that appears to be changing. Last month, only two Bentleys were sold in all of Russia, compared with 27 in February, according to industry executives. Some observers believe the souring sentiment among ordinary Russians could eventually reach beyond the economy. The last time real incomes nearly ground to a halt was in 2011, the year when thousands of Muscovites took to the streets to protest against President Vladimir Putin. According to independent pollster Levada Center, the five top things Russians fear most according to an August poll are economic: rising prices, poverty, a growing income gap, an economic crisis and unemployment. Evgeny Gontmakher, an economist and political commentator, warns that worsening trends in all these areas are calling Russia’s social and political stability into question. Turning the ship round will be difficult. “A return to higher growth in Russia will depend on solid private investment growth and a lift in consumer sentiment, which will require creating a predictable policy environment and addressing the unresolved structural reform agenda,” the World Bank concluded in its report. None of that is happening. Rather than pressuring Mr Putin to change course on Ukraine – as western policy makers had hoped – the sanctions have so far prompted the president’s inner circle to close ranks. Vladimir Yevtushenkov, one of the country’s leading industrialists, is being kept under house arrest in a case believed to be driven by the desire of state oil company Rosneft to gain control of Bashneft, one of Mr Yevtushenkov’s assets. Separately, the government has pledged to concentrate its response to western sanctions on supporting those hit by the punitive measures. “The investment climate in Russia has actually improved,” says Alexander Lebedev, a former billionaire, with bitter irony. “The Russian economy – that’s increasingly state companies, and they are being taken care of.” First in line are the major state banks Sberbank, VTB and Vnesheconombank, and the country’s largest energy firms, all now almost completely barred from western capital markets. The central bank has been instructed to use its monetary reserves to refinance maturing hard-currency debt of Sberbank, VTB and VEB. Other groups are also asking for help, led by Rosneft with a request for Rbs1,500bn. That is almost half of the entire National Welfare Fund, the oil revenue-fed rainy day reserve. Russia chart These bailout requests are triggering comparisons with the 2009 financial crisis, to which Moscow responded with a $36bn bank bailout and yet still suffered a severe recession that year. “Looking at it from the angle of how much state support is needed, this could become at least as bad as 2008/2009,” a senior Sberbank executive says. In an assessment paper on the Russian economy, EU economic officials in Moscow warn that the three big banks alone will need $75bn from the central bank over the next 18 months, draining its reserves. Combined with the requirement to keep at least $180bn of foreign exchange reserves to cover six months of imports, that would leave the central bank with just $115bn to defend the currency in case of speculative attacks or sudden capital flight. In early March, the bank converted $11.3bn into roubles in a single day. “It therefore cannot be excluded that Russia’s macro-financial situation over time could become one of financial distress,” the paper concludes. It seems unlikely, then, that Mr Zub will see any relief to his troubles, since Mr Putin has bigger fish to fry. Last week, the president warned private companies not to jump on the bailout bandwagon: “They have to understand that they must bear the burden of all issues arising not as a result of political developments, but in the course of their economic and financial activity alone.”
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**Recent government crackdowns on private businesses have killed Russian investor confidence—government overreach chills investment and further weakens the business environment**

**The Economist 9/28** (The Economist, “The Arrest Of A Billionaire Does Not Bode Well For Russia's Economy,” Business Insider, 9/28/14, <http://www.businessinsider.com/the-arrest-of-a-russian-billionaire-does-not-bode-well-for-russias-economy-2014-9#ixzz3Ef36Dn65)>

On September 16th 2014 Vladimir Yevtushenkov, the president and principal shareholder of AFK Sistema, was accused of money-laundering and placed under house arrest by a Moscow court. It is unlikely that the arrest is part of a co-ordinated strategy to revise the relationship between the state and business. Rather, the affair marks an opportunistic attack by a faction within the elite seeking to take control of AFK Sistema's assets. The arrest has shaken confidence in Russia's business community, which had assumed that loyalty to the Kremlin would protect it from the depredations of law enforcement. The arrest is a worrying sign for businesses, and illustrates that members of the Russian elite are prepared to risk significant damage to investor confidence in order to achieve their aims. On September 25th the court rejected an appeal from Mr Yevtushenkov's lawyers that the terms of his arrest be amended to allow him to go to his office, under bail of Rb300m (US$7.7m). The court also ruled that Mr Yevtushenkov should remain under house arrest until at least November 16th. AFK Sistema is a conglomerate with holdings ranging from oil to telecommunications, including MTS, the leading telecoms firm in Russia, which has over 100m mobile subscribers in Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries. Mr Yevtushenkov is charged with money-laundering in connection with AFK Sistema's purchase in 2005 and 2009 of shares in the oil company Bashneft, the dominant oil producer in the Volga republic of Bashkortostan. AFK Sistema currently holds 85% of the voting shares in Bashneft. Business confidence shaken The reaction to Mr Yevtushenkov's arrest among the Russian business elite has been sharply negative. Aleksandr Shokhin, head of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, Russia's leading business lobby, immediately sent a letter to Vladimir Putin, the president, defending Mr Yevtushenkov. German Gref, the head of Sberbank, Russia's largest bank, and a former minister of economic development, stressed the negative impact on the business climate. Aleksei Kudrin, who was minister of finance at the time the deals went through, claims that every aspect of those deals was vetted at all levels of government, and announced that he found Mr Yevtushenkov's arrest incomprehensible. Anatoly Chubais, the president of Rosnano, the Russian nanotechnology company, and a former minister of privatisation, warned that the actions had inflicted serious damage on the Russian business climate and "come just at a time when Russia is teetering on the brink of recession and stagnation." The affair is seen by many, including reportedly Dmitry Medvedev, the prime minister, as a violation of the informal agreement between government and business reached after the nationalisation of Yukos, once the country's largest oil company. Under this agreement, big business undertook not to intervene in politics (as Mikhail Khodorkovsky, the owner of Yukos had done), while the government would attend to the interests of business and refrain from re-examining the privatisations of the 1990s. Mr Yevtushenkov has always adhered strictly to those principles and was seen as entirely loyal to the Kremlin. The impact of the affair on financial markets has been dramatic. At the news of Mr Yevtushenkov's arrest, AFK Sistema's shares fell by 36% on the Moscow Stock Exchange. They remain more than 30% below their pre-crisis level. Bashneft's shares fell by more than 20% on September 16th. In London, the market valuation of AFK Sistema's Global Depositary Receipts fell by 39% on the same date. MTS shares also fell by 8% when Mr Yevtushenkov was first arrested. The market disturbance was not limited to AFK Sistema shares-the Moscow Stock Exchange index fell by 2.5% on September 16th. On receipt of the news that the court had refused on September 25th to lift the house arrest, AFK Sistema shares fell by a further 8.8% and Bashneft shares by 4.5%. The prosecutor in the
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investigation alleges that Ural Rakhimov, the son of the former president of Bashkortostan, Murtaz Rakhimov, used his position as minister of privatisation of the republic to sell off, at a knock-down price, the assets of a number of state-owned companies, including Bashneft, to private companies that were in fact controlled by himself. These were then transferred to AFK Sistema for a total of around US$2.6bn, in return for kick-backs to Ural Rakhimov. The net income of Bashneft in 2012 alone was US$1.7 bn. There is, however, an alternative version of the history of the sale of Bashneft. In 2003 the authorities in Moscow, concerned at how Bashneft was being managed by the Rakhimov family, started to put pressure on Ural Rakhimov to sell Bashneft to a respectable company. Ural Rakhimov resisted, and it took several years for Moscow to get its own way. Finally, in 2009, a suitable company was found. That company, by agreement between all interested parties going right up to Mr Medvedev, then president, was AFK Sistema. Reflecting the murkiness and complexity of Russian politics, these two versions are not entirely mutually exclusive. It is therefore important to take a cautious approach to the interpretation that sees the arrest of Mr Yevtushenkov as an integral part of a strategic push by Mr Putin to regain control of all the "commanding heights" of the Russian economy. A more plausible explanation is that Igor Sechin, the powerful head of state-owned oil company Rosneft, is seeking to expand his company's oil assets by acquiring Bashneft, possibly to offset the increased costs imposed by US and EU sanctions. Under this scenario, Mr Sechin, the deputy prime minister with responsibility for the oil industry at the time of the negotiations over Bashneft's sale, was unhappy with the deal with AFK Sistema. As a result, there have been repeated attempts since then to bring Bashneft under Rosneft's control. This interpretation can be folded into a broader theory that the Yevtushenkov affair represents a further episode in the running battle between the siloviki-the "strong men" in the Russian elite-and the liberal (at least in economic terms) technocrats. Significantly, all the prominent figures who have spoken out publicly against the treatment of Mr Yevtushenkov belong to the latter group. The Ukraine crisis and international sanctions have empowered the siloviki faction in the Kremlin. This has put the liberal technocrats within the elite on the defensive, and the siloviki may simply be taking their chance to extend their power and influence. Disregarding collateral damage It is possible that members of the siloviki faction have an eye on AFK Sistema assets other than Bashneft. AFK Sistema has been hit hard by the arrest. It would be hit even harder if, as is widely expected, Rosneft does eventually take control of Bashneft. Bashneft is a very profitable company, and loss of Bashneft income would put AFK Sistema in difficulties in terms of debt-service, and could force it to sell off some of its subsidiaries, possibly even MTS. Whether or not other parts of the Sistema empire are divided up, the affair illustrates that powerful members of the Russian elite, possibly including Mr Putin himself, are prepared to risk significant damage to investor confidence to achieve their aims. This does not bode well for the future of the Russian economy, given the already very poor perception of the business environment.
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**World Bank forecasts predict inevitable Russian economic downturn—a combination of Western sanctions and internal problems guarantee stagnation**

**Dow Jones Newswires 9/24** (Dow Jones Newswire, “World Bank Slashes Forecast for Russian Economy,” Fox Business, 9/24/14, <http://www.foxbusiness.com/economy-policy/2014/09/24/world-bank-slashes-forecast-for-russian-economy/)>

The World Bank on Wednesday slashed its forecast for Russia's economy over the next two years, saying growth would stagnate amid a lack of structural reforms and Western sanctions over Russia's role in the Ukraine conflict. In its biannual report, the World Bank cut its forecast for Russian economic growth to 0.3% in 2015 and 0.4% in 2016 under its baseline scenario from 1.5% and 2.2%, respectively--well below the government's estimates. Even if Western sanctions are quickly repealed, the economy would only inch upward, while an increase in geopolitical tensions would bring a small recession, the bank said. Even under the most optimistic scenario, which envisages the full resolution of the geopolitical tensions and an end of all sanctions by the end of 2014, the World Bank sees only a 0.9% growth in 2015, increasing to 1.3% in 2016. "The economy is at the threshold of recession and will remain there for a while," said Birgit Hansl, the bank's lead economist on Russia and the main author of the report. Russia's economic growth slowed to near zero in the first half of the year amid declining consumer activity, waning investment and the several rounds of the Western sanctions in response to Russia's policy toward Ukraine. Russia's government has lowered its forecasts, but still sees 1.2% growth in 2015 and 2.3% in 2016. This month, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development gave a downbeat view of the economic prospects for Ukraine and Russia. Michal Rutkowski, the bank's director in Russia, told reporters that its forecast was more pessimistic than the government's as it expected a slower pickup in investment and much lower consumption in the coming years. "The policy uncertainty about the economic course the country will take that is casting the longest shadow on Russia's medium-term prospects," the bank said in the report. The World Bank's baseline scenario suggests that even though the government will be able to preserve the macroeconomic stability despite the persistence of the sanctions, growth will be minimal. The bank based its outlook on the continuation of Russia's economic policy, which since the beginning of the geopolitical tensions "has been dominated by measures to maintain macroeconomic stability and safeguard the economy from the impact of these tensions." The base scenario also assumes that fiscal policy remains prudent and the central bank sticks to its promise to fully float the ruble next year. However, the World Bank expects no substantial structural reforms to take place, which it says are badly needed. Under the pessimistic scenario of an increasing intensity of geopolitical tensions, the bank said the economy slipping into a protracted low-level recession. If the government lifts caps on budgetary spending in an attempt to kick-start the economy, it would lead to higher inflation, ruble depreciation and further deterioration of the investment climate, the bank said. Although the bank doesn't expect any limitation of Russia's oil trade, access to the international capital market would become increasingly restricted for the country's companies and banks, further increasing borrowing costs and hampering investment activities. Under this scenario the World Bank expects the economy to contract 0.9% next year and by a further 0.4% in 2016. The bank reiterated its usual suggestions for Russia to grow its economy: keep the macroeconomic stability, make the policy environment predictable and ensure a positive shift in business and consumer confidence. "Economic recovery in 2015 and afterward would depend on solid private investment growth and a lift in consumer sentiments," the bank said. The bank expects downward pressure to continue on the ruble, which has already lost 16% in the past 12 months.

2NC – Russian Econ Low Now (4/4)

**A combination of Russian financial policy and sanctions have stagnated the economy—government doesn’t have the capacity to effectively replace lost investment**

**Reuters 9/16** (Reuters, “Kudrin: Russian Economy Will Stagnate Over Sanctions,” The Moscow Times, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/kudrin-russian-economy-will-stagnate-over-sanctions/507146.html)>

Russia risks slipping into recession because the government is not investing enough in the economy to weather Western sanctions, former Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin said Tuesday, criticizing the strategy so far. A strong advocate of liberal reforms, Kudrin has become almost the only voice in the Russian elite to question economic policy since the Ukraine crisis, counting on his long-term close ties to President Vladimir Putin to protect him from censure. Taking aim at the generous spending pledges Putin made when he returned to the presidency in 2012, Kudrin said Moscow did not have the funds to invest in an economy, which was flagging before the West imposed sanctions over Russia's role in Ukraine. "In a difficult moment like this, it would be useful to increase government investments. This is exactly what the market needs now. To cut government investment now and increase pay is inappropriate," he told a foreign business conference. "The government's support is limited, bound by continued large social spending," said Kudrin, who has long been a critic of Putin's pledges to tackle the gap between Russia's rich and poor by increasing wages. Kudrin, often summoned by Putin to discuss economic matters against more statist economists and a useful tool for the president to keep his government on its toes, said he expected the economy to stagnate this year or weaken further, and that growth could be negative in 2015, well below government forecasts for 0.5 percent in 2014 and 1 percent next year. "The sanctions that have been imposed are going to have an impact over one, or two years, because they have cut investment opportunities," Kudrin says, warning that if more punitive measures are imposed, the economy may fall by 3 to 4 percent. While Russian officials criticize sanctions over Kremlin policy in Ukraine for bringing back the Cold War, they argue measures to cut off companies from Western markets, investment and technology will spur Russia's homegrown industries and develop ties with partners in the East. "Turning to the East brings good prospects, especially for Russia's Far East," Deputy Prime Minister Arkady Dvorkovich told the same conference. "When it comes to sanctions we consider them meaningless, counterproductive … measures that do not solve political problems." Support for Champions They are also banking on using 'rainy day' funds, including those reserved for Russia's 40 million pensioners, to support what Putin calls Russia's 'national champions,' pillars of the economy in sectors such as energy and defense. Kudrin said it was clear that some state companies under sanctions needed support, but he counseled the government to consider what kind of support they needed before channelling money to them, especially in the case of state oil producer Rosneft which has asked for $40 billion. "I think that to provide Rosneft with a government loan or investing in its bonds, shows explicitly that Rosneft cannot on its own refinance its debt. This lowers the quality, the status of Rosneft as a borrower — it significantly affects its capitalization, its perspectives," he said. "It is possible that Rosneft should divide its share in some projects with others and as such lower the burden on the government. Support is necessary, but it should be well thought-through." Several state and private companies have suggested they would need to turn to the government for funds to weather the sanctions. The government is considering supporting whole sectors such as agriculture by reducing tariffs. But Kudrin said state support should be extended only to companies that are under sanctions. Asked whether his voice was heard by the authorities, Kudrin, who first met Putin in St. Petersburg while both worked for its liberal mayor in the 1990s, said he believed he was. But he underlined that with more than half Russia's population willing to make sacrifices for Putin's patriotic push against Ukraine, politics may trump economics for the time being. Putin enjoys approval ratings of above 80 percent. "We understand that today that the logic of taking decisions lies to a large extent in the political sphere and the economic consequences — well, they are the forced consequences of political decisions," he said. "Now, at this stage, the government, the president of Russia enjoy substantial support of the population — this is not a trivial factor."

1NC – Manufacturing High

**US manufacturing high-employment, econ growth, longer hours, demand for goods**

**Reuters 9/23** [Reuters-staff writer, “U.S. manufacturing activity holds near 4-1/2-year high”, 9/23/14, The Globe and Mail, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economy/us-manufacturing-activity-holds-near-4-12-year-high/article20738461/]

U.S. manufacturing activity hovered at a near 4-1/2-year high in September and factory employment surged, supporting views of sturdy economic growth this quarter. The growth picture was also boosted by other data on Tuesday showing an acceleration in services industry growth this month. Financial data firm Markit said its preliminary or “flash” U.S. Manufacturing Purchasing Managers Index was at 57.9, unchanged from August’s reading when it touched its highest level since April 2010. A reading above 50 signals expansion in manufacturing, which accounts for about 12 per cent of U.S. economic activity. Factory employment increased for a second straight month, with a gauge of labour market conditions touching its highest level since March 2012. “The third quarter as a whole has seen the strongest expansion since the sector began to recover from the financial crisis,” said Chris Williamson, chief economist at Markit in London, adding that he expects manufacturing to add to third-quarter U.S. gross domestic product growth. Separately, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia said its general activity index for non-manufacturing firms jumped to 35.7 this month from 27.3 in August. It was the first time that the survey of non-manufacturing firms in the Mid-Atlantic region was published. The survey, however, has been conducted since March 2011. The surge in activity reflected a jump in new orders, sales as well as an increase in full-time hiring. Non-manufacturing employees also worked longer hours this month, while firms increased their spending on capital. The relatively strong manufacturing and services sector reports bode well for third-quarter economic growth, whose estimates range as high as a 3.5 per cent annual pace. The economy expanded at a 4.2 per cent pace in the second quarter. “We expect GDP to grow at an annualized rate of at least 3 per cent and as much as 4 per cent, depending to a large extent on how the vast services economy fared in September,” Williamson said. Markit’s gauge of new orders held steady above the 60 level for the third time in the past four months, indicating persistent demand for manufactured goods. Markit’s “flash” reading is based on replies from about 85 per cent of the U.S. manufacturers surveyed.

1NC – Oil Prices High

**Futures cause increase in oil prices**

**WSJ 14** (Wall Street Journal, 10/6/14, “Gasoline Futures Push Oil Prices Higher,” <http://online.wsj.com/articles/brent-crude-rises-after-declines-last-week-1412588612>)

NEW YORK—Oil prices rebounded from early losses Monday as news of an extended refinery shutdown buoyed gasoline futures. Irving Oil Corp.’s refinery in Saint John, New Brunswick, will be closed through Nov. 20, Bloomberg News reported. The refinery produces more than 300,000 barrels a day of refined products and is a major provider of gasoline to the Northeast U.S. November reformulated gasoline blendstock, or RBOB, gained 3.47 cents, or 1.5%, to settle at $2.4132 a gallon. Light, sweet crude for November delivery settled up 60 cents, or 0.7%, at $90.34 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Brent rose 48 cents, or 0.5%, to $92.79 a barrel on ICE Future Europe. The news of the shutdown extension boosted prices, along with a weaker dollar and gains in the stock market, said Kyle Cooper, analyst at IAF Advisors in Houston. “The dollar index started to slide, insinuating higher crude prices, at the same time equities moved off their morning lows,” Mr. Cooper said. Combined with the refinery news, “all three factors…had a slight influence.” Oil prices have slid more than $15 a barrel from their mid-June highs as traders bet that ample global supplies couldn’t be absorbed by relatively lackluster demand. Futures settled at more than one-year lows on Friday. “The overall sentiment in the market hasn’t shifted,” said Tony Headrick, energy analyst at CHS Hedging LLC. “It’s a matter of oversupply and lower demand that continues to drive values.” The U.S. Energy Information Administration and OPEC are set to release their monthly oil-market reports this week, which could offer traders fresh insight into current supply-and-demand dynamics. The International Energy Agency isn’t scheduled to release its monthly outlook until next week. November diesel rose 0.5 cent, or 0.2%, to $2.6213 a gallon.

\*\*\*MORE SPENDING DA\*\*

1NC – Spending Down

**US heading for budget surplus**

**Presta 7/10** (John Presta, Chicago Finance Examiner, 7/10/14, “Is Obama administration heading toward a budget surplus over the next two years?” Examiner, <http://www.examiner.com/article/is-obama-administration-heading-toward-a-budget-surplus-over-the-next-two-years>)

There is a quiet murmur in financial circles that the United States government may be headed once again toward a surplus budget, opined 24/7Wall Street.com yesterday. That has not happened since the final few years of the Clinton administration and during George W. Bush's first year in office. However, Bush managed to decimate the budget surplus in short order, with the first of his two inadvisable tax cuts. Add to that the launching of two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Counting the increased government expenditures incurred by the Bush administration it all added up to record deficits that at the end of the Bush years, the economy was damaged and went into a deep recession. Going forward, government expenditures are expected to stay under control, led by reduced military spending because of the wind down of the two wars, and the expiration of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program. The improving economy means increased numbers are returning to work, thus increasing tax revenues. The most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics released showed total nonfarm payroll employment increased by 288,000, dropping the unemployment rate to a declining to 6.1 percent. The unemployment rate is the best since Sept. of 2008. Adding fuel to the argument of the returning budget surplus during the Obama administration is a report from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), that said the United States federal government had a budget surplus of $70 billion in the month of June (2014). That surplus eclipses the budget surplus from last June (2013). Marketwatch reported that the CBO reported receipts in June (2014) that were $324 billion, $37 billion more than in June 2013. Spending came in at $253 billion in June, $83 billion more than a year ago. For the fiscal year to date, the total deficit is $366 billion, $144 billion less than in the same nine months of fiscal 2013. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently estimated that the federal deficit through the first nine months was $366 billion, which was significantly better than the $510 billion deficit for the same period during the 2013 fiscal year. The primary reason for the improvement was receipts, which improved by $172 billion. Total receipts were up by 8 percent in the first nine months of fiscal year 2014 and were lead by individual income taxes and social insurance (payroll) taxes, which together rose by $123 billion, or 7 percent. In addition, receipts from corporate income taxes rose by $29 billion (or 14 percent), because of growth in taxable profits in calendar years 2013 and 2014. Receipts from April through June—largely representing corporations’ first two quarterly estimated tax payments for the 2014 tax year—increased by about $12 billion (or 11 percent). Also, receipts from the Federal Reserve rose by $18 billion, or 32 percent. The increase was attributable in part to the larger size of the central bank’s portfolio of securities and to a higher yield on that portfolio. Almost all gains occurred from January through June.

2NC – Spending Down (1/4)

**US spending low now**

**Boak 7/11** (Josh Boak, AP Economics Writer, 7/11/14, “US Records $71 Billion Budget Surplus in June,” ABC News, http://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory/us-records-71-billion-budget-surplus-june-24525694)

The U.S. government ran a monthly budget surplus in June, putting it on course to record the lowest annual deficit since 2008. The Treasury Department said Friday that its June surplus totaled $71 billion, following a $130 billion deficit in May. The government also ran a surplus in June 2013, bolstered by dividends from Fannie Mae, the mortgage giant under federal conservatorship for the past six years. For the first nine months of this budget year, the deficit totals $366 billion, down 28 percent from the same period in 2013. Tax receipts are up 8 percent compared to the prior year-to-date, while spending has increased 1 percent. The Congressional Budget Office is forecasting a deficit of $492 billion for the full budget year ending Sept. 30. That would be the narrowest gap since 2008. In 2008, the government recorded a deficit of $458.6 billion, which was the record high for deficits up to that time. But with the outbreak of the recession, deficits soared to unprecedented levels, exceeding $1 trillion for four consecutive years. Tax revenues fell during that period, while government boosted spending in an attempt to stabilize the financial system and provide relief to people who had lost jobs. The yearly deficit peaked at $1.4 trillion in 2009 during the worst of the financial crisis. It gradually fell from there, plunging to $680.2 billion last year.

**US spending low now**

**Boak 7/11** (Josh Boak, AP Economics Writer, 7/11/14, “US reports $71 billion surplus in June; projected to have smallest annual deficit in 6 years,” US News, <http://www.usnews.com/news/business/articles/2014/07/11/us-records-71-billion-budget-surplus-in-june>)

WASHINGTON (AP) — The U.S. government ran a monthly budget surplus in June, putting it on course to record the lowest annual deficit since 2008. The Treasury Department says the June surplus totaled $71 billion, following a $130 billion deficit in May. The government also ran a surplus in June 2013, bolstered by dividends from Fannie Mae, the mortgage giant under federal conservatorship for the past six years. For the first nine months of this budget year, the deficit totals $366 billion, down 28 percent from the same period in 2013. Tax receipts are up 8 percent compared to the prior year-to-date, while spending has increased 1 percent. The Congressional Budget Office is forecasting a deficit of $492 billion for the full budget year ending Sept. 30.

2NC – Spending Down (2/4)

**US deficit is declining**

**Felsenthal 7/12** (Mark Felsenthal, Journalist, 7/12/14, “White House trims 2014 deficit projection to $583 billion,” BDN Main Nation, <https://bangordailynews.com/2014/07/12/news/nation/white-house-trims-2014-deficit-projection-to-583-billion/>)

WASHINGTON — The White House lowered its U.S. federal deficit forecast for the 2014 fiscal year by $66 billion to $583 billion on Friday on the basis of gathering economic momentum as evidenced by gains in hiring. “The deficit has been cut by more than half as a share of the economy, representing the most rapid sustained deficit reduction since World War II, and it continues to fall,” acting White House budget director Brian Deese said in a statement. Despite the narrower deficit, Republicans and analysts raised concerns about high levels of debt over the long term. The White House projection shows that, even though the debt is on a declining path, it would reach 72 percent of GDP in 2024 instead of 69 percent as originally estimated, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted. The Obama administration projected a $649 billion deficit for the fiscal year ending on Sept. 30 when it delivered its budget proposal to Congress in March. The deficit peaked at $1.4 trillion in 2009 in the aftermath of the recession that ended that year. The White House said it revised its forecast in the mid-session review because the national unemployment rate has come down more rapidly than expected. The jobless rate fell to 6.1 percent in June from 6.7 percent in March, a six-year low. The administration said it expects the deficit to be 3.4 percent of gross domestic product for the year, down from 3.7 percent, and to fall to below 3 percent of GDP in 2015. President Barack Obama in recent speeches has pointed to an improving economic climate, citing gains in hiring, housing and manufacturing. But wages have lagged and polls show many Americans remain downbeat about their prospects five years into the recovery from the recession.

**US deficit is declining**

**McIntyre 7/9** (Douglas A. McIntyre, Host of Mcintyre in the Morning; Winner of the Best Columnist award in 2011, “Is the U.S. Headed Toward a Budget Surplus?” 24/7 Wall St, <http://247wallst.com/economy/2014/07/09/is-the-u-s-headed-toward-a-budget-surplus/>)

The last time the United States had a budget surplus was in 2001, according the White House. Unimaginably, it may have one again, and within a very few years. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently estimated that the federal deficit through the first nine months was $366 billion, which was significantly better than the $510 billion deficit for the same period during the 2013 fiscal year. The primary reason for the improvement was receipts, which improved by $172 billion.

2NC – Spending Down (3/4)

**US deficit is declining**

**Taylor 7/13** (Andrew Taylor, journalist for Associated Press, 7/13/14, “US deficit in 2014 forecast to drop by US$100 billion: White House,” The China Post, <http://www.chinapost.com.tw/international/americas/2014/07/13/412241/US-deficit.htm>)

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. government's budget deficit will drop to US$583 billion this year, the lowest level of President Barack Obama's tenure, the White House said Friday. Last year's deficit was US$680 billion. The latest update from the White House budget office is also US$66 billion less than the administration predicted earlier this year when releasing the president's budget. Obama presided over trillion-dollar-plus deficits during his first term as the economy struggled to recover from a deep recession and financial crisis. Attempts to strike deals on spending cuts and revenue increases with GOP leaders such as House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio have failed, though Obama was successful in muscling through a tax increase on wealthier earners in early 2013. Tight spending on annual agency budgets is also responsible for lower deficits. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects an even lower deficit of US$492 billion for the budget year ending Sept. 30. “Under the president's leadership, the deficit has been cut by more than half as a share of the economy, representing the most rapid sustained deficit reduction since World War II, and it continues to fall,” said acting White House budget director Brian Deese. “At the same time, our economy is moving forward and businesses are creating jobs. Businesses have added nearly 10 million new jobs over the past 52 months.”

**Budget Surplus now**

**AP, 7/11/14** (7/11/14, “Untied Sttaes Records 71 Billion Budget Surplus in June”, http://www.ndtv.com/article/world/united-states-records-71-billion-budget-surplus-in-june-557217)

Washington: The US government ran a monthly budget surplus in June, putting it on course to record the lowest annual deficit since 2008.¶ The Treasury Department said Friday that its June surplus totaled $71 billion, following a $130 billion deficit in May. The government also ran a surplus in June 2013, bolstered by dividends from Fannie Mae, the mortgage giant under federal conservatorship for the past six years.¶ For the first nine months of this budget year, the deficit totals $366 billion, down 28 percent from the same period in 2013. Tax receipts are up 8 percent compared to the prior year-to-date, while spending has increased 1 percent.¶ The Congressional Budget Office is forecasting a deficit of $492 billion for the full budget year ending Sept. 30. That would be the narrowest gap since 2008.¶ In 2008, the government recorded a deficit of $458.6 billion, which was the record high for deficits up to that time.¶ But with the outbreak of the recession, deficits soared to unprecedented levels, exceeding $1 trillion for four consecutive years. Tax revenues fell during that period, while government boosted spending in an attempt to stabilize the financial system and provide relief to people who had lost jobs.¶ The yearly deficit peaked at $1.4 trillion in 2009 during the worst of the financial crisis. It gradually fell from there, plunging to $680.2 billion last year.¶ Over the next decade, CBO is projecting that the deficits will total $7.6 trillion.¶ The deficit will fall to $469 billion in 2015 before rising again and topping $1 trillion annually starting in 2023, according to the CBO. Spending on the government's major benefit programs, including Social Security and Medicare, will drive those increases as more baby boomers retire.

2NC – Spending Down (4/4)

**Fiscal Discipline now**

**Sparshott**, Reporter at The Wall Street Journal, 1/13/**14**

(Jeffrey, 1/13/14, “US Posts December Budget Surplus of $53.22 Billion”, http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303595404579318742766736128)

WASHINGTON—The federal government posted a budget surplus in December after mortgage giants Fannie Mae FNMA -0.25% and Freddie Mac FMCC +0.25% posted big payments to the Treasury, further narrowing the deficit in the first quarter of the fiscal year.¶ Revenues outpaced spending by $53.22 billion in December, the first surplus for the month since the 2007 fiscal year and the biggest on record. Economists surveyed by Dow Jones had forecast a $44.5 billion surplus.¶ Federal finances have been improving steadily as spending remains contained and revenues rise.¶ Federal revenue climbed by 8% to $664.60 billion in the first three months of the latest fiscal year. Individual income and payroll taxes accounted for the bulk of the increase, largely a result of higher tax rates that kicked in during the 2013 calendar year.¶ Spending fell 8% in the first quarter to $838.20 billion, in large part because of improving finances at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The two companies paid $39.57 billion to the Treasury at the end of last year. Because of the way the government accounts for the funds, they are deducted from spending, rather than included in revenues.¶ The latest budget figures follow trends from 2013, when the deficit fell below $1 trillion for the first time in five years. The $680.28 billion shortfall for the full year was down by more than one-third from 2012 as a slowly recovering economy and higher tax rates boosted receipts.¶ U.S. lawmakers in December negotiated a two-year budget deal, setting a $1.012 trillion spending ceiling for the 2014 fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30.

**Falling deficits but we still need to curb spending**

**Boccia**, Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs,Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, The Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, Fraser, Heritage Expert, and Goff, Policy analyst, transportation and infrastructure, Thomas A Roe for Economic Policy Studies **13**

(Romina, Alison, Emily, “Federal spending by the numbers, 2013: Government spending trends in graphics, tables, and key points”, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/08/federal-spending-by-the-numbers-2013>)

In 2013, federal spending approached $3.5 trillion and the deficit dropped to “only” $642 billion. Some are using this small improvement in the nation’s fiscal situation to avoid further budget tightening. But as the figures and graphics in this report show, this is the wrong conclusion to draw. Following four years of trillion-dollar deficits, the national debt will still reach nearly $17 trillion and exceed 100 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) at the end of the year. Publicly held debt (the debt borrowed in credit markets, excluding Social Security’s trust fund, for example), is alarmingly high at three-quarters of GDP. Without further spending cuts, it is on track to rise to a level last seen after World War II.¶ Deficits fell in 2013 because President Obama and Congress raised taxes on all Americans, the economy saw slight improvement which helped to bring in more revenue, and spending cuts from sequestration and spending caps under the Budget Control Act of 2011 took effect.¶ The nation should not take this short-term and modest deficit improvement as a signal to grow complacent about reining in exploding spending. Though deficits will decline for a few more years, existing spending cuts and tax increases will not prevent them from rising soon, and within a decade exceeding $1 trillion once again. Driving this is federal spending which, despite sequestration cuts, will grow 69 percent by 2023.¶ The nation’s long-term spending trajectory remains on a fiscal collision course. Total spending has exploded by 40 percent since 2002, even after inflation. Some programs have grown far in excess of that. Defense, however, has been slashed. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Obamacare are so large and growing that they are on track to overwhelm the federal budget. While the Budget Control Act of 2011 and sequestration are modestly restraining the discretionary budget, mandatory spending—including entitlements—continues growing nearly unabated. Without any changes, mandatory spending, including net interest, will consume three-fourths of the budget in just one decade.

2NC – US Key to Global Econ (1/3)

**Financial crises in the US spills over - all markets are reliant on the US**

**Harris and Burrows 09** (PhD in European History @ Cambridge and Counselor of the US National Intelligence Council AND Member of the National Intelligence Council’s Long Range Analysis Unit (Mathew J. and Jennifer, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis,” April, Washington Quarterly, <http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr_Burrows.pdf>)

Such was the world the NIC foresaw as the crisis unfolded. Now, emerging markets the world over have lost more than half of their value since September 2008 alone. Banks that have never reported a net loss earnings quarter were dissolved in a matter of days. Even with the one year anniversary of the Bear Stearns collapse approaching in March, markets may have yet to find a floor. The proportions of the current crisis hardly need familiarizing. As the panic has not yet given way to a lucid picture of the impacts, most economists and political forecasters are smart enough to shy away from sweeping predictions amid the fog of crisis. Yet, in the post-crisis world, it seems conceivable that global growth will most likely be muted, deflation will remain a risk while any decoupling of the industrialized from developing countries is unlikely, the state will be the relative winner while authoritarianism may not, and U.S. consumption as the engine for global growth will slowly fade. Whether U.S. political and market clout will follow, and whether U.S. political leadership will come equipped with knowledge of the strategic forces affecting the United States remains to be seen. How Much of a Geopolitical ‘‘Game Changer’’ is the Financial Crisis? Mapping the NIC’s predictions against early facts, one of the most interesting observations is less about any particular shock generated by the financial crisis and more about its global reach. If anything, the crisis has underscored the importance of globalization as the overriding force or ‘‘mega-driver’’ as it was characterized in both the NIC’s 2020 and 2025 Global Trends works. Developing countries have been hurt as decoupling theories, assertions that the emerging markets have appreciably weaned themselves from the U.S. economy, have been dispelled. This second epicenter of the crisis in emerging markets could also continue to exacerbate and prolong the crisis. Alongside foreseeable exposures, such as Pakistan with its large current account deficit, are less predictable panics like Dubai, whose debt was financed on suddenly expensive dollars. Even those with cash reserves, such as Russia and South Korea, have been severely buffeted.

2NC – US Key to Global Econ (2/3)

**The US is key to the global economy**

**Caploe 09** (CEO of the American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia, PhD in International Political Economy @ Princeton (David, “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression.

2NC – US Key to Global Econ (3/3)

**Empirics prove**

**Sesit 08** (Michael, Bloomberg News Columnist, “The four myths of economic decoupling,” The Korea Herald, February 16, 2008, http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/returnTo.do?returnToKey=20\_T6876616661)

Myth No. 2: The rest of the world can escape the clutches of a U.S. slowdown. Not according to history. The United States has had five recessions since 1970. Each time, other economies' GDP growth also declined. The U.S. economy fell an average of 3.8 percent during the recessions of 1974-75, 1980, 1982, 1991 and 2001, with other industrial countries slowing an average of 2 percent, Latin America falling 1.7 percent and emerging Asia declining 1.3 percent, according to the International Monetary Fund. "Despite all the chatter about one region or another being immune from problems in the United States, the reality is that in a globalized economy characterized by rising cross-border flows of goods, services and capital, only hermit economies like North Korea are truly de-linked from planet Earth," says Joseph Quinlan, New York-based chief market strategist at Bank of America Capital Management. "Every one, more or less, sinks or swims in the global village." Myth No. 3: Rising demand in the developing world will compensate for the expected drop in U.S. consumer spending.Emerging-market countries are consuming more, yet growth in many of them is still mostly driven by exports, not domestic demand. Moreover, 2.55 billion people -- almost half the population of the developing world -- lived on less than $2 a day in 2004, the latest year of available data, according to the World Bank and Bank of America. U.S. consumers spent $9.27 trillion in 2006, or 3.5 times the aggregate $2.62 trillion personal-consumption expenditure of the so-called BRIC countries: Brazil, Russia, India and China. Myth No. 4: Growing intra-Asian trade -- especially that between China and other countries in the region -- will make up for lost exports caused by a steep U.S. slowdown. No doubt, intra-regional trade is growing rapidly, but much of it reflects shipments of intermediate goods. Still, 61 percent of emerging Asia's exports are ultimately consumed in the U.S., European Union and Japan, according to the Asian Development Bank, while Asian developing countries account for just 21 percent of final demand. "The U.S. is still more important to each Asian country's total output than demand from other ex-Japan Asian economies combined," the bank said in a recent report.Myth No. 5: Europe is becoming less dependent on the United States. True, America accounts for only 12 percent of EU exports to countries outside the 25-nation bloc, down from 18 percent in 2000. But exports aren't the whole story. Sales by U.S. affiliates of German companies totaled $352 billion in 2005, the last year of available data -- four times the $86 billion of German exports to America. Meanwhile, Dutch U.S. affiliate sales were 16 times exports, U.K.-affiliate sales 7.6 times British exports and French-affiliate sales 5.9 times. "If the U.S. economy heads south, so too will the earnings of many European firms," Quinlan says. What's more, Wall Street's pull on the world's financial markets is unrivaled. "U.S. equity returns remain the single biggest driver of global equity returns," says David Woo, London-based head of global currency strategy at Barclays Capital. "A sizable U.S. equity correction, by precipitating a global equity correction, will likely lead to a synchronized global economic slowdown."

\*\*\*MORE AFF ANSWERS TO SPENDING DA\*\*\*

2AC – Spending Now

**The Treasury is accelerating government spending**

**Cagahastian 7/8** (David Cagahastian, writer, 7/8/14, “Treasury claims to have accelerated government spending in June,” Business Mirror, <http://businessmirror.com.ph/index.php/en/news/top-news/35134-treasury-claims-to-have-accelerated-government-spending-in-june>)

The government on Tuesday claimed to have accelerated its spending activities in June by an undetermined amount, the event happening months after a slowdown in the disbursement of funds that enabled it to post a surplus in May instead. This is significant in that the government is supposed to have engaged in a fiscal stimulus program that has yet to find fulfillment in a year when local output, measured as the gross domestic product (GDP), came out lower than expected and seen by some to disappoint, even the most conservative analyst. National Treasurer Rosalia de Leon said there had been an uptick in the expenditures in June, based on initial figures compiled by the Bureau of the Treasury. “For June, what we’ve seen is that there’s an acceleration in the disbursement program. There are no final numbers yet but there will be an improvement in terms of expenditures, although the deficit will still be within the program,” de Leon said. The latter pertains to the deliberately crafted program to spend far more than government expects to generate from its collection activities and for this deficit to act as stimulus for accelerated growth. This fiscal imbalance or deficit was programmed to equal at least 2 percent of GDP. Figures from the Department of Finance (DOF) show the government posting an P11.8-billion surplus in May, or the five-month balance as budget excess totaling P8.5 billion. The DOF said the surplus position was due to buoyant revenue collection even as spending also slowed slightly during the January-to-May period. De Leon said the slowdown in spending, which some analysts believe could affect economic growth because government spending is a key growth driver, could be because of the decreased need to disburse money in areas affected by Supertyphoon Yolanda which hit the country late last year. For the period January-to-May, government spending still increased by 5 percent from disbursement figures reported for the period in 2013. As of end-May, the government already spent P786.6 billion compared to P747.27 billion disbursed over five months by the government in 2013. Revenue collections from January to May 2014 were up to P795.1 billion, with the Bureau of Internal Revenue collecting the most with P549.1 billion for the five-month period.

1AR – Spending Now (1/5)

**The government is going to go on a spending spree between now and September**

**Carrol 7/7** (Rebecca Carroll, Senior Correspondent; BA from University of Pennsylvania, 7/7/14, “Why the Government Is Probably about to Go on a Spending Spree,” Nextgov, <http://www.nextgov.com/cio-briefing/2014/07/why-government-probably-about-go-spending-spree/88039/>)

Agencies will make 35.4 percent of their 2014 purchases between this month and the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30, with most of that activity occurring in September, Deltek predicted. In a typical recent year, 32.4 percent of all spending took place in the fourth quarter, and 18 percent occurred in September alone, Deltek found. The numbers are even higher for specific procurement types and at certain agencies. For instance, in the last five years, 39 percent of government information technology purchases were made in the fourth quarter. “Agencies can hold off on software and IT equipment upgrades,” Carey Webster, Deltek’s director of federal information solutions, explained in a webinar. “At the same time, it’s very easy to procure these types of services quickly when there is money to burn.” Large aerospace and defense acquisitions that take years to procure are less likely to take place quickly at the end of the year, which is why the Energy and Defense departments and NASA are the agencies least prone to balloon spending in the final quarter, as a percentage of their overall spending. The State Department, meanwhile, makes more than half of its purchases -- 56 percent -- in the fourth quarter. Researchers didn’t know why this was the case; they checked for an anomalous year that may have thrown off the average, but larger fourth-quarter spending has been the norm at the department for the last five years, at least, Webster said. The departments of Interior and Health and Human Service and the U.S. Agency for International Development were the next most likely to save their purchases for the last quarter, spending an average of 47 percent, 46 percent and 44 percent of their contracting budgets at the yearend, respectively. Deltek based its analysis on this year’s enacted discretionary budget of $1,127 billion. In recent years, about 43 percent of the discretionary budget is contracted, the analysis found. Assuming the pattern holds this year, about $489.5 billion will have gone to contractors by the end of September. Because the year started off slow -- only about 17 percent of estimated expenditures were contracted out in the first quarter -- Deltek expects federal outlays of about $168.2 billion this quarter, or 35.4 percent.

**Government spending remains high**

**Hood 7/1** (John Hood, President and Chairman of the John Locke Foundation President and Chairman of the John Locke Foundation, 7/1/14, “John Hood: Government spending remains high,” The Durhan News, <http://www.thedurhamnews.com/2014/07/01/3975884/john-hood-government-spending.html>)

Total state spending adjusted for inflation and population growth reached its highest point in 2011-12, at about $5,350 per person. It has declined slightly since then, primarily because of lower recession-related federal funding, but remains well over $5,000. That’s higher than any year before 2012, and about double what North Carolina spent as recently as the late 1980s.

1AR – Spending Now (2/5)

**Government spending high now**

**Bilmes 2/5** (Linda Bilmes, Daniel Patrick Moynihan Senior Lecturer in Public Policy, 2/5/14, “Reforming the Budget: Four Steps to Restore Fiscal Discipline,” Brookings, <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/fixgov/posts/2014/02/04-budget-reform-accounting-system-overhead-bilmes>)

America’s dysfunctional budget process has been mired in federal shutdowns and debt ceiling brinksmanship for the past several years. No wonder citizens’ confidence in government is at its lowest in four decades. Conventional wisdom in Washington is that hyper-partisanship has infected appropriations along with everything else, and that barring a dramatic shift in political tone, the best we can do is to pass one-off deals such as the recent Ryan-Murray bill. But there are a series of structural reforms that could substantially improve the way the US does budgeting, and which could be enacted by a bipartisan majority dedicated to good government. The current budget system is broken: it consumes far too much time for little gain. Every year, thousands of officials across government prepare detailed estimates of how much it will cost to run their organizations, which Congress mostly ignores. Instead, we enact budgets based on the previous year’s spending—not based on true need, shifting priorities or changing realities. As a result, Congress has enacted 75 stopgap “continuing resolutions” during the past decade. In an effort to illustrate value, federal agencies also conduct an elaborate annual process to evaluate how well they are performing, but these assessments have almost no impact on Congressional appropriations. Meanwhile, Congress has spent trillions for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan using more than 30 such “emergency supplemental" bills, which circumvent normal budget caps and scrutiny. Even worse, we can’t keep track of where the money goes. Federal accounting systems provide little management information and are completely unsuited to rooting out overhead, duplication and inefficiencies. Most agency budgets are simply long itemized lists of salaries and expenses. There is no mechanism for calculating costs by the type of service delivered, and no way for managers to obtain such information. The process lags far behind many local governments, which break down their spending into “program budgeting”–providing much greater transparency over expenses, costs and overheads at each stage in the process. The lack of functional budgeting and accounting has lowered the quality, and increased the cost of federal government services. Agencies are unsure how much money they will have for next year, or even next month. A recent study by Philip Joyce of the University of Maryland showed that such funding delays result in a series of inefficiencies. Agencies pay higher prices than necessary to hire contractors because the government needs to use short-term contracts. Agencies too often delay maintenance, leading to higher costs in the future and significant harm to employee morale, retention, hiring and training. In a separate study, my Harvard colleague Jeffrey Liebman found that federal agency spending spikes in the 52nd week of the fiscal year, and unsurprisingly, much of that spending goes to lower-quality items.

1AR – Spending Now (3/5)

**Spending high now – its being masked by tax collections**

**Manning 14** (Rick, Public Affairs Chief of Staff at the U.S. Department of Labor during the George W. Bush Administration, and has worked in numerous grassroots and political communications roles, most notably, as a state lobbyist for the National Rifle Association for nine years, 6/18/14, “Federal revenues and spending rise but no balanced budget”, http://netrightdaily.com/2014/06/federal-revenues-spending-rise-balanced-budget/)

The federal government released the good news that revenue collections have reached an all-time high with total receipts of $1.935 trillion from October 1, 2013 to the end of May. The federal government projects that total federal government revenues for the entire year will reach just slightly more than $3 trillion.¶ Yet, even with this unprecedented flow of cash into the nation’s Treasury, the October-May deficit is an astounding $436 billion with May’s deficit alone totaling almost $130 billion.¶ The problem is that the record revenue flows are largely driven by growth inhibiting tax increases and the restoration of the payroll tax after a short-term stimulus cut. Yet, rather than holding the spending line so revenues could catch up with spending, the federal government is projected to spend $3.65 trillion for the year, more than ever in history.¶ In fact, federal spending in this fiscal year is jumping by almost $200 billion according to Treasury Department projections.

Year Receipts Outlays Surplus or Deficit (-)

2009 2,104,989 3,517,677 -1,412,688

2010 2,162,706 3,457,079 -1,294,373

2011 2,303,466 3,603,059 -1,299,593

2012 2,450,164 3,537,127 -1,086,963

2013 2,775,103 3,454,605 -679,502

2014 estimate 3,001,721 3,650,526 -648,805

2015 estimate 3,337,425 3,900,989 -563,564

2016 estimate 3,567,952 4,099,078 -531,126

2017 estimate 3,810,779 4,268,606 -457,827

2018 estimate 4,029,856 4,443,145 -413,289

2019 estimate 4,226,119 4,728,791 -502,672

With almost two/thirds of all federal government spending on automatic pilot, the above chart shows the mushrooming growth of outlays even with receipts projected to double from 2009 to 2019.¶ If the projected increase in federal government expenditures only rise by 2 percent over the next two years rather than the current 9.3 percent rise, and the receipts remained as projected, the deficit would be reduced to $256 billion in just those two years. Incredibly, this two percent increase in federal government spending over the next two years would lower the increase in the national debt by more than half a trillion dollars over that time.

1AR – Spending Now (4/5)

**NonUQ – billions spent on climate change activities now**

**Clabough**, Marketing Assistant at Job Corps, Writer at The New American, **13**

(Raven, 10/30/13, “Government to spend twice as much on global warming than border security”, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/16836-govt-to-spend-twice-as-much-on-global-warming-than-border-security)

Estimates reveal that the federal government will spend more money on fighting global warming than it will on tightening border security. Global-warming spending is estimated to cost approximately $22.2 billion this year, twice as much as the $12 billion estimated for customs and border enforcement.¶ According to the White House, there are currently 18 federal agencies engaged in activities related to global warming. Those agencies fund programs that include scientific research, international climate assistance, renewable energy technology, and subsidies for renewable energy producers.¶ Republicans have criticized the administration for its global-warming efforts and have demanded more transparency. The online Daily Caller reported, “Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been calling on the heads of major federal agencies to testify on global warming activities.”¶ The efforts to acquire testimony have been mostly unsuccessful, however, with just the heads of the Energy Department and Environmental Protection Agency agreeing to testify in front of the House of Representatives.¶ “With billions of dollars currently being spent annually on climate change activities, Congress and the public should understand the scope of what the federal government is doing, how the billions of dollars are being spent, and what it will accomplish,” said Kentucky Republican Rep. Ed Whitfield. “Anyone who believes the committee ought to be focusing its attention on climate change related issues should be standing with us to get these answers.”

**NonUQ- spending increasing**

**Dorfman**, professor of economics at The University of Georgia, consultant on economic issues to a variety of corporations and local governments, author of Ending the Era of the Free Lunch, Contributor at Forbes, **14**

(3/6/14, “The federal reserve is enabling Obama and Congress’ Out of control spending”, http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffreydorfman/2014/03/06/the-federal-reserve-is-enabling-obama-and-congress-out-of-control-spending/)

In the past twelve months the federal government has increased the national debt held by the public by $697 billion while the total debt has grown by $820 billion. Since revenue collected by the government is at record highs, these enormous deficits must be due to spending. Among the many extraordinary measures taken by the Federal Reserve over the past five or so years are several that are serving to enable President Obama and Congress in continuing to spend with little, if any, restraint. If we hope to get spending under control, it would help if the Fed stopped encouraging so much wasteful spending.

1AR – Spending Now (5/5)

**Lavish spending now**

**Boccia**, Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs,Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, The Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, Fraser, Heritage Expert, and Goff, Policy analyst, transportation and infrastructure, Thomas A Roe for Economic Policy Studies **13**

(Romina, Alison, Emily, “Federal spending by the numbers, 2013: Government spending trends in graphics, tables, and key points”, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/08/federal-spending-by-the-numbers-2013>)

Obamacare will add $1.8 trillion to federal health care spending by 2023. By 2015, health care spending will overtake Social Security as the largest budget item, including Obamacare’s coverage expansion provisions: a massive expansion of Medicaid and subsidies for the new health insurance exchanges.

While mandatory spending is growing out of control and needs reform, there are also plenty of places to cut in the rest of the budget. For example, the Internal Revenue Service spent $4.1 million on a lavish conference in 2010 for 2,609 of its employees in Anaheim, California. Expenses included $50,000 for line-dancing and “Star Trek” parody videos, $135,350 for outside speakers, $64,000 in conference “swag” for the employees, plus free meals, cocktails, and hotel suite upgrades.

Beyond waste, the federal government is too big. Energy spending increased over 2,000 percent since 2002—after adjusting for inflation. Today there are roughly 80 means-tested anti-poverty programs.

Washington must stop kicking the can down the road, or we could soon find ourselves teetering on the edge of a Greece-style meltdown. Instead, lawmakers should eliminate waste, duplication, and inappropriate spending; privatize functions better left to the private sector; and leave areas best managed on a more local level to states and localities. And they should make important changes to the entitlement programs so that they become more affordable and benefits help those with the greatest needs.

2AC – Spending Good

**Spending aids governments and averts collapse**

**Krugman, 2011** (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; “The Truth About Federal Spending”; 7/29/2011; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/07/29/the-truth-about-federal-spending/)

Whenever someone like me or Bruce Bartlett points out how little Obama resembles the right’s portrait of a raging leftist, someone is sure to come back with the assertion that Obama has presided over a vast expansion of federal spending. Even people who really should know better, like John Taylor, do it. So what’s the truth? I’ve written about this before, but here’s another take. The fact is that federal spending rose from 19.6% of GDP in fiscal 2007 to 23.8% of GDP in fiscal 2010. So isn’t that a huge spending spree? Well, no. First of all, the size of a ratio depends on the denominator as well as the numerator. GDP has fallen sharply relative to the economy’s potential; here’s the ratio of real GDP to the CBO’s estimate of potential GDP: A 6 percent fall in GDP relative to trend, all by itself, would have raised the ratio of spending to GDP from 19.6 to 20.8, or about 30 percent of the actual rise. That still leaves a rise in spending; but most of that is safety-net programs, which spend more in hard times because more people are in distress. The CBO breaks out “income security” (Table E-10 in Historical Budget Tables), which is unemployment insurance, food stamps, etc., and also gives us numbers on Medicaid; here’s what they look like as percentages of GDP: That’s another 2 points of GDP, or about half the rise. So we’re still left with a bit, around 1 point of GDP. That’s the stimulus, more or less. And there are two things you need to know about it. First, it’s temporary, and already fading out fast. Second, a large part of the stimulus “spending” was actually aid to state and local governments, intended not to expand spending but to avert a fall — that is, it was about maintaining government, not expanding it.

1AR – Spending Good (1/3)

**Spending myths are wrong-Spending actually has a ‘large positive multiplier’**

**Krugman, 2014** (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; “No Time For Sargent”; 4/21/2014; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/21/no-time-for-sargent/)

So when Sargent reminds us that communities face trade-offs, that’s much less clear at a time when the community is not at all like an individual – in which there are substantial amounts of unemployed resources, and putting those resources to work would be pure gain, not a tradeoff. And then he tells us this: When a government spends, its citizens eventually pay, either today or tomorrow, either through explicit taxes or implicit ones like inflation. There are very good reasons to believe that this is just wrong under current conditions. There’s overwhelming evidence that in an economy against the zero lower bound government spending has a large, positive multiplier, so the goods the government buys don’t come at the expense of other consumption or investment; and there’s a reasonable argument to the effect that even in purely fiscal terms spending more than pays for itself.

1AR – Spending Good (2/3)

**Spending helps sustain the economy and prevents a second Great Depression**

**Krugman, 2013** (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; “Dwindling Deficit Disorder”; 3/10/2013; http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/11/opinion/krugman-dwindling-deficit-disorder.html?\_r=0)

For three years and more, policy debate in Washington has been dominated by warnings about the dangers of budget deficits. A few lonely economists have tried from the beginning to point out that this fixation is all wrong, that deficit spending is actually appropriate in a depressed economy. But even though the deficit scolds have been wrong about everything so far — where are the soaring interest rates we were promised? — protests that we are having the wrong conversation have consistently fallen on deaf ears. What’s really remarkable at this point, however, is the persistence of the deficit fixation in the face of rapidly changing facts. People still talk as if the deficit were exploding, as if the United States budget were on an unsustainable path; in fact, the deficit is falling more rapidly than it has for generations, it is already down to sustainable levels, and it is too small given the state of the economy. Start with the raw numbers. America’s budget deficit soared after the 2008 financial crisis and the recession that went with it, as revenue plunged and spending on unemployment benefits and other safety-net programs rose. And this rise in the deficit was a good thing! Federal spending helped sustain the economy at a time when the private sector was in panicked retreat; arguably, the stabilizing role of a large government was the main reason the Great Recession didn’t turn into a full replay of the Great Depression. But after peaking in 2009 at $1.4 trillion, the deficit began coming down. The Congressional Budget Office expects the deficit for fiscal 2013 (which began in October and is almost half over) to be $845 billion. That may still sound like a big number, but given the state of the economy it really isn’t. Bear in mind that the budget doesn’t have to be balanced to put us on a fiscally sustainable path; all we need is a deficit small enough that debt grows more slowly than the economy. To take the classic example, America never did pay off the debt from World War II — in fact, our debt doubled in the 30 years that followed the war. But debt as a percentage of G.D.P. fell by three-quarters over the same period. Right now, a sustainable deficit would be around $460 billion. The actual deficit is bigger than that. But according to new estimates by the budget office, half of our current deficit reflects the effects of a still-depressed economy. The “cyclically adjusted” deficit — what the deficit would be if we were near full employment — is only about $423 billion, which puts it in the sustainable range; next year the budget office expects that number to fall to just $172 billion. And that’s why budget office projections show the nation’s debt position more or less stable over the next decade. So we do not, repeat do not, face any kind of deficit crisis either now or for years to come. There are, of course, longer-term fiscal issues: rising health costs and an aging population will put the budget under growing pressure over the course of the 2020s. But I have yet to see any coherent explanation of why these longer-run concerns should determine budget policy right now. And as I said, given the needs of the economy, the deficit is currently too small. Put it this way: Smart fiscal policy involves having the government spend when the private sector won’t, supporting the economy when it is weak and reducing debt only when it is strong. Yet the cyclically adjusted deficit as a share of G.D.P. is currently about what it was in 2006, at the height of the housing boom — and it is headed down. Yes, we’ll want to reduce deficits once the economy recovers, and there are gratifying signs that a solid recovery is finally under way. But unemployment, especially long-term unemployment, is still unacceptably high. “The boom, not the slump, is the time for austerity,” John Maynard Keynes declared many years ago. He was right — all you have to do is look at Europe to see the disastrous effects of austerity on weak economies. And this is still nothing like a boom. Now, I’m aware that the facts about our dwindling deficit are unwelcome in many quarters. Fiscal fearmongering is a major industry inside the Beltway, especially among those looking for excuses to do what they really want, namely dismantle Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. People whose careers are heavily invested in the deficit-scold industry don’t want to let evidence undermine their scare tactics; as the deficit dwindles, we’re sure to encounter a blizzard of bogus numbers purporting to show that we’re still in some kind of fiscal crisis. But we aren’t. The deficit is indeed dwindling, and the case for making the deficit a central policy concern, which was never very strong given low borrowing costs and high unemployment, has now completely vanished.

1AR – Spending Good (3/3)

**Spending averts a great depression**

**Stiglitz, 2010** (Joseph E. Stiglitz; University Professor at Columbia University and recipient of the 2001 Nobel Prize in Economics; ”Stiglitz: The Dangers of Deficit Reduction”; 3/5/10; http://www.sfbg.com/bruce/2010/03/05/stiglitz-dangers-deficit-reduction)

NEW YORK – A wave of fiscal austerity is rushing over Europe and America. The magnitude of budget deficits – like the magnitude of the downturn – has taken many by surprise. But despite protests by the yesterday’s proponents of deregulation, who would like the government to remain passive, most economists believe that government spending has made a difference, helping to avert another Great Depression. Most economists also agree that it is a mistake to look at only one side of a balance sheet (whether for the public or private sector). One has to look not only at what a country or firm owes, but also at its assets. This should help answer those financial sector hawks who are raising alarms about government spending. After all, even deficit hawks acknowledge that we should be focusing not on today’s deficit, but on the long-term national debt. Spending, especially on investments in education, technology, and infrastructure, can actually lead to lower long-term deficits. Banks’ short-sightedness helped create the crisis; we cannot let government short-sightedness – prodded by the financial sector – prolong it. Faster growth and returns on public investment yield higher tax revenues, and a 5 to 6% return is more than enough to offset temporary increases in the national debt. A social cost-benefit analysis (taking into account impacts other than on the budget) makes such expenditures, even when debt-financed, even more attractive. Finally, most economists agree that, apart from these considerations, the appropriate size of a deficit depends in part on the state of the economy. A weaker economy calls for a larger deficit, and the appropriate size of the deficit in the face of a recession depends on the precise circumstances. It is here that economists disagree. Forecasting is always difficult, but especially so in troubled times. What has happened is (fortunately) not an everyday occurrence; it would be foolish to look at past recoveries to predict this one. In America, for instance, bad debt and foreclosures are at levels not seen for three-quarters of a century; the decline in credit in 2009 was the largest since 1942. Comparisons to the Great Depression are also deceptive, because the economy today is so different in so many ways. And nearly all so-called experts have proven highly fallible – witness the United States Federal Reserve’s dismal forecasting record before the crisis. Yet, even with large deficits, economic growth in the US and Europe is anemic, and forecasts of private-sector growth suggest that in the absence of continued government support, there is risk of continued stagnation – of growth too weak to return unemployment to normal levels anytime soon. The risks are asymmetric: if these forecasts are wrong, and there is a more robust recovery, then, of course, expenditures can be cut back and/or taxes increased. But if these forecasts are right, then a premature “exit” from deficit spending risks pushing the economy back into recession. This is one of the lessons we should have learned from America’s experience in the Great Depression; it is also one of the lessons to emerge from Japan’s experience in the late 1990’s. These points are particularly germane for the hardest-hit economies. The United Kingdom, for example, has had a harder time than other countries for an obvious reason: it had a real-estate bubble (though of less consequence than in Spain), and finance, which was at the epicenter of the crisis, played a more important role in its economy than it does in other countries. The UK’s weaker performance is not the result of worse policies; indeed, compared to the US, its bank bailouts and labor-market policies were, in many ways, far better. It avoided the massive waste of human resources associated with high unemployment in America, where almost one out of five people who would like a full-time job cannot find one. As the global economy returns to growth, governments should, of course, have plans on the drawing board to raise taxes and cut expenditures. The right balance will inevitably be a subject of dispute. Principles like “it is better to tax bad things than good things” might suggest imposing environmental taxes. The financial sector has imposed huge externalities on the rest of society. America’s financial industry polluted the world with toxic mortgages, and, in line with the well established “polluter pays” principle, taxes should be imposed on it. Besides, well-designed taxes on the financial sector might help alleviate problems caused by excessive leverage and banks that are too big to fail. Taxes on speculative activity might encourage banks to focus greater attention on performing their key societal role of providing credit. Over the longer term, most economists agree that governments, especially in advanced industrial countries with aging populations, should be concerned about the sustainability of their policies. But we must be wary of deficit fetishism. Deficits to finance wars or give-aways to the financial sector (as happened on a massive scale in the US) lead to liabilities without corresponding assets, imposing a burden on future generations. But high-return public investments that more than pay for themselves can actually improve the well-being of future generations, and it would be doubly foolish to burden them with debts from unproductive spending and then cut back on productive investments. These are questions for a later day – at least in many countries, prospects of a robust recovery are, at best, a year or two away. For now, the economics is clear: reducing government spending is a risk not worth taking.

2AC – Econ Resilient (1/2)

**Global economy is resilient- Sandy and EU prove**

**Eberly 2013** (Jan Eberly, Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy for the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, “Statement by Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy Jan Eberly for the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association”, February 4, 2013)

WASHINGTON - Economic recovery in the U.S. continued at a moderate pace over the course of 2012, with real GDP expanding by 1.5 percent following a 2.6 percent increase during 2011. After thirteen straight quarters of growth, real GDP edged down slightly in the final quarter of last year, as sharply lower defense spending, slower inventory growth, and a widening of the trade deficit offset a solid increase in consumer spending and strong growth of both residential investment and business capital spending. Job creation has accelerated in recent months. The unemployment rate declined notably over the first nine months of 2012 and has been little changed since September. The economy sustained a number of temporary shocks last year, such as a jump in energy prices early in 2012, a severe drought during the summer, and Hurricane Sandy in late October, and also contended with the ongoing sovereign debt crisis in Europe and a more general slowdown in global growth. Growth is expected to pick up in the first quarter of 2013, despite some fiscal drag. Other potential challenges this year include the risk of renewed setbacks in Europe, the impact of continued uncertainty about the U.S. fiscal situation, and the possibility of additional, sequester-related fiscal tightening. Even so, private forecasters anticipate a gradual acceleration in the pace of expansion as 2013 unfolds, as well as further progress in reducing unemployment. According to the advance report released last week, real GDP edged down 0.1 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, compared with a 3.1 percent advance in the third quarter. The swing was due in part to a 6.6 decline in government spending. Federal outlays fell 15.0 percent – the largest quarterly decline in four decades – as federal defense purchases plummeted 22.2 percent. In the third quarter, federal spending rose sharply, boosted by a jump in defense outlays. The composition of the pronounced swing between Q3 and Q4 suggests that uncertainty about the impending sequester played a role. State and local government spending, which has been falling nearly continuously since late 2009, declined 0.7 percent in Q4. Altogether, the decline in government expenditures cut 1¼ percentage points from real GDP growth in Q4. GDP growth in late 2012 was also held back by a sharp slowdown in private inventory accumulation, which subtracted 1¼ percentage points from real GDP in the fourth quarter after adding 0.7 percentage point to growth in the third quarter. The drought-related drawdown in farm inventories, which reduced GDP growth in the prior two quarters, slowed. A wider trade deficit subtracted an additional ¼ percentage point from GDP growth in the fourth quarter. Notwithstanding the slight dip in headline GDP, the main components of underlying private demand strengthened in the fourth quarter. Consumer spending, which accounts for roughly two-thirds of GDP, grew by 2.2 percent at an annual rate, accelerating from the third quarter’s 1.6 percent rise, and adding 1.5 percentage points to real growth. Business fixed investment grew 8.4 percent in the fourth quarter, contributing 0.8 percentage point to growth. Equipment and software investment rose at a 12.4 percent pace after falling by 2.6 percent in the prior quarter. Residential investment grew by 15.3 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, up from 13.5 percent in the third quarter, and contributed 0.4 percentage point to GDP growth. Residential investment has increased in each of the past seven quarters -- the first such string of advances in this sector since 2005 – and has grown at an average annual rate of almost 11 percent per quarter over this period. Private domestic final purchases (the sum of consumption, business fixed investment, and residential investment) jumped by 3.3 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, more than double the third’s quarter’s 1.5 percent pace. Over the past three years, this marker of a private-sector led, self-sustaining recovery has grown at an average annual rate of just under 3 percent. Labor market conditions continue to improve at a steady but gradual pace, and the most recent data show that job creation at the end of 2012 was actually faster than initially reported. Private-sector job growth averaged 225,000 per month during the fourth quarter, up from 142,000 in the third quarter, and nearly double the 117,000 jobs per month created on average in the second quarter. More than 6.1 million new jobs have been created in the private sector since the employment trough in February 2010. Moreover, underlying labor demand appears to be improving. The average private-sector workweek stood at 34.4 hours in January, up from a low of 33.8 hours in 2009 and just 0.2 hour shorter than in December 2007. The unemployment rate stood at 7.9 percent in January, up slightly from a near four-year low of 7.8 percent in November and December. Measures of longer-term unemployment as well as marginal attachment to the labor force and part-time employment continue to trend lower. The median duration of unemployment fell by 4.8 weeks over the past year to 16.0 weeks in January and is down from a high of 24.8 weeks in mid-2010. It is
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worthwhile to look at progress across the country, too: in December, 25 states reported unemployment rates that were significantly below the national average. These are all positive signs that underlying labor market conditions continue to firm. With the progress made in the housing market in the past several months, we now appear to be approaching important milestones. For example, total housing starts rose in December to a 4½ year high and the number of residential building permits issued reached their highest level since mid-2008. As of December, total existing home sales had retraced to a level about two-thirds of their 2005 peak, and the decline in new single-family homes during that month was actually attributed to a lack of supply, rather than a dearth of demand – sales in this category were still up nearly 9 percent year-over-year. The inventory of unsold new homes is just above record lows for the series, which dates to the early 1960s, and the inventory of existing homes available for sale continues to move lower and is now two-thirds below its July 2010 peak level. During 2012, residential investment climbed 14.4 percent – the strongest yearly increase since 1983. The major house price indexes have been moving higher on a year-over-year basis for the past ten months, and are now being supported by tighter supply and stronger demand conditions. Record or near-record lows in mortgage rates, a relatively high level of housing affordability, and improving household wealth are also helping to boost demand and to support broader-based improvement in the housing sector. Looking ahead, downside risks to U.S. economic activity remain, including persistent concerns about instability in European sovereign debt markets. Here at home, consumer sentiment faltered at the turn of the year in the face of fiscal uncertainty and the expiration of tax cuts. Still, energy prices have eased in very recent months, and there are signs of reviving demand in Asia. While downside risks create vulnerabilities in any economy, recent progress within the U.S. has improved the economy’s resilience in the face of potential challenges. The underlying and consistent strength of private demand over the past three years constitutes an important foundation for that resilience, and the level of real GDP is now 2.4 percent higher than in the fourth quarter of 2007, at the time of the previous expansion’s peak. After five years of decline, residential investment has added to growth in each of the past seven quarters. The workweek has lengthened to a duration close to that last seen in December 2007, the peak month of the previous upturn, and the unemployment rate is at a four-year low. These are important milestones for consumers as well as the housing and labor markets, and are evidence of a moderate and steady forward movement.
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**Econ resilient, US isn’t key, and impact empirically denied**

**Lamy ’11** (Pascal Lamy, is the Director-General of the World Trade Organization. Lamy is Honorary President of Paris-based think tank Notre Europe. Lamy graduated from the prestigious Sciences Po Paris, from HEC and ÉNA, graduating second in his year of those specializing in economics. “System Upgrade”)

The bigger test came with the 2008-2009 Great Recession, the first truly global recession since World War II. When the international economy went into free fall, trade went right along with it. Production and supply are today thoroughly global in nature, with most manufactured products made from parts and materials imported from many other countries. These global value chains have a multiplier effect on trade statistics, which explains why, as the global economy contracted by 2 percent in 2009, trade volume shrank by more than 12 percent. This multiplier effect works the other way around as well: Growth returned to 4.6 percent and trade volume grew by a record 14.5 percent over the course of 2010. Projections for trade in 2011 are also strong, with WTO economists predicting that trade volume will rise 6.5 percent during the current year. This sharp rebound in trade has proved two essential things: Markets stayed open despite ever-stronger pressures to close them, and trade is an indispensible tool for economic recovery, particularly for developing countries, which are more dependent on trade. Shortly after the crisis broke out, we in the WTO began to closely monitor the trade policy response of our member governments. Many were fearful that pressures to impose trade restrictions would prove too powerful for governments to resist. But this is not what happened. Instead, the system of rules and disciplines, agreed to over 60 years of negotiations, held firm. In a series of reports prepared for WTO members and the G-20, we found that governments acted with great restraint. At no time did the trade-restrictive measures imposed cover more than 2 percent of world imports. Moreover, the measures used -- anti-dumping duties, safeguards, and countervailing duties to offset export or production subsidies -- were those which, in the right circumstances, are permissible under WTO rules. I am not suggesting that every safeguard measure or countervailing duty imposed during those difficult days was in compliance with WTO rules, but responses to trade pressures were generally undertaken within an internationally agreed-upon framework. Countries by and large resisted overtly noncompliant measures, such as breaking legally binding tariff ceilings or imposing import bans or quotas. As markets stayed open, trade flows began to shift, and countries that shrugged off the impact of the crisis and continued to grow -- notably China, India, and Brazil -- became ever-more attractive markets for countries that were struggling, including those in Europe and North America. Trade has been a powerful engine for growth in the developing world, a fact reflected in the far greater trade-to-GDP ratios we see there. In 2010, developing countries' share of world trade expanded to a record 45 percent, and this trend looks set to continue. Decisions made in Brasilia, Beijing, and New Delhi to open their respective economies to trade have been instrumental in enabling these countries to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.
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**Best studies prove**

**Brandt and Ulfelder ‘11** (\*Patrick T. Brandt, Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the School of Social Science at the University of Texas at Dallas. \*\*Jay Ulfelder, Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University, is an American political scientist whose research interests include democratization, civil unrest, and violent conflict, April, 2011, “Economic Growth and Political Instability,” Social Science Research Network)

These statements anticipating political fallout from the global economic crisis of 2008–2010 reflect a widely held view that economic growth has rapid and profound effects on countries’ political stability. When economies grow at a healthy clip, citizens are presumed to be too busy and too content to engage in protest or rebellion, and governments are thought to be flush with revenues they can use to enhance their own stability by producing public goods or rewarding cronies, depending on the type of regime they inhabit. When growth slows, however, citizens and cronies alike are presumed to grow frustrated with their governments, and the leaders at the receiving end of that frustration are thought to lack the financial resources to respond effectively. The expected result is an increase in the risks of social unrest, civil war, coup attempts, and regime breakdown. Although it is pervasive, the assumption that countries’ economic growth rates strongly affect their political stability has not been subjected to a great deal of careful empirical analysis, and evidence from social science research to date does not unambiguously support it. Theoretical models of civil wars, coups d’etat, and transitions to and from democracy often specify slow economic growth as an important cause or catalyst of those events, but empirical studies on the effects of economic growth on these phenomena have produced mixed results. Meanwhile, the effects of economic growth on the occurrence or incidence of social unrest seem to have hardly been studied in recent years, as empirical analysis of contentious collective action has concentrated on political opportunity structures and dynamics of protest and repression. This paper helps fill that gap by rigorously re-examining the effects of short-term variations in economic growth on the occurrence of several forms of political instability in countries worldwide over the past few decades. In this paper, we do not seek to develop and test new theories of political instability. Instead, we aim to subject a hypothesis common to many prior theories of political instability to more careful empirical scrutiny. The goal is to provide a detailed empirical characterization of the relationship between economic growth and political instability in a broad sense. In effect, we describe the conventional wisdom as seen in the data. We do so with statistical models that use smoothing splines and multiple lags to allow for nonlinear and dynamic effects from economic growth on political stability. We also do so with an instrumented measure of growth that explicitly accounts for endogeneity in the relationship between political instability and economic growth. To our knowledge, ours is the first statistical study of this relationship to simultaneously address the possibility of nonlinearity and problems of endogeneity. As such, we believe this paper offers what is probably the most rigorous general evaluation of this argument to date. As the results show, some of our findings are surprising. Consistent with conventional assumptions, we find that social unrest and civil violence are more likely to occur and democratic regimes are more susceptible to coup attempts around periods of slow economic growth. At the same time, our analysis shows no significant relationship between variation in growth and the risk of civil-war onset, and results from our analysis of regime changes contradict the widely accepted claim that economic crises cause transitions from autocracy to democracy. While we would hardly pretend to have the last word on any of these relationships, our findings do suggest that the relationship between economic growth and political stability is neither as uniform nor as strong as the conventional wisdom(s) presume(s). We think these findings also help explain why the global recession of 2008–2010 has failed thus far to produce the wave of coups and regime failures that some observers had anticipated, in spite of the expected and apparent uptick in social unrest associated with the crisis.